

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Hunter, Russ (2021) The sign of the cross: Georges Melies and early Satanic cinema. In: Giving the Devil His Due: Satan and Cinema. Fordham University Press, New York, pp. 15-26. ISBN 9780823297900

Published by: Fordham University Press

URL: <https://www.fordhampress.com/9780823297900/giving-...>
<<https://www.fordhampress.com/9780823297900/giving-the-devil-his-due/>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<https://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/47020/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



**Northumbria
University**
NEWCASTLE



UniversityLibrary

The Sign of the Cross: Georges Méliès and Early Satanic Cinema

Russ Hunter

In a recent exhibition at Stanford's Cantor Art Center forty pieces of work from over 500 years of artistic representation of Satan were put on display.¹ *Sympathy for the Devil: Satan, Sin and the Underworld* was a three-month long exploration of the ways in which artists have visualized and utilized the image of the Devil and of Hell. The exhibition outlined the ways in which depictions of Satan, his minions, and Hell had altered over time to reflect changing artistic understandings of his religious and cultural significance. The representation of Satan through art, although necessarily varied in nature, has been a crucial tool for reinforcing Christian teachings about the dangers of the temptation offered by Lucifer. But religious art—and specifically images of the Devil—have an address beyond the spiritual. They can also serve a wider cultural function too. Satan, the idea of an overarching malignant spiritual force, has also been utilized by artists, as well as writers and then filmmakers, as an important narrative agent. The Devil can act therefore as both a specifically religious symbol with a set of spiritual meanings and as the archetypal antagonist in a variety of cultural forms. Images of Christ may have a much longer artistic history, but as the exhibition's curator Bernard Barryte noted: "people are more fascinated with evil than with good" (Dunne 2).

From the start, cinema demonstrated its own fascination with evil by employing the figure of Satan in numerous films. Cinema's adoption of the Devil generally differed from the religious imperatives of much earlier artistic traditions, instead using Satan in ways that integrated with the needs of the new medium. This chapter explores the dynamics behind the use of Satan within early cinema (1896-1915) by using the work of Georges Méliès. Specifically, it

focuses upon his cinema before 1906, a period that has undergone a number of reassessments by film historians, and where there has been a shift from “models that privilege the development of narrative as the principle axis of film history” to models that recognize that early cinema was “often structured by displays of visual spectacle” (Solomon¹⁴). As a relatively “new” medium within this period, I want to suggest that the use of Satan by Méliès, among others, was important for demonstrating its possibilities in dealing with macabre themes and images. In this way, cinematic depictions of the Devil (and importantly hell and the minions with which Satan is associated) provided a cinematic reference point for later filmmakers to utilize, adapt, or diverge from, and thus impacted upon the much later development of horror as a distinct genre. I do not wish to suggest that early directors such as Méliès “invented” the genre (indeed, we might view some of his works as “proto-horror” films); rather, I will argue that his contributions to demonstrating that cinema was a particularly effective medium with which to explore the macabre—and *how* it might begin to do so—were integral in both facilitating and providing visual reference points for the bit-by-bit development of the horror as a fully-fledged cinematic genre. The presence of Satan in films such as *Le manoir du diable / The Haunted Castle* (1896), *Le manoir du diable, Le Diable au Couvent / The Devil in a Convent* (1899), *Le diable géant ou Le miracle de la madonne / The Devil and the Statue* (1901), *Le Puits Fantastique / The Enchanted Well* (1903) and *The Merry Frolics of Satan* (1906), helped to cement cinema’s position as a medium that was well-suited suited to exploration of not only the macabre, but also Manichean narratives (even if rather playfully employed by Méliès himself).

