Oxford Handbooks Online

Abstract and Keywords

As screendance has evolved, its foremost theorists have been remarkably generous in welcoming works that flicker in the space between stage and screen, where they cast strange shadows and illuminate uncanny forms. Catherine Galasso's *Bring on the Lumière*! is an interactive hybrid performance work that stretches the definition of screendance in directions indicated by scholars like Noël Carroll and Douglas Rosenberg. Galasso calls her piece "a multimedia dance-theater-light installation about the Lumière brothers, French founders of cinema." But it also reclaims the early history of cinema for dance. The piece foregrounds the physicality of early motion-picture performance history, including *ombramanie* shadow movement technologies and the laboring bodies of the Lumière brothers' first film, *La sortie des usines Lumière à Lyon*, shown at the Lumières' Cinématographe, and suggests if we can understand what celluloid meant for corporeality perhaps we can deepen our sense of what "recorporealization" might mean for screendance in the future.

Keywords: Catherine Galasso, screendance, early cinema, Lumière, ombramanie, Cinématographe, multimedia, recorporealization, shadow movement

Framing the Between

ᴀꜱ screendance has evolved in recent years, its foremost theorists have been remarkably generous in welcoming works that flicker in the space between stage and screen, casting strange shadows and illuminating uncanny forms. "The very fact screendance has always been a hybrid form," as Douglas Rosenberg states, urges us to consider the full potential of its ragged seams and refracted bodies.[1] Following Noël Carroll's insistence on a

"transmedia conception" for screendance that leaves room for "creative artists [who] attempt to exploit new technologies," I propose that we can also frame screendance as an intermedia space *between* dance and screen-image.[2] Departing from these expansive definitions of screendance, this chapter—like the legendary Lumière film of the train puffing into La Ciotat—attempts to challenge certain assumptions about the extent to which screens can truly contain the movement they channel.

In order to look forward into the future of interactive, hybrid works of screendance, it is helpful to examine some of the frameworks we have inherited from the prehistory of screen-movement practices. When moving images first began to reflect moving bodies, which temporal and material relationships emerged between screen and stage? What were the taxonomies, anxieties, myths, and techniques that governed the earliest encounters between cinema and live bodies? If we can understand what celluloid meant for corporeality, perhaps we can deepen our sense of what "recorporealization"—this phenomenon that "occurs at the interstices between the multiple practices of dance and the techniques and materiality of media"[3]—might mean for screendance in the future.

Click to view larger

Fig. 10.1 Dancers Marina Fukushima and Christine Bonansea as the Lumière brothers.

Photograph by Miguel Azrabe, courtesy of Catherine Galasso.

In this chapter, I focus on Catherine Galasso's *Bring on the Lumière!* (ODC Theater, San Francisco, 2011), an interactive hybrid performance work that stretches the (p. 206) definition of screendance in some of the exploratory directions indicated by scholars like Carroll, Rosenberg, and Kappenberg.[4] Galasso calls her piece "a multimedia dance-theater-light installation about the Lumière brothers, French founders of cinema," but it is also an initiative to reclaim the early history of cinema for dance, and a refusal to limit the screen to a single site. Galasso's piece is particularly interesting as a "between" form of screendance because it foregrounds the physicality of early motion-picture performance history, including *ombramanie* technologies and the laboring bodies of *La sortie des usines Lumière à Lyon* (1895). Choreographically, Galasso's piece links the

styles of working and performing bodies in the late nineteenth century to that "particular type of physicality" that Chaplin and Keaton bequeathed to cinematic movement in the twentieth.[5] Channeling Chaplin's quirky, involuntary grace in certain duets, and Keaton's wide-eyed, angular acrobatics in others, Galasso alludes to the pervasive ghostliness of bodies that characterized early cinematic kinesthetics. As the two dancers in Galasso's piece (Christine Bonansea and Marina Fukushima; Figure 10.1) inhabit a haunted temporality between stage and screen, they also dramatize a chronology of movement quality.

Bring on the Lumière! reanimates Auguste and Louis Lumière (who died in 1954 and 1948, respectively) in an elegiac, affectionate, and sometimes uncanny tribute to the origins of film history. In bringing the Lumière brothers back into life through dance, Galasso asks us to reflect on the relationship between live bodies and the ghostly preservation of those bodies as images on film. For the Lumière brothers, cinema was the (p. 207) dazzling progeny of photography, and its essential quality was documenting the ephemera of a moving world through technologies of light. Bodies were a special category of ephemera, and early cinema was particularly attracted to physical activity— dancing, rowing, playing *boules* in the park. On the surface, this was because images could finally represent live motion; underneath, though, there was a dark hinting at the impermanent materiality of bodies themselves, as they moved through time toward death.

In early cinema's fascination with mechanical innovation and the rush to document and preserve, it identified itself with narratives of light: it was miraculously luminous, a repeatable and reproducible beam projected from the past, a bright remainder. It offered an alluring possibility of casting those precious, evanescent bodies in light and celluloid, where it would keep their images after they had disappeared. However, cinema is also born of a long history of shadows. Its roots in the tradition of shadow-theater tell a different story, one that relied absolutely on the live presence of physically skilled performers and body-to-body transmission. In one way, *Bring on the Lumière!* is about bringing the Lumière brothers back to life as only dance can do—by giving them wondrous new bodies to inhabit. In a deeper way, though, it is also about restoring a prehistory of early cinema, a narrative that has been obscured by the excitement of industrial light and magic.

As film theorist André Gaudreault has proposed, when we undertake historiographic projects for cinema, we must account for the peculiarities of fragmentation, assemblage, intersection, simulacra, and shifting frames that ground the medium in materiality.[6] Studies in screendance can draw upon this principle, allowing inventive intermedia works to broaden our understanding of the medium's potential to incorporate physicality—and thus to recorporealize the history of dance on camera. In theorizing screendance, I would

argue, we can now move beyond Phillip Auslander's claim that in the "intermedial hybridization" of live theater and filmed images, "Dance + Virtual = Virtual."[7] Although Auslander concludes that there is "a devaluation of live presence in mediatized culture that is a fact of our present cultural economy," artworks like *Bring on the Lumière!* creatively confront this pessimism by returning the discussion to the historical origins and founding myths of cinema.[8] As artists like Catherine Galasso continue to explore the potential of intermedia aesthetic practices, definitions of screendance will need to evolve beyond a simple formula for virtual dominance to allow bodies their own place in the frame.

