



University of Dundee

Looking beyond the Mutoscope

Williams, Keith

Published in:
Modernism/modernity

DOI:
[10.1353/mod.2024.a935444](https://doi.org/10.1353/mod.2024.a935444)

Publication date:
2024

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Williams, K. (2024). Looking beyond the Mutoscope: Cinematicity in "Nausicaa". *Modernism/modernity*, 31(1), 45-64. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mod.2024.a935444>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**Looking beyond the Mutoscope
Cinematicity in “Nausicaa”
By Keith Williams**

Moving Image Peepshows in Dublin

Ulysses (1922) illustrates the creative richness and critical depth of Joyce’s engagement with cinematic forms which projected film remediated and developed. Famously, the novel’s one direct reference to a moving picture technology by name invokes the Mutoscope. This peepshow was a hand-cranked alternative to Thomas Edison’s kinoscope, the device spurring the Lumière brothers to solve the problem of film projection with their 1895 Cinématographe. Joyce’s reference determines both the themes *and* techniques employed in his “Nausicaa” episode to critique modernity’s growing “media-cultural imaginary” (in Errki Huhtamo’s term), by highlighting its propensity for voyeurism and an objectifying consumerist gaze affecting both sexes.ⁱ However, Joyce does this by framing the mutoscope within a wider cinematic structure, which also takes account of how film narrative and viewing culture had developed by 1922, long after the novel’s diegetic present set in 1904 in which the reference is embedded. This article treats “Nausicaa” as a case study in the value of taking a longer-term view of technological/cinematic innovations across the modern period and hence recognizing modernity itself as something constantly shifting, as Joyce did too. We need to be more cognizant of this within the broader field of Modernist studies as in, for example, the case of Dorothy Richardson’s highly intermedial *Pilgrimage* sequence of novels, written and set across several decades, the first of which (*Pointed Roofs*) was published in 1915, but set in 1893.

Dublin’s first kinoscope parlors opened in April 1895 on Dame and Westmoreland Streets.ⁱⁱ As Kevin and Emer Rockett note, their short film loops of 20 seconds or less were “best suited to explicit (or staged) display rather than involved

narrative sequences” (Rockett, *Magic Lantern, Panorama and Moving Picture Shows*, 158-59). Hence they tended to focus on performing bodies. Dublin’s first programs consisted of: *The Barber Shop*; *Sandow*, the strongman; a “Wild West Show” of some kind; a cock fight; and an unnamed, possibly risqué “skirt dance” by Carmencita or Annabelle. The first known act of film censorship was provoked in Newark, New Jersey, by revelation of Carmencita’s ankle during her “Butterfly Dance.”ⁱⁱⁱ However, the film featuring German-American bodybuilder, Eugen Sandow, posing in skimpy satin trunks, reveals far greater expanses of flesh (as discussed below).^{iv}

Kinetoscopes were also exhibited at the Royal Dublin Showground’s themed charity bazaars, in the tradition of “Araby in Dublin,” subject of Joyce’s eponymous *Dubliners*’ story about a boy’s infatuation with an illuminated mirage of sorts.^v The Ierne Bazaar of May 1895 featured five Kinetoscopes and “an outdoor lantern display of a character hitherto unattempted in Dublin,” as reported in the *Evening Telegraph*.^{vi} The magnified images of the latter, as the Rocketts point out, sharply emphasized both the technical and social limitations of kinesiographic viewing. This eventually undermined its commercial success after the advent of film projection (Rockett, *Magic Lantern*, 159-60). Hence in December 1895 the American Mutoscope and Biograph Company launched Edison’s former technical researcher W.K.L. Dickson’s cheaper alternative to his device’s waning appeal. A branch was established as the “Irish Mutoscope Company” in April 1898. Mutoscopes were based not on “high-tech” electrically-powered loops, but photographic cards rotated in frame sequence to mechanize the “flipbook” principle. This achieved the same cinematic effect of movement as the filmstrip. Phenomenologically speaking, it is a perceptio-cognitive “eye-con” produced by the rapid acceleration of a sequence of photographic stills, so they appear to blur into motion.^{vii}

Dublin's first parlor opened at 14 College Green in October 1898. Soon they sprang up in locations across town (Condon, *Early Irish Cinema*, 22 and 33-34; Rockett, *Magic Lantern*, 161). Not all mutoscope programs were *risqué*; some exhibited family-friendly subjects. The May 1899 inaugural program of Grafton Street's "Mutoscope Palace" featured Dickson's recording of photophile Pope, Leo XIII, mentioned in *Dubliners*' "Grace" for his ode blessing the camera (Condon, *Early Irish Cinema*, 34; Rockett, *Magic Lantern*, 161).^{viii} Despite this, mutoscopes rapidly acquired notoriety and became known as "What the Butler Saw" for increasing association with erotica.^{ix} Bloom's experience certainly confirms some programs were not so innocent by standards of the time.

As Katherine Mullin points out, guardians of public morality were particularly focused on controlling access to new technological leisure pursuits. Challenges were thrown up by mediated mass-culture because of "cheapness, ubiquity, associations with pleasure resorts and home in gaudy arcades."^x Moral Moral panic about the younger generation played a leading role, typified by the Dublin White Cross Vigilance Association's concerns that mutoscopes were "calculated to debauch and demoralise" youth (Mullin, *James Joyce*, 167). However, indictments often used the term loosely, to the irritation of the patent company, which defended itself in Parliament and press (Plunkett, "Selling Stereoscopes," 251).^{xi} Many peepshows implicated were in fact downmarket imitations such as "Canovasopes" (the latter evoking knowing associations with sensual neo-classical sculptures by Antonio Canova). These also cashed in on the general appeal of the new "living pictures", as films were known, which they often featured alongside (Barnes, *The Beginnings*, 157). This resulted in widespread prosecutions, leading to such devices' inclusion in the 1908 parliamentary

enquiry into Lotteries and Indecent Advertisements (Plunkett, "Selling Stereoscapy," 247, 251-52).

After Bloom's physically-distanced encounter with Gerty Macdowell in "Nausicaa," he recalls: "A dream of a well-filled hose. Where was that? Ah, yes. Mutoscope pictures on Capel Street: for men only. Peeping Tom. Willy's hat and what the girls did with it. Do they snapshot those girls, or is it all a fake?" (13.793-6).^{xii} A necessarily solitary experience, Mutoscopes were controlled by hand crank, sometimes suggestively positioned at waist level for watching photographs in motion or pausing individual cards as "action stills." It is well-known that Bloom refers to two actual titles. The first, *Peeping Tom*, designates several early films, including an 1896 kinoscope loop and an 1897 biograph picture; the latter featuring a sequence of keyhole-shaped views. Bloom's other picture, *Kicking Willy's Hat* (Biograph 1897), features hosiery-sheathed legs revealed, like Gerty's, by high-kicking girls. As the Rocketts argue, while "no more explicit" than the films of Annabelle or Carmencita's dances, *Kicking Willy's Hat* "is arguably more potent and erotic as its narrative element ... serves to heighten pleasure, which becomes coded as voyeuristic" (*Magic Lantern*, 162). The contradiction within its mediated illusion of reality "caught unawares" is precisely what Joyce deconstructs in "Nausicaa." Significantly, the "Meaning" of the episode is "Projected Mirage" and its principal "Organ" is the "Eye", according to the Linati Schema.^{xiii} As we shall see, Joyce places emphasis on the term "projected," going beyond the mutoscope's peepshow view, not just by alluding to its superseding by film projection, but also by notions of psychological self-projection which the episode's wider cinematic structure reveals.

