27
MEDIA AND MEDIATIZATION

Pelle Snickars

'There are no realities any more, there is only apparatus', lamented the Austrian cultural historian Egon Friedell in the late 1920s. Working during the interwar period with his three-volume cultural history, 'from the Black Death to the World War', media modernity finally seemed to have caught up with him. The spiritual and religious spell of previous ages appeared as disenchanted – the *Entzauberung der Welt*, as famously diagnosed by sociologist Max Weber – where rural society and culture were replaced by urban secularization, cultural rationalization and modernized bureaucracy.[1] For Friedell, however, even reality gave the impression of disintegrating into a mediated dimness, with film and radio as the main perpetrators for blurring cultural hierarchies between high and low.

> As long as the cinema was numb, it had other … possibilities: namely, spiritual ones. But the sound-film has unmasked it, and the fact is patent to all eyes and ears that we are dealing with a brutish dead machine. The bioscope kills the human gesture only, but the sound-film the human voice as well. Radio does the same. At the same time it frees us from the obligation to concentrate, and it is now possible to enjoy Mozart and sauerkraut, the Sunday sermon and bridge.[2]

This dreadful and mediated 'world of automata' appeared in the epilogue – ultimately entitled 'the collapse of reality' – at the very end of Friedell's majestic *Cultural History of the Modern Age* (1927–31). It was a publication that became a huge commercial success, especially in the German-speaking world, and was also subsequently translated into numerous other languages. Spanning some 1,500 pages covering 600 years, and with the main focus put firmly on 'great men' and their achievements in art, science and culture, Friedell's book was a classic cultural history; a portrait of different ages, with a personal and even anecdotal touch. Friedell's broad historical panorama was colourful, lively and witty – ironically he described himself as a 'dilettante', and it is not surprising that a present blogger designates the book as 'obscenely readable'.[3] With his somewhat odd background as a cabaret performer and actor, at least for a cultural historian, Friedell simply knew how to please an audience.

Yet, given his personal experience of 'low' culture and the ways in which various forms of mass media increasingly seemed to alter reality at the time of his writing, it remains surprising how murky Friedell's account of popular media appeared in his cultural historical overview – that is to say, if media were mentioned at all. In passing, Friedell noted that the first newspapers for decades had to fight censorship, and hinted towards the link between printed communication and the rise of nineteenth-century nationalism. On another occasion, Friedell associated media with a 'particular utensil' symbolizing a given 'culture-period'. The man of the dawning Modern Age, for example, 'might be represented with a compass, Baroque man with a microscope, nineteenth-century man with a newspaper, the man of today with a telephone'.[4] Furthermore, he briefly stated that the 'high-speed printing press' was the most important machine introduced during the 1830s, and his account of the 1840s firmly described the 'characteristic inventions of the age' as being 'telegraphy and photography'.[5] But apart from such quite condensed notations, Friedell was not particularly interested in historical media accounts or descriptions, and consequently left them out, until the epilogue.

Media-historiographically this is odd, since Egon Friedell had previously published on, for example, the ways in which perception and representation around 1900 had been transformed via the medium of film. In 1912 he wrote that films are 'short, quick, at the same time coded, and [the medium] does not stop for anything. … This is quite fitting for our time, which is a time of extracts'.[6] Taken from his essay, 'Prolog vor dem Film', these remarks and others in many ways forebode cultural critic Walter Benjamin's canonized account of the artwork in the age of mechanical reproduction written during the 1930s.[7] But if Benjamin took a positive stance towards mass media, and especially film, Friedell's characterization was much more gloomy. 'Both cinema and radio eliminate that mysterious fluid which emanates from artist and public alike … We already have nightingale concerts and Papal speeches transmitted to us by wireless'. For Friedell this amounted to the real decline of the West: 'Der Untergang des Abendlandes'.[8] However, given the epilogue of *Cultural History of the Modern Age*, Friedell realized and to some extent even anticipated notions of mediatization – that is, mass media's increased importance for ordinary people and society at large. His final remarks were contemporary, but they could also have been historicized if he had paid more attention to the cultural history of media.

Cultural historical media research

Departing from Friedell's paradoxical acknowledgement of both a 'world of automata' and his apparent lack of interest in situating media within cultural history, this chapter will provide an overview of the cultural impact of media forms and formats, technologies and practices from the early nineteenth century until the advent of sound-film and radio; that is, approximately at the time when Friedell was completing his cultural history. The period essentially corresponds with 'the long nineteenth century', lasting from the French Revolution to the First World War.

'If we wish to understand the cultural transformations associated with the rise of modern societies', the sociologist John B. Thompson argued in his book, *The Media and Modernity*, 'then we must give a central role to the development of

communication media and their impact'. In a similar manner, this chapter seeks to trace the roots of media modernity within nineteenth- and early twentieth-century culture. Social theorists such as Thompson, however, have usually mounted a top-down approach towards media history, and made sweeping theoretical claims about the ways in which the use of often unspecific 'communication media' transformed the 'spatial and temporal organization of social life' by transmitting 'information and symbolic content'.[9] I am less interested in such non-empirical generalizations about hovering and non-specific 'communication media'. Contrary to media sociologists like Thompson, this chapter will rather take a 'bottom-up' approach towards nineteenth-century media culture.

Taking my cue from novel ways to perform cultural historical media research and equipped with a media archaeological perspective[10] – which seeks to perform media-specific readings of technologies and uncover forgotten media layers in the past, without falling into teleological linearities of mono-media histories from past to present – I will consider both new media and residual media forms, all the while trying to pin down how these were publicly perceived. In general the chapter will focus on broader, yet empirically situated media systems – rather than particular media forms, as the dominant daily press. In addition, the chapter will especially pay attention to hybrid forms of media culture and exchanges of intermediality. Like contemporary digital media, 'old' media during the nineteenth century were highly transnational, entangled and dependent on each other.[11] Media did not exist in isolation. Linked to the rise of consumer capitalism, popular media forms rapidly disseminated, first in Western Europe and North America, then globally. Importantly, both content and form migrated; *The Illustrated London News* first appeared in 1842, the Swedish *Ny Illustrerad Tidning* started in 1865 and the German *Berliner Illustrirte Zeitung* began in 1891. Cultural globalization is hence not a recent phenomenon. By 1910, the same French Pathé Frères films, the leading film company at the time, could be seen in such major cities as Paris and London, Moscow or Tokyo – but basically also in any small town in the European and American countryside that had a permanent cinema.[12] If the technical reproduction of texts and images, sounds and films via fast printing presses, photographic techniques such as daguerreotypes or calotypes and phonographic and cinematographic recordings was almost unimaginable in the early 1800s, a hundred years later these media formed a natural part of everyday life. As can be expected, this had tremendous consequences for how ordinary people perceived both themselves and their world. Hence, towards the end of the chapter, I will conclude with a discussion of how to understand transformations of media within cultural history, particularly with a focus on theories of mediatization.