From Plato to the Cinématographe

The governing metaphor of cinema is Plato's description of the cave of fantastical shadows that, projected on a wall, create the flickering illusion of reality. As Gaudreault points out, from this model we understand that "the film image is a simulacrum of a simulacrum," because of the double artifice of the projection.[9] The philosopher Jean-Claude Dumoncel clarifies the logic behind this claim: "The shadows on the rear wall (p. 208) of the cavern are not shadows of a tree or a bull but rather shadows of *statuettes*: they are copies of copies."[10] If cinema adheres to this Platonic model, though, it has a strangely distant relation to bodies, and especially to performing bodies. It is the technology here that is essential—the statuettes, the firelight, even the chains that bind the audience to a fixed perspective—but there is no place for live performers.

Usually the tension in the uneasy interdependence between dance and film is attributed to the fact that dance is a live, sweaty, precariously *present* medium—inadequately rendered by film or video as flat, fixed, repeatable, and coldly distant from kinesthetic experience.[11] But the early history of cinema, as well as cinema's ongoing self-identification with the Platonic story of the cave, imply that the issue lies not just with dimensionality and temporality: it is a conflict between a medium at two removes from bodily experience and a medium absolutely centered in the body. How can dance bring a quality of lived bodily experience back to cinema, when there is clearly an anxiety about the loss that occurs when three-dimensional live dance is filmed in two technologically framed dimensions? In order to decipher new performances like *Bring on the Lumière!* that integrate live dance and recorded film, we have to return to the cave, and to the prehistory of cinema in Europe—in short, to the realms of shadow theater.

As art historian Nancy Forgione relates, *théâtre d'ombres* [shadow theater] and *ombramanie* [shadowgraphy or hand-shadow shows] riveted audiences of the 1880s and

1890s in France. Contemporary theater critics such as Jules Lemâitre proposed that the shadow theater shows given at the Chat Noir in Paris were iterations of Plato's cave, possessing a similar power to suggest the real.[12] *Ombramanie* performers were traveling showmen who practiced "this art of casting shadows formed by arrangements of the fingers and hands in front of a light source, usually a magic lantern," using techniques they had adopted from Chinese shadow theater.[13] Not only did the Lumières' invention of motion pictures as a form of communally experienced entertainment[14] draw on shadow-theater and *ombramanie*, as Forgione notes, but the element of skilled live performance persisted as well, since "many of those showmen went on to work in cinema."[15]

Eventually, the cinema would come to inhabit the venues of its predecessor, as Tom Gunning observes: "Motion pictures were shown in fairground booths and village halls and even tent shows, sites that previously offered lantern shows."[16] In Paris, where the Lumière brothers gave their first two public film screenings in 1895, it is telling that magic lanterns were used to project the titles of the films at the Grand Café: early cinema was not a monolith of new technology.[17] "Although cinema can be considered to create a rupture in the history of entertainment by replacing liveness with mediation, presence with absence," dance scholar Claire Parfitt concludes, "recent work by film, dance and visual culture theorists has emphasized various continuities between cinema and its live predecessors in Paris."[18] In short, the Cinématographe patented in 1895 by Auguste and Louis Lumière was deeply indebted to an itinerant theatrical tradition that used real bodies to make magical illusions, and to a self-consciousness about the Platonic model that these shadow shows invoked.[19]

(p. 209) Dancers Leaving the Factory

Bring on the Lumière! opens with a looped projection of *La Sortie des usines Lumière à Lyon* [*Workers Leaving the Factory*]. Over and over, these working-class bodies emerge from tall double doors, streaming homeward in their simple dresses and trousers, moving out of the way of a dog and a weaving bicycle, talking with each other. As the audience files into the theater, therefore, this 46-second film shows them a social and quotidian choreography. It also shows them the first cast of the ghosts of cinema. In May 2011, when Catherine Galasso restaged *Sortie des usines* at the San Francisco MoMA, inviting the community to re-enact the film sequence, the images of the Lumière workers were re-embodied and brought back into the world of live performance in a novel form of "recorporealization."[20]

This choice to approach historiography as a corporeal practice illustrates a dynamic that underlies the whole piece: the cinematic tension between live movement and the inevitable disappearance of the bodies who create it. However, the Lumière brothers, known both for filming the working class and for showing their films to "the masses," stand for a kind of mediated self-representation that Catherine Galasso's participatory process clearly moves beyond. What the choreographer has in common with the Lumière brothers is, as the French press reported in 1895, a shared commitment to *"showing the movement among the people* as they hasten towards the street." In 1895, this vision of a mass of bodies in motion produced "a most shocking effect so that a repetition of the projection was required by the wholly astonished audience."[21] In 2011, *La Sortie des usines* appears both quaint and ghostly. It is as if the MoMA performers are superimposing their bodies on the screen that keeps showing the same 800 frames of people, all of whom have been dead for decades, walking casually into the sunlight.

Galasso *does* enact a "repetition of the projection," if we take "repetition" in Deleuze's special sense: repetition that involves its own difference, images with generative capacities, film "capable of thinking the production of the new."[22] Screen media theorist Felicity Colman explains that Deleuze's proposition of cinema as a "closed system … open to change" depends upon "the sense of the cinematic body as a social, living system" and "a position of defining film through process."[23] In inverting the roles of audience and actors, Galasso knits together two separate durations of physical movement by collectively reperforming them. The MoMA performers ensure that *Sortie des usines* re-enters our contemporary visual canon—a modern art museum, no less—by re-enacting it, but they inevitably alter the sequence of images by channeling its movements through their own bodies. "With the cinema," Deleuze declared, "it is the world which becomes its own image, and not an image which becomes the world."[24] Doubling cinema back on itself through live re-performance, Galasso makes a world-become-image into a new world, one that represents the fragility of imaged bodies.

In this instance, the principles of screendance are rear-projected: live movement takes its cue from screenic movement, but only by acknowledging the lost liveness of (p. 210) the bodies that first produced both the movement and the material of its technologies. The workers of the Lumière factory are visible to us now only because their corporeality has been transferred to celluloid, digitized, and placed in the public domain. In this version of screendance, the virtual realm enables an audience to become active performers of an elegiac dance—participants in the simultaneity of choreography, cinematography, and historiography.

The Choreography Within Cinematography

Although Catherine Galasso creates dances rather than films, she has an unusual aesthetic for a choreographer: "I come from creating dance from within a frame, from two dimensions," she explains. "It's almost like a painting that's moving, and the moving parts are the people." Even more than painting, though, she sees dance as a twin of film, since both are artistic movement practices. "Some of the greatest cinematography is extremely choreographic," Galasso notes. "I'm just looking at choreography in films, not choreography in dance."[25] As she envisions this dance piece in *tableaux*, rather than in movement phrases, she returns to the historical moment when still photographs were perched on the edge of becoming motion picture sequences.