Kicking Willy's Hat was cited in Parliament in 1900 to exemplify moving pictures deserving banning (Barnes, *The Beginnings*, 152-3, 156-9).^{xiv} Hence early film

culture figures topically in Bloom's sexuality, not least his obsession with forbidden, snapshot-like "flashes" of women's ankles, real or mediated. Joyce thus alludes to the genre of "ankle" films which was booming by 1904 and taking peepshow pleasures onto the big screen for communal viewing. Such fetishism featured in films by "Hove pioneer," George Albert Smith. His *As Seen through a Telescope* (1900) zoomed into a screen-filling close-up of shoe-lacing and stockinged ankle, through its titular masking device. Smith's *A Photograph Taken from Our Area Window* (1901) elaborated the trope. Framed by a basement window, so only feet and ankles are visible in POV shot, it renders passers-by as visual synecdoches for chance encounters: a man and woman approach from opposite directions; he bends to tie her shoelace; then they leave together.^{xv} The contrast between Smith's delicate hint and Pathé's version of the same trope highlights greater explicitness in early French cinema: in *The Dialogue of Legs* (1902), a couple rolling together on grass are shot entirely through foot close-ups (Brown, "Early Cinema in Britain," 175-76). By Bloomsday Joyce's Dublin contemporaries could have seen formally innovative films such as Edwin S. Porter's *The Great Train Robbery* (1903) (with its parallel editing and close-up revolver firing point-blank), but as Austin Briggs points out, the American director's other hit that year, *The Gay Shoe Clerk*, with its lower-leg close-ups, would have been more to Bloom's taste. Briggs also suggests Bloom's "love's young dream" about being a shoe fitter at Manfield's in "Circe," lacing up "dressy kid footwear satinlined, so incredibly impossibly small, of Clyde Road ladies" (10.2813-6), might well stem from Porter's film.^{xvi}

Performance and the Gaze

Nevertheless, automation of erotic performance was made explicit in mutoscope peepshows by the penny inserted to activate the machine. In a complementary sexual economy, Gerty's naive romanticism, shaped by media discourses from women's magazines texturing her stream of consciousness, is underpinned by desire to escape impoverished and crippled circumstances disadvantaging her in the contemporary "marriage market." There is particularly reflexive irony in the fact Gerty's thoughts about her mysterious stranger (later revealed as Bloom) are mediated not just through fiction and fashion tips, but advertisements defining feminine attractiveness as artful self-display dependent on consumer products marketed by Bloom's own profession. In particular, as historians of costume demonstrate, design and marketing of women's underclothing became highly elaborate around the turn of the nineteenth century, boosting its power as fetish object.^{xvii} Moreover, Gerty fantasizes about and "performs" for Bloom in a way mirroring stereotypes from the moving pictures he recalls, paralleling the sex-commodity equation of the mutoscope itself. As Briggs notes, like a silent moving image, Gerty performs a private "dumbshow," its purely visual language "eloquently demonstrated" by her actions (Briggs, "Roll Away the Reel World, the Reel World," 147).

Thus Gerty is conditioned by, and even obscurely aware of, the power of a mediated gaze and the effect of playing to it within an Edwardian sexual culture pervaded by mechanically-reproduced moving images. By contrast Bloom's apparent belief that female narcissism is innate—"Best place for an ad to catch a woman's eye on a mirror." (13.919-20)—misses Joyce's point: that cultural prescribing of femininity demands a woman constantly checks and adjusts her performance as a desirable sight. Gerty's mirror allows her to rehearse her public self even when relieving "pent up feelings" in private, "though not too much because she knew how to cry nicely"

(13.191-2). Although Laura Mulvey's famous essay, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" (1975), concentrates on the idea of a cinematic male gaze, it casts an interesting sidelight on Gerty's own ambivalences. Mulvey suggests pleasure gained from gazing is dual, based on both "scopophilia"—derived from looking at another often voyeuristically—and the "ego libido," or the desire for reflected likeness and recognition of oneself through sameness.^{xviii} Hence Gerty's attraction-repulsion by mediated skirt-dancers. It reinforces Joyce's hint that Gerty is familiar with conventions of erotica to which Mutoscopes gave newly animated form, by simultaneously recognizing yet condemning flirtatious manipulation of male response.

Molly Bloom seems like Gerty to be aware of the part mediation plays in simultaneously constructing femininity and commodifying its attractions, though as a feisty, maturer woman she confronts the issue head-on. Her thoughts in "Penelope" about Bloom's suggestion that she embody his fantasies in nude photographs bear this out: "would I be like that bath of the nymph with my hair down yes only shes younger or Im a little like that dirty bitch in that Spanish photo he has" (*Ulysses* 18.562-63). Actual stills from *risqué* Mutoscope sequences were also sold as postcards or narrative sets. Bloom's cherished image of the uninhibited *señorita* might well originate from such. Gary Leonard compares scenarios in Joyce's characters' erotic fantasies, as well as his own letters to Nora, with such photo-sequences reproduced as postcards.^{xix} Moreover, Mervyn Heard demonstrates that dissolving views in some photographic "life-model" lantern slide shows also played on the illusion of snapshotting women in stages of revealment in private boudoir or bathroom spaces.^{xx} Similarly, Mullin argues the "full view" pose on which Gerty comes climactically to rest at the end of her performance (*Ulysses* 13.728-29) resembles a kind of "freeze frame" still catching the decisive moment—the "money shot" as it were—achieved by stopping action with a

mutoscope's crank. Hence female body and machine coalesce to materialize a widespread and multi-media photographic fantasy of male control and gratification, which adolescent Gerty plays along with, at least half-knowingly (Mullin, *James Joyce*, 155, 156).^{xxi}

As Tom Gunning recognizes, Bloom's concerns about the authenticity of the revealing moment in moving pictures carries distant echoes of instantaneous photography's goal to capture the secret truths of animal and human locomotion in picture sequences which were eventually reanimated through the filmstrip: "Do they snapshot those girls, [ie. catch them unawares] or is it all a fake?"^{xxii} That goal was similarly highlighted by Virginia Woolf's view that *Ulysses* is preoccupied both with accurate mediation of moving phenomena and the mental process of its apprehension.^{xxiii} Ironically, Gerty's off screen mimicry of high-kicking mutoscope girls does not resolve the conundrum about hyperreal simulation perplexing Bloom—whether they are playing to the camera and their naturalness is faked—because Gerty's performance only "promotes a similar illusion of unselfconsciousness" (Mullin, "Gerty through the Mutoscope," 1). Through Bloom Joyce indicates profound awareness of problems in the ontology and interpretation of mechanically-reproduced images. Indeed, Joyce seems to parody the "What the Butler Saw" convention of such surreptitiously titillating observation again in one of "Circe's" emasculating fantasies. Transformed into Boylan's valet, Bloom is permitted to peep through the bedroom keyhole at his own cuckolding, even offering to snapshot the act himself for exhibiting his humiliation publicly (15.3787-94). Like several other moments, Briggs argues this is deliberately redolent of the "flicker" effect of interrupted visibility in early film caused by the lower standard frame rate of the time (Briggs, "Roll Away the Reel World," 151), but it also emphasizes the revelation of real action which the virtualism

of photographic images teasingly promises, while simultaneously effacing. Watching Boylan and Molly's vigorous intercourse, Bloom yells excitedly: "Show! Hide! Show!" (15.3816) This confirms Joyce's fascination with the camera eye's role as proxy voyeur and its apparent pandering to a "male gaze" by invading private female space, as exploited in many early moving pictures. As Mullin notes, its thrill was morally and ontologically risky, however: another film, *Peeping Tom in the Dressing Room* (American Mutoscope and Biograph Company, 1905) features a voyeur discovered by other men, then punished by semi-naked girls he has been spying on (Mullin, "Gerty Through the Mutoscope," 1). This comic remediation of the Acteon myth suggests a discomfiting level of threat to counterpart viewers off-screen.^{xxiv} However, in Joyce's ironic echo of this chastisement theme, Gerty suddenly breaks her illusion of un-selfconsciousness after finishing her act, by returning Bloom's gaze with challenging directness, acknowledging she has been aware of it all along in a "pathetic little glance of piteous protest, of shy reproach" (13.742-43). This credits Gerty with some awareness and agency, however ambiguously. Mullin points out Gerty's admonishing look closely matches actual film scenarios such as *Disrobed Woman Surprised* (Mullin, "Gerty Through the Mutoscope," 1). It certainly leaves Bloom shaken, creating a table-turning effect as gazing male subject suddenly feels himself revealed as target of the female other's equivalent fantasy, then finally disempowered object of her moral scrutiny: "under which he coloured like a girl" (13.743). It is also only after Gerty limps away, breaking the peepshow frame as it were and reverting to a complex selfhood beyond the endlessly-looping action she has been mimicking, that Bloom's interior monologue resumes in all its discomfiture. Strategically, Joyce chose to *re-present* Bloom's subjectivity not during his self-absorbed gratification, but as he reflects on its significance and consequences. This is also the point Bloom ceases to be the "idealized