A popular and entangled media landscape

The most important aspect of the development of various media from the early nineteenth century and onwards – whether in the modality of text, image, sound or film – was arguably their *mass appeal*. The term 'media' is an evasive concept and was not a particularly frequent notion used during the nineteenth century. Yet, it is useful as a term joining different communication forms, as well as stressing how attractions and technologies became increasingly intertwined and hard to separate from the rise

of a common popular culture, and to some extent even traditional folk culture. It is during the nineteenth century that notions of 'communication' and 'media' appear, and develop within various parts of Western culture and society. Communication, however, also had a clear linkage to infrastructure and geography. 'In the nineteenth century the movement of goods or people and the movement of information were seen as essentially identical processes and both were described by the common noun "communication"'.[13] A media history of the nineteenth century might thus include looking at infrastructural technologies – or even the usage of media within warfare. It might also incorporate medical media technologies – from refinements of microscopic lenses in the 1850s to electromagnetic radiation known as X-rays in the 1890s – or the rise of bureaucratic media formats such as office paper.

This chapter focuses on popular media, even if some cultural historians have argued that it is difficult to label objects or cultural practices as 'popular'. 'People with high status, great wealth or a substantial amount of power are not necessarily different in their culture from ordinary people', as cultural historian Peter Burke has stated.[14] From a media-historical perspective, however, popular culture during the nineteenth century was increasingly interlinked and bound together with media. Popular culture, in short, became ever more *media saturated* as a consequence of media-technological developments combined with consumer capitalism.

In the following, however, media is of primary concern, not popular culture. According to media historian Lisa Gitelman, media are 'unique and complicated historical subjects. Their histories must be social and cultural, not the stories of how one technology leads to another, or of isolated geniuses working their magic on the world'. Somewhat anachronistically Gitelman uses the digital notion of 'protocols' to describe and define media as 'socially realized structures of communication, where structures include both technological forms and their associated protocols'. The protocols surrounding media comprise a vast 'clutter', which gathers around a media 'technological nucleus', of more or less normative rules and conditions about how and where one used a medium. Looking into a stereoscope during the nineteenth century, for example, involved paying visual attention – since the 3D image would not appear otherwise – but the medium's supporting protocols also involved the actual purchase of the technology, the availability of different images and the regular habit of looking at home. According to Gitelman, media-historically situated 'protocols express a huge variety of social, economic, and material relationships'.[15] From a cultural historical perspective, mediated communication can hence be perceived as an evolving cultural practice, where both media and media usage took the form of dynamic sociocultural phenomena which altered over time.

Importantly, the popularity of the flourishing media culture during the nineteenth century made it increasingly different from the realm of art and high culture. As the century progressed, the contrast in scale and scope became ever more staggering. A well-liked painting at an art gallery in 1820, for example, might have been seen by a thousand people, and some 30 years later a reproduction of it featured in an illustrated journal could have reached 100,000 or sometimes even 200,000 potential readers – an impressive number of eyeballs at the time, yet a figure that is completely dwarfed by the 50 million people who saw D. W. Griffith's *The Birth of a Nation* in the five years after its release in 1915. The nineteenth century thus witnessed the

increased *spreadability of culture* to 'the masses',[16] often in novel, unexpected and even pirated ways. In 1859, Charles Dickens, for example, published *A Tale of Two Cities* as a 45-chapter novel in 31 weekly instalments in his own literary periodical, and the book thereafter became one of the best-selling novels of all time – with perhaps as many as 200 million copies being sold. At the same time Dickens regularly complained about book piracy and the lack of intellectual property protection (the Berne convention recognizing copyright was signed in 1886).

On the one hand, popular media culture hence democratized access to content for people in general, but on the other hand, selling culture to these 'masses' also made content streamlined, catering to all tastes and thus giving rise to notions of 'low' and later mass culture. Media entrepreneurs, however, usually tried to prevent such denigrating descriptions since they were bad for business. Instead they were keen on promoting their commercial content or popular attractions as instructive entertainment – whether as illustrated journals, stereoscopic peep shows, wax museums or nonfiction film. Occasionally, different media supported and even tried to culturally elevate one another, as when the Parisian wax museum, Musée Grévin, began to screen nonfiction films in 1901, as 'visual corollaries' embedded in 'narratives that occurred off-screen in illustrated newspaper and at the wax museum [itself]', to quote art historian Vanessa R. Schwartz.[17]

In many ways, nineteenth-century popular media culture constantly oscillated between high and low – at least in the eyes of its producers and some audiences, but more seldom among critics of popular culture who usually saw it as coarse or even vulgar. Mass media is a twentieth-century term, but since almost all previous media were commercial by nature and popular in scope, attracting attention from a broad and paying public was essential. The dominant medium during the nineteenth century, the daily press, for example, operated under strict commercial terms. Following historian Benedict Anderson's famous claim, 'print-capitalism' targeting a mass audience created an 'imagined community' – that is, print-capitalism became crucial for the creation of nation states during the nineteenth century.[18] In a more mundane setting, however, news rapidly became a commodity to be reported about, commented upon, sold – and consequently manufactured. From the 1830s onwards, especially the so-called 'penny press' – inexpensive, tabloid-style newspapers mass-produced initially in the United States – achieved previously unheard-of sales figures.

