

Introduction

Leo Charney and Vanessa R. Schwartz

“Triumphant, exultant, brushed down, pasted, torn in a few hours and continually sapping the heart and soul with its vibrant futility, the poster is indeed the art . . . of this age of fever and laughter, of violence, ruin, electricity, and oblivion.”¹ The rush of adjectives used by this French social commentator in 1896 to describe the poster as product of the “modern age” typifies the way in which modernity has elicited vigorous discourses that have attempted to construct, define, characterize, analyze, and understand it.² “Modernity,” as an expression of changes in so-called subjective experience or as a shorthand for broad social, economic, and cultural transformations, has been familiarly grasped through the story of a few talismanic innovations: the telegraph and telephone, railroad and automobile, photograph and cinema. Of these emblems of modernity, none has both epitomized and transcended the period of its initial emergence more successfully than the cinema.

The thirteen essays in this volume present cinema and modernity as points of reflection and convergence. All of the essays generate from the premise that cinema, as it developed in the late nineteenth century, became the fullest expression and combination of modernity’s attributes. While some essays more than others directly address the links between the cinema and other modes of modernity, all presume that modern culture was “cinematic” before the fact. Cinema constituted only one element in an array of new modes of technology, representation, spectacle, distraction, consumerism, ephemerality, mobility, and entertainment—and at many points neither the most compelling nor the most promising one.

These essays collectively argue that the emergence of cinema might be characterized as both inevitable and redundant. The culture of modernity rendered inevitable something like cinema, since cinema’s characteristics

evolved from the traits that defined modern life in general. At the same time, cinema formed a crucible for ideas, techniques, and representational strategies already present in other places. These essays identify a historically specific culture of the cinematic which emerged from—yet also ran parallel to—other transformations associated with modernity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in such countries as France, Germany, England, Sweden, and the United States.

This collection juxtaposes the work of scholars in a variety of disciplines in the hope of bridging the frequent divide between the history of cinema and the history of modern life. By drawing on scholarship from a range of fields, we hope to enrich such areas as Cultural Studies, Film Studies, Literature, Art History, and Cultural History by insisting that studies of modern life can be enhanced when read through and against the emergence of film. Indeed, these essays will suggest that modernity can be best understood as inherently cinematic.

Despite the multiple connections and points of confluence linking these essays, we have grouped them into four broad conceptual areas: “Bodies and Sensation,” “Circulation and Consumer Desire,” “Ephemerality and the Moment,” and “Spectacles and Spectators.” These headings are meant not to provide an exclusive or restrictive framework but to highlight common threads among the topics considered by these authors.

In “Bodies and Sensation,” essays by Tom Gunning, Jonathan Crary, and Ben Singer address new bodily responses to stimulation, overstimulation, and problems of attention and distraction. From the perspective of these analyses, perception in modern life became a mobile activity and the modern individual’s body the subject of both experimentation and new discourses. The essays explore such techniques as photography, detective fiction, scientific psychology, Impressionist painting, the mass press, and “thrilling” entertainments, all of which endeavored to regulate and manage the newly mobilized subject.

Both mechanical reproduction and the mobility of products, consumers, and nationalities characterized forms of commercial culture at the turn of the century. The essays by Marcus Verhagen, Erika Rappaport, Alexandra Keller, and Richard Abel in “Circulation and Consumer Desire” elaborate a culture of market mechanisms that challenged boundaries between private and public spheres and reconstituted gender and national identities. These essays also make clear that cinema participated in but did not create an urban leisure culture that pivoted on women’s active participation.

In “Ephemerality and the Moment,” Margaret Cohen, Jeannene Przyblyski, and Leo Charney suggest that modernity resided in an immersion in the everyday; yet the everyday was, by definition, ephemeral. In response to this problem, such forms as panoramic literature, photography,

and film endeavored to freeze fleeting distractions and evanescent sensations by identifying isolated moments of “present” experience. In these literary, artistic, and philosophical discourses, the negotiation between ephemerality and stasis emerged as a defining feature of modernity.

In “Spectacles and Spectators,” essays by Vanessa R. Schwartz, Mark Sandberg, and Miriam Bratu Hansen investigate the allure of such diverse phenomena as wax museums, folk museums, amusement parks, and cinema in the development of a mass audience. While the first two essays focus on the *fin de siècle*, Hansen pushes forward into the twentieth century. Each essay elaborates from a different perspective what Hansen calls “the liberatory appeal of the ‘modern’ for a mass public—a public that was itself both product and casualty of the modernization process.”