As historian Robert Muchembled notes in *A History of the Devil: From the Middle Ages to the Present*, Satan has always had both religious and cultural significance in that his particular representational form at any given time sheds light upon how societies deal with “the

imaginary.” This he sees as manifesting itself as “mass phenomenon produced by the many cultural channels that irrigate a society” creating “explanatory systems and [motivating] both individual actions and group behavior” (2). For Muchembled, both the individual and the social systems around them are “junctions of meaning ... where the experiences of past centuries are accumulated and passed on” (4). Thus, to mobilize and realize the idea of “Satan” came loaded with a long history of meanings and associations. For cinema, particularly during its nascent period before 1906, the presence of Satan onscreen functioned in a variety of ways. Given the desire for filmmakers, most notably George Méliès, to use cinema as a way of providing entertainment as an extension to that offered by the stage (and sometimes even including it on the stage) and subsequently exploring the potential of the medium itself, Satan provided an instantly recognizable symbol of evil, a clear and unambiguous visual, narrative and moral reference point. This was crucial as it meant that within the bounds of short one-reel scenes it was possible to rapidly establish the conceit of any given scenario. The Devil in this way could act as an effective short-hand to rapidly suggest particular character traits, and as an immediately recognizable narrative type.

But the Devil was important for reasons that went beyond his impact upon the storytelling potential of cinema. The presence of demonic forces, most usually the Devil or malevolent forces controlled by him, also meant that within the bounds of any given scene filmmakers were, in effect, licensed to use a variety of spectacular effects and tricks. But the tricks evident in such films were not generated purely due to the creation of cinema. In many cases, they drew upon a much longer tradition of stage magic and effects, being influenced by a number of factors (both from France and abroad). Méliès’s purchase of the Théâtre Robert-Houdin in 1888 saw him hone his craft as a magician and utilize the kinds of physical effects that

he would later integrate into—and expand upon—in cinema. While these often relied upon the clever use of mirrors and the employment of masking devices, such as puffs of smoke or (hidden) pulleys, the new medium offered an expanded and more seamless magical “toolkit.” In general cinematic terms, Melies’s main contribution was vast and centered around the “organization of his fictional compositions around modern concepts of filmmaking, such as scenario, costume, makeup, background set, editing cuts, and, of course, actors” (Fournier Lanzoni 34). However, within this, the cross-fertilization of stage magic with the possibilities offered by working on film meant that Melies’s pioneering work in relation to cinematic special effects should not be underplayed. While his contributions here are numerous (and have been well documented), his development of and experiments with multiple exposure and jump cut, in particular, were crucial in allowing for the effective and uncanny presentation of Satan within his work (and that of others).

Theatrically, his stage work drew heavily upon his time spent in London and, notably, the melodramatic *féerie* play tradition, which stressed—among other things—the fantastic leavened with morally inflected narratives where good usually triumphed over evil. The *féerie* had endured in popularity since the period after the French Revolution and was noted for “extravagant visual effects with sudden transformations, disappearances, instantaneous voyages in time or space and the like,” with Alan Williams noting that, “severed heads and disembodied bodies were common, as were appearances by the devil himself” (Williams 37). As he has argued, cinema could effectively multiply the number of magical devices possible in the theatre and that the “controlled, chamber theatre of illusion spawned in film a chaotic nightmare world,” moving beyond the physical limitations of a theatrical space (Williams 37). The stress upon malign forces (of varying kinds) in the *féeries* and their influence upon both his stage and screen

work, as Williams recognizes, is testament to Méliès's understanding that "wicked, disruptive elements were more interesting than the forces of sweetness and light ... [and] ... It is not a coincidence that one of his favorite roles was the devil" (37). In short, the Devil was the most interesting, poignant, and fruitful character Méliès could bring to the silver screen. As Wyman wryly notes, the "Devil made for the perfect magician" (301).

In the latter half of 1896, Méliès utilized his experiments with both jump cuts and double-exposures on the *The Haunted Castle*, a three-minute film set in the gothic surrounds of a haunted fortifications. This was the beginning of Méliès's exploration of using Satan as his central cinematic antagonist. Such films were not unusual during the early period of cinema's development and *The Haunted Castle* was merely one of the numerous films Méliès, in particular, would make that explored the medium using the Devil. As Nicholas Schreck (2001) has contended, the extent to which the diverse and regular representation of Satan in particular was a feature of early cinema demonstrates its embedded nature within early Western filmic representations. In the two decades following the invention and popularization of cinema, European filmmakers, in particular, increasingly began to explore supernatural, mythical, and quasi-religious themes and imagery within which the Devil (naturally) played a central role.