One concern early cinema inherited from photography—as well as from late eighteenth century *plein air* [outdoor] painting—was "how to represent the ephemeral"; film scholar Jacques Aumont argues the "the Cinématographe was inspired by the desire for a faithful rendering of such fleeting phenomena" as clouds, steam, rainbows, and smoke.[26] Aumont summarizes the accomplishment of the Cinématographe as being "the first to offer pictures of moving objects," calling it "*mobilis in mobile*" [moving in a mobile world].[27] He implies, too, that there was a special kind of "fleeting phenomenon" for the Lumière brothers—a category of moving object that was the consummate representation of the magic of cinema: the dancing body. "The Lumière catalogue lists only one *Danse serpentine*," Aumont writes, "but all of its documentary views offer the picture of movement."[28]

In recalling the time in the 1880s when photographs began to click forward and speed up, faster and faster, approaching something like the real continuous motion of the first film, Galasso recovers some of the magic of this early technology of memory. As an audience, we imagine the wonders that late-nineteenth-century technology could show us: suddenly, we could see ourselves moving as if in a time-lapse mirror; we could watch landscapes rolling by although we had never visited them; we could stop a frame and see a horse hovering in the air, mid-gallop, all four feet off the ground. This was the era when Eadweard Muybridge's "Animal Locomotion" series was just pushing the still photograph of a woman holding the hem of her skirt toward the short, jerky, but life-like sequence of a woman fancy-dancing; when Étienne-Jules Marey, whose interest in (p. 211) anatomy and physiology permeated his images of bodies in motion, was making chronophotograph strips of motion studies; and when Georges Demenÿ, Marey's assistant, created Phonoscope disks depicting a girl doing the French can-can.

Moreover, early cinema's interest in dancing bodies as the epitome of human movement is intertwined with turn-of-the-century dancers' interest in new visual technologies that

could enhance or publicize their performances. Dancer Loïe Fuller's experiments with colored lights projected on her voluminous skirt, for example, dovetail with early cinema's desire to capture the most showy, most mobile, most magical images that human bodies could produce.[29] In 1896, when the Lumière brothers filmed a dancer performing Fuller's *Serpentine Dance* (1891),[30] they invoked both Fuller's history as a vaudeville, circus, and burlesque dancer and the Cinématographe's roots in shadow-theater, cabaret, and itinerant magic shows.[31] In a broader sense, Fuller's use of theatrical lighting effects in her dances commits her to the same technological trajectory as the Lumière brothers: both are inventing ways of marking the presence of bodies with light.

Over the course of *Bring on the Lumière!*, a telos of dance develops. The first dance is a stiff, shuffling jig, in which the silent brothers syncopate their almost mechanical steps in the wan glow of an Edison bulb. In this scene the brothers look like they have been caught up by the music and made to dance: they are animated by an exterior force, rather than by any expressive desire of their own bodies. With their greasepaint faces kept in wide-eyed deadpan expressions, they peer out together into the cavernous depths of the darkened house. The dance seems to slowly enliven them; as they swing their bent elbows, the elliptical circles of the jig grow more vigorous, eventually propelling Fukushima up the stairs of the center aisle—and then, slyly, she disappears into the light-booth, moving from performance space to the domain of *metteur-en-scène*.

In the second dance sequence of *Bring on the Lumière!*, Galasso cites the movement style of early comic films, even incorporating one phrase taken directly from Buster Keaton. These off-kilter falls into each other's arms, mincing waltzes, improbable side lifts, and the "back-kick" that André Bazin identifies as quintessentially Chaplinesque, are an extension of the nostalgia that inheres in cinema, embodied in a way that only live dance can provide.[32] Keaton and Chaplin, two of the great movement artists of silent film, come from vaudeville, the music hall, and the itinerant theatrical traditions to which cinema is indebted from its very beginning. Their ghostly presence in *Bring on the Lumière!* is a reminder that dance as a medium has not forgotten its history, even when it appears in the luminous realm of cinema.

Noël Carroll has proposed that Buster Keaton's "grand theme is the concrete intelligence of the body as it manifests itself adaptively or fails to do so in its encounter with things," whereas Chaplin's "vision is metaphoric; he can see everything reflected in everything else."[33] Taken together, these two qualities describe the historical intersection of dance and film: the body learns to move within the screenic frame, but sometimes exceeds its parameters; the body can see itself mirrored on film, made figurative—but is also given a capacity to imagine new, "impossible" movements through editing. "Keaton's innovation

of cutting on exact movement continuity so that his character (p. 212) 'walks' across time and space," as dance filmmaker Amy Greenfield points out, was also "a major inspiration" for Maya Deren's *A Study in Choreography for Camera* (1945).[34] In bringing Keaton and Chaplin into her piece both as movement artists *and* as cinematographic innovators, Galasso stages an integrated history of screendance.[35]

Over the course of the evening, we see the dancers acting double roles: they are the Lumière brothers, who are gradually regaining the fullness of their live, moving bodies as the piece progresses, but they are also bearing bodily witness to the intertwined histories of dance and film. From the first hesitant jig through the slapstick dances of silent film, and finally to an almost balletic, elegiac dance that circles through the whole space of the stage, the dancers' bodies become freer in their movements. They seem to be showing us that the Lumière brothers are recovering the physicality of their own bodies through this dance that is happening in time, and that the evanescence of dance can restore the lived bodily experience that cinema necessarily dismisses. Cinema is a weightless documentation in light; dance gives it materiality, depth, and shadow. Twenty-first-century screendance has the potential to interweave these lineages, allowing us both to mourn the bodies that have disappeared into celluloid and to reanimate them, refracting their dances back through new bodies.

The Living Image

Invoking the ghosts of the Lumière brothers means recognizing that they will strive to introduce life-like motion into any technology of visual representation they encounter. As dancers, of course, Bonansea and Fukushima inherently animate their characters through movement. "Dance, closely associated with visual forms and rhythms, is fundamentally a multimedia system," new media choreographer Johannes Birringer points out. "Since the beginning of photography and motion studies, performances were staged exclusively for the camera."[36] And because dance and film are both invested in the act of attesting to presence, the difference between the modes they use to mark and heighten physical presence is particularly interesting. While dance insists on the presence of the live moving body happening in time, early cinema exhibits its documentary impulse, its desire to show people what their own moving bodies look like, its excitement about the magic confluence of pictures and motion, and its photographic affiliation with technologies of light instead of histories of shadow.

