Newcastle University e-prints

Date deposited: 5th August 2010

Version of file: Author, final

Peer Review Status: Peer reviewed

Citation for published item:

Shail A. [Reading the Cinematograph: Short Fiction and the Intermedial Spheres of Early Cinema](#).
Early Popular Visual Culture 2010,8 1 47-62.

Further information on publisher website:

<http://www.tandf.co.uk/>

Publishers copyright statement:

This article was originally published by Taylor & Francis, 2010 and can be seen (with permissions) from the URL below:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17460650903516002>

Always use definitive version when citing.

Use Policy:

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not for profit purposes provided that:

- A full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- A link is made to the metadata record in Newcastle E-prints
- The full text is not changed in any way.

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Robinson Library, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Newcastle upon Tyne.

NE1 7RU.

Tel. 0191 222 6000

Reading the Cinematograph:
Short Fiction and the Intermedial Spheres of Early Cinema

Andrew Shail

Newcastle University, a.e.shail@ncl.ac.uk

Biographical Note

Andrew Shail is Lecturer in Film at Newcastle University. He is co-author, with Robin Stoate, of a BFI Film Classic on *Back to the Future* (2010), editor of *Reading the Cinematograph* (University of Exeter Press, 2010), co-editor, with Laura Salisbury, of *Neurology & Modernity* (Palgrave, 2009) and co-editor, with Gillian Howie, of *Menstruation: A Cultural History* (Palgrave, 2005). He has completed a monograph on the place of cinema in generating literary modernism, and is currently working on the emergence of the figure of the 'picture personality' in Britain in 1911 and the 'discovery' of the purpose of menstruation during the 1880s.

Abstract

Appearances of cinema in fiction were numerous even in the earliest years. This article discusses the evidence about impressions of the new technology preserved in nine short stories written before 1905, all of which were first published in the UK, and all of which make cinema the fulcrum of the plot. It focuses on the popular profile that these dramatic structures show cinema to have possessed in these years of least agreement about its purposes and predilections, and suggests that this deeply embedded 'spontaneous intermediality' nonetheless awarded cinema a distinctive identity even before it achieved a media identity of its own in the ensuing years.

Keywords: early cinema, short story, intermediality

This article examines nine short stories, all published in the UK before 1905, which make significant mention of film.¹ Until the launch, in 1911, of both regular cinema columns in national newspapers and the popular film magazine, popular discourses on the cinematograph in the UK had no institutional home. Perceptions of the new entity have survived in newspaper and magazine articles, diary entries, letters, technical manuals, producers' catalogues, travel writing and cartoons, but they have also survived as fiction. The latter constitutes a largely untapped body of evidence about how the public consensus, of which their writers were voices, perceived the phenomenon of projected motion pictures on its arrival and during the years most marked by uncertainty about its purpose that we denote with the term 'early cinema'. Fiction's non-factual status may suggest that it is non-informative as a historical resource, but as an array of narratorial, causational, temporal, generic and intertextual statements (and as relations between these), a piece of fiction is capable of densely recording contemporary perceptions of the new technology's claims to a media profile.

The nine stories are:

1. Dagonet [George R. Sims], 'Our Detective Story', 24 January 1897. A husband hires a private detective to follow his wife while she travels in Spain. As the detective is unable to discover anything, the husband puts his suspicions behind him and, in the Autumn of the same year, takes his wife and business partner to the Alhambra variety theatre in Leicester Square. 'The Cinematographe' is amongst the acts there, and they see a series of travel films taken in Madrid in the Spring. One film includes a view of a public park, in the corner of which the wife and the business partner can be seen conducting a secret affair. A divorce case ensues, the Cinematographe appearing as chief witness.
2. Mrs Henry Mansergh [Jessie Mansergh née Bell], 'An Idyll of the Cinematographe', February 1898. Unsuccessful detective Mark Robson finds a new living soliciting commissions to secretly film people whom clients wish to see as if in the flesh. John and Daisy, a betrothed couple separated for fifteen years while John establishes himself in India, simultaneously commission

him to make films of each other, and the resulting films, by showing how each has aged, cause them to break off their engagement.

3. A.S. Appelbee, 'The Awful Story of Heley Croft', 20 May 1899. Aspley, a country doctor, is asked by Tommy Whyte to investigate his wife Margaret's apparent nervous disintegration. She will not confide in anyone and insists on sleeping alone. Even when she confides in Aspley that she is waking each night to see the writing on the wall from the Biblical Book of Daniel foretelling her death, Aspley can find nothing wrong with her to suggest that she is hallucinating, until he spends a night in the room and sees the same 'hallucination'. Working out some angles of reflection, he traces the source of the projection to a nearby house, and rumbles the agent of a spurned lover, who has been using a 'vision-plant', including a cinematograph, to try 'to frighten Margaret into her grave' (400).

4. Walter Herries Pollock, 'The Phantasmatograph', May 1899. The titular technology is presented as an improvement to the cinematograph that makes it capable of projecting thought. The 'inventor', Jean Marie de Sartorys, holds a small private showing, to an audience which includes the narrator's friend Peregrine, in which he creates three-dimensional projections of shockingly real dramatic and operatic scenes, in all of which he plays the protagonist. In the last scene, as Faust, and 'collected' by a hideous Mephistopheles, de Sartorys dies. No apparatus can be found, the implication being that demon was real, come to claim his payment for giving de Sartorys true psychic abilities.

5. G[eorge] E[dward] Farrow, 'The Cinematograph Train', February-June 1900. Bobbie, a young child, is taken to see the cinematograph by his older cousin Irene. Amazed by a train film, 'which attracted Bobbie's attention more than any of the others' (5), he decides to enter first the film and then the train and is taken off to Fairyland, where he meets another child, Evelyn, who has also imagined herself there while reading a fairy book. Their lengthy adventures end with Bobbie waking as the audience sings 'God Save the King'.

6. Raymond Rayne, 'Colonel Rankin's Advertisement', December 1901. While in London, American 'kinetograph' inventor and entrepreneur Colonel Cornelius P. Rankin pays down-on-his-luck Briton Walter Heslop to stage a mock assassination attempt on the German Emperor during the King's procession to the February 1901 State Opening of Parliament, Rankin expecting great profits from his film of the event. Heslop agrees but, restored to his former status in the interim, passes on the task to a man who happens to be an Italian anarchist named Brescia, who, using the window of the house on the parade route that Rankin has arranged for Heslop, attempts to shoot the Emperor for real, managing only to shoot Rankin's kinetograph, ruining the film, before the building is stormed and he shoots himself.