observer-voyeur promoted by the dominant Western scopic tradition, in Jonathan Crary's view, and effectively extended by the male gaze in early film.^{xxv} Bloom is no longer a disembodied eye, privileged by culture and technology to watch safely at a distance, becoming instead a troubled conscience chafing against that role.

Turning the Gender Tables

As the Rocketts demonstrate, Dublin Mutoscope parlors were actually cheap enough to be patronized by *both* sexes and all ages, rather than reserved for “men only” (*Magic Lantern*, 162). One inspector's testimony (from a Parliamentary Select Committee Report of 1908) refers to boys and girls “indulging in all sorts of indecent acts among themselves” and picking out “machines which bore the most seductive titles and which they thought contained the worst pictures.”^{xxvi} Similarly, although a famous 1912 photograph features a row of four pier-end Mutoscopes advertising “*Willies [sic] Hat*,” among other “Living Pictures,” the viewers are both young women.^{xxvii} While ignoring that specific title, one watches another legshow—“*The Ramping Girls on the Swing*—but the other most likely views athletic male bodies in “*The Great Cricket Match*.” Cinematic peepshows undoubtedly loosened rigid social boundaries. Condon notes they “not only allowed the respectable classes to engage in virtual slumming,” but permitted women to participate vicariously in activities “once the sole preserve of men” (*Early Irish Cinema*, 26). He exemplifies this with an *Evening Telegraph* review of Edison's kinoscope illustrated by a middle-class couple viewing its cockfight loop.^{xxviii} Other visual historians corroborate Condon's point. Musser argues film peepshows “were involved in a breakdown and curtailment of an older homosocial world and the emergence of a newer heterosocial culture.”^{xxix} Indeed the term “kineto-or mutoscope parlor” implied a blurring between women's historically limited domestic

sphere and potentially transgressive experience of mediated elsewhere.^{xxx} As Condon infers, even if the cockfighting and skirt dancing were primarily calculated to attract “a dominant male gaze” familiar with blood sports and burlesque, other subjects such as *Wild West Show*, *Barber's Shop* and especially *Sandow* exercising had far less predictable appeal (*Early Irish Cinema*, 27).

Mullin and Philip Sicker agree that Bloom seems oblivious to Gerty's reciprocal, media-conditioned voyeurism or women's in general. Joyce is arguably directing attention to that blindspot in his male contemporaries, through scrutinizing how scenarios from early film and their social mimicry “conceal a choreographed performance behind the conventions of Peeping Tom and his innocent victim,” as Mullin puts it (“Gerty Through the Mutoscope,” 2). Moreover, besides featuring sequences aimed specifically at gratifying male desires, mutoscope parlors had wider, much more unpredictable appeal, to which Edwardian patriarchy, with its monopolization of erotic privileges and moral double-standards, seemed largely oblivious. As historians of sexual culture point out, debates about pornography were sometimes more concerned with preventing women, children, and the working classes from accessing such material than suppressing it altogether, because it was assumed they were less mature and more prone to corruption.^{xxxii} As the Rocketts put it, cinematic peepshows “nevertheless allowed for a new more transgressive space in which women could access previously taboo images particularly in relation to violence and the male body” (*Magic Lantern*, 162-63). Gerty's real life counterparts almost certainly saw semi-naked males performing at kinoscope or mutoscope parlors, most notably Sandow, the “Modern Hercules” with his appropriately Joycean-Homeric stage title. R.B. Kershner has researched the Jewish strongman's extensive presence in *Ulysses*, including on Bloom's own bookshelf in “Ithaca” through Sandow's bestseller, *Strength*

and How to Obtain It (1897) (see 17.513-14). This featured lavish full-page photographs of Sandow mimicking athletic stances by classical statues, clad in a posing pouch.^{xxxii} Kershner stresses Sandow's calculated scopophilic appeal to women and homosexuals, as well as the ego-libidos of heterosexual men emulating him.^{xxxiii} Moreover, his act was widely screened, making him globally "desirable, and famous, in an unusual new way" only possible through the new medium, as Ian Christie argues.^{xxxiv} As we saw, Sandow's performing body featured in Dublin's first kinetoscope program, a preview to his live performance at its Empire Theatre in May 1898. Significantly, as Musser notes, Dickson's loop did not focus on prodigious feats as might be expected, among which lifting a horse with one hand became particularly famous on advertising for Murphy's Irish Stout. Instead it records the posing preceding Sandow's act. This creates a curious effect resembling a series of medium close-up stills, like a virtually naked "living statue" only animated by changes of position for displaying different muscle groups and allowing time to linger on them (Musser, *The Emergence of Cinema*, 75). Molly reminisces about similarly arousing glimpses of Olympian male bodies, posing before taking dynamic action during her Gibraltarian adolescence:

those fine young men I could see down in Margate strand bathingplace from the side of the rock standing up in the sun naked like a God or something and then plunging into the sea with them why arent all men like that thered be some consolation for a woman

(18.1345-49)

Significantly, Dublin's *Evening Telegraph* explained the functioning of the Kinetoscope using boxing rather than a performing female body (*Evening Telegraph*,

April 6, 1895, 5). After viewing became socialized through projection, this focus on sport intensified. In her account of a screening of the Corbett-Fitzsimmons match, which took place in Carson City, Nevada, in March 1897, American feminist Alice Rix focused on female audience reactions not the fight itself. Prompted by overhearing a man comment outside—“Turn women loose on the chance to see a prize fight without getting herself talked about and there’ll be no holding them back”—Rix investigated this potentially liberating experience.^{xxxv} The same film was also shown in Dublin (appropriately by widescreen-format “Veriscope,” literally “truth seer”).^{xxxvi} It is recalled by Master Dignam in “Wandering Rocks,” testifying to its lasting impact on Irish popular consciousness (10.1145–9). Film’s reputation for being “quicker than the eye” in revealing secrets of bodily action allowed audiences to make up their own minds about the alleged foul missed by the referee, but also proliferated displays of male semi-nakedness.

Similarly, just as Bloom has his mutoscope legshows and bathing nymph photo pin-up, his appeal to Gerty is by resemblance to “the image of the photo she had of Martin Harvey, the matinee idol, only for the moustache” (13.416-17). In other words, Gerty’s desire is also mediated through technology. English actor, Sir John Martin-Harvey, toured regularly to Dublin in the 1900s, becoming a heartthrob to all ages, as recalled by Molly (18.1055). He also made the transition to film stardom in the 1910s. Gerty clearly keeps his photograph as an accessory to fantasy just as she immerses herself in romantic fiction, “softest of all forms of pornography” as Angela Carter described it.^{xxxvii} This intersection with media-conditioned male arousal is underscored by “pictures cut out of papers of those skirt dancers and highkickers” kept by her friend Bertha Supple’s lodger (*Ulysses* 13.704).. Bertha evidently knows they “cause him to do something not very nice that you could imagine sometimes in the bed”—the phrase

“you could imagine” being conspicuously ambiguous (13.704-06). Gerty finds this hint towards masturbation distasteful, but also thrilling enough to recall during her own exhibitionistic display.