The Haunted Castle takes place in a single location. The film begins with what looks to be some inner chamber or courtyard of a gothic castle, as we see a bat flying around the center of the frame before a jump-cut transform into dark-cloaked figure with a pointed beard, angular boots, and skull-cap with two long horn-like feathers protruding from the top of it. The figure, immediately recognizable as Mephistopheles, makes a cauldron appear before summoning an imp and making a female figure appear out of it. Two elegantly dressed gentlemen stroll into shot apparently quite unaware of the devilish forces they are about to encounter. An imp appears

from thin air (another jump-cut) and prods them with a pitchfork before disappearing, leaving them both confused. One man runs away, leaving the other to face whatever remains. A series of objects appear and disappear (including a bench and a skeleton), before a bat materializes and the man attacks it with his sword, at which point it once again transforms into Mephistopheles. He conjures imp, ghosts (who cause the man to faint), then a woman who the man greets but is shocked when she turns into a witch (and then four witches). The man's friend returns but is scared off by them (in fact he appears to jump off the edge of the castle). Mephistopheles finally confronts him, but the man grabs a large nearby crucifix and causes the Devil to flee.

Mephistopheles was the guise in which Satan would repeatedly appear in Méliès's work. As a traditional antagonist in German folklore as part of the legend of Faust, he is usually positioned as a servant of the Devil whose task is to collect souls by tricking their owners into bargaining them away. His use played upon broad public exposure to the character, in a variety of mediums, in both the period of the film's creation and as a narrative 'leitmotif for Western art for half a millennium'. As Jeffrey Burton Russell stresses, '[p]lays, painting, poems, novels, operas, cantatas, and films from the sixteenth century have featured Faust and his demonic companion Mephistopheles' (Russell 58). Therefore his mobilization across numerous media (as a *de facto* manifestation of the devil) meant he was a recognisable folk-devil and an embodiment of the earthly temptations offered by Satan. It also meant that Méliès could readily use popular understandings of Mephistopheles and/or his visual manifestation and confidently expect his audience to have a sense of what he represented. This has had the effect of making him a cipher for Satan himself and, across art, literature, and film, Mephistopheles has come to symbolize the Devil. This looseness of usage meant that although "the name is a purely modern invention of uncertain origins [making] it an elegant symbol of the modern Devil with his many novel and

diverse forms" (Russell 61). For Méliès, appearing in the form of Mephistopheles had a practical appeal. While he had been pictured with wings in some illustrations, contemporary depictions of Mephistopheles were much more humanoid in form. To create him for the screen therefore required little make-up and costumes that Méliès would already have had to hand as part of his stage show could be easily utilized.

As Nikolas Schreck has noted, there was a tradition of *fin de siècle* stage magicians attempting to draw an association between their own skill and some form of satanic possession. This tactic was employed regularly, the idea being that if “credulous audiences imagined that the wonders were the result of the magician’s Satanic alliance, then so much the better” (13). Schreck observes that Méliès, “affected a deliberately Satanic appearance, sporting a barbed goatee” (14) and typically dressed in the red-lined cape that was normally associated with the Devil in both the theatre and the opera. Posters for the Theatre Robert-Houdin, often showed a variety of supernatural and occult images, including those of animated skeletons, specters, and wizards. It is unsurprising therefore that the image of the Devil that he chose to employ in his cinematic work was congruent with this image. Thus, in films such as *The Haunted Castle*, *The Devil in a Convent*, *The Devil and the Statue*, *The Enchanted Well*, Satan consistently appears in the form of Mephistopheles with a variation of dark cloak, pointed shoes, and feather-horned hat. Given its close proximity to Méliès’s successful career as a stage magician (which in part ran alongside his filmmaking), the film demonstrates a congruity between the cinema and some of the techniques and tricks employed at his stage shows. Patrons of the theatre were well accustomed to seeing objects (including people) apparently disappear as part of magic routines. When combined with the suggestion that the onstage magicians might be part of some other-worldly influence, cinema—with all the editing trickery it could offer—could deepen this association.

For Henri Langlois (a film pioneer in his own quite different way), *The Haunted Castle* was “conceivable only in the cinema and due to the cinema” (qtd. in Kracauer, 33). In effect, Langlois argues that the medium specificity of cinema meant that only it could fully realize the effects displayed within the film. That is to say, while it is possible to recognize the theatrical nature of *The Haunted Castle*, it was only in cinema that, for instance, a bat could apparently instantly transform into Satan or an imp could be conjured out of (apparently) thin air. As such, Lynda Nead has argued that, “The magic in Méliès films changed from the straightforward filming of tricks, performed by a magician on the stage, to the creation of major special effects, involving multiple exposure, stop-motion and other devices, which were difficult or impossible to achieve in the theater in front of a live audience” (97).