Cinema is "un model qui transmet l'image vivante de notre existence, un model qui témoigne de notre realité" ["a model that transmits the living image of our existence, a model that bears witness to our reality"], Bonansea declares with grandiose conviction in

the second scene. Representing the dead Louis Lumière, Bonansea—who studied French literature at the Sorbonne—has written a text based on some of her readings of the Lumières' writing, but with her own flair. The paradox of the "living image" that film promises is pointed out by Bonansea's presence onstage; here it is dance, not cinema, enacting the live transmission of the Lumières' history. In fact, cinema may be (p. 213) composed of images of the living, but as soon as the image is created, it can be split off from the living body.

What cinema is interested in preserving, above all, is the quality of the image—to be precise, the *vividness* of the image, its life-*like* appearance. Dance, in contrast, demands a lifelong practice of preserving and maintaining the body. This brings dance much closer to the (mostly female) laboring bodies that are the subjects of *Sortie des usines*, whose identities are connected to physical work. The fact that the *usine Lumière* was manufacturing photographic dry plates (and was therefore part of the realm of image technologies) must have been much less important to the factory employees than the reality of their working lives. If there was really going to be "a model that bears witness to our reality," for these workers, it would have been a bodily form, like dance, rather than an airy sequence of images, like cinema. This is another way in which *Bring on the Lumière!* proposes dance as a mode of recovering and representing the realities lost behind the triumphant history of early cinema.

As Bonansea pronounces this discourse, seated in sharply-lit profile on a wooden chair downstage right, we see her shadow on the white screen hung just behind her. Sententiously, she lifts a hand to her chin: "À croire que le nom de Lumières nous était destiné!" ["To think that the name Lumière ("light" in French) was destined to be ours!"][37] she says, looking back with satisfaction on the brothers' achievements. Beyond the Lumières' self-conscious affiliation with light, we discover something here about the nature of cinematic time in this dance. Bonansea is speaking in the self-important register of French documentaries, creating a historiographical perspective on the accomplishments of the Lumières' whole lifetimes.[38] She is newly alive to us—physically present in the way that only dance, with its "immediate, phenomenological embodiedness, its lived experience in one place," allows—but she is also narrating with a knowledge that comes from the closure of death.[39]

While Christine Bonansea is proclaiming, *"Le cinema comme moyen de communication en documentant ou créant l'image permettant ainsi au monde de se comprendre dans sa globalite pour l'éternité"* ["Cinema, as a means of communication and documenting or creating images, thus permits the world to understand itself globally for eternity"], something strange happens to her shadow on the white screen behind her. It rises from its chair while she remains seated. It walks away from her. Halfway across the screen, it

looks back at her as if it were going to say something—perhaps to remind her that she is a body that has been separated from its shadow by a screen of light and image—but then turns away again and walks off the edge of the screen. Slowly, Bonansea rises and walks toward the wings, while a bright sidelight projected at her face (and then dissipating in the grid overhead) leaves her shadowless.

At this point in the piece, we face an inversion of the Platonic model that governs cinema. Instead of illusory shadows and absent bodies, a present body—taking up considerable space, since Bonansea has a large pillow buttoned under her black suit-jacket—with no shadow is wandering across the stage. Galasso has given us an intermediate phase in the deconstruction of cinematic myth, so that here we see how a film screen and lighting design have permitted shadows to disassociate from bodies. (p. 214) The promise of technologies of light, infinitely repeatable performance, and a broader circulation than one body could accomplish drew dancers to the Lumières' creation of a new Platonic spectacle. As Galasso asks us to return to the cave, we must reconsider what was lost in the translation of skilled live performance to this iterable, mechanized, catchy, luminous medium—and whether intermedia screendance might recover it.

Recovering Lost Bodies

In addition to framing *Bring on the Lumière!* with *Sortie des usines*, Galasso utilizes a series of the earliest Lumière films in her piece, projecting them on a white sheet hung downstage right. Both narrative and documentary films are shown, and a new presence animates them: the rear-projected shadow of Christine Bonansea, instantly recognizable with its racing cap and bellied-out strut. In each short film, the shadow must find a place to locate itself, as well as a movement that allows it to participate in the action of the scene. In one scene, the shadow tries to hail a passing trolley bus, which ignores it; in another, the shadow is so diminutive that a baby, toddling toward its open arms, dwarfs it. Bonansea's shadow struggles with the technological limitations of the medium—seventeen meters of film ran only about fifty seconds—and is sometimes caught unawares when one film sequence ends and another begins. When Susan Sontag cited Béla Balázs' conviction that moving pictures represented "the herald of a new 'visual culture' that will give us back our bodies," this may not have been what either theorist of film had in mind.[40]

In a witty visual play on the famous *Arrivée d'un train en gare de la Ciotat [Train arriving at the station]*, the shadow is still sitting in its chair, playing cards and smoking its cigar from the last film, as the train heaves into view down the tracks. It is a canard of film history that audiences fled the theater in a mêlée when this sequence was first screened;

here Bonansea's shadow is literally, comically knocked off its chair by the image of the oncoming train.[41] We hear the real chair clatter to the ground behind the screen as Bonansea goes sprawling on the floor, elbows akimbo, falling out of the screen-frame onto the real stage. Cinema's proud claim to have mastered the realistic representation of ephemera is also gently ironized here, since the steam-train, puffing into the station and trailing its vaporous plume, is so real that it tumbles the creator of the Cinématographe to the ground.

A few seconds later, Bonansea has scrambled up and entered the realm of fantastic mechanized motion, as she "flies," like Superman on a green screen, through a landscape shot by the Lumières from a moving train. It is awkwardly amateur—she stands on one leg with her arms stretched out in front, body parallel to the ground—and this joke is amplified when, as Fukushima wanders over to watch the montage with rapt attention, Bonansea comes out from behind the screen to join her, leaving her own shadow still flying through the projected images. The silhouette of the moving body is superimposed on a moving landscape—which has been shot by a motion picture (p. 215) camera from a moving train—thereby bringing live dance back into the cinematic fantasy of total mobility. "Recorporealization," in Rosenberg's terms, "refers to the literal *re*-construction of the dancing body via screen techniques," and results in a body "not encumbered by gravity, temporal restraints, or even death."[42] In presenting Bonansea's body simultaneously as a live dancer, a shadow trapped in a film, and a spectator who watches her own impossible flight, this scene playfully redefines what recorporealization can mean for screendance.