7. George R. Sims, 'The Side-Show Pianiste', 1902. When Major Dare, facing bankruptcy, commits suicide, his adult children Hubert, Margaret and Barbara are reduced out of 'society' and move to London, each obtaining low-paid work. Playing piano for a cinematograph side-show at Earl's Court, Barbara becomes the object of affection for Signor Luino, a fellow performer who claims to be a likewise fallen Italian count. After being laid off by the manager for his constant attentions to Barbara, Luino enters the side-show and shoots Barbara just as she is beginning to play. She survives, the publicity about the shooting reaching their father's estranged brother, who restores them to their former position and buys back the family home.

8. Rudyard Kipling, 'Mrs Bathurst', September 1904. On the chance meeting of three pairs of friends at a coastal railway siding near Cape Town, the conversation turns to cases of desertion from the Royal Navy. Petty Officer Pyecroft and Marines Sergeant Pritchard tell of the desertion of an officer called Vickery after the latter's chance viewing, at a travelling circus in Cape Town, of a cinematograph film of the Plymouth Express arriving at Paddington Station, in which he recognized Mrs Bathurst, the owner of a hotel near Auckland. Railway Inspector Hooper then reveals that he has recently discovered two corpses 'up-country' near the Zambezi, one of which matches Vickery's description.

9. A[rthur Henry] Sarsfield Ward [later Sax Rohmer], 'The Green Spider', October 1904. Finding that a giant green spider seemingly responsible for killing Professor Brayme-Skepley was in fact just an image projected by a cinematograph, the amateur detective Harborne discovers that the Professor faked his own death.

This article will look at the structures into which the cinematograph was fictionally distilled. What kind of evidence do these fictional structures constitute for the history of 'kine-attractography'? (Gaudreault 2006) Before it had a media identity as 'the cinema', 'the cinematograph' nonetheless had an identity as a technology. But how was this public profile constituted? *Which* of the many possible media pedigrees initially available to cinema do the stories evince? What predecessors did first-hand experience of the new technology invoke? And how did these produce a common definition of the technology's function, processes, habits and future? Do the stories evidence widespread perceptions of the new technology as a tool or outgrowth of existing media, or do they speak of distinct methodologies that would soon germinate its own existence as a media form?

Narrating Film

First, to *what* do these stories openly liken cinema? In Sims's January 1897 story, the detective tells of asking, while in Madrid, what a 'man with a photographic apparatus of some kind' is doing and being told by a bystander that 'he's taking views for the cinematographe'. Not only is the apparatus seen as a recorder of views in the vein of travel photography (as suggested by the Spring to Autumn delay between filming and projection being acceptable because Madrid won't have changed, the title 'A Tour of Spain', and the narrator calling the projection 'moving photographs'), 'the cinematographe' is a name for the variety theatre turn which encompasses the projecting of these views, *not* the mechanism for capturing them. When the wife is recognised, the narrator refers to her image as '[i]n the Cinematographe' rather than 'in the projection'. In Mansergh's February 1898 story, Robson's advertisement for his services boasts

‘Cinematographic Slides of private individuals taken without their knowledge’ (363), and the projection for John in India is a ‘magic-lantern exhibition’, set up by a local Calcutta photographer. Robson’s commission by both lovers is also dependent on them understanding film to be superior to the ‘present-day ... vignette’, the portrait photograph for which a subject sits as for a painting, that John has of Daisy, suggesting a perception of the cinematograph, by Mansergh, as simply a *lot* of instantaneous photographs (364).

In Appelbee’s May 1899 story, the cinematograph is just one of a number of optical apparatuses – ‘an electric light, a cinematograph of beautiful construction, and a large mirror, hung on the stable wall’ – used together to create an image on the wall of a particular room inside a building some distance from the building containing the cinematograph (400). The ex-lover’s English agent has even made allowances for producing the image if Margaret closes her white window blinds. This primacy of the logistics of projection and reflection implies that the cinematograph’s closest perceived affinity was with those stage magic apparatuses that employed mirrors and glass to reflect light in order to achieve an illusion of the presence or absence of an object. The fact that the projected image is circular also evokes the magic lantern, as does the fact that the ‘vision plant’ has the common magic lantern function of fading up and down. In Pollock’s May 1899 story, the ‘phantasmatograph’ is advertised as if it is a mechanism, Peregrine receiving a programme that reads ‘Jean Marie de Sartorys ... has the honour to announce a trial performance of his “phantasmatograph” at 211 Black Street, Mayfair, at ten o’clock tomorrow evening’ (63). But rather than a technology passed off as a real séance, this is a real séance passed off as a technology, implying a common equation between the two. The cinematograph of this story is the need to believe in the presence of an apparatus. The drawing room is ‘draped heavily with black velvet, exactly, as you may remember, Buatier de Kolta’s stage used to be draped at the Egyptian Hall; but, as I see your surmise, *not*, to the best of my lodged belief, for the same reason’: i.e. while stage-managed like a séance and like the magic shows of the illusionist Joseph Buatier, it is actually hiding no apparatus (63). That a projection of three-dimensional bodies in a

darkened space to people with heightened perceptual attentiveness, given to a small audience (only four), including ‘a hard-headed, sceptical man of science’, and featuring ‘a breath of coldest air rush[ing] through the room like a very lightning of frost’ on the conclusion of one scene can all be believably passed off by this character as the function of a mechanism suggest a very close affinity in popular perception between the cinematograph and the séance (63, 66). Like magic, the trick is just beyond the abilities of the audience to guess, but, closer to the séance, the ‘trick’ is demonstrated as if real. This was also by no means an outlandish identification at the time. The *British Journal of Photography*’s reviewer of the press showing of the Lumière Cinématographe at the Polytechnic on the 20 February 1896 called the show a ‘séance’ (Anon., 6 March 1896), and a July 1897 reporter described a cinematograph operator giving four shows in one day as “giving four séances” (Dickman, 4).

One of Farrow’s 1900 characters explains that ‘the cinematograph pictures are very like those of the magic lantern, with the exception that in the former case the figures in the pictures all move in the most natural manner possible – exactly as though they were alive’ (5). Understood not as an enhanced photograph but as an illusion of reality all the more illusory for closely approximating real movement, the new technology is indeed very like the magic lantern. In Rayne’s December 1901 story, by contrast, the Colonel imagines the ‘myriad of little photographs which would reproduce the scene to admiring audiences’ (774): for him film is a prosthetic version of sight. Parliament Street certainly lacks sufficient space, even for those who *are* there, to be able to see the procession. The pavements of Parliament Street become ‘so crowded as to be almost impassable’ (771). People climb ‘on abutments, on roofs, and even on the chimney-stacks’ (772). Reflecting the importance of the news event film to music hall cinematograph items and town hall cinematograph shows at the time, it suggests that film’s immediate intermedial neighbour was journalism, a dematerialising of the communicating language in the name of ‘seeing at a distance’. In strict contrast, in Sims’s 1902 story, however,

it's *the* entertainment ('of the cinematograph order') at the Earl's Court side-show, the technology subordinated to its showmanship (76).