Michael Bird in *Religion in Film* suggests that *The Haunted Castle* was symptomatic of a certain kind of Méliès film because the director “created extravagant and surrealistic sets substituting stage illusion for everyday events, and who augmented perception with fantastic adventures of the imagination” meaning such works were “excursions into inaccessible fantasy worlds” (11). The latter point is worth interrogating as *The Haunted Castle*, in particular, plays with visual tropes that had been long established in other mediums. Its castle setting and the presence of supernatural elements are suggestive of the influence of Gothic literature and art, which has led some to view this not only as the first horror film but the first *Gothic* horror (see Morgart). Moreover, in providing a cinematic version of the Devil, Méliès was merely employing a very familiar kind of representation of the Satan.

Given its release in 1896, *The Haunted Castle* falls under the auspices of Gunning’s ideas around the cinema of attractions. The film has increasingly been recognized as the “first” horror film (Allmer, Brick and Huxley 1) and, released in the latter half of 1896 would therefore place

the horror genre among the very first in cinematic history. That said, we might more fruitfully view the film, as well as Méliès's other macabre-inflected work, as proto-horror—a set of images that, bit-by-bit, contributed to the broader visual and thematic reference points of a genre. As such, the film is important precisely because it acts as a transition point for the visual representation of Satan to include cinema. In so doing, it also demonstrated the visual possibilities for cinema as a medium in approaching macabre subject matter more generally. As James Morgart has noted, “Despite being only three minutes in length, the film establishes precedents for many of the visual motifs that have become synonymous with Gothic horror films ever since, including the visual depictions of witches, ghosts and bats” (377).² Although it is possible to view early attempts at horror cinema (however problematic the application of that term might be) as rather tame by contemporary standards, they are important in that they “assist in tracking the evolution of the application and innovation of Gothic horror aesthetics” (Morgart 376). Effectively, they provided the technical, aesthetic, and cultural building blocks that meant horror as a genre had a cinematic reference point as it developed. While this did not make the development of “horror cinema” as a generic category inevitable, it is clear that early cinema engaged with ideas and motifs that we can now see would later develop into tropes of horror cinema.

The Devil and the Statue is also representative of the ways in which the use of Satan allowed for the spectacle of cinema to be underlined via the display of a number of special effects and tricks drawn from both stage magic and the cross-breeding with cinema as facilitated by Méliès. The film shows a clear connection to what Tom Ruffles has viewed as “part of the stage-magic tradition” that began with his illusion work from 1888 onwards at the Théâtre Robert-Houdin and, continued albeit intermittently, with his film work (36). Made in 1901, the

film lasts a little over two minutes and, as was typical of its director's work in this period, with the action taking place in one location. It concerns a woman in an elegant baroque room being wooed by a suitor, who is singing to her from outside of her window. Almost unnoticed in the far right hand corner of the frame a statue of the Virgin Mary looks on (in reality an actor standing stock-still). When the young man leaves, the woman paces around the room in rapture before blowing a kiss to where he stood before. At this moment, we see a puff of smoke as a jump-cut makes the Devil appear out of thin air (played by Méliès, made-up to look like Mephistopheles). With another jump-cut he makes bars appear across the previously open window and dances as if to mock her newly found imprisonment. As he does so, he slowly and menacingly increases in size until the statue of the Virgin Mary comes to life, shrinks and then banishes him. She then removes the bars from the window as the two lovers are happily reunited.³

In this way, cinema effectively acted as a continuum and then development of images and techniques employed to represent Satan, a process Muchembled argues has metamorphosed with each new historical epoch and its associated social and cultural developments. Cinematic representations of the Devil resonate with audiences therefore because “they make an implicit connection with a stock of images and ideas drawn from a range of chronological periods” (Muchembled 7). For early cinema audiences during a period when religious observance, church attendance, and the general centrality of religion to daily life were much stronger, the cinema offered a new dynamic for representations of a variety of religious matters. The cinematic fantastic was thus able to function as a “literary and cultural way of treating the supernatural” (Muchembled 7).