As a group, the essays in this volume map a common terrain of problems and phenomena that defines the “modern.” In the remainder of this introduction, we identify six elements that emerge from the essays as central to both the cultural history of modernity and modernity’s relation to cinema: the rise of a metropolitan urban culture leading to new forms of entertainment and leisure activity; the corresponding centrality of the body as the site of vision, attention, and stimulation; the recognition of a mass public, crowd, or audience that subordinated individual response to collectivity; the impulse to define, fix, and represent isolated moments in the face of modernity’s distractions and sensations, an urge that led through Impressionism and photography to cinema; the increased blurring of the line between reality and its representations; and the surge in commercial culture and consumer desire that both fueled and followed new forms of diversion.

Modernity cannot be conceived outside the context of the city, which provided an arena for the circulation of bodies and goods, the exchange of glances, and the exercise of consumerism. Modern life seemed urban by definition, yet the social and economic transformations wrought by modernity recast the image of the city in the wake of the eruption of industrial capitalism in the second half of the nineteenth century. As the German sociologist Georg Simmel remarked in his landmark 1903 study “The Metropolis and Mental Life,” the modern city occasioned “the rapid crowding of changing images, the sharp discontinuity in the grasp of a single glance, and the unexpectedness of onrushing impressions.”³

It is not an accident that Simmel’s words could double as a description of the cinema, since the experience of the city set the terms for the experience of the other elements of modernity. In a tradition that began with the work of the French poet Charles Baudelaire, this modern city has most frequently been allied to post-1850 Paris, which Walter Benjamin called the “capital of the nineteenth century.”⁴ The city’s mid-century redesign, now known as “Haussmannization,” was contrived by Napoleon III and his

prefect of the Seine, Baron Georges Haussmann, to “modernize” the city’s infrastructure, creating sweeping boulevards, a new sewer system, and a reconstructed central market.⁵ These controversial changes made a formerly labyrinthine geography more legible, orienting Paris toward greater visibility. As T. J. Clark has put it, Paris became, for its inhabitants, “simply an image, something occasionally and casually consumed.”⁶

Paris was later reclaimed as the source of modern life by such critics as Benjamin and Siegfried Kracauer, who allied it to the phenomena that surrounded them in Twenties and Thirties Berlin.⁷ Miriam Hansen’s essay in this volume comprehensively assesses Kracauer’s evolution from a “pessimistic discourse on modernity” before 1925 to a view of mass culture as allegory for and symptom of the changes transforming German society. Kracauer began to see that mass cultural forms, as the specimen of modernity, gave viewers the potential to understand the conditions in which they were living and thereby to acquire the capacity for self-reflection (at least) or enlightened emancipation (at best).

From the contrast between Kracauer’s focus on contemporary phenomena of the twentieth century and Benjamin’s projection of modernity back toward nineteenth-century Paris, Hansen draws a distinction between a nineteenth-century modernity, primarily associated with the culture of Paris, and a twentieth-century modernity of “mass production, mass consumption, mass annihilation, of rationalization, standardization and media publics” identified with America and epitomized by the interdependence of mass culture and factory production.

If Paris initiated the transformation of the modern city into a show-place of visibility and distraction, the teeming New York of the turn of the century set the pace for frenzy and overstimulation. As Ben Singer writes in this volume,

Cities . . . had never been as busy as they rapidly became just before the turn of the century. The sudden increase in urban population density and commercial activity, the proliferation of signs, and the new density and complexity of street traffic . . . made the city a much more crowded, chaotic and stimulating environment than it had been in the past.

The photographs and cartoons from mass-circulation newspapers and magazines that accompany Singer’s essay testify to this sense of the city as an overflowing cauldron of distraction, sensation, and stimulation. The city in this way became an expression and site of the modern emphasis on the crowd. Whether one’s aim was to tame it, join it, or please it, the crowd, in the form of the masses, became a central player in modernity. The emergence of modern life went hand in hand with the rise of a “mass society” that resulted, in part, from the growth of industrial capitalism. Addi-

tionally, in Europe and America the second half of the nineteenth century witnessed the birth of fervent nationalism and imperialism, as liberal bourgeois democracies dominated by elites gave way to societies in which the vast majority of the population was slowly enfranchised. The masses became recognized as a key constituency, imagined and figured as an often-undifferentiated grouping with putatively common desires and aspirations.