For Kipling in 1904 the cinematograph is 'Home and Friends for a Tickey' (i.e. a threepenny piece), a show in Phyllis's travelling Circus seen by British ex-patriots in southern Africa. Pyecroft refers to the screen as a 'big magic-lantern sheet' (382). Echoing Farrow's narrator, Pyecroft recounts to Hooper that '[y]ou 'eard a little dynamolike buzzin', but the pictures were the real thing – alive an' movin' (381-2).' The fact that Hooper feels it necessary to state that 'they are taken from the very thing itself – you see', suggests that for Kipling, as for Farrow, a perceived origin in the hand-drawn animations of optical toys was so strong as to necessitate an assurance that the originals are not hand-drawn (382). In Ward's October 1904 story, the device that the amateur detective discovers is referred to as both a 'magic-lantern ... [w]ith cinematograph attachment' *and* simply 'the cinematograph' (435), this interchangability suggesting that film was understood as a mere novelty in lantern practice. The detective also describes how the Professor seems to have taken care to eliminate a tell-tale circle in projection by first filming the spider on a black ground, again assuming the circular magic lantern aspect rather than the square cinematograph aspect (435).

Of the nine short stories, five state or cite the perception that the cinematograph is the relative of the magic lantern (Mansergh, Appelbee, Farrow, Kipling and Ward), although only three include a statement that it more or less *is* the magic lantern (Mansergh, Farrow and Ward). In his history of screen practice (his preferred term over 'pre-cinema'), Charles Musser writes that 'cinema appears as a continuation and transformation of magic-lantern traditions in which showmen displayed images on a screen, accompanying them with voice, music, and sound effects', and that, in the case of America, this was frequently articulated between 1896 and 1908 (15). He also points out that this tradition had already expanded to include experiments combining lantern projection, photographs and 'persistence of vision' optical toys to produce a moving photographic image, even *before* instantaneous photography was developed, during the

1870s, to the point at which shutter speeds and emulsion sensitivities permitted the brief exposure required to actually take photographs of such rapidly moving subjects as dancers, and before the introduction of the celluloid film strip to still photography (for example, Henry Renno Heyl's 1870 'phasmatrope' (Musser, 45-7)).

Spontaneous Intermediality

However, the relative frequency of allusions to the magic lantern in these UK stories does not necessarily mean it provided the dominant perception of the cinematograph's nearest relative, as one way of explaining its novelty to the unaware was to state that it added projection – for which the magic lantern was a widespread cipher – to the already familiar kinetoscope, or even earlier 'persistence of vision'-based optical toys. The cinematograph's first reviewer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* in February 1896 stated that 'some French inventors ... have sufficiently tamed the kinetoscope to compel it to exhibit its wonders on the sheet of a magic lantern' (Anon. 21 February 1896). 'Magic lantern' was merely one of several codes that could be used to denote 'projection'. One 1904 account described the screen used in a cinematograph showing as a 'stereopticon screen' (Doubleday, 118), using 'stereopticon', as was common at the time, to mean a photographic lantern slide projector (a nickname which came about because the photographic images were often derived from one half of a stereopticon pair (Musser, 30)). The fact that none of these explicit descriptions of the cinematograph in the short stories cite the stereopticon in describing the projected nature of cinematographic images could nonetheless be taken as evidence that the greatest perceived continuity was with the magic lantern, with its highly sophisticated sequential image practice of the 1890s, and not, for example, movement-based optical toys. But unlike the March 1896 newspaper article that referred to the cinematograph as 'an ordinary magic lantern supplied with an electric light' (Anon. 6 March 1896), even the stories that *do* include a character or narrator's statement that it is more or less the magic lantern undercut this with another genealogy.

In Mansergh's February 1898 short story, the cinematograph is opposed to the vignette photograph not just as an instantaneous photograph, capable of showing the body un-posed, but as fulfilling instantaneous photography's promise to enable the production of an image that bypasses the right of the imaged to vet that image. The idea that the cinematograph realised the human body 'unprepared' was expressed as early as May 1897, when Cecil Hepworth reported, on a proposal by R.W. Paul, to undertake portrait photography using film:

Nine out of every ten persons who go to have their portraits taken, complain – inwardly, if the be wise, otherwise aloud – that the likeness is by no means a flattering one. If this be so with ordinary portraiture, when all the beauty that careful lighting can bestow has been bestowed, and after the artfully aiding retoucher has been at her secret work, what will it be when we “see ourselves as ithers see us.” (7 May 1897, 374)

Hepworth treated the idea of making a small flipbook version of an 'animated portrait' as a valid wing of the industry (28 May 1897, 434). Indeed, in the form of the Filoscope, a cheap flipbook format for displaying images taken with the cinematograph, a single-user, non-projecting, domestic profile for film continued, and the single-user genealogy cited by Mansergh suggests that private use was still a substantial part of cinema's perceived identity. The Kammatograph, marketed in early 1901 and based on a wheel plate rather than a strip of celluloid film, aimed 'to bring the making and the projection of “animated photographs” within the grasp of the amateur' (Anon., 21 February 1902). Nonetheless Hepworth's quotation, taken from Robert Burns's 'To a Louse: On Seeing One on a Lady's Bonnet at Church' (1786) ('O wad some Pow'r the giftie gie us / To *see oursels as ithers see us!*' (132, emphasis in original)) appeared in the boosting of local films at the turn of the century (see Bottomore, 34), and was still around as an account of cinema as late as a comment in a popular British film magazine in November 1916:

To the film actress, whose facial expressions must be schooled to express her everyday emotion, the time spent before her mirror is of the utmost importance. To see herself as others see her in every mood and phase is absolutely essential to successful character-portrayal, and I have yet to meet the actress who does not indulge in this critical self-contemplation. ... The reflection in the mirror during the making of your toilet is not you as other people see you: it is not you as you are at work or pleasure – animated, interested, and expressive. You have no idea of the frown that disfigures you when you are worried neither do you know how brilliant your eyes be when you are happy and bright. (Movie Margerie, 113)