Newspapers and magazines had been widely published in Western Europe already during the eighteenth century. Newspaper readers were predominantly envisioned as male, and according to sociologist Jürgen Habermas, the discussion around such periodicals gave rise to a new public sphere, the *Öffentlichkeit*, where the enlightened (male) bourgeoisie exchanged opinions and debated public matters at coffeehouses and cafés. This type of public interface between sociability and oral and written communication has become essential to our modern understanding of democracy, even if Habermas himself erroneously perceived the press history during the nineteenth century as one of decay and manipulation.[19] Habermas' notion of the public sphere, however, was limited to the educated upper-classes, and in general print culture had during centuries been oriented towards affluent society, since books were expensive. This is essentially why the inexpensive daily press during the nineteenth century

became so important; 'not until four centuries after Gutenberg did the printed news media enter the daily lives of more than a tiny educated stratum of society'.[20]

As already noted by Egon Friedell, by the 1830s high-speed presses rapidly printed tens of thousands of newspapers, which started to appear in most major cities throughout the world. During the nineteenth century newspaper production and journalism were both professionalized and industrialized. Advertising revenues gradually increased and made newspapers affordable also for the working class. In short, the daily press was widely read – not least because of improvements in literacy which had taken place across Northwest Europe prior to 1800, and were later reinforced during the century by the introduction of compulsory education in a number of Western countries.[21]

After the different inventions of photography, in the late 1820s, 1830s and 1840s, and ways to reproduce and print images on paper, illustrated journals also began to be published. Popular media culture thus became increasingly visual, and in the mid-1850s *The Illustrated London News* sold as many as 200,000 copies per week. At the time, the press also benefited from another invention, the telegraph, which in its commercial usage permitted overnight news reporting and the ability to communicate globally in real-time – the 'Victorian Internet', as the telegraph has later been dubbed.[22] The electric telegraph made newspapers 'instant', and as media historian James Mussel has shown, they also became 'more explicitly informational' when integrated into broader systems of information technology. 'Telegraphic news' was often labelled as such, 'frequently printed in stacked columns which mimicked its abbreviated forms'.[23] The electric telegraph, which obviously operated with electric signals, had superseded optical semaphore telegraph systems in the 1830s, and in order to work properly telegraphy needed a *media infrastructure* of reliable cables, a task easier said than done. Efforts to lay a stable cable across the floor of the Atlantic, for example, failed on a number of occasions, and the first steadfast transatlantic telegraph cable began operating as late as 1866.[24]

The daily press – as well as the telegraph – were in many ways stable media forms during the nineteenth century. They became widely used and hugely popular: in 1870 a daily total of 2.6 million papers were sold in the United States – and figures kept on rising at an astonishing rate. After the First World War, Sweden had 235 daily newspapers, a total number never surpassed since, while the city of Lemberg where Europe basically 'ended' – today's Lviv in western Ukraine, which during the Habsburg Empire was the fifth largest city in Central Europe – boasted some 200 daily newspapers published in Polish, Ukrainian, Yiddish and Hebrew. Newspapers were text printed on paper, and even if they graphically developed during the long nineteenth century, they basically looked the same.

The development of production of paper, from linen rags to wood-pulp, also made newspapers increasingly inexpensive, as well as precarious and somewhat paradoxically outdated. For nineteenth-century readers, newspaper became a casual media form, almost instantly becoming old – the day after publication – in ardent contrast with the persistent novelty, which was an important trait of the general development of nineteenth-century media culture. 'Newness' can, in fact, be seen as one of the dominant meta-cultural discourses of media modernity. The spread of consumer capitalism is partly to blame since new products needed to be ceaselessly launched, but

media history is also often told as a succession of improved technological inventions. It has, for example, often been argued that during the latter half of the nineteenth century, telegraphy and the application of electricity to communication led to the successive and rapid inventions of the telephone (1876), the phonograph (1877), the gramophone (1887) and later (after 1900) wireless transmissions.[25] However, all media were once new media, and the notion of 'new technologies' is always 'a historically relative term', to quote communication scholar Carolyn Marvin's magisterial *When Old Technologies Were New*.[26]

Looking into the novelty years and transitional states of media forms can, as Gitelman has observed, 'tell us much, both about the course of media history and about the broad conditions by which media and communication are and have been shaped'.[27] Then again, novelty and media transitions need not always be in focus, since some media forms kept their popularity among audiences over a very long period of time. Media history tends to privilege the introduction of new technologies – which often occurred at expositions and public exhibitions during the nineteenth century. A history of nineteenth-century world expositions will essentially cover all major media innovations. The cultural impact and extensions of media were occasionally rapid, but often utterly slow.[28] Within nineteenth-century media culture previous and commonly known everyday media were arguably more favoured by general audiences. During the long nineteenth century the stereoscope and panorama buildings are two of the most vivid examples of so-called 'residual media'. The term stems from Raymond Williams' study of culture's dominant, emergent and residual forms, and was later adapted to refer to media that are not new, but are nonetheless prevalent in society and culture.[29] The notion of residual media is hence an attempt to act as a corrective to the idea that when media become old, they always become obsolete.

The stereoscope and the panorama testify that during the nineteenth century this was far from the case. On the contrary; stereo images were as popular in the 1850s when they were introduced as they were half a century later. Stereoscopic images create the illusion of three-dimensional depth from two given two-dimensional images mounted next to each other, and photographed with a slight difference in angle. During the 1850s stereo images became hugely popular; an industry developed with millions of stereo cards and hundreds of thousands of stereoscopes being produced – from the expensive box-like Brewster Stereoscope to the open wooden-stand Holmes Stereoscope, being most favoured during the nineteenth century. Intriguingly, people did not get tired of looking at 3D images; the popularity of the medium lingered, and new attractions were built around stereo images such as the German *Kaiserpanorama*. This was a stereoscopic medium, which strived both to educate and entertain in visual form, with some 50 stereoscopic glass images arranged around a circular, rotating device that audiences peeped into. During the late nineteenth century its inventor August Fuhrmann developed this enterprise into a Central European image empire with some 250 branches. Even more successful was the American firm, Underwood & Underwood, which at the same time became the largest publisher of stereoviews in the world, producing a staggering 10 million images a year. In 1901, the company was said to have published 25,000 stereographs a day.[30]

A similar long-lasting and residual media form during the nineteenth century was the panorama. Even if the media history of the panorama – a visual medium in the

form of a 360-degree painting mounted inside a building – stretches back to the late 1790s, a hundred years later it could still be fully praised as a complete novel medium. Among the 'main attractions in cities abroad *now* counts so-called panoramas'[31] (my italics), stated a newspaper article when in 1889 the first panorama building opened in Stockholm, depicting the defeat of the Paris Commune in 1871. The Swedish daily press stressed the splendid illusionary effect and, stepping inside the panorama and immersing himself in the image, one critic stated:

> When you climb up the small spiral staircase, you are unjustly struck by surprise in front of the sight that appears. You are in the middle of Paris. The illusion is complete and has been achieved by seeing only the painting which continues uninterrupted in whatever direction you look. But the reasons for this effect, you do not immediately reflect upon – you have only one impression: you are in the city of the Seine.[32]

The historian Jürgen Osterhammel has argued that nineteenth-century media – like the panorama – 'opened communicative spaces of every conceivable dimension'. Panorama buildings and stereoscopic images literally made it possible for audiences to virtually travel and immerse themselves in a foreign, imagistic space. For nineteenth-century audiences media could hence resemble travelling, but travelling could also resemble media – a kind of 'panoramic travel', which historian Wolfgang Schivelbusch once eloquently described in his classic nineteenth-century study, *The Railway Journey: The Industrialization and Perception of Time and Space*.[33] According to Osterhammel, however, the daily press was particularly important for mediated globalization: newspapers 'from the local sheet to the London *Times*, [were] by the end of the century … bringing news from all around the world while delivering its papers to be read on every continent'.[34]

Another significant spatial question regarding the nineteenth-century communication landscape is where media were actually located. On the one hand, media were individual consumer products to be purchased like any other commodity and disposed of in private. But on the other hand, media were also semi-public attractions (permanent or mobile) as well as infrastructures geared towards the public good, like telegraphy and later telephony. At urban newspaper stands, the daily press and magazines, illustrated press and comics could be bought by anyone who had the means, and in specialized shops visual media like photographs and postcards could be obtained. From the 1840s onwards, daguerreotypes and later *cartes de visite* – small, personal photographs of oneself or family members, patented in Paris by photographer André Adolphe Eugène Disdéri in 1854[35] – were acquired from the local photographer, who could also provide stereo cards or photographic albums. However, nineteenth-century media were also popular entertainment in the form of public attractions. In urban settings, media entrepreneurs tried to lure prospective audiences to splendid and fixed locations – from dance halls and vaudevilles, to wax museums, panoramas or dioramas. In order to get people to return to these entertainment venues, programmes had to be constantly renewed – which was fairly easy regarding vaudeville, but much more difficult and expensive when it came to wax tableaux or panorama paintings. The 1889 Stockholm panorama building, for example, only

changed its painting once. Another strategy was to move the medium to prospective onlookers in both different cities and around the countryside; phonography and later cinematography were primarily exhibited in this way during the 1890s. After the Lumière brothers unveiled the Cinématographe at the Grand Café in Paris in 1895, they rapidly opened film theatres in London, Brussels, New York, Stockholm, etc. However, since there were not enough new films to screen, the popularity of the medium soon diminished. The commercial strategy was altered; Lumière cameramen/projectionists were instead sent out into the world – both to record scenes and produce new films, as well as to showcase the invention at constantly different places.

Hybrid media

Towards the end of the nineteenth century almost all 'new' media were becoming global phenomena. The Lumière cinematographer Gabriel Veyre, for example, toured Mexico, Canada, Japan, China and Indochina during the late 1890s, filming nonfiction actualities and projecting them to amazed local audiences.[36] A key feature of the nineteenth-century press was, arguably, the global character of its leading organizations. 'The major newspapers felt they had a responsibility to print news from all over the world'.[37] Newspapers were thus a global medium, but as the Lumière Cinématographe exemplifies, it is equally true for contemporary audiences that print media formed but a part of a broader media landscape with news and actualities being delivered in a number of different modalities. During the latter half of the nineteenth century, text and images were the most common media that people encountered. Roger Fenton's and Mathew Brady's photographs from the Crimean War and the American Civil War in the 1850s and 1860s, respectively, are canonized examples of visual reports which shocked the general public. But news, events and culture at large also started to reach people in astonishingly different ways; news were hence not only *read* about – they were also *experienced* in a number of other communication formats.

This was especially the case from the 1870s onwards – a period that media philosopher Friedrich Kittler has characterized as a *Mediengründerzeit*, alluding to the contemporary unification of Germany – a founding media age, where new information technologies rivalled and sometimes even dislodged the privileged position of writing with the alluring potential of sound and audiovisual recordings, something that (according to Kittler) fundamentally reconstituted Western culture.[38] One does not, however, need to attribute a significant, and somewhat deterministic, agency of change to the development of particular new media technologies. Suffice to say, towards the end of the nineteenth century, media became intertwined in an ever-expanding *media system* of various communication forms, where similar content reappeared in a range of media. During the 1890s, travelling showmen exhibited thrilling narratives in lantern slides and cinematography; at the same time Swedish audiences could see their king Oscar II portrayed in wax, print media and photography as well as on film, and occasionally hear his voice on phonographic recordings, of which most were fake, however. Similarly, sceneries of beautiful topographies were displayed in both major panorama buildings and minor stereo and postcards, dissolving views or moving pictures. Hybrid media is a digital notion[39] – but late nineteenth-century media culture can also be characterized in terms of increased hybridity. A famous

example is the Hungarian *Telefon Hírmondó*, the 'Telephone Herald', a telephone newspaper service in Budapest which from the 1890s to the 1920s provided news and entertainment to subscribers via telephone lines. Another hybrid media format emerging at the same time was the Edison Kinetophone, an attempt to create a sound-film-system. In addition, the actress Sarah Bernhardt (among others) appeared at the Phono-Cinéma-Théatre in so-called 'living visions' at the 1900 Paris Exposition. As these different examples testify, some media forms did indeed technically converge. More importantly for contemporary audiences, however, were the ways in which the protocols – the clutter of rules, conditions and relationship that gathered around media, to use Gitelman's term – generally did merge, and to some extent even converged.