As the *Sympathy for the Devil: Satan, Sin and the Underworld* art exhibition demonstrates, cinema was, of course, not unique in providing a visual representation of Satan. As Muchembled notes, the “devil has been part of the fabric of European life since the Middle Ages, and has accompanied all its major changes” (1). The birth of cinema was no different in this respect, providing another medium through which the culturally created figure of the devil could circulate and be explored. Within visual culture, depictions of the Devil had appeared in art since at least the fourteenth century. But representations of the Devil were always dynamic inasmuch as, over time, his shifting socio-religious function led to gradual changes in the ways in which he was realized. For early artists, such as Albrecht Dürer and Hieronymus Bosch, there were few visual reference points that could be drawn upon in order to create an image of the Devil. The vagueness of his depiction (and that of Hell) in the Bible meant that they tended to piece together “imagery from older traditions that had already decided what demons looked like” (Dunne 3) and prior to “the 16th century, artists borrowed features from the Arcadian god Pan and from Celtic, Egyptian and Near Eastern deities” while during the Renaissance they “found inspiration in accounts by Homer, Dante and Virgil.”⁴ Drawing upon representations of demons from a number of pre-Christian religions, early visualizations of Satan often stressed his bestial, animalistic qualities. In effect, there was no definitive source from which to derive images of the Devil until the point at which artists could begin to use each other’s works as reference points. By the twentieth century, the Devil was depicted in a much more obviously human form, with paintings such as Jerome Witkins’s *The Devil as a Tailor* (1978-79) representing a move away from the more animalistic, bestial Satan of earlier periods and presenting him as distinctly humanoid (and indeed as “one of us”).⁵ The Devil’s presence in Western art is just part of what can be viewed as

Europe, by the invention of cinema, having been bequeathed “an extraordinary diabolic heritage” (Muchembled 7).

As one of early cinema's key pioneers, Méliès has long been recognized as “the first to exploit cinematic devices systematically” by utilizing them in a way that meant they “were to play an enormous role in the future” of cinema (Kracauer 33). A hugely innovative early adopter of cinema, Méliès's contributions in developing and establishing some of the basic grammar of film and his dynamic use of cinematic stagecraft have resulted in his being recognized as “an *auteur* in every sense” (Ezra 151). To the modern eye his work now looks rather naïve and static. So, although he is “universally acknowledged to an early film pioneer” Méliès's work has frequently been characterized as “simplistic, both narratively and technically” (Ezra 2). As Elizabeth Ezra has noted, increasing evidence of early cinema's modernity has meant that characterizations by critics such as Noël Burch of it as “primitive” now look outmoded. And while Tom Gunning's positioning of the period before 1906 as one of a “cinema of attractions” has reframed it in relation to its desire to present “the spectacular,” this school of thought has also suggested that such films lack clear narratives. However, in her book *Georges Méliès*, Ezra challenges this norm, arguing that the French director's work was not devoid of narrative structure and that “his films lend themselves to narrative analysis” (150). Such narratives may be short, straightforward, or lacking in nuance, but that does not mean that they cannot be examined. In *The Enchanted Well*, for instance, an old crone begs for alms in a medieval village well but is unceremoniously shoed-away by one of the villagers. Affronted, she sneaks back and places a curse upon the well. After the villager who had earlier thrown her out the village comes to use the well, a number of creatures issue forth from it, until eventually the Devil himself appears. He is quickly attacked by the village inhabitants before turning into a bat and flying off.

It is a short film of just over four minutes in length and yet there is a clear, simple narrative of sorts within it, even though it is concise and not extensively developed.

This is important as it impacts upon how we view the role of Satan in early cinema. If we accept that films during the cinema of attractions are all about spectacle and lack narratives, then Satan can be seen to function solely as an instantly recognizable visual symbol but (importantly) one whose presence allows for the inclusion of the kind of effects that Méliès developed and championed. But it need not be that this is viewed as a zero-sum game. If we accept his films before 1906 as part of the cinema of attractions, that does not mean they cannot have spectacular elements but still contain simple narratives. In this way, the Devil's function within such films changes and he becomes a familiar symbol who can lend narrative clarity to films based around the idea of spectacle. Indeed, even if filmmakers like Méliès were not particularly fascinated in filmmaking for its storytelling potential and were more interested in trick films or cinema as a series of displays (Gunning 41), a sense of narrative—not matter how loose—is still possible.