In Mansergh's story the idea of an image of oneself that is so unfamiliar as to be unrecognisable appears in John's initial failure to recognise Daisy when she enters the frame. Daisy even suspects the film of John to be a 'counterfeit presentment of her lover' (366). Notably, Mansergh avoids explaining how the films are obtained without the knowledge of either fiancée, thus implying that, for her, the cinematograph was a simple widening of the range of media in which the object was to render an image outside of a contract between seer and a seen, where one's *image* (the seeing of a person still somewhat under the control of the person seen) becomes a *view* (the seeing of a person outside of the control of the person seen). The possibility of being an invisible seer is this story's structuring motif; watching the film, 'John Webb lay back in his chair and stared at his *fiancée*, and his *fiancée* went on with her work in methodical unconsciousness' (365). This interpretation of the 'view' linked cinema to post-Renaissance oil painting and engraving, in which key moments of a larger movement were dramatised so as to create an impression of a duration and so imply that the viewer was watching a scene to which they were invisible. In addition, by featuring the cinematograph as the medium for an, albeit unaware, two-way exchange of communications, this story suggests that, on the basis of the circulation of

filmed ‘views’ around the European empires, another perceived close relative of the cinematograph was the telegraph, 1898 also being the year that H.G. Wells, newly exposed to the cinematograph, imagined the television when writing *When the Sleeper Wakes* (first serialized in *The Graphic*, 7 January – 6 May 1899) (Wells, 1994, 106).²

Appelbee’s May 1899 story is likewise rooted in another genealogy, one that gave rise to a common sense that the cinematic image was neurologically traumatic. A trip to the nineteenth century spa town of Malvern (radically enlarged by the ‘discovery’ of the hydrotherapeutic benefits for disorders being newly associated with neurological pathologies, by such Victorian medical practitioners as James Manby Gully and James Wilson, who set up a clinic there in 1842 (see, for example, Lane 1846)) is curative for Margaret in the story merely because going there removes her from the house in Fensham, but it is nonetheless seen by her contemporaries as precisely the right palliative for the disorder which viewing the cinematographic time-segment has induced. The first time Aspley sees her, ‘[s]he had the pallor and heavy expression of sleeplessness, and sat in a listless attitude’, and the second time she has ‘just the air of a woman thoroughly run down’ (397). In a classic state of nervous agitation, she is both tired and anxious, Aspley only getting her story out of her after he ‘soothed and comforted her gently’ (398). Aspley refers to the damaging effects on her health and appearance of her ‘delicately strung nerves and artistic temperament’ (399). Margaret understands her constitution to be so different from that of her husband that he would be unable to see the hand, commenting that ‘I had an indefinable sense ... that a warning had been vouchsafed to me that he would be unable to perceive with his different and rather unbelieving constitution’ (398). Aspley’s familiarity with the idea that ‘disordered cerebrations’ are the origin of supposedly occult occurrences indicates that when he finds the reverse to be the case he is finding film to be at the root of neurological disorder (399). This nervous trauma is described as a function not merely of the content of the image but of the cinematograph in general: Aspley observes that, on the night he took Margaret’s place, ‘[t]he room was filled with an instantaneous flash of white light, which came and went in a second,

leaving everything totally dark. I started up and waited breathless. The flash appeared and vanished a second time, as before. My brain seemed stirred to abnormal activity' (399). This association between the cinematograph and the operation of the nerves derived from the fact that both nerve-conduction and the reception of an instant in time by the human eye were seen as occurring so briefly as to be beneath the threshold of human perception – nerve conduction seemed instantaneous and instants blended into movement. This implies, in turn, that cinema still appeared to inhere within the rapid-exposure photographic practice that had been popularly revealing these instants of time since the 1880s.

<p>SPECIAL ATTRACTIONS.</p> <hr/> <p>THE CRYSTAL PROMENADE GARDENS</p> <p>OPEN FOR THE SEASON.</p> <p>Magnificent Display of RHODODENDRONS</p> <p>Thousands upon Thousands of Crystals.</p> <p>CHARMING ILLUMINATIONS.</p> <hr/> <p>IN THE CRYSTAL GARDENS.</p> <p>THE 'RÖNTGEN' X RAYS,</p> <p>THE NEW PHOTOGRAPHY.</p> <p>FREQUENT SEANCES.</p> <p><i>"To see ourselves as others see us."—BURNS.</i></p> <p>See the Latest Experiment:</p> <p>THE CRYPTOSCOPE.</p> <hr/> <p>ON THE BALCONY.</p> <p>GALLERY OF ILLUSIONS,</p> <p>INCLUDING</p> <p>"THE FLYING LADY."</p>	<p>IN THE PALMARIUM.</p> <p>THE ELECTROPHONE,</p> <p>Round the London Theatres in 15 Minutes.</p> <hr/> <p>IN THE PALMARIUM.</p> <p>THE</p> <p>THEATROGRAPHE</p> <p>(PAUL'S)</p> <p>ANIMATED PICTURES,</p> <p>IN BRILLIANT COLOURS.</p> <p>The most wonderful Scientific Marvel of the Age.</p> <p>THE SAME AS NOW BEING SHOWN AT THE ALHAMBRA.</p> <hr/> <p>MARVELLOUS MOVING PICTURES FROM REAL LIFE.</p> <p>ADMISSION SIXPENCE.</p> <hr/> <p>IN THE PALMARIUM.</p> <p>THEATRE ROYAL, RICHARDSON,</p> <p>"MERRY MACBETH"</p> <p>Macbeth - WHIMSICAL WALKER.</p> <hr/> <p>Oscar Carre's Royal Dutch Band,</p> <p>Conductor - - - Mr. C. Weichmann.</p> <p>COMBINED WITH</p> <p>Olympia Orchestral Band,</p> <p>Conductor, Meyer Van Praag.</p> <p>Will play in the Arena during the Performance.</p>
---	--

Figure 1: Programme for the Olympia, Addison Rd., Kensington, 6 June 1896, featuring both 'Animated Pictures' courtesy of R.W. Paul's Theatrographe and X-ray photography.

Courtesy of University of Exeter Library (Bill Douglas Centre).

Terry Castle points out that the emergence of the phantasmagoria at the end of the eighteenth century was a consequence of the emergence of the belief that any ghost was ‘in the mind’: an ‘apparition’ of a dead person was a re-projection of a remembered sight of that person, on the retina, by a disordered brain. Visual culture literalised this new conception of ‘seeing things’, she argues, and continued to manifest in the double-exposure ghost photographs of the late nineteenth century, in which the ‘ghosts’ would often be exposed so as to be in some way linked with the real person’s head (52-4). Pollock’s de Sartorys likewise ‘sees things’ around him, literalised, as is seen to be appropriate, by a hypothetical piece of technology. The ‘phantasmatograph’, described as the improved cinematograph method of ‘photographing or “Kodaking” thought’ (62), is also understood as much like x-ray photography – which had begun to feature on variety bills at the same time as the cinematograph (see Fig. 1), and which constituted a public entertainment for roughly 16 months – specifically in its identity as ‘the photography of the invisible’ (see, for example, Swinton, June 1896). The idea of a hypothetical cinematograph improved to make mental images visible is based on a cinematograph perceived as showing in the everyday visual field that which cannot normally be seen, making time visible as the variation of light impacts in the same way that x-ray photography made more of the electromagnetic spectrum visible by making photographic plates sensitive to it.³ The ‘phantasmatograph’ is the expected improvement of film to photograph further categories of invisible activity: in this instance de Sartorys’s own neurological activity, capable of being made visible given the right medium. Indeed, in February 1896 one journalist gave an account, under the title ‘Can Thought be Photographed’, of a ‘seance’ in which he produced photographic negatives of a vivid recalled memory of a dead child, explaining that this provided evidence that ‘astral’ bodies were just human thoughts manifesting as electrical ‘rays’ that could, as x-ray photography was widely demonstrating at the time, influence such sensitive surfaces as photographic plates.⁴ Just as photographic plates were often, and had for some time been, understood as capable of perceiving certain inputs that the naked eye was insensitive to (this