Mullin concludes that in placing the mutoscope at “Nausicaa’s” thematic core, Joyce adds more than just another quaint period detail to a chapter already littered with the mass-culture detritus of modernity. It is but one of a number of devices which subtend the optic with the priapic, thus permitting the invasive scrutiny of Joyce’s female characters. The mutoscope supplies the voyeur’s lens which glints throughout Joyce’s fiction, as the sexual act is repeatedly displaced by the pleasures of “only looking” (Mullin, “Gerty Through the Mutoscope,” 2).

However, a question still hovers over the episode: does that make “Nausicaa” merely symptomatic of modernity’s visual commodification of the erotic; a critique of it for either sex; or perhaps both at once? Certainly, in her reading through Walter Benjamin’s theory, Maurizia Boscagli has argued “Nausicaa” marks a historical moment when a whole

system of visuality reaches a point of rupture, exactly through the spectacle of femininity Gerty stages: more precisely through the shift from nineteenth century portraiture, whether painterly or photographic, to its “degradation” in the spectacular anonymity of the fashion plate, to the mobility of the cinematic image which the Mutoscope Girls anticipate.^{xxxviii}

Hence there is a double irony in the fact that Bloom, an advertising canvasser, feels stung by being temporarily caught out by Benjamin’s “phony spell of a commodity,”

but also begins to reflect on the shared media-cultural imaginary which facilitates that.^{xxxix} Commentators such as Anthony Paraskeva have argued that Joyce's subsequent zooming out from Bloom's voyeurism to the phantasmagoric visual anarchy of "Circe" "explod[es] private Mutoscopic peepshow into public cinematic projection."^{xl} But if we look closer, the peepshow is in fact not the only cinematic aspect of "Nausicaa" itself. This crisis in a system of visuality, located by Joyce's fiction in 1904, is actually framed by a wider, more complex structure responding to how film culture and the narrative possibilities of cinematic form had developed by 1922 when *Ulysses* was published.

Simultaneous Perspectives

Cinematic peepshows were eventually banished to seaside arcades and fairgrounds. Ironically, this was not due to strident campaigns (despite mounting accusations, mutoscopes were never banned), but "market forces." Among superior attractions of projected films was a simultaneous, large-scale viewing experience like the magic lantern's, as recognized by reviews of Dublin's first kinoscope programs (see Rockett, *Magic Lantern*, 163). Similarly, when Gerty limps away, she also breaks the limits of peepshow perspective and triggers the wider, more mobile kind of ekphrastic cinematicity structuring the rest of Joyce's episode. Hence The techniques and themes in "Nausicaa" analyze, but also move beyond early viewing culture as a solitary, gendered experience, providing a retrospective critique of it. Joyce implies Gerty too knows about mutoscope pictures—possibly recalling and imitating roles from the burlesque kind seen by Bloom, when she admits "she wasn't ashamed and he wasn't either to look in that immodest way like that because he couldn't resist the sight of the wondrous revealment like those skirt dancers behaving so immodest before gentlemen

looking” (13.730-33). However, by juxtaposing their respective subjectivities Joyce underscores the effects of a media-cultural imaginary on the thoughts and behavior of both sexes; in particular he exposes the mutual misconception this abets, problematizing it for both characters and readers. Thence the episode’s literary cinematicity subsumes scopic isolation through presenting contrasting perspectives, giving us means to compare them and thereby deepen our understanding of processes alienating us from more authentic selfhood. This hinges on reading “Nausicaa” as a key instance of *Ulysses*’ dual time frame in relation to moving picture history. By 1922, film narrative had evolved far beyond peepshow loops, into increasingly complex, multi-reel features and communal viewing in “dream palaces” on a vast scale. Formally innovative directors such as D.W. Griffith and Lois Weber in the US, Fritz Lang in Germany and Abel Gance in France had also developed sophisticated editing techniques to represent multiple character perspectives or parallel and simultaneous actions. These sometimes highlighted the importance of empathizing across differences of age, sex, and socio-economic circumstances.^{xli}

Stephen Kern demonstrates how Joyce’s , episode in which twilight gradually alters conditions of visibility, is dominated by the eye. This is for a “chronotopical” function which is ultimately unifying, albeit Joyce’s characters and leitmotifs initially seem to present seeing as misalignment: Gerty and Bloom furtively ogle each other; while everybody else gazes at a firework display; a clergyman eyes the host at a church nearby; unnoticed, a bat veers blindly around, but linking them all through echolocation, appropriately.^{xlii} Far from merely reinforcing mutoscopic isolation of viewpoints and actions, Joyce’s cinematic structure places readers in the position to transcend and integrate them. Contracting the scope of “Wandering Rocks”—*Ulysses*’ most cross-sectional and panoramic episode which tracked parallel and simultaneous

movement on a city-wide scale earlier that day—to the beachside locality of Sandymount, “Nausicaa” nonetheless interweaves actions occurring in separate places within it: Gerty on the shore with girlfriends and infant charges; Bloom sitting nearby; and a service at the Men’s Catholic Temperance Retreat at the Star of the Sea church just inland.^{xliii} However, Joyce’s overlooking “monstrator” gradually unites all three locations through ironic juxtaposition, suggesting underlying connections by showing not telling.^{xliiv} As in “Wandering Rocks,” his technique constitutes a form of parallel editing between visualized actions and streams of consciousness occurring simultaneously. Joyce implies that Gerty and Bloom are both distanced *and* connected by voyeurism, self-display, and masturbation, although they don’t fully understand the effect they are having on each other, as their separate thoughts reveal. Nonetheless, the self-pleasuring is not one-sided, as sometimes assumed: Sicker argues Gerty’s leg-swinging doubles as auto-frottage. Hence Joyce’s orgasmic fireworks metaphor should also be regarded as indicating simultaneous and mutual climax.^{xliv} Dióg O’Connell draws attention to a parallel cross-cutting sequence in Pat Murphy’s biopic of Joyce’s partner, *Nora* (2000), showing the couple simultaneously masturbating to exchanged letters, mediating mutual desire to their distant partner (the same letters Leonard compares to erotic photo-sequences). Nora is on their bed in Trieste; Joyce, significantly, at his deserted Volta cinema in Dublin with a magical trick film playing behind him. Murphy’s editing and *mise-en-scène* imply that the couple’s pleasure is based on visualizing the absent other, thus re-affirming connection at a moment of separation and crisis brought on by Joyce’s jealous suspicions that Nora has another lover and Nora’s that Joyce will resort to prostitutes while away.^{xlvi} This sequence might also serve as commentary on representation of mediated fantasy in “Nausicaa,” with its similarly virtual contact against a background of emotional alienation, but within wider

cinematic framing. “Nausicaa” produces mutual consolation and empathy between strangers, albeit fleetingly. Indeed Murphy’s technique of simultaneity seems inspired by reading Joyce’s episode, so strikingly does she echo and repurpose its themes and methods.

“Nausicaa” underscores that our self-presentation and deciphering by others are conditioned by Huhtamo’s media-cultural imaginary, even when not gazing through actual lenses or literally at screens. Joyce expresses skepticism about the uncontaminated naturalness of human vision by the internalized pulp romance clichés through which Gerty frames Bloom’s returning gaze: “Yes, it was *her he was looking at*, and *there was meaning* in his look. His eyes *burned into* her as though they would *search her through* and through, *read her very soul*.” (13.411-13; emphasis added) Thus Joyce draws attention to the epistemological paradox of simultaneously being subjects and objects—seeing and being seen, giving and receiving visual signals — but also how that is conditioned by textual and, increasingly, technological viewing.