The appearance of the Devil is part of a long socio-cultural process related to the embedded nature of Christian imagery in Western culture. As such, when cinema developed as a medium, religious images were a ready-made frame of reference for audiences. In effect, the cinema represented an extension of more than 500 years of visual culture depicting Satan. Just as *Sympathy for the Devil: Satan, Sin and the Underworld* demonstrated the ways in which artistic representations of Satan changed over time, reflecting differing socio-religious dynamics, so did cinema's. Méliès, it should be pointed out, was not unique in depicting Satan onscreen.

Famously, Segundo de Chomon would depict a dancing Lucifer in *The Red Spectre* (1907), where he is portrayed as a curious mix between Mephistopheles and a skeleton. Indeed, the development of longer film form and of feature films after 1906 meant it was possible to weave

Satan into longer, more complex narrative forms. Méliès would again return to the figure of Mephistopheles in *Les Quat'cents farces di diable / The Merry Frolics of Satan* (1906). Lasting a touch over seventeen minutes, the narrative was based around the Faust legend, with the Englishman William Crackford signing his soul away to Devil and eventually having to pay his debt by roasting on a spit for all eternity. Satan would also feature in a number later notable films, such as *L'Inferno / Inferno* (Francesco Bertolini, Adolfo Padovan and Giuseppe de Liguoro, 1911), Stellan Rye and Paul Wegener's *Der Student von Prag / The Student of Prague Haxan* (Benjamin Christensen, 1922) and *eine deutsche Volkssage / Faust* (F. W. Murnau, 1926). Although the Devil himself would, for a time, fade in terms of his usage onscreen, as the 1920s moved in the 1930s and Universal developed its popular series of monster movies, his influence was significant (although perhaps fittingly rather diffuse).

The use of Satan made sense in early cinema for filmmakers for several reasons then. In both the Catholic France of Méliès and the West more generally, Satan was a clearly recognizable reference point. As such his frequent appearance on film in early cinema is, perhaps, unsurprising. He could be made use of in a variety of ways. Thus, when cinema began to develop as a medium, it was natural that among the subject matter explored would be those that had particular cultural significance as societal frames of reference. In early cinema, Satan was not necessarily mobilized in ways that he traditionally had been as either a spiritual symbol or as a means to structure an artistic or literary narrative. He would be used in this way by early film practitioners too, but the desire for early filmmakers, such as Méliès, to experiment with film form in order to provide increasingly spectacular cinematic forms of entertainment meant that Satan also provided a supernatural rationale for the employment of a number of tricks. Moreover, in mobilizing the Devil cinema practitioners had, of course, to use the kinds of

macabre, ghoulish imagery that had long been associated with him. This meant that from at least 1896 onwards—in reality from its beginnings—cinema would begin to explore the macabre. The path towards these images becoming realized as the horror genre would take time. But it was a path whose flagstone was laid by Georges Méliès.

Works Cited

- Allmer, Patricia, Emily Brick and David Huxley. "Introduction" in Patricia Allmer, Emily Brick and David Huxley, eds. *European Nightmares: Horror Cinema in Europe Since 1945*, London: Wallflower Press, 2012, pp.1-8.
- Dunne, Carey. "The Changing Face of Satan, From 1500 To Today," <https://www.fastcodesign.com/3034309/the-changing-face-of-satan-artistic-depictions-of-the-devil-1500-to-today>
- Ezra, Elizabeth. *George Méliès: The Birth of an Auteur*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Fournier Lanzoni, Rémi. *French Cinema: From Its Beginnings to the Present*, London: Continuum, 2005.
- Geraghty, Lincoln and Mark Jancovich. "Introduction: Generic canons" in Lincoln Geraghty and Mark and Jancovich, *Media*, London: McFarland, 2008, pp.1-14.
- Gunning, Tom. *D.W. Griffith and the Origins of America Narrative Film: The Biograph Years*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press (1994)
- Hunter, Russ. "Preferisco l'inferno: Early Italian horror cinema" in *Italian Horror Cinema*,