The possibility of a mass audience, combined with the atmosphere of visual and sensory excitement, opened the door for new forms of entertainment, which arose both as a part of the culture of sensation and as an effort to relieve it. The turn-of-the-century emergence of Coney Island, for example, ironically re-created the city's exhausting sensations and frenzied tempo in a seemingly more leisurely atmosphere.⁸ The aura of seaside strolling allowed producers of the Coney Island distractions to draw on the increased appetite for mobile, kinetic sensation while packaging that appeal in the guise of a break from those sensations. In the same way, in its early years as an urban phenomenon, cinema served multiple functions: as part of the city landscape, as brief respite for the laborer on his way home, as release from household drudgery for women, and as cultural touchstone for immigrants.⁹

As a result of all this stimulation, notes Singer, "observers around the turn of the century were fixated on the notion that modernity has brought about a disturbing increase in nervous stimulation and bodily peril." In this environment, the body became an increasingly important site of modernity, whether as viewer, vehicle of attention, icon of circulation, or location of consuming desire. This sensual experience of the city has been embodied in the figure of the *flâneur*, the emblematic persona of nineteenth-century Paris, who strolled the city streets, eyes and senses attuned to the distractions that surrounded him. The *flâneur's* activity, at once bodily, visual, and mobile, set the terms for film spectatorship and the other forms of spectatorship that dominated the period's new experiences and entertainments.¹⁰ As a Parisian type, the *flâneur* exemplified the masculine privilege of modern public life. In Janet Wolff's formulation, "There is no question of inventing the *flâneuse*: . . . such a character was rendered impossible by the sexual divisions of the nineteenth century."¹¹ Others have argued that the prostitute, who shared the sidewalk with the *flâneur*, represented his female counterpart.¹²

Several of the essays in this volume address *flânerie* and the gendered nature of public life. In his treatment of the late nineteenth-century posters of Jules Chéret, Marcus Verhagen shows how the artist's whimsical character, the *chérette*, was figured as a prostitute, and how the representation of female sexuality was thereby mobilized in the service of consumption. By contrast, Erika Rappaport's essay on the department store indicates

how, for commercial ends, new forms of consumer culture enticed women into urban space and cultivated female desire. And in Alexandra Keller's analysis of turn-of-the-century mail-order catalogs, women similarly become both object and subject of this new form of consumer activity.

As typified by *flânerie*, modern attention was conceived as not only visual and mobile but also fleeting and ephemeral. Modern attention was vision in motion. Modern forms of experience relied not simply on movement but on the juncture of movement and vision: moving pictures. One obvious precursor of moving pictures was the railroad, which eliminated traditional barriers of space and distance as it forged a bodily intimacy with time, space, and motion.¹³ The railroad journey anticipated more explicitly than any other technology an important facet of the experience of cinema: a person in a seat watches moving visuals through a frame that does not change position.¹⁴

In this way, modernity's stimulations and distractions made focused attention more vital yet less feasible. In Jonathan Crary's account in this volume, modern attention was explicitly predicated on its potential for failure, resulting in inattention or distraction. "Attention," writes Crary in light of the period's scientific psychology on the subject, "was described as that which prevents our perception from being a chaotic flood of sensations, yet research showed it to be an undependable defense against such chaos. . . . Attention always contained within itself the conditions for its own disintegration." In this view, "attention and distraction were not two essentially different states but existed on a single continuum." Crary traces this ambiguity through both the discourse of scientific psychology and Claude Manet's 1879 painting *In the Conservatory*, in which Manet struggled to channel the viewer's potential for both attention and distraction.

The tension between focus and distraction set the terms for a wider interchange between mobility and stasis, between the ephemerality of modernity's sensations and the resulting desire to freeze those sensations in a fixed moment of representation. Leo Charney's essay investigates the attempt "to rescue the possibility of sensual experience in the face of modernity's ephemerality" which links philosophical and critical work on modernity from Walter Pater in the 1870s through Martin Heidegger in the 1920s and Walter Benjamin in the 1930s. This concern emerged in film both through Jean Epstein's concept of *photogénie*—evanescent instants of cinematic pleasure—and through the precinematic motion studies of Eadweard Muybridge and Etienne-Jules Marey which broke down continuous movements into their component moments. These writers and artists crystallized ephemerality as not just an abstract concept but an active problem of bodily sensation, cognition, and perception. The present moment could exist "only as the site where past and future collide," since

ephemerality would always outrun the effort to stabilize it, and the body's cognitive awareness of its "present" sensations could never coincide with the initial moment of sensation.