As this image answers the scene in which Bonansea's shadow walks away from her, it also layers separate planes of cinema history together on one rear-projected screen. Conflated here are shadow theater, the magic lantern, and the earliest cinematic sequences, all being watched from the front by the characters who have invented this, as we watch them watching the screen. This participatory conjoining of shadow, light-image, and real dancer's body is the resolution *Bring on the Lumière!* offers for cinema's insistence on its own self-contained repleteness—one where the bodies can leave, because they have been recorded, preserved, and documented.

Screendancing

"Site, as it pertains to screendance," Rosenberg reminds us, "tends to be a moving target."[43] Thus in one of the most innovative explorations of screendance in *Bring on the Lumière!*, the screen itself is recruited as a dancing body. Standing on the darkened stage, Marina Fukushima is handed a white sheet hung on a long pole. Solemnly at first,

she begins to wave it like a semaphore, as it captures swaths of film images projected from the front edge of the stage (by a stagehand with a hand-held projector). The matte materiality of the sheet gives the moving images an unexpected depth and sharpness; as the dancer turns and bends, the sheet responds with billows and fluttering. Carroll has argued that, "with film, we are not actually talking about the surface onto which the image is projected, but the shape of that surface," but Fukushima's duet with her own mobile screen confounds this distinction.[44]

In one film sequence that flickers across the sheet, a group of earnest young sailors rowing together seem entirely innocent of the camera in the rowboat with them as they bob on the waves. The camera peers intently into their faces, as if cherishing this brief period in photographic history before the self-conscious pose would become an automatic reaction. The visceral rocking of the sea, the smooth collective pull of the oars, and the bright, untroubled eyes of the sailors make this Lumière film one of Galasso's favorites, because it exemplifies "the spectacular transporting that film does."[45]

These multiple and simultaneous forms of movement remind us of the primary place that dance holds in film. In the scene with the superimposed projections of the moving landscape and the special effect of Bonansea's "flying" body, we witnessed the shadow of the moving subject, filmed by a motion picture camera in a highly mobile world, as an answer to cinema's claim to be the model that transmits a living image all by itself. (p. 216) In this scene, we are seeing that moving bodies are not only the subjects of the film, but necessary to the technology of its visibility as well. The sheet "dissects the light of the projection," as Galasso says, so that there is a complex dance in and out of legible image between Fukushima, the sheet, and the film sequences.[46]

As in the *Serpentine Dance* created by Loïe Fuller, the motion of fabric catches the moving light when the dancer whirls in a circle; then she races upstage. The image looms larger, projected at a greater distance. We glimpse a black-and-white flash of a woman's figure, as Fukushima dances with the sheet, catching its ghostly imprint when she strains her arms upwards. The sheet billows through the air, and as it ripples flat for an instant we see clearly at last: it is an image of a woman, in long flounced skirts, somewhere in a public square, and *she is dancing.*

Finally, the promise of a "living image" is fulfilled, as the live dancer gives her movement to the screen, allowing the dancing image to flicker momentarily into being. This scene shows us the precariousness and labor of bodies that cinema cannot preserve, because they exist in a present that is always cranking forward, and always dissipating into a vaporous past. Galasso has created a new "model that bears witness to our reality," in Bonansea's words, by choreographing a duet of past and present, including the reality of bodies that labored in the Lumière factory. As Fukushima dances on this dim stage with

her white sheet, she pays homage to the skilled shadow-performers who created the dazzling illusions that preceded cinema. Instead of the "simulacrum of a simulacrum" witnessed by fixed bodies that Gaudreault identifies as a model for filmic image, the Platonic cave becomes the site of a dance between body, screen, and image—all three moving, interdependently, in a newly embodied history of cinema.[47]

If, as Rosenberg has argued, when we limit screendance to the realm of modern dance, "we overlook or suppress the relationship between bodies in motion and moving image production, which has existed since the earliest days of film," what can we learn about screendance from its most inventive artists—those who help us to refuse the binaries of digital dominance or "subgenres" of dance?[48] One possibility is that screendance can come to see its own history differently: although cinema cherished images of dancing in its earliest years, it also rushed forward into narratives of bodily invincibility. With the new prosthetic technologies of perspective that cinema supplied, the audience could feel themselves *transported:* they were being carried along by trains, they were arising in hot-air balloons, they were being rowed out to sea by vigorous young sailors whose oarstrokes viscerally rocked their field of vision. In the meantime, cinema took up photography's promise to witness, document, and preserve—and it did perform miraculous feats of iterability and likeness. But cinema, as Gunning points out, is "only one link in a long chain of devices and practices, a centuries-long tradition of images made of light and shadow."[49]

Click to view larger

Fig. 10.2 Marina Fukushima and Christine Bonansea channeling the Lumière brothers.

Photograph by Mimi Cave, courtesy of Catherine Galasso.

Intermedia screendance pieces like *Bring on the Lumière!* can recover some of the other links in that long chain, reminding cinema of its shadow histories of laboring bodies and live performance (Figure 10.2). When Galasso brings the Lumière brothers back into life through dance, she evokes the wonder of the moment in history when (p. 217) still images were drawn inexorably toward motion by the "claws" Louis Lumière had designed

to drag the celluloid strip through his Cinématographe. She traces the chronology of dance on film through ever-livelier phases, from the flickering frames of the late nineteenth century to the wry, antic timing of Chaplin's wide-eyed pratfalls, and from Keaton's insightful use of editing to create choreographic sequences to the full-body, full-camera, full-stage movement Astaire would insist upon. But this piece is not merely a history of dance on camera; it is an exploration of the possibilities of screendance as an open, evolving form.

Click to view larger

Fig. 10.3 The last scene in *Bring on the Lumière!*, with Christine Bonansea and volunteer performers re-staging *Sortie desusines*.

Photograph by Mimi Cave, courtesy of Catherine Galasso.