- Baschiera, Stefano and Russ Hunter, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016.
- Kracauer, Siegfried. *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*, Princeton: Princeton, 1997.
- Kawin, Bruce. F, *Horror and the Horror Film*, London: Anthem, 2012.
- Muchembled, Robert. *A History of the Devil: From the Middle Ages to the Present*, Cambridge: Polity, 2003.
- Morgart, James. "Gothic Horror Film From The Haunted Castle (1896) to Psycho (1960) in Dale Townshend and Glennis Byron, *The Gothic World*, London: Routledge, 2013. Pp. 376-87.
- Nead, Lynda. *The Haunted Gallery: Painting, Photography, Film, c.1900*, London: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Rigby, Jonathan. *Euro Gothic: Classics of Continental Horror Cinema*. Cambridge: Signum, 2016.
- Ruffles, Tom. *Ghost Images: Cinema of the Afterlife*, Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2004.
- Russell, Jeffrey Burton *Mephistopheles: The Devil in the Modern World*: New York: Ithaca, 1990.
- Schreck, Nikolas. *The Satanic Screen: An Illustrated History of the Devil in Cinema 1896 – 1999*. London: Creation Books, 2001.
- Solomon, Matthew. "Introduction" in *Fantastic Voyages of the Cinematic Imagination: Georges Méliès's Trip to the Moon*. Matthew Solomon, ed, New York: SUNY, 2011.
- Stuart, Roxana. *Stage Blood: Vampires of the 19th Century Stage*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Press, 1994.

- Thompson, Kirsten. "Animation" in *Comedy: A Geographic and Historical Guide, Volume 1*, Maurice Charney, ed. Praeger: London, 2005, pp.135-154
- Wells, Paul. *The Horror Genre from Beelzebub to Blair Witch*, London: Wallflower (2000)
- Williams, Alan. *Republic of Images: A History of French Filmmaking*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Williamson, Colin. *Hidden in Plain Sight: An Archaeology of Magic and the Cinema*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2015.
- Wyman, Kelly J. "Satan in the movies" in *The Continuum Companion to Religion and Film*. William L. Blizek, ed. London: Continuum, 2009, pp. 300-310.

Notes

¹ The exhibition ran from August 20th to December 1st 2014. For details see https://museum.stanford.edu/news_room/sympathy.html

² We need to be cautious, however, in using the term "horror cinema" too freely. It has become increasingly commonplace for those writing about films produced prior to the 1930s to refer to "horror films." The horror genre itself, however, is typically not viewed as developing, as an industrial film category at least, until sometime in the mid-1930s. For the most part the kinds of films under discussion here—the kinds that numerous authors have assigned the generic label of "horror" to—were marketed and discussed very generally as fantastic films, and have tended to be viewed by film historians as "trick films." While genre definitions are often highly subjective and notoriously elastic, horror has increasingly been mobilized in problematic ways. For instance, in his book *Horror and the Horror Film*, Bruce F Kawin claims that "The Haunted Castle was Méliès's fifth horror film, with *A Terrible Night*, *The Vanishing Lady*, *The Devil's*

Manor, A Nightmare all being made a year earlier in 1896” (210). It is debateable as to whether any of the four films Kawin lists as coming before *The Haunted Castle* could be identified as horror films in any case. *The Devil’s Manor* is, in fact, an alternative title for *The Haunted Castle* (and so is a repetition) and only *A Nightmare* can have any claim to being a horror of sorts.

³ The illusion of the Devil increasing and decreasing in size was created by filming him separately and slowly moving the camera towards (and away from him) before superimposing it on the image of baroque room. The film’s original French title, *Le diable géant ou Le miracle de la madonne* (literally “the big devil or the Virgin Mary’s miracle”) is significant here in setting up the notion a battle between the forces of good and those of evil. But as was typical of George Méliès this was not a straightforward morality tale. The Virgin Mary reunites the lovers and there is, as with much of his work, a tongue-in-cheek quality to the brief narrative.

⁴ https://museum.stanford.edu/news_room/sympathy.html, accessed 12th December 2016.

⁵ In Watkins’ painting, Satan is represented as a slightly corpulent and spectacled, bald tailor. He is surrounded by various items of his work and can be seen stitching a concentration camp outfit. The message that the Devil was and has been among us could not be starker.