The subsequent evolution of cinematic culture and form after 1904 are thus reflected in the episode’s structure and used to stress this process, but also overcome the limits of disparate visions. Kern argues that the transitionless way Joyce unites different actions occurring simultaneously—stringing them together through syntactical “run-ons” by simple conjunctions into long, breathlessly unpunctuated sentences—deliberately evokes film’s effortless movement between disparate shots edited together into continuous sequences (Kern, *The Culture of Time and Space*, 79).^{xlvii} This is similar to the cinematic switching between locations in “Wandering Rocks,” albeit on smaller, more concentrated scale:

Gerty could see without looking that he never took his eyes off her and then Canon O’Hanlon handed the thurible back to Father Conroy and knelt down

looking at the Blessed Sacrament and the choir began to sing *Tantum ergo* and she just swung her foot in and out of time as the music rose and fell

(*Ulysses* 13.495-59)

Joyce's juxtaposing is suffused with ironic visual matching, a device also copiously employed in "Wandering Rocks" and irresistible to his punster's instinct. It is epitomized by the parallel between swinging thurible and revealing leg movements, as priest and Bloom kneel before respective sacred and profane "shrines". Ungrammatically, Gerty too imagines Bloom is "literally worshipping at her shrine" (13.564). Her rock also suggests a (living) statue's pedestal and ironic matching aligns other objects by symbolic close-up, such as phallic altar candles, removed from ovic flowers lest they ignite them. This sequence is followed by Joyce's climactic parallel between soaring rockets from the display opening the nearby Mirus Bazaar, with its gasping onlookers, and the simultaneous rapture of Gerty and Bloom's covert orgasms. Surely one of the most famous and extended visual double-entendres in modern fiction (clichéd to the point of parody on screen today). It is played out between, "And she saw a long Roman candle" and "O so soft, sweet, soft!" (13.719-40).^{xlviii} Pyrotechnic association with climax is recalled in moving image fantasy form in "Circe": "*Mirus bazaar fireworks go up from all sides with symbolical phallopyrotechnic designs*" (15.1494-95).

The dying cadence of the fireworks also cues the expansion of Joyce's visual frame into one of *Ulysses* most mobile sequences of simultaneous, cross-sectional action. This is rendered from his monstrator's panoramic perspective, enfolding Bloom's individual consciousness:

A last lonely candle wandered up the sky from Mirus bazaar in search of funds for Mercer's hospital and broke, drooping, and shed a cluster of violet but one white stars. They floated, fell; they faded. The shepherd's hour: the hour of folding: hour of tryst. From house to house, giving his everwelcome double knock, went the nine o'clock postman, the glowworm's lamp at his belt gleaming here and there through the laurel hedges. And among the five young trees a hoisted linstock lit the lamp at Leahy's terrace. By screens of lighted windows, by equal gardens a shrill voice went crying, wailing: *Evening Telegraph, stop press edition! Result of the Gold Cup races!* and from the door of Dignam's house a boy ran out and called. Twittering the bat flew here, flew there. Far out over the sands the coming surf crept, grey. Howth settled for slumber, tired of long days, of yumyum rhododendrons (he was old) and felt gladly the night breeze lift, ruffle his fell of ferns. He lay but opened a red eye unsleeping, deep and slowly breathing, slumberous but awake. And far on Kish bank the anchored lightship twinkled, winked at Mr. Bloom.

(13.1166-81)

Ambiguous phrases such as "yumyum rhododendrons (he was old)" suggest that Bloom's touchstone memory of sharing seedcake during *al fresco* consummation with Molly on distant Howth (rendered in vibrant detail in "Lestrygonians" (8.906-09)) is fading out amid darkening horizons too. Nevertheless, diurnal routines of city and environs carry on indifferent to Molly's adulterous breach in their marriage that afternoon.

Like "Wandering Rocks," "Nausicaa" also concludes with a composite moving image sequence summarising its action and themes. This substitutes the spatial

coordination provided by the viceregal procession crossing Dublin (glimpsed by many citizens at different points) with the synchronicity of actions in close proximity. Joyce also combines auditory and visual effects through a method which (anticipating its actualization by the optical soundtrack from 1927 onwards) “laps” sound between locations, while physically conjoining them by the hither-and-thither flitting bat. Thus Bloom’s stertorous post-ejaculatory breathing evokes the parochial house clock where clerics are enjoying their own post-service wind down—Gerty simultaneously remembering its punctual cuckoo from her own visits—as well as echoing Bloom’s cuckolding for which their mediated encounter proved temporary, but scant consolation:

A bat flew. Here. There. Here. Far in the grey a bell chimed. Mr Bloom with open mouth, his left boot sanded sideways, leaned, breathed. Just for a few.

Cuckoo

Cuckoo

Cuckoo

The clock on the mantelpiece in the priest’s house cooed where Canon O’Hanlon and Father Conroy and the Reverend John Hughes, S.J. were taking tea and sodabread and butter and fried mutton chops with catsup and talking about

Cuckoo

Cuckoo

Cuckoo

Because it was a little canarybird bird that came out of its little house to tell the time that Gerty MacDowell noticed the time she was there because she was as quick as anything about a thing like that, was Gerty MacDowell, and she

noticed at once that that foreign gentleman that was sitting on the rocks looking
was

Cuckoo

Cuckoo

Cuckoo

(13.1286-1307)

As Kern points out, restless bat and 9:00 cuckoo are leitmotifs signifying “visual and auditory ubiquity,” which lace together characters and settings in ironic commentary (Kern, *The Culture of Time and Space*, 80). Thus Joyce’s conclusion emphatically widens the episode’s creative cinematicity far beyond mutoscopic tunnel vision.

“Nausicaa” in the Reisman-Zukovsky Treatment

A particularly revealing sidelight on the relationship between “Nausicaa” and cinema post-1904 is cast by an early attempt to actually adapt Joyce’s novel: the screenplay by Objectivist poet Louis Zukofsky with his protégé Jerry Reisman, completed by 1935 although never produced.^{xlix} Their treatment capitalized on Joyce’s cinematic simultaneity, at both naturalistic and psychological levels, and strove to visualize it. After establishing footage of Sandymount, their screen was to have segmented three ways. This strategy was influenced by pioneering films such as Lois Weber’s *Suspense* (1913), which divides between wife at home, burglar breaking in from the street, and husband desperately telephoning. Such techniques were enlarged to epic scale in *Napoléon vu par Abel Gance* (1926-7), with Gance’s screen segmenting into multiple battlefronts, as well as symbolic links between them. Reisman-Zukovsky also anticipate more recent synchronic features such as Mike Figgis’s *Time Code*

(2000), with its Zoom-like, quadripartite screen division. On the right, a continuous close-up of Gerty's burlesque mimicry would have appeared; left, a corresponding medium longshot of the "writhing" Bloom; between them, a central montage of romantic scenes representing the girl's successive imaginings in fuzzy-edged iris.¹