In nineteenth-century Paris, the impulses to freeze the moment and represent the present took early form in the development of photography and the corresponding aesthetic of Impressionism.¹⁵ The essays of Tom Gunning and Jeannene Przyblyski in this volume suggest some of the complex uses made of photography in this period. Gunning locates photography as a multiply determined crossroads of new modern concerns. The photograph aided police detection by identifying individuals in the midst of the circulation and anonymity that otherwise marked modern life. By re-presenting the appearance of the putatively unique individual, the photograph destabilized traditional conceptions of personal identity by making the body "a transportable image fully adaptable to systems of circulation and mobility that modernity demanded."

As Gunning's essay makes clear, these new techniques of representation did not simply reproduce a self-present "reality." In the case of police photography, the photograph broke down the individual body into component parts and then processed it through new regimes of information organization. More important, the blurring of representation and reality gave rise to one crucial aspect of modernity—the increasing tendency to understand the "real" only as its re-presentations.¹⁶ Analyzing photographs of the 1871 Paris Commune uprising, Jeannene Przyblyski notes "the growing tendency throughout the 1860s and 1870s to turn the camera upon contemporary events." Przyblyski's discussion indicates that as photography began to capture the real, the "real" became inconceivable and unimaginable without the photograph's verifying presence. "What was apparently asked of photographic *actualités* in 1871," Przyblyski writes, "was . . . that they exhibit bits of the 'real,' that they operate fragmentary and relic-like, with a metonymical claim to authenticity. In their almost mummified condition midway between historical artifact and simulated re-creation, there is something . . . particularly modern."

Many of this volume's essays echo Przyblyski's claim that representation as the re-presentation of the "real" marked the defining form of modernity; or, more exactly, that with the advent of a chaotic and diffuse urban culture, the "real" could increasingly be grasped only through its re-presentations. In addition to Gunning's and Przyblyski's accounts of the uses of photography, essays by Margaret Cohen, Vanessa R. Schwartz, and Mark Sandberg outline instances of this new form of re-presentation. Cohen analyzes French panoramic literature of the July Monarchy (1830–1848), a genre that aimed to provide a visual and verbal overview of contemporary life. These books were "everyday genres for representing the everyday,

genres with minimal transcendent aesthetic claims. . . . the close attention to external and particularly visible material details . . . gives the reader vivid access to the sensuous materiality of contemporary Parisian reality."

Cohen calls this zone between representation and reality the "epistemological twilight," a striking phrase that captures the ambiguity of the interaction between a reality that can be grasped only in its representations and the representations that feed off and form part of that ongoing reality. Schwartz's essay indicates several phenomena of late nineteenth-century Parisian culture that were popular because they transfigured and re-presented a vision of "reality": wax museums, panoramas, the mass press, and the public display of corpses at the Paris Morgue. "To understand cinema spectatorship as a historical practice," argues Schwartz, "it is essential to locate cinema in a field of cultural forms and practices associated with the burgeoning mass culture of the late nineteenth century." Like cinema, these other new diversions compelled the spectator to negotiate spectacle and narrative to produce a "reality-effect."

In similar fashion, Mark Sandberg's essay locates turn-of-the-century Scandinavian folk museums as part of a broader "roving patronage of visual culture." These museums presented nostalgic dioramas as a way to compensate for the threatening losses of a modernity that came relatively late to Scandinavia. The folk museum's display of frozen moments and the resulting reliance on the spectator to fill voids in the spectacle anticipated cinema in indicating how narrative could serve a stabilizing function in the face of modern evanescence. "It may well be," Sandberg proposes at the end of his essay, "that narrative was more important to spectating at the turn of the century than has often been assumed, serving as the unobtrusive safety net that made the unmooring of the eye in modernity possible and pleasurable. . . . Narrative helped make modernity attractive, turning a sense of 'displacement' into 'mobility' and 'rootlessness' into 'liberation.'"

Narrative and visuality endeavored to channel the subject's floating attention not just as a viewer but also as a consumer. The forms analyzed by Gunning, Przyblyski, Cohen, Schwartz, and Sandberg were all commercial enterprises, as were the railroad, the telegraph, and virtually every other icon of modernity. Consumerism's role as engine of modernity comes forward in the essays by Marcus Verhagen, Richard Abel, Erika Rappaport, and Alexandra Keller. For Verhagen, the explosion of the poster onto the late nineteenth-century Parisian landscape "revolutionized the Parisian entertainment business" as both a "manifestation of the emergence of mass culture . . . and a catalyst in the development of other mass cultural forms." In Verhagen's analysis, moralistic responses to the poster's popularity echoed both early objections to the cinema and the generally fear-

ful reactions to new forms of a consumer culture "whose market mechanisms threatened to wear away the foundations on which class society was built."