Media scholar Henry Jenkins has argued that media convergence is best understood as a cultural process rather than a technological characteristic. Jenkins' term 'convergence culture' is a digital notion primarily referring to user-generated content and the ways in which contemporary media users become producers,[40] yet hybridity, intermediality and convergence also occurred frequently within the cultural history of media. Arguably, too little scholarly emphasis has been put on stressing the importance of a mixed-media approach towards understanding and describing the media landscape of the past. Even in Asa Brigg's and Peter Burke's great book, *A Social History of the Media*, 'convergence' is a term that appears first towards the very end to describe media convergence within the computer. 'From the 1980s onwards, [convergence was] applied most commonly to the development of digital technology, the integration of text, numbers, images and sounds', Brigg and Burke state, while admitting that these 'different elements in the media' have largely been 'considered separately in the previous periods of history covered in [our] book'. They do admit that convergence involves far more than technology *per se*, yet fail to give specific media-historical examples thereof.[41]

However, one only has to take a closer look at a particular event in media history in order to recognize how mixed media reproductions were. A detailed account of German reports taken from turn-of-the-century Berlin on the devastating Messina earthquake can serve as a case in point on how both entangled *and* differentiated media processes and protocols had become already a hundred years ago – hence, it can be perceived as an example of media convergence in a cultural rather than strict technological sense. The mediation of the catastrophe also points towards the need for a broad media-historical understanding of how news and events were mediated to the public – beyond the daily press.[42] In addition, it is an illustrative example of how an early media event rapidly unfolded and became publicly known to many people.

On 28 December 1908 an earthquake hit southern Italy. A number of cities, especially Messina on Sicily, were almost completely reduced to rubble. Berlin newspapers immediately reported on the event, which was initially believed to have claimed up to 200,000 casualties. During the first week of 1909, the front pages of *Berliner Tageblatt*, *Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger*, *Berliner Morgenpost* and *BZ am Mittag* were all filled with articles on the Messina catastrophe. Besides textual reports, the daily press also printed a number of illustrations. Naturally, the illustrated press like *Die Woche* and *Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung* featured additional images. These publications were both high-circulation illustrated weeklies; each issue of the former was by 1909 printed

in approximately 400,000 issues, and the latter in an astonishing 800,000 issues. The visual reports of the Messina earthquake were thus quintessentially mass mediated, but they also drew attention to nuisances in the mediation process. Before the publication of the Messina issue of the *Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung*, for example, the newspaper *BZ am Mittag* featured an article about the photographers depicting Messina. The *BZ* reported that just after the earthquake, a number of Italian photographers had hastily travelled to Sicily, but only a few of them had, actually, managed to reach parts shattered by the earthquake. Thus, according to the *BZ*, a number of the illustrations from the earthquake, which had by then been published, were fake. Some of the published photographs did not at all depict the Messina catastrophe, but instead earlier earthquakes – old photographs had been manipulated.[43]

Somewhat surprisingly, moving pictures from the Messina catastrophe appeared in Berlin even before these illustrations were printed in the daily and illustrated press. Already on 1 January 1909, the *Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger* reported that the cinema at a contemporary film exhibition was to visually report on the earthquake the next day, and that telegraphically ordered films from Messina were projected as soon as they arrived. Finally, the Messina event was visually mediated in Berlin in at least three more ways: in a staged reconstruction, in stereoscopic images and in illustrated lectures. Already by mid-January 1909, the Berlin wax museum, *Passage-Panoptikum*, had put together new visual tableaux displaying the earthquake. The tableaux featured a round trip through the earthquake areas of Messina, reconstructed from authentic images. At the same time, the *Kaiserpanorama* showed stereoscopic images from the event, and during spring 1909 the attraction displayed no fewer than 10 series of images from the earthquake, each one containing 50 stereoscopic photographs. Lastly, illustrated lecturers gave hundreds of slide performances, 'Lichtbilder-Vortrag', focusing on the Messina earthquake at a number of public locations in Berlin.

The different ways in which the Messina catastrophe was represented also raise the tricky media-historical question of whether ordinary people perceived various forms of communication differently; that is, if media representations were understood as distinctly separate and dissimilar from each other. Around 1900, for instance, it can be argued that moving images both referred to cinematography as well as different forms of lantern projections. Prior to 1905 – and the establishment of permanent cinemas, the so-called *nickelodeon boom* (in the U.S.) – audiences often mixed up film and slide projections. Especially so-called *dissolving views*, a popular type of nineteenth-century magic lantern slide that exhibited a gradual transition from one projected image to the next – for example, from day to night – resembled early cinematography. The material technology itself facilitated these transitions, since lantern projectors sometimes had double or triple lenses which made it easy to double-expose and project slides on top of each other.

Then again, dissolving views of landscapes *also* belonged to the painterly tradition of dioramas – a variation of the 360-degree panorama painting. As a theatrical experience, dioramas dated back to the 1820s, and in the diorama building two huge canvases, sometimes featuring real objects, displayed landscapes, battles or earthquakes, usually depicting a 'before' and an 'after'. Importantly, dioramas 'moved' and included revolving seating for the audience, as well as vivid and detailed pictures – which were lit and illuminated from different angles – and thus created visual effects of

imagistic transformations. Occasionally sound and living performers were also added. 'In viewing the Diorama', John Timbs stated in his 1855 publication, *Curiosities of London: Exhibiting the most Rare and Remarkable Objects of Interest in the Metropolis*,

> the spectator is placed, as it were, at the extremity of the scene, and thus has a view *across, or through it*. […] The combination of transparent, semi-transparent, and opaque colouring … renders the Diorama the most perfect scenic representation of nature; and adapts it peculiarly for moonlight subjects, or for shewing such accidents in landscape as sudden gleams of sunshine or lightning.[44]

Before inventing the daguerreotype process of photography during the 1830s, the painter Louis Daguerre was the owner of the first and most famous diorama in Paris (it opened in 1822). Daguerre's diorama stresses the often intricate interrelations within media culture, and the ways in which boundaries of media became blurred for the public. Even print culture during the early nineteenth century can be seen as involving a number of different media forms which readers did not always perceive as differentiated. Since books, magazines and newspapers were at the time printed sheets of paper, they resemble each other. Processes and methods used for the printing and binding of books were different; bookbinders physically assembled a book from an ordered stack of paper sheets. Hence, the medium of the book and that of the newspaper were not so unalike. In fact, prior to the mass production of inexpensive newspapers, the binding of newspapers into annual volumes was not an uncommon practice and commercial strategy during the early nineteenth century. With indexed categories such as 'foreign news', 'politics', 'war' or 'crime', 'old' newspapers appeared almost as books, with information being recontextualized for potential readers.[45]