At the end of *Bring on the Lumière!*, the piece returns to its first image: the looped film of *Sortie des usines*. However, this is repetition that involves its own difference—or, as Deleuze said of Bergson (whose *Matter and Memory* was published in 1896, at just the moment of cinema's emergence): "startlingly ahead of his time: it is the universe as cinema in itself, a metacinema."[50] "In an early design for a Lumière poster," film scholar Lynda Nead notes, "the train [arriving in La Ciotat] appears as if projected upon, or, equally possible, as emerging from a woman's abdomen." In this nascent conception of what the Lumière Cinématographe meant for the relation between body, screen, and visual world, Nead concludes, "image, screen, and viewer have become mutually absorbed and the space between them has imploded."[51] Having achieved an intermedia performance that integrates dance and film as equals—and by showing us that dance allows cinema to recover its lost bodies and history of shadows—Galasso revises cinema's Platonic self-narrative. (p. 218)

As *Sortie des usines* sheds its ghostly gray light on the stage, there is a sudden loud knocking on the tall double doors that lead to the dressing rooms. Slowly, the doors crack open, and a beam of sunlight falls through; birds can be heard singing offstage. As the doors widen, a young woman walks out of them, wearing a scarf, and strolls across the

stage and down the aisle. Two more people in hats and boots come out of the doors, conversing; then five more, then a man on a bicycle; now people are streaming in and out of the doors, bathed in daylight, arm-in-arm, tying their scarves, waving at each other across the stage, speeding up, as if they were running out of film in which to exist. As the last few people disappear, the Lumière brothers walk through the doorway, and into the light, their shadows trailing faithfully along on the ground behind them (Figure 10.3).

The dancers are leaving the factory.

References

Albright, Ann Cooper. *Traces of Light: Absence and Presence in the Work of Lo ï e Fuller.* Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2007.

Aubert, Michelle, and Jean-Claude Seguin. *La production cinématographique des Frères Lumière.* Paris: Bibliothèque du Film, 1996.

Aumont, Jacques, and Ben Brewster. "Lumière Revisited." *Film History* 8, no. 4 (1996): 416–430.

Auslander, Phillip. "Liveness, Mediatization, and Intermedial Performance." *Degrés: Revue de Synthèse à Orientation Sémiologique 101* (Spring 2000): 1–12.

Bazin, André. *What is Cinema?* Vol. 1. Translated and edited by Hugh Gray. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Birringer, Johannes. "Dance and Media Technologies." *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art* 24, no. 1 (Jan 2002): 84–93.

Blankenship, Janelle. "Futurist Fantasies: Lukács's Early Essay 'Thoughts Toward an Aesthetic of the Cinema.'" *Polygraph* 13 (2001): 21–36.

Brannigan, Erin. "'La Loïe' as Pre-Cinematic Performance—Descriptive Continuity of Movement." *Senses of Cinema* 28 (Sept–Oct. 2003). .

Carroll, Noël. *Engaging the Moving Image.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

Carroll, Noël. *Comedy Incarnate: Buster Keaton, Physical Humor, and Bodily Coping.* Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007.

Colman, Felicity. *Deleuze and Cinema: The Film Concepts.* New York, Berg, 2011.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image.* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. London: Athlone, 1986.

Dumoncel, Jean-Claude. "Deleuze, Platon, et les poètes." *Poétique* 59 (1984): 367–387.

Forgione, Nancy. "'The Shadow Only': Shadow and Silhouette in Late Nineteenth-Century Paris." *The Art Bulletin* 81, no. 3 (1999): 490–512.

Galasso, Catherine. Personal Interview. October 27, 2011.

Gaudreault, André. "Fragmentation and Assemblage in the Lumiére Animated Pictures." *Film History* 13, no. 1 (2001): 76–88.

Gaudreault, André. *From Plato to Lumière: Narration and Monstration in Literature and Cinema.* Translated by Timothy Barnard. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Gunning, Tom. "Introduction." In *The Great Art of Light and Shadow: Archeology of the Cinema* by Laurent Mannoni, translated and edited by Richard Crangle, xix–xxx. Exeter, NH: University of Exeter Press, 2000.

Gunning, Tom. "Loïe Fuller and the Art of Motion: Body, Light, Electricity and the Origins of Cinema." In *Camera Obscura, Camera Lucida: Essays in Honor of Annette Michelson*, edited by Richard Allen and Malcolm Turvey, 75–90. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2003.

Gunning, Tom. "Early Cinema and the Variety of Moving Images." *American Art* 22, no. 2 (Summer 2008): 9–11.

Kappenberg, Claudia. "Does Screendance Need To Look Like Dance?" *International Journal of Performance Arts and Digital Media*. 5, no. 2–3 (2009): 89–105.

Lepecki, André. "Introduction: Presence and Body in Dance and Performance Theory." In *Of the Presence of the Body*, edited by André Lepecki, 1–9. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2004.

Loiperdinger, Martin. "Lumière's *Arrival of the Train*: Cinema's Founding Myth." *The Moving Image* 4, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 89–118.

Mannoni, Laurent. *The Great Art of Light and Shadow: Archeology of the Cinema*. Translated and edited by Richard Crangle. Exeter, NH: University of Exeter Press, 2000.

McCarren, Felicia. *Dancing Machines: Choreographies of the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003.

Mitoma, Judy, ed. *Envisioning Dance on Film and Video*. Text edited by Elizabeth Zimmer. DVD edited by Dale Ann Stieber, 115 minutes. New York and London: Routledge, 2002.

Musser, Charles. "Before Cinema." In *The Emergence of Cinema: The American Cinema to 1907*. Vol. 1. Edited by Charles Harpole. New York: Scribner, 1990.

Nead, Lynda. "Strip: Moving Bodies in the 1890s." *Early Popular Visual Culture* 3, no. 2 (Sept 2005): 135–150.

North, Dan. "Magic and Illusion in Early Cinema." *Studies in French Cinema* 1, no. 2 (2001): 70–79.

Parfitt, Claire. "'Like a Butterfly Under Glass': The Cancan, Loïe Fuller and Cinema." *International Journal of Performance Arts and Digital Media* 5, no. 2–3 (2009): 107–120.

Rosenberg, Douglas. *Screendance: Inscribing the Ephemeral Image*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Rossell, Deac. "A Chronology of Cinema, 1889–1896." *Film History* 7, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 115–236.

Solnit, Rebecca. *Motion Studies: Time, Space, and Eadweard Muybridge.* London: Bloomsbury, 2003.

Sontag, Susan. "Film and Theater." *The Tulane Drama Review* 11, no. 1 (Autumn 1966): 24–37.

Media

Bring on the Lumière! Choreography by Catherine Galasso. Music by Michael Galasso. Performed by Christine Bonansea and Marina Fukushima. ODC Theater, San Francisco. November 11, 2011.

WITHIN (Labyrinth Within). Choreography by Pontus Lidberg. Music by David Lang. Performed by Pontus Lidberg. Joyce Soho Theater, New York. November 16, 2012.