being one of the more believing explanations for ghost photographs, for example),⁵ one journalist wrote in September 1896 that in the military tournament films in Birt Acres's Kineopticon programme, 'the action is shown with much better effect than the actual manoeuvres, the clouds of smoke being more susceptible to the lens than to the eye' (Anon., 3 September 1896). Even in May 1909 a journalist used the phrase 'Kinematographing the Invisible' to refer to a German invention which, able to shoot 5,000 frames a second, was being used to film moving bullets (Anon., 20 May 1909). Neither was the cinematograph's séance genealogy incompatible with its identity as a continuation of the various 'photographies of the invisible'. The June 1896 Kensington Olympia programme reproduced in Fig. 1 listed 'frequent seances' of 'The 'Röntgen' X Rays'.

Rayne's December 1901 short story was the first to describe the cinematograph eliciting a pro-filmic scene, a fictional performance that is fictional independently of the camera but which would not exist without the camera. Fictionalising via manipulating the camera or via manipulating the film gives way in this story to fictionalising via orchestrating that which the camera records, suggesting that, by 1901, this had recently been incorporated into cinema's remit. The presence of the camera is the reason for the action, rather than the other way round, its presence constituting such a force that, like a protagonist in the story, it participates in a drama equal to the drama it normally represents, getting 'shot'. Although the covert lie of the séance may be the basis of this instance of film fakery, the absence of this trope before 1901 suggests that the séance had recently been supplemented by affinities with intrinsically fictional media, a significant leap for film given that its fictionality was usually limited to filming scenes that were already fictional. Tom Gunning observes, for example, that fictionality in cinema before 1906 was usually 'restricted to gags, vaudeville numbers or recreations' (58-9).

Just as Rayne's story connotes a cinematograph that was becoming associable with aspects of the status of fiction, in Pollock's story the projection of scenes from Shakespeare's plays *Julius Caesar* and *Hamlet*, Scott's novel *Waverley* and Gounod's opera *Faust* suggests that the implicit

cinematograph of the story reflects a real technology already being imagined within a tradition of lantern projections which since the 1850s had been using photography rather than hand-painted slides as illustrations in nonetheless fictional storytelling. However, this authoring may mean that both stories likened film not to photographic sequential narratives or to drama, opera or literary fiction, but to magic. Joe Kember has recently argued that, well before cinema's reinvention, in c.1908, as an intrinsically fictional medium, a germinal form of precisely the cultural tradition of fiction existed in cinema because it drew on the underpinning logic of stage magic (see Kember 2009). The basic contract of magic, he argues, is not an attempt to deceive but an invitation to overcome the discrepancy between the audience's and the conjurer's knowledge of how the illusion is performed, an invitation to marvel at the difficulty of solving a puzzle rather than to believe in the supernatural. This was strongly iterated by the attempts of celebrity magicians at the turn of the century to expose spirit mediums as illusionists with fraudulent claims to the supernatural (often by duplicating and describing their 'tricks'). As Max Beerbohm wrote in 1911, '[t]he true conjurer finds his guerdon in the consciousness of the work done perfectly and for its own sake. Lucre and applause are not necessary to him. If he were set down, with the materials of his art, on a desert island, he would yet be quite happy. He would not cease to produce the barber's-pole from his mouth. To the indifferent winds he would still speak his patter' (15-16). The conjurer's 'art' does not need an audience, as his 'tricks' do not, unlike those of the medium, masquerade as realities. An open lie, the magic illusions is an elementary statement, and so contains the basic aspect of pre-modernist fiction.

While the hypothetical cinematograph of Pollock's story is somewhat distanced from magic (by the séance/x-ray genealogy, the absence of a challenge to its spectators to guess where the apparatus behind the trick was hidden, and by Peregrine's observation that, unlike the magic performances he has seen at the Egyptian Hall, 'there was no raised stage, and ... not a hand's-breadth between the drapery and the walls' (63)), there is also evidence in Pollock's story that the cinematograph as the 'lie not intended to deceive' of stage magic is present too. De Sartorys's

projections are not illustrations for a pre-existing spoken lecture but, like fiction, expressions of a mind, statements. Although neither Pollock nor Rayne cite the cinematograph as fiction in the full-blown sense of a text that testifies to and is observed by the portable public privacy of the reading self, they anticipate the idea of the cinematographic performance as fully synthesised that became an orthodoxy with the development of editing patterns for describing internality after 1906 (see Shail 2006).

However, a suggestion that the event staged for the cinematograph was by this point understood to be *somewhat* incompatible with the profile of a lie – either open or concealed – lies in Pollock and Rayne’s shared transformation of ‘faked’ events into real ones: de Sartorys’s duplication of Faust’s death means his own death, and Rankin’s planned ‘assassination’ becomes a real assassination attempt. This would seem to anticipate the later account of cinema as occasioning performance that was so high-expenditure that everything about it was basically real – from a speeding train deliberately de-railed for an aftermath scene to an 85-foot dive from a high wire into the sea by Annette Kellerman (Anon. 15 August 1914 and Anon. 10-17 November 1917) – that commenced around 1910. The unstable position between witness and actant which the kinetograph occupies in Rayne’s story (getting shot like a character) suggests that it was already imagined as sufficiently powerful to initiate a real event in the first place. This in turn suggests that by the end of 1901 it was possible to envision mechanical reproducibility endowing a film industry with astronomical spending power. It is, after all, the mass-reproducibility of the end product that has made the Colonel rich enough to pay Heslop £300, equivalent to a payment of almost £130,000 in 2008, to undertake the pretend assassination (Officer 2009).