One of the historiographical reasons, however, why book history is different from the history of the press, and why mixed or hybrid media forms have often been neglected, has to do with a traditional scholarly understanding of media history as driven by particular media forms. Specific media – or media institutions like the daily press – have usually been perceived as revolutionary for the development of general communication, a view that at the same time has been promoted by the very same media institutions, sometimes with frenetic journalistic excitement. The great relevance of, for example, the daily press for society was not only described in newspapers themselves; statues of newspaper tycoons were erected, journalistic conferences and exhibitions arranged – all with the purpose of underscoring the prominence of the medium. Different audiences were a resource for the nineteenth-century press, according to media historian Patrik Lundell, just as the press was 'a resource for them. Instead of separating proper journalism, the spreading of the self-image [of the press], and the reception of different audiences as clearly defined areas, they must be seen as constituting each other'.[46] It was simply never in the interest of the daily press to promote the film or book publishing industry, for example. As a consequence, the dependence and interaction with other media forms became secondary (at best). Within an academic setting, a similar focus on mono-media studies was later institutionalized; film-historical research was primarily devoted to one medium, media and communications studies initially to the history of the press, etc. Even if an influential media theorist like Marshall McLuhan in the 1960s argued that 'the content of any

medium is always another medium', media-historical scholarship for decades by and large disregarded looking at interrelated *media systems* and the ways in which they determined epochs in the past.[47]

A cultural history of the media during the nineteenth as well as the twentieth century, however, needs to stress that 'all media are, from the standpoint of sensory modality, "mixed media"', as art historian W. J. T. Mitchell has argued.[48] A final example can act as a vivid illustration, and at the same time give a detailed impression of the mediated clutter surrounding mid-nineteenth-century popular culture. In 1850, the Swedish 'nightingale' Jenny Lind undertook an extraordinarily popular concert tour in North America. Born in 1820, Lind was considered one of the best soprano opera singers of her time – but since she was a performer just prior to the ability of mechanically capturing sound, there are ironically no recordings of her voice. Responsible, however, for her American tour was none other than the legendary showman P. T. Barnum. He was an early media entrepreneur and booster of popular culture, and is said to have paid Lind an unprecedented amount of money for the almost 100 concerts she gave, riches she mostly donated to charity.

In Barnum's autobiography, published in 1855, he retold the story of how he promoted Lind during her concert tour; the 'Jenny Lind enterprise', as he termed it. Needless to say, Barnum's autobiography was an exaggerated account of both himself and his deeds – *The life of P. T. Barnum*, 'written by himself, including his golden rules for money-making' – yet at the same time it is an exceptional historical source regarding the ways in which popular media culture took form during the mid-nineteenth century. Barnum, for example, described the advertisement strategy for one of his travelling shows as a spectacle in itself: his 'Magnificent Advertising Car' carried

> press agents, the 'paste brigade,' numbering twenty, and tons of immense colored bills, programmes, lithographs, photographs, electrotype cuts, etc., to arouse the entire country for fifty miles around each place of exhibition to the fact that 'P. T. Barnum's New and Greatest Show on Earth' was approaching.[49]

When Barnum reflected on 'Jenny Lind, her musical powers, her character, and wonderful successes', and the way in which she at first was practically 'unknown on this side of the water' – that is, before he brought her to America – he essentially suggested that it was he himself who had made her into a star. Following his own account, he created 'a Jenny Lind mania', invoking a number of subsequent modern media strategies to promote her to stardom. Barnum can thus be seen as an early exponent of the ways in which media and celebrity culture became mutually linked. In short, consumer capitalism promoted, took advantage of and profited from a star to sell commodities or newspaper issues, while Lind herself capitalized on becoming extremely well known through various media accounts. Barnum was in many ways the middle-man who made this symbiosis work. Through his various efforts – at least following his own account – Lind's presence and whereabouts became known and filled newspaper columns day after day. But Barnum also referred to a heterogeneous blend of commodities and newspapers, photographs and illustrated journals, and even riding hats and typical female 'bonnets' that all depicted Lind. In sometimes bizarre ways, merchants tried to profit from and take advantage of Lind's persona – praising

her, while at the same time making money from her 'image'. Interestingly, Barnum argued that these manifestations in due time would all give evidence of Lind's fame and 'show that never before had there been such enthusiasm in the city of New York, or indeed in America'.

> For weeks … the excitement was unabated. … The carriages of the wealthiest citizens could be seen in front of [Lind's] hotel, at nearly all hours of the day, and it was with some difficulty that I prevented the 'fashionables' from monopolizing her altogether … Shopkeepers vied with each other in calling her attention to their wares … Songs, quadrilles and polkas were dedicated to her, and poets sung in her praise. We had Jenny Lind gloves, Jenny Lind bonnets, Jenny Lind riding hats, Jenny Lind shawls, mantillas, robes, chairs, sofas, pianos – in fact, everything was Jenny Lind. Her movements were constantly watched, and the moment her carriage appeared at the door, it was surrounded by multitudes, eager to catch a glimpse of the Swedish Nightingale.[50]

Conclusion: a history of increased mediatization?

During the last decade so-called theories of mediatization have gained academic popularity within media studies as a way to stress the importance of media for culture and society at large, both in a contemporary and historical setting.[51] In many ways, mediatization theory has emerged as a key concept to reconsider old – but still fundamental – questions about the role and effect, influence and impact of media and media culture. Since the concept of mediatization places media at the very centre of culture and society, it has attracted scholarly attention and become fashionable predominantly among media and communications scholars.