Notes:

(1.) Douglas Rosenberg, *Screendance: Inscribing the Ephemeral Image* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 4. Claudia Kappenberg, citing Rosenberg's "what if" curatorial approach as a guiding principle, concludes that we need to upend our one-

dimensional maps of the field, open up new planes "to further the diversification of screendance practices," and, perhaps most importantly, "empower artists to stake their claim and to seek new territories" (Claudia Kappenberg, "Does Screendance Need To Look Like Dance?" *International Journal of Performance Arts and Digital Media* 5, no. 2–3 [2009]: 103–104).

(2.) Noël Carroll, *Engaging the Moving Image* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), xxv, 236.

(3.) Rosenberg, *Screendance*, 10.

(4.) Pontus Lidberg's *WITHIN (Labyrinth Within)* (2012), another intermedia screendance that unfolds between screen-image and live dancing, thematizes this interactive "between-ness" in its title. That this dance emerged from Lidberg's film *Labyrinth Within* (2010), which was then shown as part of the premiere of *WITHIN (Labyrinth Within)*, emphasizes the inseparable intertwining of dance and screen made possible in this new form. When I watched an excerpt—danced by Pontus Lidberg in November 2012—it was difficult to know whether to call it a "double solo" for dancer and filmed dancer, or a "diptych" of stage/screen, or a sort of duet between screenic image and live body.

(5.) Rosenberg, *Screendance*, 42.

(6.) André Gaudreault, "Fragmentation and Assemblage in the Lumiére Animated Pictures," *Film History* 13, no. 1 (2001): 76–88.

(7.) Phillip Auslander, "Liveness, Mediatization, and Intermedial Performance," *Degrés: Revue de Synthèse à Orientation Sémiologique* 101 (Spring 2000): 1, 10. In the case of *Bring on the Lumière!* Auslander's claims of digital dominance do not account for inchoate phases of film like those in the 1890s, which were still deeply attached to live performance practices. Secondly, Auslander focuses so much on the absorbing totality that filmic images seem to provide that he does not address the nostalgia, the ghostliness, and the mourning of past bodies that early films conjure.

(8.) *Ibid.*, 9.

(9.) André Gaudrealt, *From Plato to Lumière: Narration and Monstration in Literature and Cinema*, trans. Timothy Barnard (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 150.

(10.) Jean-Claude Dumoncel, "Deleuze, Platon, et les poètes," *Poétique* 59 (1984): 371, quoted in Gaudreault, *From Plato*, 150.

(11.) In her foreword to *Envisioning Dance On Film and Video*, text editor Elizabeth Zimmer begins by identifying "the phalanx of the dance world that believes dance suffers mightily in the transfer from three dimensions to two" (Judy Mitoma, ed., *Envisioning Dance on Film and Video* [New York and London: Routledge, 2002], xv). As André Lepecki elaborates, "It is one of dance studies' major premises to define dance as that which continuously plunges into pastness—even as the dance presents itself to visibility … But there is also an inscription of the dance onto the mnemonic mechanisms of technology, either through photography, film, [etc.] … Between one kind of memory and the other, the question of the presences of the dancing body becomes a matter of delicate excavation" (André Lepecki, "Introduction: Presence and Body in Dance and Performance Theory," in *Of the Presence of the Body*, ed. André Lepecki [Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2004], 4).

(12.) Nancy Forgione, "'The Shadow Only': Shadow and Silhouette in Late Nineteenth-Century Paris," *The Art Bulletin* 81, no. 3 (1999): 502.

(13.) *Ibid*, 505.

(14.) *Ibid*., 508. This distinction is important, because Thomas Edison's Kinetoscope, which was functional by 1891, was also a form of celluloid-strip motion picture. However, as Rebecca Solnit remarks, the kinetoscope provided only "a peepshow picture, seen by peering into a box," rather than a publically-projected form of mass entertainment (Rebecca Solnit, *Motion Studies: Time, Space, and Eadweard Muybridge* [London: Bloomsbury, 2003], 231).

(15.) Dan North traces the transmission history of the Lumières' Cinématographe in terms of magicians, including the fact that "the first UK demonstration of the Cinématographe was overseen not by the Lumière Brothers, but by one of their associates, Félicien Trewey, a magician, and the most famous shadowgrapher in France" (Dan North, "Magic and Illusion in Early Cinema," *Studies in French Cinema* 1, no. 2 [2001]: 71).

(16.) Tom Gunning, "Early Cinema and the Variety of Moving Images," *American Art* 22, no. 2 (Summer 2008): 10.

(17.) "The projection started with a stationary image … One spectator, it was reported, showed his dissatisfaction: 'The magic lantern again!' But then [Charles] Moisson began to turn the handle [of the Cinématographe]. The image began to move" (Laurent Mannoni, *The Great Art of Light and Shadow: Archeology of the Cinema*, trans. and ed. Richard Crangle [Exeter, NH: University of Exeter Press, 2000], 461).

(18.) Claire Parfitt, "'Like a Butterfly Under Glass': The Cancan, Loïe Fuller and Cinema," *International Journal of Performance Arts and Digital Media* 5, no. 2–3 (2009): 107. Charles Musser has chronicled a similar pattern for the Cinématographe in the United States; Lumière films were sent around "the vaudeville circuit," garnering record attendance (Charles Musser, "Before Cinema," in *The Emergence of Cinema: The American Cinema to 1907*, vol. 1, ed. Charles Harpole [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1990], 140).

(19.) Cinema historian Laurent Mannoni traces the direct "ancestry of the cinematograph" convincingly back to the medieval *lanterne vive*, although he emphasizes the importance of sixteenth and seventeenth century scientific technologies in its development (*Great Art*, 28). Nonetheless he is particularly impressed by "the lanternists of the eighteenth century," many of whom were "travelling showpeople," who "displayed astonishing creativity" (104). At the end of nearly five hundred pages of proto-cinematic history, Mannoni concludes, "It was the showmen … who revealed to the public the marvels and unexpected artistic possibilities of animated projection" (467).

(20.) Rosenberg, *Screendance*, 10.

(21.) Deac Rossell, "A Chronology of Cinema, 1889–1896," *Film History* 7, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 133, emphasis added.

(22.) Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam (London: Athlone, 1986), 7.

(23.) Felicity Colman, *Deleuze and Cinema: The Film Concepts* (New York, Berg, 2011), 43.

(24.) Deleuze, *Cinema 1*, 57.

(25.) Catherine Galasso, Personal Interview, October 27, 2011.