Although Gerty was to be rendered through shots of an actress, visualizing her hyper-feminine, fashion-magazine shaped mentality through costuming and gesture, her interiority was nonetheless figured through these imaginary scenarios screen-center: sitting in her opulent boudoir, admired by attendants; completing her wedding *toilette*; or composing herself artfully before the mirror. These were to be intercut with here-and-now shots of Gerty's squabbling infant charges and bantering girlfriends (Reisman and Zukovsky, *JJU*, 98, shots 354-55). Bloom's initial appearance, as an anonymous "Gentleman," was to be temporarily unrecognisable in the "waning light." (99, shot 358) Significantly, he throws the boys' ball back, the camera tracking it like *Portrait's* rolling napkin ring (signifying Stephen's embarrassed gaze avoiding the adult argument raging overhead in Joyce's Christmas dinner passage). The ball inevitably lodges under Gerty's skirt, connecting them by visual suggestion (99, shot 359). Gerty (made aware the stranger is looking) raises her skirt to kick it, triggering the triptych frame division: "In the lower RIGHT, a CLOSESHOT OF GROUP, GERTY nearest CAMERA. In the lower LEFT, a MED. LONGSHOT of the GENTLEMAN. An OUT OF FOCUS IMAGE (GERTY'S Thoughts) is IRISED IN in the center." (100, shot 362.) Brief scenarios then flow through the central pane in the stereotypes of pulp romance as remediated and intensified in 1930s popular features: "CENTRE: Gerty, in peasant costume, meets the Gentleman, romantically tall, dark and handsome at a well. She touches his cheek, sorrowfully, and whispers. He encircles her waist and gallantly takes her bucket, as

they walk off.” Meanwhile, “real” Gerty remains visible swinging her foot and raising skirt ever higher screen right, as Bloom leans in left for closer sidelong glances (100-1, shot 362). The fetishism of Edwardian peepshows had been (literally) magnified in other film genres by this time. Hence recurrent flashbacks of a swinging leg in Reuben Mamoulian’s *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1931) was instrumental in provoking tighter censorship through Hollywood’s Hays Code.^{li} In contrast, Reisman-Zukovsky’s effect of psychological interplay between central and side panes is unabashed and knowingly meta-cinematic: as Gerty is rescued from brigands by Bloom on a white charger, “forward” Cissy Caffrey crosses from right to left frame sections to ask the Gentleman the time (Reisman and Zukovsky, *JJU*, 101, shot 363). Imagined bliss in the marital home is then figured by Bloom lingering to kiss Gerty and stare into her eyes despite running late for work. Meantime, her swinging leg accelerates right and garters begin showing, fireworks breaking out simultaneously at the screen’s edge. On the left, the Gentlemen (returning her glance ever more intensely) thrusts hand deeper into pocket (102-03, shot 365). As Gerty leans back to watch the fireworks (soundtrack music crescendoing), her own show of underwear becomes brazen. Her sublimated self in the center, by contrast, demurely presses a ribbon-bound diary to her breast. On the right, Roman Candles shoot fireballs, as present Gerty comes to rest at the limit of her arc while off-screen voices cry, “Oh! Oh!”, lapping into her girlfriends calling time to leave. Standing awkwardly, she waves her hanky to the Gentleman as she, who squirms climactically on his side of the frame (103-04, shot 366).

At this point, Reisman and Zukovsky proposed a radical departure from Joyce’s cinematic simultaneity by suddenly arresting their flow of images with a still intended to comment on them extra-diegetically: Surrealist Max Ernst’s “Poème

Visible,” *Minotoure*, no.5, picture 2. Only after this prolonged pause, was there to have been a fully identifying close-up of Bloom, “visibly shocked” by Gerty’s limp (Reisman and Zukovsky, *JJU*, 104, shots 367-69). However, they did not intend to conclude by resuming Bloom’s interior monologue nor with Joyce’s final intercutting between beach and parochial house, albeit the latter could have been achieved by more split screening. Additional stills from Ernst’s “La Clé des Chants,” *Minotoure*, no.5, picture 1 and 4, and “Poème Visible,” *Minotoure*, no.5, picture 3, would have flashed up instead, before images finally began moving again with a cut to Boylan and Molly at the piano in Eccles Street, breaking off a passionate kiss as she bursts into “Love’s Old Sweet Song” (104-5, shots 370-73). The rest of their treatment specifies darkening images of Bloom gazing after Gerty into the distance while forlornly scratching a message with a stick in the sand, punctuated with a final close-up of Joyce’s connecting motif—the bat flitting overhead between (105, shot 375).

Nevertheless, Reisman and Zukovsky dealt more creatively with the post-mutoscopic cinematic structure in “Nausicaa” than any adaptation of Joyce’s novel which has made it to the screen as yet. While their script also omits direct reference to peepshows, as a topical updating of Joyce’s setting and themes to the 1930s it neatly emphasizes how moving image culture increasingly figured in the media-cultural imaginary of the time, as well as how film’s narrative methods had developed. It used the latter to critique the former in a reflexive form, with interestingly “haptic” implications.

Conclusion: Vision as Touch

Effectively, Reisman and Zukovsky foregrounded the engagement with the phenomenology of cinema in “Nausicaa,”; how Joyce represents vision as

simultaneously organic and mediated, but consequently also as a form of touching at a distance. He presents it as virtual contact between bodies, which acts on them in the most visceral of ways. The ranks of disembodied, but mutually aligned eyes and severed, grasping hands in stills from *Poème Visible* would have emphasized mediated aspects of Gerty and Bloom's "near encounter" very suggestively. As Cleo Hanaway-Oakley argues, by alluding to technological prosthesis of the senses, Ernst's pictures would have stressed how filmic vision stimulates haptic contact between bodies and minds.^{lii} As we saw, after Gerty breaks the peepshow frame, Bloom is also touched in a more human way by an empathic response to her lameness. This causes him and us to question the ethics of media-conditioned looking. Joyce noted film's capacity to touch spectators at a neural level: "cinematographic images act like those stimuli which produce a reflex action of the nerves."^{liii} Hence he recognised that far from sponsoring a "disembodied eye, it tantalisingly restored corporeality to vision. This "synaesthetic" quality was already integral to the pleasure of handling optical toys such as the zoetrope, by spinning its drum of images, or the stereoscope's impression of "solid" seeing applied closely to the eyes. Mutoscopes effectively combined features of both. Optical toys depended on handling to activate their "consensual hallucination, to borrow William Gibson's term," just as Mutoscopes were hand-cranked.^{liv} Hence "Nausicaa" invokes the history as well as future of cinematicity, pre- and post-1904.

Film historians confirm detached scopophilia was not the principal response of early audiences at projected film shows either: bodily excitement—being moved—was integral to their attractions.^{lv} Lynda Nead cites accounts of audiences starting away from oncoming locomotives or trying to touch figures on screen because they seemed more "hyperreal" and present than in any medium before as foundational

evidence that “[i]n the presence of animated pictures the viewer himself becomes animated. . . . Looking, in those early years, was corporeal; and viewing was embodied.” Cinematic erotica expressed this with particular intensity, so in “the consumption of images of the unclothing body. . . the sensory and phenomenological implications of the wondrous new media became most focused.”^{lvi} In *Portrait*, Joyce’s avatar Stephen asserts the superiority of a contemplative theory of High Art over “improper” cultural forms, didactic or pornographic. However, in “Nausicaa” his maturer author poses a challenge to non-tactile, aesthetic detachment. Similarly, noting symptomatic proximity between the terms filmstrip and striptease, Nead argues that, if optical machines reintroduced the viewer’s body as “an integral part of their attraction,” this was never more intense than when their object of representation was the body itself. Hence they “eroded the distinctions between gaze and body, body and machine,” though as the case of Sandow epitomizes unclothed male bodies figured much more in this process than often realized (Nead, “Strip,” 136-37). In this sense, it is no coincidence that “Nausicaa” presents experience of the visceral intensity of cinematic movement not through the more distanced format of a cinematograph show (controlled by a projectionist separated from viewing public), but a device through which individuals themselves made images move by intimate grasping, while applying eyes to a slot. Literal physical contact with the apparatus, though lacking projection’s larger-than-life impact, nonetheless accentuated haptic effects, with their virtually interactive motion.

However, projection did not switch off corporealized viewing, so much as modify and extend it on a more immersive scale. Phenomenological accounts of cinema, such as Hugo Münsterberg’s, Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s and Vivien Sobchack’s, date back at least to the 1910s. Building on this approach, Hanaway-

Oakley makes a convincing case that for Joyce film's artificial eye offered vicarious experience of being inside another sensorium and consciousness; potentially, an empathic mirroring through others. The wider literary cinematicity of *Ulysses* effectively creates an ekphrastic parallel to this through which Joyce expands understanding both of ourselves and those regarded as not-self, epitomized by his Jewish-Irish Odysseus, Bloom (Hanaway-Oakley, *James Joyce and the Phenomenology of Film*, 1-4).

