

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/119643/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Chan, Hiu M. 2018. Book review: Between still and moving images: photography and cinema in the 20th Century. *Animation* 13 (3) , pp. 254-257.

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746847718799407>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



*Review Manuscript*

Laurent Guido and Olivier Lugon, eds., *Between Still and Moving Images: Photography and Cinema in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*, New Barnet: John Libbey Publishing, 2012: 400 pp., [ISBN: 9780861967070; paperback: \$32]

Corresponding author:

Hiu M. Chan, Birmingham City University, Birmingham, UK

Email: [hiu-man.chan@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:hiu-man.chan@bcu.ac.uk)

Attempts to historicize and theorize the illusion of life and the illusion of motion are relevant to anyone who researches or practices in the field of animation. After all, animation is essentially the combination of, or the constant negotiation between, the still and the moving, evident either in our thinking about animation or in the practice of making it. Although marginal within the field of cinema studies, scholars at least since the publication of Alan Cholodenko's seminal edited volume *The Illusion of Life I* (1991) have been increasingly exploring the relationship between still and moving images while questioning the differences and interactions between both forms (John, et al., 2006; Mulvey, 2006; Cholodenko, 2007); Beckman & Ma, 2008; Røssaak, 2011). What distinguishes *Between Still and Moving Images* from other scholarship in this area is that the contributors bring much-needed historical and interdisciplinary perspectives to the project of reinvestigating technological and artistic explorations of 'stillness', 'movement' or the combination of both in visual culture throughout much of the twentieth century. The editors have looked for intersections beyond the usual media discussed by other scholars to expand the topic to alternative cases, such as medical images and early newspapers. Their goal is to remap a broader historical context for our understanding of both still and moving images.

The volume contains five sections that chronologically follow the history of photography and the cinema. Instead of focusing on essential differences between these mediums, the chapters in each section deal with different historical periods and approach the relationship between photography and cinema with a focus on their intimate interactions. The first section revisits some debates regarding photography and cinema from both a historical and philosophical point of view, concentrating on the issue of 'movement'—technological and scientific—in the context of modernity. Guido's introduction maps out the key debates that are dealt with

specifically in each chapter; it also establishes a good theoretical context as a foundation for the new debates by the book's contributors. For example, Tom Gunning revisits Bergson's *Creative Evolution* (1907) and gently problematizes Bergson's critique of mechanical movements in images by focusing on early photography and film practices and how artists displayed movements in still images and stillness in moving images. Maria Tortajada revisits the historical configuration where the distinction between the two forms emerged in the early twentieth century by highlighting one element which 'distinguished' the emergence of cinema from still photography: the representation of 'speed' through representing vehicle movements (pp. 33-34). By focusing on the different functions of cinematic images and photographic images, Tortajada engages anew with Bergson's writings on movement through more precise theorisations, definitions and problematisations of what cinematic and photographic images aimed to achieve at the turn of the century. Turning to an alternative focus, Mireille Berton's chapter investigates the role that still and moving images play in the construction of scientific knowledge, particularly with regard to medical representations of the psyche during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Samantha Lackey concludes the section with a chapter that uses the screening of Man Ray's first solo film *Le Retour à la Raison* (1923) and its reception to suggest a more contextualised approach to the study of film history and surrealist films.

While the first section focuses on the concept of 'movement', Lugon introduces the second section by mapping debates about different film 'forms' as another term to engage with the relation between a photograph and a film frame. How can the concept of 'form' help us to think about the essence of stillness and movement further? A film strip, Lugon writes, was "able to bring together the passing of time and the mechanical run in multiple ways and to articulate very diverse relations between instant and duration" (74). Lugon believes the intersection between still photograph and moving image oftentimes gives birth to some new hybrid forms, examples of which are taken up in the section's chapters. Clément Chéroux focuses on Méliès' trick films and experiments in photography and proposes a "cross analysis of these recreational practices" as a way to "understand the great trade of tricks at the turn of the century, an important moment in the exchange between photography and cinematography" (p. 96). Kim Timby uses another form to demonstrate the intimate interaction between photography and cinema in early film history: the animated line-screen portrait produced between the 1910s and 1920s. Timby argues that this animated photographic portrait practice can in fact be seen as cinema in one single photograph. Valérie

Vignaux analyses the case of the ‘still film,’ a piece of 35-mm film, in the length of one meter, where twenty images (sometimes fifty) are being reproduced from end to end. By focusing on the Pathéorama still film catalogue distributed by Pathé, Vignaux questions whether Pathéorama can even be seen as a social phenomenon where the culture of amateur cinema and pedagogical cinema were promoted as an alternative to both photography or cinema. Christel Taillibert examines the mixed uses of both still and moving images for education during the WWII period to provide another perspective on cinema’s pedagogical function.