In Abel's essay, the development of American cinema in the early years of the twentieth century cannot be understood outside the marketplace pressures that impelled film studios to differentiate their product from the potentially more popular French films of the Pathé studio. In response to both the saturation of the American market by "the Gallic red rooster" and an audience of newly arriving immigrants in need of "Americanization," American studios positioned Pathé as a suspicious and demoralizing "other," a formation that intertwined national and commercial identities. Abel's discussion underscores the interdependence of capitalism and nationalism, as a capitalist industry (emblemized by a film studio) could both distribute its products internationally and intercede in its own national markets. In this way, writes Abel, "cinema as a specific instance of modernity . . . was inscribed within the discourses of imperialism and nationalism and their conflicted claims, respectively, of economic and cultural supremacy."

In similar fashion, Rappaport and Keller investigate how consumer desires were mediated by the written texts that surrounded and incited them. Rappaport demonstrates how, in early twentieth-century London, "the press produced Edwardian commercial culture in partnership with men such as Gordon Selfridge." Selfridge, the owner of the department store that bore his name, cannily employed advertising and newspaper articles to promote himself, his store, and the vision of women as consumers and London as a commercial metropolis that would support them. By shifting focus from the stores to the manipulations of discourse that surrounded them, Rappaport illustrates that modernity's social phenomena can be understood only through the representations that constructed them.

Keller's essay on early Sears Roebuck mail-order catalogs expands this interdependence of text and consumerism to suggest that the mail-order catalog offered only text as the basis for desire, as the catalog's illustrations evoked the absent products wanted by the consumer. These ghostly images, like the catalog's mass dissemination, made the mail-order catalog a phenomenon parallel to cinema. Keller goes on to indicate that mail-order catalogs "effected a kind of rural *flânerie* for those who browsed its pages." The catalog's rural reader could stroll through products as the *flâneur* roamed the city. Like the modern city, the "world as brought into the rural home by the mail-order catalog was an abundant and crowded place, jammed with goods, the representation of a marketplace whose fleshly embodiment would be equally jammed with vendors, consumers, and gawkers."

Cinema, then, marked the unprecedented crossroads of these phenomena of modernity. It was a commercial product that was also a technique of mobility and ephemerality. It was an outgrowth and a vital part of city culture that addressed its spectators as members of a collective and potentially undifferentiated mass public. It was a representational form that went beyond Impressionism and photography by staging actual movement; yet that movement could never be (and to this day still is not) more than the serial progression of still frames through the camera. It was a technology designed to arouse visual, sensual, and cognitive responses from viewers beginning to be accustomed to the onslaught of stimulation.

Most important, cinema did not simply provide a new medium in which elements of modernity could uncomfortably coexist. Rather, it arose from and existed in the intertwining of modernity's component parts: technology mediated by visual and cognitive stimulation; the re-presentation of reality enabled by technology; and an urban, commercial, mass-produced technique defined as the seizure of continuous movement. Cinema forced these elements of modern life into active synthesis with each other; to put it another way, these elements created sufficient epistemological pressure to produce cinema.

Cinema, therefore, must not be conceived simply as the outgrowth of such forms as melodramatic theater, serial narrative, and the nineteenth-century realist novel, although all of these modes influenced its form. Nor can technological histories sufficiently explain the emergence of cinema. Rather, cinema must be reunderstood as a vital component of a broader culture of modern life which encompassed political, social, economic, and cultural transformations. This culture did not "create" cinema in any simple sense, nor did cinema advance any new forms, concepts, or techniques that were not already available along other avenues. In providing a crucible for elements already evident in other aspects of modern culture, cinema accidentally outpaced these other forms, ending up as far more than just another novel gadget.

These essays, finally, help us reconsider the lineage from modernity to postmodernity and the technologies, distractions, and representations of our own turn of a century. By specifying a particular culture of modern life, this volume will ideally initiate a more rigorous interrogation of the contrasts and resemblances between the "modern" and the putatively "postmodern." While postmodernism has often been conceived as the sequel to Modernism as an artistic movement, these essays create a context through which to reimagine postmodernity as the outgrowth of modernity, a broader social, political, and cultural transformation of which Modernism formed only one aspect. While the implications of this distinction have yet to be fully explored, the framework of modernity articulated in these essays encourages future scholars to begin from and return to the

cinema as a common denominator bridging the nineteenth, twentieth, and (potentially) twenty-first centuries, at each turn uncanny repository of times gone by and prescient oracle of things to come.