Hanaway-Oakley argues Joyce and film pioneers seem equally pre-occupied with creating sensations of embodied experience, particularly synaesthesia between vision and touch. Bloom and Gerty's virtual contact suggests a reciprocal, inter-subjective mingling of self with other (Hanaway-Oakley, *James Joyce and the Phenomenology of Film*, 91-2). In this context, Gerty's mimicry of erotic performance and Bloom's memorized response involve projecting mutual desire, representing both as body-subjects locked in simultaneous gazing (109-10). Their encounter is shown to be conditioned by a common media-cultural imaginary. By enfolding this within the episode's wider structure, which emulates post-mutoscopic evolution of film techniques as Reisman and Zukovsky realized so astutely, Joyce both revisited a particular moment in the history of visual culture and contemplated its ongoing implications.

Notes

I am grateful to Fritz Senn and colleagues at the Zürich James Joyce Foundation for allowing me to consult (in the Hans E. Jahnke bequest) their carbon copy of the screenplay of *James Joyce's Ulysses*:

Scenario and Continuity which is at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center (University of Texas at Austin); also to the Carnegie Trust for the travel grant to do so.

ⁱ Erkki Huhtamo, *Illusions in Motion: Media Archaeology of the Moving Panorama and Related Spectacles* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013), 332.

ⁱⁱ See Denis Condon, *Early Irish Cinema, 1895–1921* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2008), 25-34; also Kevin and Emer Rockett, *Magic Lantern, Panorama and Moving Picture Shows in Ireland, 1786-1909* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011), 158-60.

ⁱⁱⁱ Charles Musser, *The Emergence of Cinema: The American Screen to 1907* (London: Macmillan, 1990), 78; also Michael Harvey, “The Mutoscope and Joyce,” *James Joyce Broadsheet*, No. 49 (Feb., 1998), ‘Notes’ section: 3.

^{iv} Stills from many of these are reproduced in Rockett, *Magic Lantern*, plates 87-94.

^v See Keith Williams, *James Joyce and Cinematicity: Before and After Film* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020), 121.

^{vi} See *Dublin Evening Telegraph*, May 18, 1895, 8.

^{vii} Persistence of vision and the phi phenomenon together “allow us to see a succession of static images as a single unbroken movement and permit the illusion of continuous motion” (David A. Cook, *A History of Narrative Film*, 4th edn. [New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2004], 1).

^{viii} For Pope Leo and photographic media, see also Williams, *James Joyce and Cinematicity*, 39, 49 and 143.

^{ix} In January 1899, a joint stereoscope/mutoscope parlor at 6 Parliament Street was prosecuted for exhibiting stereoviews “‘in various stages of undress’.” Ironically, though they were destroyed as indecent, the mutoscopic subjects were judged “‘perfectly unobjectionable’” (see Rockett, *Magic Lantern*, 161). See also: Anon. “Alleged Objectionable Pictures,” *Freeman’s Journal*, January 7, 1899, 2; John Plunkett, “Selling Stereoscapy, 1890-1915: Penny Arcades, Automatic Machines and American Salesmen,” *Early Popular Visual Culture*, 6, no. 3 (2008), 239-55, 250.

-
- ^x Katherine Mullin, *James Joyce, Sexuality and Social Purity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 167. (Chapter 5 elaborates her “Gerty through the Mutoscope,” *James Joyce Broadsheet*, No. 49 (February 1998), 1-2.)
- ^{xi} See also John Barnes, *The Beginnings of the Cinema in England 1894-1901*, vol. 4, 1899, revised edition (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1996), 152-53 and 156-59.
- ^{xii} Musser’s *The Emergence of Cinema* features a *Peeping Tom* still on 230; one from *Kicking Willy’s Hat*, on 188.
- ^{xiii} See reproduction in Appendix A of *James Joyce, Ulysses* (1922), ed. with intro. and notes by Jeri Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 734-9 (738).
- ^{xiv} See also Mullin, *James Joyce*, 166 and 147, respectively. Similar pictures were attacked in the January 1903 issue of Dublin’s White Cross Vigilance Association’s periodical, reporting obscenity proceedings against Fanning’s Irish-American Marionette Company in Great Britain (now Parnell Street (Mullin, *James Joyce*, 167)
- ^{xv} Simon Brown, ‘Early Cinema in Britain and the Smoking Concert Film,’ *Early Popular Visual Culture*, vol.3, no.2 (September 2005), 165-78 (176).
- ^{xvi} Austin Briggs, “‘Roll Away the Reel World, the Reel World’: ‘Circe’ and the Cinema,” in Morris Beja and Shari Benstock (eds), *Coping With Joyce: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1989), 145–56, 146.
- ^{xvii} See for example, D. Kunzle, *Fashion and Fetishism: A Social History of the Corset, Tight-Lacing and Other forms of Body Sculpture in the West* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1982).
- ^{xviii} See Laura Mulvey, “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema,” in Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen (eds.) *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, 6th Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 837-48 (especially 839-41).
- ^{xix} See Garry Leonard, *Advertising and Commodity Culture in Joyce* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 1998), 88-97.

^{xx} See text and images in Heard, “Pearls Before Swine: A Prurient Look at the Lantern,” *Early Popular Visual Culture* 3, no. 2 (September 2005), 179-95 (189 and 191).

xxi

^{xxii} Tom Gunning, “Waking and Faking: Ireland and Cinema Astray,” in Kevin Rockett and John Hill (eds), *National Cinema and Beyond: Studies in Irish Film 1* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), 19–31, 23–24.

^{xxiii} For Woolf, Joyce and animal locomotion studies, see Williams, *James Joyce and Cinematicity*, 16, 109, 111.

^{xxiv} Conversely, such outcomes provide further twists of masochistic fantasy: Bloom’s public exposure and punishment in “Circe’s” fantasy trial seems in tune with this equivocation.

^{xxv} Jonathan Crary makes this argument in “The Camera Obscura and the Subject,” *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992 [1990]), 25-66.

^{xxvi} Cited in Richard Brown and Barry Anthony, *A Victorian Film Enterprise: the History of the British Mutoscope and Biograph Company, 1897-1915* (Trowbridge: Flick Books, 1999), 97. Hence the enquiry was most concerned about “corruption” of adolescents in general. See its conclusions as quoted in Plunkett, “Selling Stereoscapy,” 252.

^{xxvii} From the National Science and Media Museum, Bradford (rpt. in Laura Marcus, *The Tenth Muse: Writing about Cinema in the Modernist Period* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 96; also Barnes, *The Beginnings of the Cinema in England*, vol. 4, 158, plate 87).

^{xxviii} Illustration to “The Mechanism of the Kinetoscope,” *Evening Telegraph*, April 6, 1885, 5.

^{xxix} Charles Musser, “At the Beginning: Motion Picture Reproduction, Representation and Ideology at the Edison and Lumière Companies,” in Lee Grievesen and Peter Krämer (eds.), *The Silent Cinema Reader* (London: Routledge, 2004): 23.

^{xxx} Miriam Hansen, *Babel and Babylon: Spectatorship in American Silent Film* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991), 40-41.

^{xxx} See, among others, Brown, “Early Cinema in Britain and the Smoking Concert Film,” 170; Lynda Nead, *Victorian Babylon: People Streets and Images in Nineteenth-Century London* (London: Yale University Press, 2000), 182; Michael Mason, *The Making of Victorian Sexuality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 157.

^{xxxii} See Eugen Sandow, *Strength and How to Obtain It* (London: Gale and Polden, 1897).

^{xxxiii} See R. Brandon Kershner, *The Culture of Joyce’s Ulysses* (London: Palgrave, 2010), 156-63.

^{xxxiv} Ian Christie, *The Last Machine: Early Cinema and the Birth of the Modern World* (London: BFI/BBC, 1994), 65.