Mediatization is generally perceived as an historical metaprocess, a *grand narrative*, in the same manner as globalization, urbanization or modernization. Importantly, mediatization theory stipulates that over time an 'increasing number of technologically mediated forms of communication have become permanently available'.[52] In institutionalist accounts, mediatization is a process in which social actors adapt to media's rules and aims, logics and constraints. In more social constructivist accounts, the mediatization process is driven by media technologies that alter and refine the communicative construction of culture and society. 'Contemporary culture and society are permeated by the media, to the extent that the media may no longer be conceived as being separate from cultural and social institutions', media and communication scholar Stig Hjarvard has argued.[53] In a similar vein, media scholar Andreas Hepp states that media 'have increasingly left their mark on our everyday life'. Through 'the increasing use of media', so-called 'cultures of mediatization' have therefore emerged: 'that is, cultures that are "moulded" by the media'.[54]

Mediatization theory can, on the one hand, describe some of the transformations this chapter has traced that occurred within nineteenth-century media culture, relevant for understanding twentieth-century developments as well. The media landscape did, indeed, develop and grow; more and more people encountered media, hybrid media formats developed and new ways to technologically store and transmit culture were introduced – an extended process in which media increasingly came

to constitute the infrastructural basis for human experience and understanding. On the other hand, mediatization theory is not geared towards *really* understanding or explaining media history, since it postulates a continuous and unceasing expansion of communication forms. It is an invalid argument in at least two different ways. Firstly, because some media forms or media usage decreased or even vanished. People went to the cinema more in the 1930s than today, the number of newspapers in Sweden during the 1920s has never been surpassed and in Lviv today there are not 200 daily newspapers. Secondly, as the example of P. T. Barnum displays, popular culture was moulded by the media already 150 years ago. It is not a recent phenomenon. Barnum's account of Jenny Lind might come across as a contemporary Hollywood merchandise campaign, but her concert tour in America took place in 1850. Lind was, no doubt, a great singer, but she is also a vibrant example of the ways in which mediated popular culture already during the mid-nineteenth century *produced* celebrities and stardom. Importantly, Lind was not an exception. Mediated mechanisms of celebrity culture developed in Europe already during the Enlightenment;Voltaire was a veritable celebrity in his time, and Heinrich Heine coined the idea of 'Lisztomania' in the 1840s.[55]

Proponents of mediatization theory usually perceive it as a continuous process which has emerged over a long period of time, but critics of this theoretical fallacy have, in fact, remarked that 'there is little consensus on when it started'. Arguably, there is consequently a need 'for more diachronous research' – that is, studies of media alterations over time, 'demonstrating rather than presuming historical change'. Indeed, 'the diachronous research that has been done seems to show that mediatization may well be an erratic process'.[56] Other scholars have argued that 'mediatization needs to be historicized' since 'too much of existing research has hypostasized the existence of mediatization' and then focused 'the contemporary effects of this taken-for-granted process'.[57] As the many empirical examples in this chapter have shown, however, mediatization theory does not really explain or help us understand the various transformations of media during the long nineteenth century, since it is essentially non-historical in its supposition of a constant increase and accumulation of media and media usage. With its contemporary set-up, the so-called mediatization of culture and society should rather be perceived as a continuation of John B. Thompson's argument in his publication, *The Media and Modernity* – 'a book primarily written as a work of social theory'[58] – with its non-empirical, top-down approach towards media history.

As a classic cultural historian – with an interest in the ways in which contemporary media culture during the interwar period altered reality into a 'world of automata' – Egon Friedell might instead serve as a great reminder that almost all modern epochs have perceived themselves as saturated and moulded by the media. If digital media today increasingly leave 'their mark on our everyday life', following claims made by contemporary mediatization scholars, for Friedell, it was the 1920s bioscope that appeared as 'a brutish dead machine' which presumably made a whole epoch unable to concentrate. Cultural historian Robert Darnton has often reminded us that every age was an age of information. In his presidential address to the American Historical Association at the height of the dotcom boom in the year 2000, Darnton argued that it seemed that society had by now 'entered the information age' with a future

'determined by the media. In fact, some would claim that the modes of communication have replaced the modes of production as the driving force of the modern world'. In his talk, however, Darnton disputed this view, which in many ways can be seen as a variation of mediatization theory. 'Whatever its value as prophecy', he stated,

> it will not work as history, because it conveys a specious sense of a break with the past. I would argue that every age was an age of information, each in its own way, and that communication systems have always shaped events.[59]

As this chapter has shown, a cultural history of media during the long nineteenth century indeed exemplifies Darnton's claim: it was an epoch that historian Eric Hobsbawm once described as the 'age of capital' and the subsequent 'age of empire' – but that could just as easily have been termed the 'age of media'.[60]

Notes

1 The notion of the disenchantment of the world, 'Entzauberung der Welt', appears in Max Weber's classic essay, 'Wissenschaft als Beruf' from 1919 – later translated as 'Science as Vocation' in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1946, 129–56.
2 E. Friedell, *A Cultural History of the Modern Age, Volume III*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1932, 475.
3 'What You Absolutely Should Read: Egon Friedell's Cultural History', *Farilian*, 16 January 2013, https://realmsofacademia.wordpress.com/2013/01/16/what-you-absolutely-should-read-egon-friedells (accessed 1 September 2017).
4 E. Friedell, *A Cultural History of the Modern Age, Volume II*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1931, 149.
5 Friedell, *A Cultural History of the Modern Age, Volume III*, 78, 80, 120.
6 E. Friedell, 'Prolog vor dem Film', *Blätter des deutschen Theaters*, no. 2, 1912. Later reprinted in A. Kaes (ed.), *Kino-Debatte. Texte zum Verhältnis von Literatur und Film 1909–1929*, Tübingen: Max Niemayer Verlag, 1978, 42–6.
7 W. Benjamin, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' (1936), reprinted in M. W. Jennings, B. Doherty and T. Y. Levin (eds), *The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility, and Other Writings on Media*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008, 19–55.
8 Friedell, *A Cultural History of the Modern Age, Volume III*, 475. Friedell naturally alluded to Oswald Spengler's *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* (1918–22) – published in English as *The Decline of the West* in 1926 – a cultural pessimistic treatise which predicted the deterioration of 'Faustian' Western culture, a theme enthusiastically picked up by intellectual proponents of German National Socialism. Arguably, Friedell's contemporary dismal was, hence, likely *also* political. Being of Jewish origin, he had witnessed the rise of National Socialism, and later during the 1930s his cultural historical books were all banned by the Nazi regime. Four days after Nazi Germany's *Anschluss* of Austria in March 1938, local SA-men came to arrest Friedell – who committed suicide by jumping out of the window of his apartment on Gentzgasse in Vienna.
9 J. B. Thompson, *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of the Media*, London: Polity Press, 1995, 4.
10 For new perspectives on the cultural history of media published after the millennium, see for example L. Gitelman and G. B. Pingree (eds), *New Media 1740–1915*,

Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003; David Thorburn and Henry Jenkins (eds), *Rethinking Media Change: The Aesthetics of Transition*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003, and A. Ekström, S. Jülich and P. Snickars (eds), *1897. Mediehistorier kring Stockholmsutställningen*, Stockholm: SLBA, 2006. For an introduction to the field of media archaeology, see W. Ernst, *Digital Memory and the Archive*, Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota University Press, 2012, and J. Parikka, *What Is Media Archaeology?*, London: Polity Press, 2012.