However, another explanation of the inability of the cinematograph to lie in these two stories is the presence of a further distinct genealogy – photography. This is not to argue that this is how photography was received – as photographic faking processes were familiar by the end of the nineteenth century – but that photography’s own identity was based on a line of scientific

inquiry that attempted to exclude the human altogether. Concurrent with the rise of the account of afferent nervous impulses as electrical stimuli that arose at the end of the eighteenth century, the turn to the human as an object of knowledge (see Foucault, 30) created a crisis amongst the rational project and impulse to know the world, as the knowing mind was discovered to be a manipulable substance that was merely part of that world (see Delmas 2007). Unlike the phantasmagoria, panorama and *trompe l'oeil* painting, which employed the mediating properties of the senses to openly create an impression of surroundings that were *not* there (Mannoni 144), photography derived from the newly-felt imperative to bypass the senses and create an image of what *was* there but, because of the mediating properties of perception, was normally either not seen or not noticed. It derived from the dual notion that while it was worthwhile to study the human, the human was the least capable of undertaking this study. One journalist wrote that one of Muybridge's 1884 'automatic electro-photographic' images, of a tiger attacking its prey, proved the traditional representation of a tiger attached to the back of its victim incorrect by showing that its feet hardly leave the ground, 'upon the unimpeachable testimony of the sun' (Anon., 15 November 1885). In the 1890s it was common to refer to a photographer as "the maker of sun pictures" (Anon., 10 January 1896, 17). This was extended to the cinematograph. When George R Sims, at the time established as a literary observer of industrialised London, explained why he titled his 1902 short story collection *Biographs of Babylon: Life-Pictures of London's Moving Scenes*, he invoked the technology as 'nature's own record': 'They are all taken from life. As they happened so you will see them reproduce themselves' (viii). Although this was a normal short story collection, in trying to establish it as informed by his own ethnography, Sims indicated what, for him, had the best identity as *anathema* to mediation of any kind: the 'Biographs' 'reproduce themselves'.

In Sims's own 1902 short story, the cinematograph inhabits the distinctly working-class world into which Barbara Dare falls when ejected from society, property and fortune: the manager of the side-show perceives that she is 'quite unused to the show business' (84). While Sims asserts

the dignity of 'the show business' by having the manager protect Barbara, so indicating that she is in error to think that the unwanted attentions of Luino were part of her new life, *after* Luino shoots her the venue features the shooting on its contents bills, with 'vivid details and every picturesque invention' (87). While she recovers, her siblings are 'besieged by "interviewers"', their shameful life story of paternal suicide and ruin somehow becoming known and 'paragraphed all over the country' (87). The cinematograph's prime characteristic is dramatised by its participation in a total working-class publicness that replaces the privateness of their previous life. Similarly, in Ward's October 1904 the trail of devastation and gore left by the 'spider' echoes Sims's association between the cinematograph and orgiastic violence, the fulfilment of, as Arnold Bennett put it in describing the fairground, 'the furious pleasure of the people' (81-2), both stories thus indicating the cinematograph's perceived rootedness, by 1904, in an entertainment practice in which images of violent death, prize-fights, freakery and the uncanniness of the projected image all went hand-in-hand.

In Farrow's 1900 story, in such instances as Bobbie's impression that the train, when it appears in the distance, is 'a tiny little train' (5), the cinematograph appears as the successor of a viewing mode in which the alteration of the size of an object is seen not as a function of an alteration in point of view, but as a mutation of objects, as in the simple size-manipulation that had been achieved since the late eighteenth century by moving a magic lantern, often projecting from behind a screen, closer to or further from that screen. Hence Bobbie's thoughts of the train as anthropomorphised – 'puffing and snorting' – and as fake in spite of its verisimilitude – 'just like a real train' and 'delightfully natural' (6). Indeed, the manifest fakeness of the exhibition is also suggested by the principle that it is only those who have a fancy for believing in what they know to be fanciful who can transport themselves onto the train. In 1900 L Frank Baum introduced his *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* by citing the idea that 'every healthy youngster has a wholesome and instinctive love for stories fantastic, marvelous and manifestly unreal' (1). Bobbie enters the image via his childish impulsiveness: 'suddenly – without stopping to think whether it

were right or wrong – he made up his mind that he would go and see for himself if the doors of the carriages opened and shut’ (6). Even though other children get themselves into the train without even seeing the film, suggesting that the cinematograph in some way *compels* belief through its high verifiability, even Bobbie treats the cinematograph train as a palpable illusion which he nonetheless indulges because of his childish fancy for the fantastic. This suggests the cinematograph’s roots in optics, which, although it included the magic lantern, also included a range of devices from the camera obscura to the ghost trick, all with their openly-offered scientific explanations, and all of which presented a situation in which one was not forced to suspend one’s disbelief but could choose to do it anyway. Farrow’s story and Baum’s remark also evidence the felt closeness – if the cinematograph was conceived as remotely fictional, which the image of the willing suspension of disbelief implies – to the literary fairy tale since the Brothers Grimm and the nonsense story since Lewis Carroll.

In strict contrast, Ward’s October 1904 short story describes the cinematograph as able to generate images that look absolutely real *even* when they are images of an impossible object: here the giant green spider. Ward shares Appelbee’s regard for the cinematograph as a technology that can seamlessly substitute part of the visual field and, as in magic, induce its viewers to swear that they have seen something that did not happen, with the enormity of the spider, which is a result of projecting the image at a greater distance than the distance from which it was photographed, being taken by the porter as the spider’s actual size: ‘a kind of green spider – only with a body twice the size of a football!’ (430). This suggests that the ‘palpable illusion’ profile of cinema was accompanied by an equally strong profile in which its illusions were self-effacing. The first advertisements for the Lumière Cinématographe’s arrival in Britain in February 1896 asserted that it was ‘[t]he most perfect illusion of living actuality; already the talk of London’ (Anon., 28 February 1896). One August 1897 journalist commented that, in a film taken from the back of a moving train, the impression was given that the viewer was moving away from the picture, adding that ‘the illusion is perfect’ (Anon., 1 August 1897). Ward contrasts with Farrow in his

interpretation of the term 'illusion', invoking illusion not as a heightening of the image's impossibility but as seamless merging with human sight. This differing 'illusionist' identity is partly linked to the imperial sense that the seemingly impossible is merely that which has not yet been discovered, but it also represents a perceived origin for the cinematograph in such attempts to replicate the optics of the eye as the photographic stereoscopic pair, a duplication of the physics of binocular parallax.