NOTES

1. Maurice Talmeyr, "L'Age de l'affiche," *La Revue des deux mondes*, 1 September 1896, p. 216; cited by Verhagen in the present volume.

2. Three works that provide an overview of modernity and modern life are Stephen Kern, *The Culture of Time and Space, 1880–1918* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983); Marshall Berman, *All That Is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (New York: Penguin Books, 1988); and Christoph Asendorf, *Batteries of Life: On the History of Things and Their Perception in Modernity*, trans. Don Reneau (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1993).

3. Georg Simmel, "The Metropolis and Mental Life," in *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, ed. Kurt Wolff, trans. H. H. Gerth (1903; reprint, New York: Free Press, 1950), p. 410.

4. Charles Baudelaire, *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays*, ed. and trans. Jonathan Mayne (London: Phaidon, 1965); Walter Benjamin, *Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism*, trans. Harry Zohn (London: Verso, 1983); and *Paris, Capitale du XIX^{me} siècle*, ed. Rolf Tiedmann, trans. Jean Lacoste (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1989).

5. See especially David Pinkney's classic study, *Napoleon III and the Rebuilding of Paris* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958). Haussmannization was also an important act of social control; the boulevards divided working-class enclaves, impeded the building of barricades, and facilitated the deployment of troops in case of insurrection.

6. T. J. Clark, *The Painting of Modern Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), p. 36.

7. Works by and about Kracauer and Benjamin are cited throughout the essays in this volume, especially those by Hansen and Charney. On Kracauer, Benjamin, and modernity, see David Frisby, *Fragments of Modernity: Theories of Modernity in the Work of Simmel, Kracauer, and Benjamin* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1986); Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute for Social Research, 1923–1950* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1973).

8. The pivotal work on leisure and urban culture at the turn of the century is Kathy Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986). Also see John Kasson, *Amusing the Million: Coney Island at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1978), and David Nasaw, *Going Out: The Rise and Fall of Public Amusement* (New York: Basic Books, 1993).

9. On these points, among many potential sources, see Miriam Hansen, *Babel and Babylon: Spectatorship in American Silent Film* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991); Charles Musser, *The Emergence of Cinema: The American Screen to 1907* (New York: Scribner's, 1990); and Eileen Bowser, *The Transformation of Cinema, 1907–1915* (New York: Scribner's, 1990).

10. On film, flânerie, and the modern city, see Anne Friedberg, *Window Shopping: Cinema and the Postmodern* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1992); and Giuliana Bruno, *Streetwalking on a Ruined Map: Cultural Theory and the City Films of Elvira Notari* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

11. Janet Wolff, "The Invisible Flâneuse: Women and the Literature of Modernity," in Wolff, *Feminine Sentences* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1990), p. 47. On the interactions among women, film, and public space in modernity, see Bruno, op. cit.; Hansen, op. cit.; and Patrice Petro, *Joyless Streets: Women and Melodramatic Representation in Weimar Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).

12. See Benjamin, "Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century," in *Baudelaire*, pp. 155–176; Susan Buck-Morss, *The Dialectics of Seeing: Walter Benjamin and the Arcades Project* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989). See also Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson, "The Flâneur: Urbanization and Its Discontents," in *Home and Its Dislocations in Nineteenth-Century France*, ed. Suzanne Nash (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), pp. 45–64.

13. The indispensable work on the transformation of perception associated with the railroad is Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Railway Journey: The Industrialization of Time and Space in the Nineteenth Century* (1977; reprint, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1986).

14. On film and the railroad, see Lynne Kirby, *The Railroad and the Cinema* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, forthcoming); idem, "Male Hysteria and Early Cinema," *Camera Obscura* 17 (May 1988); and Mary Ann Doane, "The Moving Image," *Wide Angle* 7, 1–2 (1985).

15. On Impressionism, see Asendorf, op. cit., chapter 6; Clark, op. cit.; and Robert Herbert, *Impressionism: Art, Leisure, and Parisian Society* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).

16. See Miles Orvell, *The Real Thing: Imitation and Authenticity in American Culture, 1880–1940* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989).