The third section investigates the cinematic effect used in journalism and illustrated books that Lugon calls the “cinema flipped through” (p. 137). Thierry Gervais examines French periodicals from the 1890s to 1930s, their artistic intervention, and new techniques of using photography and illustration to accompany texts. Gervais argues that, because “modern readers no longer read illustrated newspapers: they flipped through magazines,” this editorial and transformation of “the little paper cinema” would eventually lead to or prepare the coming cinematic culture (p. 164). Myriam Chermette’s chapter looks into the artistic transformation from illustrated narratives to narratives in photography during the interwar period in France. Chermette argues this presentational change was in fact influenced by the culture of moving images at that time. Michel Frizot revisits writings on photography during the 1920s and 1930s, particularly those related to Henri-Cartier Bresson. Finally, François Albera’s chapter offers detailed aesthetic evaluations of the transition from the cinematic book (image in movement, in a book) to the film-book (a book as film with film stills laid out “like” film frames) in order to problematise the argument that “movement *belongs in* the film image, that the film-image is a *movement-image*” (p. 199).

The fourth section focuses on frozen moments in cinema. David Forgacs focuses on the still images in Italian films from 1935 to 1955, while Christa Blümlinger looks into the postcards in Agnès Varda’s films. Patricia Kruth examines Martin Scorsese’s use of freeze frames, photographic images and re-animation. Diane Arnaud’s chapter engages with the cine-photo albums of disaster influenced by Chris Marker’s *La Jetée* (1962), while André Habib and Viva Paci use Marker’s works to rethink the boundary between stillness and movement. The final section looks into some more contemporary practices through four different case studies. For example, Guillaume Le Gall investigates Muybridge’s influences in contemporary art practices, Wolfgang Brückle uses the case of Nan Goldin’s slide shows to

rethink the interaction between stillness and movement, Barbara Le Maître looks at Raymond Depardon's filmo-photographic setups, and Alain Boillat approaches the question by examining the art of comics. While the whole volume contains a great deal of rich historical research, the last section titled 'contemporary sequences' reads slightly lighter in comparison. While it is important to critically engage with historical materials to reflect on contemporary issues, be that with artistic practices or theoretical criticism, this last section could have pushed some of the questions raised in the historical section even further. For instance, to what extent can we preserve a sense of stillness artistically and philosophically in digital animation where it is constantly in motion? The essence of that stillness can only be grasped by revisiting historical resources. Another direction to be taken forward, is to investigate what critical questions have never changed, despite which technological era we live in.

Nonetheless, this volume has enriched and complicated both the history of photography and cinema in Europe and America by drawing our attention to their detailed and hybrid interactions in practices, creations and social and cultural encounters. It sets out to be a historical research model that inspires colleagues to wonder and imagine, whether there were any similar engagements with photography and cinema during the pioneering period in other parts of the world. The debates held in this volume raise an interesting question: Did images only begin to be captured or to move when photographic and cinematic technologies were invented; or, have still and moving images always existed as part of our inner vision, with technology being used to assist with our visual expression? This series of questions may benefit scholars who work in the field of animation studies, a form that is naturally a conceptual and artistic combination of both stillness and movement. While the academic discussion around animation focuses more on its production and aesthetic side, perhaps some deeper reflection on the essence of animation along these lines may encourage new artistic inspirations. This volume will be thought-provoking for those who are interested in participating in such thinking.

Author Biography: Hiu Man Chan currently works as a research assistant and project facilitator on a Leverhume Trust funded two-year project titled "Everyday Legend" at the Centre for Chinese Visual Arts, Birmingham City University.

References

Beckman, Karen Redrobe, and J. Ma (eds.) *Still Moving: between cinema and photography*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.

Cholodenko, Alan (ed.) *The Illusion of Life: Essays on Animation*. Sydney: Power Institute of Fine Arts, 1991.

Mulvey, Laura. *Death 24x a second: Stillness and the moving image*. Reaktion Books, 2006.

Røssaak, Eivind. "Between Stillness and Motion: Film, Photography." *Algorithms* (2011).

Stezaker, John, D. Green, and J. Lowry. "The Film-Still and its Double. Reflections on the 'Found' Film-Still." *Stillness and Time: Photography and the Moving Image* (2006): 113-25.