(26.) Jacques Aumont and Ben Brewster, "Lumière Revisited," *Film History* 8, no. 4 (1996): 424.

(27.) *Ibid.*, 428.

(28.) *Ibid.*, 428. Tom Gunning has argued that the early Lumière films followed largely in the vein of nineteenth-century landscape and travel photography, while the Edison and Skladanowsky brothers' films, "rather than capturing a world … limn the outlines of highly trained bodies" (Tom Gunning, "Loïe Fuller and the Art of Motion: Body, Light, Electricity and the Origins of Cinema," in *Camera Obscura, Camera Lucida: Essays in*

Honor of Annette Michelson, ed. Richard Allen and Malcolm Turvey [Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2003), 77–78]). However, the *Bulletin du Photo-Club du Paris* of April 1895, in its wonder-struck description of the first Lumière film ever projected, marvels above all at the motion of bodies: "this animated view, showing in complete motion all these people hurrying into the street … a dog coming and going, cyclists, horses, a cart at full trot" (Mannoni, *Great Art*, 425, 504).

(29.) For analyses of Loïe Fuller and early cinema, see Parfitt, " 'Like a Butterfly under Glass' "; Gunning, "Loïe Fuller and the Art of Motion"; Ann Cooper Albright, *Traces of Light: Absence and Presence in the Work of Loïe Fuller* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2007); Erin Brannigan, "'La Loïe' as Pre-Cinematic Performance— Descriptive Continuity of Movement," *Senses of Cinema* 28 (Sept–Oct 2003), http:// sensesofcinema.com/2003/feature-articles/la_loie/; and Felicia McCarren, *Dancing Machines: Choreographies of the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003).

(30.) In the United States, as Laurent Mannoni notes, Edison's newly invented revolving photo-building, nicknamed the "Black Maria," was used to capture kinetoscope scenes such as *Annabelle Serpentine Dance*, "with Annabelle Moore imitating the performance of Loïe Fuller. In France … the public were led to believe that the performer was the great dancer Fuller herself," although Michelle Aubert and Jean-Claude Seguin have identified the Lumières' "serpentine" subject as Leopoldo Fregoli, an Italian quick-change artist, "*travesti en danseuse*" [dancing in drag] (Mannoni, *Great Art*, 402; Michelle Aubert and Jean-Claude Seguin, *La production cinématographique des Frères Lumière* [Paris: Bibliothèque du Film, 1996], 324). I hope to explore Fregoli's cinematic drag impersonation in a future article.

(31.) As Gunning observes drily, "Fuller's background lay entirely in the world of the musical hall and burlesque and comedy, and, although she later assumed the airs of a high priestess of the arts … there is no question that the inspiration for her revolutionary dance came from the realm of popular spectacle and the turn-of-the-century fascination in the new decorative possibilities of electrical light ("Loïe Fuller," 79).

(32.) André Bazin, *What is Cinema?* vol. 1, trans. and ed. Hugh Gray (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 150.

(33.) Noël Carroll, *Comedy Incarnate: Buster Keaton, Physical Humor, and Bodily Coping* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007), 71, 56.

(34.) Mitoma, *Envisioning Dance*, 23.

(35.) My analysis here is indebted to Rosenberg's insight that "there is a bridge between Thomas Edison's fin-de-siècle cinematic movement portraits and Deren's *A Study in Choreography for Camera*, one that has been often overlooked for its significance to screendance," and that this "connective tissue" can be found specifically in the kinesthetics of Chaplin and Keaton (*Screendance*, 41–42).

(36.) Johannes Birringer, "Dance and Media Technologies," *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art* 24, no. 1 (Jan 2002): 87.

(37.) The Lumière brothers owed a great deal to the history of shadows, but—as their name fancifully suggests—they understood themselves as belonging to a genealogy of light. Aumont emphasizes how much this quality inheres in the Lumière films themselves: "the Lumière view is hard to dupe, it loses an indefinable but essential quality, a quality of, precisely, light, a radiance, a 'transparency' " ("Lumière," 424).

(38.) The idea of self-documentary in early cinema, expressed by Bonansea's concept of "un model qui témoigne de notre realité," is central to the Lumières' conception of film as a public medium. The *Sortie des usines* was not only the first film to be publically shown; it was also the first *actualité*, or proto-documentary film, to be projected for a general audience. When the Lumière brothers famously showed ten films to the hundred or so people gathered on Dec 28, 1895, in the Grand Café in Paris, the fourth film was the *Débarquement du Congrès de Photographie à Lyon*, showing this mostly male audience of writers, theater directors, scientists, and photographers a group of men much like themselves disembarking from a boat for a recent conference on photography (Rossell, "Chronology," 140). In other words, the Lumière film was actively pursuing its claim to uniquely reflect a moment back to the people who had experienced it. "The guiding myth, then, inspiring the invention of cinema," Bazin writes, is "a recreation of the world in its own image" (*What is Cinema?* 21).

(39.) Birringer, "Dance and Media Technologies," 85.

(40.) Susan Sontag, "Film and Theater," *The Tulane Drama Review* 11, no. 1 (Autumn 1966): 36. Georg Lukács, who belonged to the same intellectual circle as Balázs (until the early 1920s), contrasted the fateful, evocative presence of theater with the gestural, action-based world of film in 1913, proposing that with the advent of cinema, "Man has lost his *soul*; in return, however, he gains his *body*" (Janelle Blankenship, "Futurist Fantasies: Lukács's Early Essay 'Thoughts Toward an Aesthetic of the Cinema,'" *Polygraph* 13 [2001]: 16).

(41.) For an analysis and dismissal of this persistent myth, see Martin Loiperdinger, "Lumière's *Arrival of the Train*: Cinema's Founding Myth," *The Moving Image* 4, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 89–118.

(42.) *Screendance*, 55.

(43.) *Screendance*, 17.

(44.) Carroll, *Moving Image*, 270.

(45.) Galasso, personal interview.

(46.) *Ibid.*

(47.) Gaudreault, *From Plato*, 150.

(48.) *Screendance*, 4.

(49.) Tom Gunning, "Introduction," in *The Great Art of Light and Shadow: Archeology of the Cinema* by Laurent Mannoni, ed. Richard Crangle (Exeter, NH: University of Exeter Press, 2000), xxx.

(50.) Deleuze, *Cinema 1*, 59.

(51.) Lynda Nead, "Strip: Moving Bodies in the 1890s," *Early Popular Visual Culture* 3, no. 2 (Sept 2005): 136.

Selby Wynn Schwartz
Stanford University