Finding Cinema

These stories also attest that certain unique aspects of film were apparent even in these years of its pre-media existence. In Sims's January 1897 story, when 'the cinematographe' is produced in court, this time the narrator states that 'the scene was enacted amid the suppressed tittering of the junior Bar'. This implies that the second screening was seen to be a re-enacting of a previously produced performance, while it can not possibly have this status if it also qualifies as evidence. Cinema's combination of the past tense (of the recorded reality in relation to the temporality of viewing) and the present tense (it is experienced in real time) seems to have manifested as a distinct quality to its viewers as early as the end of 1896. Likewise, in Mansergh's February 1898 story, while the cinematograph is 'mere' instantaneous photography, its superior ability to deliver the present implies that it was separated from the instant pastness of even the instantaneous still photograph. This presentness is iterated by John's sense, when he sees the contemporary Daisy, that '[f]rom out the magic sheet she stared at him' (365). This presentness is also emulated by the description of Daisy and her friend Maria watching the film:

The days of John Webb's bachelorhood were drawing to a close, and he set ever-increasing store upon those long lazy evenings, when he could loll at ease, undisturbed by feminine prejudice. It was not precisely the moment he would have

chosen, however, in which to make his appearance before two maiden ladies at home, who had spent their lives in a narrow and rigid environment. (366)

An element of the increasing representability of time in the era of the punch-card, the pocket watch, telegraphy, time-and-motion studies and the emergence of the notion of entropy, the cinematograph nonetheless archived, as Mary Ann Doane writes, ‘the experience of presence’ (23).

In addition, when seeing the cinematograph for what is almost certainly intended to be the first time, John’s thoughts are given in free direct discourse: ‘The chintz-covered chairs and the maidenhair ferns under the glass domes were there all complete, not a detail was changed, from the mantelpiece to the case of stuffed birds on the chiffonier. How was it possible for furniture to stand so still while the world moved so fast?’ (364) This viewing experience suggests that film highly exaggerated the contrast between moving mechanisms (bodies, waves, trams) and their ground, transforming matter into the occurrence or absence of movement. Mrs Bathurst is likewise recognised by her walk rather than her face, again referencing the cinematograph as a language solely of movement.

An impression of unrivalled verisimilitude is preserved in Mansergh’s February 1898 story as completeness: John watches Daisy undertaking actions that don’t need her to be speaking, and vice versa. Similarly, in Pollock’s May 1899 short story, a ‘phantasmatograph’ projection of part of Act 5 of Charles Gounod’s *Faust* (1859) has ‘all the familiar stage-arrangements as to details, but with what a difference in the whole effect! – the difference between the most perfected illusion and the most damning reality’ (67). But while the common trope of the cinematograph allowing its viewers to see an important event that they would otherwise have missed (appearing in three of the nine stories in total) could be taken as evidence that Sims’s January 1897 story is the first record of a popular perception of cinema as an unrivalled level of representational achievement, the underpinning logic of Sims’s story suggests the reverse. The ‘witness to a crime’

scenario, by synthesising one of very few situations in which the visual, as constituted by the cinematograph, provided evidence of *anything* – i.e. when a massive amount of other information is already known (such as precise information of who was where and when) – actually suggests that, in the majority of cases, what would have been seen by the cinematograph's audiences was *desperately* without meaning, a four-dimensional concentration of the plethora of detail rendered by still photography. With no knowledge of the history of the places and people in the films, audiences were confronted with visual detail that emulated their everyday visual fields but which, unlike everyday visual fields, told them *nothing*. Vickery's obsessive daily visits to Phyllis's Circus just to see the four minutes of cinematograph films, followed by his two and a half hour tours of the bars in Cape Town 'at an average speed of eighteen knots on the measured mile' (382), reflects his struggle over a conundrum which is never explained, but this deliberate obfuscation may be Kipling alluding to the fascination that the cinematograph's viewers felt over its explicit statement of incompleteness, its implicit notion that the world is composed of visual fields but that most of them must be ignored for their banality.

In Mansergh's February 1898 story, a notable final paragraph makes clear that the now unattached forty year-olds have only unhappiness to look forward to, while the detective who organised the secret filmings 'grows fat and flourishes' (368), implying that finding one's lover growing old is a normal part of life that the two would have handled, and that the cinematograph has frustrated a very normal process. This suggests that film asserted itself as 'sight out of place'. Indeed, in 'Mrs Bathurst', a story about unanticipated linkages between three sets of friends (Hooper-narrator, narrator-Pyecroft and Pyecroft-Pritchard), where it is only because of these new linkages formed in the railway siding, that the question of what happened to Vickery is answered, the similarly unanticipated linkages of the 'sight out of place' of the cinematograph are preserved. This is also implied by Pyecroft's preamble to his mention of the cinematograph: 'I used to think seein' and hearin' was the only regulation means of ascertainin' facts; but as we get older, we get more accommodatin'. The cylinders work easier, I suppose' (381). Lastly, in an

echo of Mansergh's narrative, the stories told by the seamen, about how common it is for the seamen to fall for women when it is a bad idea, lay the basis for Kipling's implication that while most can handle this difficult life situation (the story of Vickery is just the last and longest of a series of other stories about the trouble women cause the service), the new-found ability to view visual fields to which one is not normally privy has messed it up.

These stories demonstrate a significant variety of choice for synthesising a profile for cinema in the years when a popular consensus was yet to exist. Part of a widespread endeavour to make sense of a new component of the cultural terrain, they suggest that before cinema achieved an identity as a media institution, and when it was still 'animated pictures', film already possessed a degree of uniqueness, not just because of its insubordination but because of the specific mixture of existing – and contrasting – media profiles from which it borrowed.

References

- Anon. 15 November 1885. No Title. *New York Times*.
- Anon. 10 January 1896. Notes and News. *Amateur Photographer* 23, no. 588: 17-19.
- Anon. 17 January 1896. Notes and News. *Amateur Photographer* 23, no. 589: 33-5.
- Anon. 31 January 1896. Photography of the Invisible – a Note Illustrative, Explanatory and Historical. *Amateur Photographer* 23, no. 591: 86.
- Anon. 21 February 1896. The Cinematograph. *Pall Mall Gazette* 62, no. 9644: 9.
- Anon. 28 February 1896. The Cinematograph. *Pall Mall Gazette* 62, no. 9647: 6.
- Anon. 6 March 1896. No title. *British Journal of Photography* 43: supplement 17.
- Anon. 3 September 1896. No Title. *Cardiff Evening Express*.
- Anon. 26 February 1897. Notes and News. *Amateur Photographer* 25, no. 647: 161-3.
- Anon. 1 August 1897. No Title. *Sunday People*.
- Anon. 21 February 1902. New Apparatus, Etc. *British Journal of Photography* 49 no. 2181: 153.