^{xxxv} ‘Alice Rix at the Veriscope’, *San Francisco Examiner*, July 18 1897, 22. [PLEASE PROVIDE SCAN OF SOURCE]

^{xxxvi} See Condon, *Early Irish Cinema*, 20 and 53–60.

^{xxxvii} Angela Carter, *The Sadeian Woman and the Ideology of Pornography* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978), 22.

^{xxxviii} Maurizia Boscagli, “Spectacle Reconsidered: Joycean Synaesthetics and the Dialectic of the Mutoscope,” in *Joyce, Benjamin and Magical Urbanism*, eds. Maurizia Boscagli and Enda Duffy, *European Joyce Studies* 21 (2011): 132-49, 133.

^{xxxix} Walter Benjamin, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn (London: Fontana, 1973), 217–52, 231.

^{xl} Anthony Paraskeva, “Theatre, Cinema and Language of Gesture in “Circe,”” in *Bloomsday 100: Essays on Ulysses*, eds. Morris Beja and Anne Fogarty (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2009), 117-35, 120.

^{xli} I am grateful to my former doctoral student, Chris Gerrard, whose practice-based PhD on “The Multi-Image in Cinema” (University of Dundee 2020) provided many historical examples of such techniques.

^{xlii} Stephen Kern, *The Culture of Time and Space 1889–1918* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983) 78-80.

^{xliii} A similar event also takes place at the end of “Grace.” Protagonist, Tom Kernan, is skeptical about projection technology in the service of piety: “I bar the magic-lantern business” (James Joyce, *Dubliners*, ed. with intro. and notes by Jeri Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 134).

[MISSING FULL CITATION; PLEASE PROVIDE SCAN OF SOURCE]

^{xliv} André Gaudreault distinguishes between “monstration” (showing) and “narration” (telling) in the relationship between moving screen images and spoken or written words based on audio-visual practices carried over from lantern shows. The lantern lecturer morphed into the “film explainer” who interpreted (and sometimes vocalized) silent pictures through their patter, before the technical perfection of synchronized dialogue through the optical soundtrack in the mid-1920s. Hence what may be disorientating about Joyce’s emulation of visual methods of storytelling consists in a deliberate silencing of any “meta-narrative” voice, equivalent to the lantern lecturer or film explainer’s commentary, guiding us through his ekphrastic visuals, because of his famously impersonal literary technique. This requires a more challenging creative interpretation from the reader to process Joyce’s images and is, therefore, closer to Gaudreault’s monstration than conventional narrative. Hugh Kenner and David Hayman conceived the idea of the Joycean “Arranger” to describe readers’ impression of an almost invisible agency at work behind the highly visual narrative structures of *Ulysses*, particularly through its orchestration of sub-sections and the implied links between them. If this general tendency in Joyce is not fully identical with Gaudreault’s filmic monstration, there is at least a suggestive convergence between the two on grounds of inter-medial resemblance. (For further details, see Williams, *James Joyce and Cinematicity*, 9-10 and passim.)

^{xlv} In evidence of this, Sicker cites cases from Havelock Ellis’s 1897 treatise, *Auto-Eroticism*, which Joyce may have been familiar with. See Sicker, “Unveiling Desire: Pleasure, Power and Masquerade in Joyce’s ‘Nausicaa’ Episode,” *Joyce Studies Annual*, 14 (Summer 2003):.92-131, 92-93.

^{xlvi} Dióg O’Connell, “Pat Murphy’s Love story *Nora*,” in John Hill and Kevin Rockett (eds.), *Film History and National Cinema: Studies in Irish Film 2* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 117-28, 122-23.

xlvii

^{xlviii} Craig Wallace Barrow notes Joyce's visual *double entendre* was reproduced more delicately by Hitchcock in *To Catch a Thief* (1955). (See his *Montage in James Joyce's Ulysses* [Madrid: Studia Humanitatis, 1980], 130).

^{xlix} Gösta Werner maintains Warner Brothers instigated the screenplay (see his "James Joyce and Sergej Eisenstein," trans. Erik Gunnemark, *James Joyce Quarterly*, 27:3 (1990), 491–507. (49)). Alternatively, Joseph Evans Slate's account suggests the writers took the initiative themselves because of Hollywood's known interest, though consulting Joyce about details of content, casting and film rights (see his "The Reisman-Zukofsky Screenplay of *Ulysses*: Its Background and Significance," *Library Chronicle of the University of Texas*, new series (1982), 20/21, 106-39, 109, 116-17).

It is interesting to compare the 1967 and 2002 adaptations by Joseph Strick and Sean Walsh, respectively, neither of which incorporates Joyce's pointed reference to the erotic virtualism of moving image peepshows. Even by 1904 harder film erotica was already overtaking the market in titillating images in stereoscopes or by lantern, which would have also rendered Bloom's mutoscope pictures mere cheesecake by comparison. Stanislaus attended a "serata nera" film program in Trieste, featuring girls undressing, bathing and gyrating naked, and Joyce was certainly familiar with such shows (Stanislaus Joyce, *Triestine Book of Days* (unpublished), qtd. in Marco Camerani, "Joyce and Early Cinema: Peeping Bloom through the Keyhole," in Franca Ruggieri, John McCourt and Enrico Terrinoni (eds.), *Joyce in Progress: Proceedings of the 2008 James Joyce Graduate Conference in Rome* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2009), 114-28, 123). By the time *Ulysses* was published, film recordings of explicit sex acts circulated widely in the shadowy market outside public circuits of distribution and viewing. There is some evidence such material was screened at men only "smoking concerts" and it was certainly shown for "fluffing" purposes in brothels, as frequented by Joyce himself. (See Brown, "Early Cinema in Britain and the Smoking Concert Film," 165-66.

Explicit sex films contemporary to *Ulysses*, mostly from France, have been collected by Michel Reilhac in the DVD *The Good Old Naughty Days* [Mélange Poductions, 2005]). However, the mutoscope would not have been out of place in Walsh's period setting. Strick also omits the striking three-way visual match in "Nausicaa," in which Joyce cuts back and forth: between Gerty's swinging leg, Bloom's recollection of high-kicking mutoscope girls, and the arcing church censer. Walsh devises

an alternative strategy for a similar effect, cutting between shots of the service's Marian statue and Gerty's increasingly daring self-display. He also grants Gerty a degree of subjective focalisation, by visualising her fantasy of marrying the romantic "dark stranger" she yearns for Bloom to embody. The cue for this clearly springs from how Joyce reveals Gerty's desires are shaped by a media-cultural imaginary complementing Bloom's. However, neither film comes near the elaborate simultaneity proposed in Reisman-Zukovsky's treatment.

^l Reisman and Zukovsky, *James Joyce's Ulysses: Scenario and Continuity*, 101-04, shots 362-66. [PLEASE PROVIDE SCAN OF SOURCE].

^{li} See Thomas Patrick Doherty, *Pre-Code Hollywood: Sex, Immorality, and Insurrection in American Cinema* (New York: Chichester: Columbia University Press, 1999), 305.

^{lii} See Cleo Hanaway-Oakley, *James Joyce and the Phenomenology of Film* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 91-94, 121-22.

^{liii} *Trieste Notebook* (1909), in *In the Workshop of Daedalus: James Joyce and the Raw Materials for A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, eds. Robert Scholes and Richard M. Kain (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1965), 92-105, 96.

^{liv} I am retrofitting Gibson's famous definition of the virtual reality of cyberspace in *Neuromancer* (New York: Berkeley Publishing, 1984), 51.

^{lv} Tom Gunning, "An Aesthetic of Astonishment: Early Film and the (In)credulous Spectator," *Art and Text* 34 (Spring 1989): 31-45.

^{lvi} Lynda Nead, 'Strip: Moving Bodies in the 1890s,' *Early Popular Visual Culture*, 3, no.2 (September 2005): 135-50, 135-36. [PLEASE PROVIDE SCAN OF SOURCE]