- Anon. 20 May 1909. Kinematographing the Invisible. *Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly* 5, no. 106: 71.
- Anon. 15 August 1914. Screen Gossip. *Pictures and the Picturegoer* 6, no. 26: 577.
- Anon. 10-17 November 1917. Flirting with Death: Annette Kellerman's Latest Dive for Pictures. *Pictures and Picturegoer* 13, no. 196: 522.
- Appelbee, A.S. 20 May 1899, The Awful Story of Heley Croft. *Chambers's Journal* 2, no. 77: 397-400.
- Baum, L.F. 1900. *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. London: G.M. Hill.
- Bennett, A. [1908] 1954. *The Old Wives' Tale*. London: Penguin.
- Beerbohm, M. [1911] 1952. *Zuleika Dobson*. London: Penguin.
- Bottomore, S. 2004. From the Factory Gate to the 'Home Talent' Drama: An International Overview of Local Films in the Silent Era. In. *The Lost World of Mitchell and Kenyon: Edwardian Britain on Film*, ed. V. Toulmin, S. Popple and P. Russell, 33-48. London: BFI.
- Burns, R. [1786] 2001. To a Louse: On Seeing One on a Lady's Bonnet at Church. *The Canongate Burns*, 130-2. Edinburgh: Canongate.
- Castle, T. Autumn 1988. Phantasmagoria: Spectral Technology and the Metaphorics of Modern Reverie. *Critical Inquiry* 15, no. 1: 26-61.
- Dagonet [George R. Sims]. 24 January 1897. Our Detective Story. *The Referee* no. 1015: 7.
- Delmas, D. Projecting the Subject: Late-Eighteenth Century Visual Culture and the Problems of Modern Subjectivity. Paper presented at 'Cinematicity' 1895: Before and After, 24-5 March 2007, University of Essex.
- Dickman, G. 2 July 1897. Cinematograph Film and the Paris Catastrophe. *Amateur Photographer* 26, no. 665: 4-5.
- Doane, M.A. 2002. *The Emergence of Cinematic Time*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Doubleday, R. 1904. *Stories of Inventors*. London: Doubleday.

- Farrow, G.E. February-June 1900. The Cinematograph Train. *The Sunday Strand* 1 no. 2-no. 6.
- Rptd. 1904. *The Cinematograph Train and Other Stories*, Illus. Alan Wright, 4-88. London: R. Brimley Johnson.
- Foucault, M. [1976] 1998. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1, The Will to Knowledge*. Trans. Robert Hurley. London: Penguin.
- Gaudreault, A. 2006. From “Primitive Cinema” to “Kine-Attractography”. In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, ed. Wanda Strauven, 85-104. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press.
- Gissing, G. and H.G. Wells. 1961. *George Gissing and H.G. Wells: Their Friendship and Correspondence*, ed. R. A. Gettmann. London: Rupert Hart-Davis.
- Gunning, T. [1986] 1990. The Cinema of Attractions: Early Film, its Spectator and the Avant-Garde. In *Early Cinema, Space, Frame, Narrative*, ed. T. Elsaesser and A. Barker, 56-62. London: BFI.
- Hepworth, C. M. 7 May 1897. The Idler’s Notes. *Amateur Photographer* 25, no. 657: 374.
- Hepworth, C. M. 28 May 1897. The Idler’s Notes. *Amateur Photographer* 25, no. 660: 434.
- Kember, J. 2009. *Marketing Modernity: Victorian Popular Shows and Early Cinema*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Kipling, R. September 1904. Mrs Bathurst. *Windsor Magazine* 20, no. 117: 376-86.
- Lane, R.J. 1846. *Life at the Water Cure, or, A month at Malvern*. London: Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans.
- Mannoni, L. 1995. *Light and Movement: Incunabula of the Motion Picture 1420-1896*. Gemona: Le Giornate del Cinema Muto.
- Mansergh, Mrs H. February 1898. An Idyll of the Cinematographe. *Windsor Magazine* 7, no. 38: 363-8.
- Movie Margerie. 4 November 1916. Reflections: “Pictures” Page for the Fair Sex. *Pictures and the Picturegoer* 11, no. 142: 113.

- Musser, C. 1990. *The Emergence of Cinema: The American Screen to 1907*. Berkeley: California University Press.
- Officer, L.H. 2009. Purchasing Power of British Pounds from 1264 to Present. *MeasuringWorth.Com*. Accessed 8 July 2009. <http://www.measuringworth.com/ppoweruk>.
- Pollock, W.H. May 1899. The Phantasmatograph. *Longman's Magazine* 34, no. 199: 58-69.
- Rayne, R. December 1901. Colonel Rankin's Advertisement, *The Strand* 22, no. 132: 767-76.
- Rogers, W.I. 21-28 February & 6 March 1896. Can Thought be Photographed?. *Amateur Photographer* 23, no. 594-6: 161, 186 & 207-9.
- Shail, A. 2006. 'A Distinct Advance in Society': Early Cinema's 'Proletarian Public Sphere' and Isolated Spectatorship in the UK, 1911-18. *Journal of British Cinema and Television* 3, no. 2: 209-28.
- Sims, G. R. 1902. The Side-Show Pianiste. *Biographs of Babylon: Life-Pictures of London's Moving Scenes*. 76-92. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Swinton, A. A. C. June 1896. The New Photography of the Invisible. *Pall Mall Magazine* 9, no. 38: 264-8.
- Ward, A. H. S. October 1904. The Green Spider. *Pearson's Magazine* 18, no. 106: 428-35.
- Wells, H. G. [1899] 1994. *When the Sleeper Wakes*. London: J.M. Dent.
- Wells, H.G. 1998. *The Correspondence of H.G. Wells*, ed. D. C. Smith, 4 Vols. London: Pickering & Chatto.

Notes

¹ This list has been compiled in collaboration with Stephen Bottomore and Roland-François Lack, and to Stephen in particular I owe many thanks. A different set of eight stories will be reprinted and examined in my forthcoming collection, *Reading the Cinematograph* (University of Exeter Press, 2010).

² In a letter to J.M. Dent dated 19 November 1897, Wells stated that it was “a pile of big fragments” (Wells 1998, 295), and George Gissing congratulated Wells on having finished the work in a letter dated 6 November 1898 (Gissing 1961, 125).

³ X-rays were discussed in terms of invisible wavelengths at the time, one early 1897 estimate gauging it to be ‘fourteen millionths of a millimetre, or in other words about seventy-five times smaller than the smallest wave length of light’ (Anon. 26 February 1897, 163).

⁴ W. Ingles Rogers, ‘Can Thought be Photographed?’, *Amateur Photographer* 23:594-6 (21-28 February 1896): pp. 161, 186 & 207-9. The influence of what we would now call electro-magnetic fields on photographic plates was being investigated as early as the mid-1880s and was explained, for example, in Anon., ‘Photography of the Invisible – a Note Illustrative, Explanatory and Historical’, *Amateur Photographer* 23:591 (31 January 1896), p. 86.

⁵ One writer explained that ‘[m]ost “spook” photographers assert that ghosts are lighted only by the ultra-violet rays, which accounts for their impressing photographic plates, although they remain invisible to the human eye.’ (Anon. 17 January 1896, 33).