11 'Entanglement is a concept that can be employed in order to problematize the presumed points of departure and the linear understandings of development, production and reception that often characterize media-history scholarship'. M. Cronqvist and C. Hilgert, 'Entangled Media Histories. The Value of Transnational and Transmedial Approaches in Media Historiography', *Media History* 1, 2017, 130–41.

12 R. Abel (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*, London: Routledge, 2005.

13 J. Carey, *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society*, Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman, 1989, 15.

14 P. Burke, *What Is Cultural History?*, London: Polity, 2008, 28.

15 L. Gitelman, *Always Already New. Media, History, and the Data of Culture*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008, 7.

16 The term 'masses' can be perceived as problematic – and to some extent the later notion of 'mass culture' as well. The latter term is usually associated with the advent of twentieth-century media (such as film, radio and television), especially in relation to the United States and the rise of Hollywood in the 1920s. Then again, popular media culture during the nineteenth century increasingly catered to the masses. But as Raymond Williams famously put it: 'The masses are always the others, whom we don't know, and can't know. … Masses are other people. There are in fact no masses, there are only ways of seeing people as masses'. R. Williams, *Culture and Society 1780–1950*, New York: Anchor Books, 1960, 319.

17 V. R. Schwartz, *Spectacular Realities: Early Mass Culture in fin-de-siècle Paris*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998, 193. For a further discussion, see also V. R. Schwartz and J. M. Przyblyski (eds), *The Nineteenth-Century Visual Culture Reader*, London: Routledge, 2004.

18 B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso, 1983.

19 J. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1962), Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991.

20 J. Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014, 38.

21 In Prussia a modern compulsory education system was implemented already in 1763, and later during the modern era Scandinavia followed suit, with for example the establishment of the Swedish elementary school, *folkskola*, in 1842. Levels of literacy were high in Northern Europe; around 1850 almost 80% of Swedes could read, and more than 60% of Germans. France, the United Kingdom and the United States had lower levels of literacy, and were generally slower in introducing compulsory education for children, which happened during the 1870s and 1880s.

22 T. Standage, *The Victorian Internet: The Remarkable Story of the Telegraph and the Nineteenth Century's On-Line Pioneers*, London: Walker & Company, 1998. Within media historiography it is worth noting that the medium of telegraphy has often been ascribed a utopian quality. 'The telegraph freed communication from the constraints of geography. [It] not only altered the relation between communication and transportation; it also changed the fundamental ways in which communication was thought about', to quote communication scholar James W. Carey in his *Communication as Culture*, London:

Routledge, 1992, 157. However, this was not the way in which the telegraph was discussed during the nineteenth century – at least not in the Swedish daily press, *Aftonbladet*. Computationally distant reading some 10,000 pages of *Aftonbladet* between the 1830s and 1860s rather reveals that the most common words associated with the telegraph were profane and precise announcements around the *materiality of the medium* (copper, wire, gutta-percha, etc) as well as the meticulous mentioning of exact distances between telegraphically linked cities – that is, hardly utopian immaterial communication. For a discussion, see J. Jarlbrink, 'Telegrafen på distans: Ett digitalt metodexperiment', *Scandia* 84, 1, 2018, 9–35.

23 J. Mussel, 'Elemental Forms: The Newspaper as Popular Genre in the Nineteenth Century', *Media History* 1, 2014, 4–20.

24 For a discussion on British imperial telecommunications networks between 1850 and 1870, see D. R. Headrick, *The Tentacles of Progress: Technology Transfer in the Age of Imperialism, 1850–1940*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, 97–101.

25 This is the usual way in which media history is described – i.e. 'the development of print media', 'the development of electronic media', etc. See for example the many editions of James Ross Wilson and Stan Roy Wilson's textbook, *Mass Media, Mass Culture: An Introduction*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001.

26 C. Marvin, *When Old Technologies Were New: Thinking About Electric Communication in the Late Nineteenth Century*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1988, 3.

27 Gitelman, *Always Already New*, 1.

28 For a discussion, see H. Salmi, *Nineteenth Century Europe: A Cultural History*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008, 3–4.

29 R. Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977, 121–7. For a further discussion, see also C. R. Acland (ed.), *Residual Media*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.

30 W. Uricchio, 'Stereography', in R. Abel (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*, London: Routledge, 2005, 885.

31 'Rundmålningsbyggnaden å Djurgården', not signed, *Stockholms Dagblad*, 27 August 1889.

32 'Rundmålningsbyggnaden', not signed, *Dagens Nyheter*, 28 August 1889.

33 W. Schivelbusch, *The Railway Journey: The Industrialization and Perception of Time and Space* (1977), Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 1986, 123–51.

34 Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World*, 29.

35 For a discussion, see E. A. McCauley, *A.A.E. Disdéri and the Carte de Visite Portrait Photograph*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.

36 P. Jacquier and M. Pranal, *Gabriel Veyre, opérateur Lumière. Autour du monde avec le cinématographe correspondance (1896–1900)*, Paris: Actes Sud, 1999.

37 Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World*, 37.

38 F. Kittler, *Discourse Networks 1800/1900*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990.

39 L. Manovich, 'Understanding Hybrid Media' (2009), http://manovich.net/content/04-projects/055-understanding-hybrid-media/52_article_2007.pdf (accessed 1 September 2017).

40 H. Jenkins, *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*, New York: New York University Press, 2006.

41 A. Brigg and P. Burke, *A Social History of the Media: From Gutenberg to the Internet*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009, 237, 236.

42 For a further discussion, see J. E. Hill and V. R. Schwartz (eds), *Getting the Picture: The Visual Culture of the News*, London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

43 Exact references to the various Berlin press and media accounts of reports around the Messina earthquake are taken from P. Snickars, 'Reading Berlin 1909:

"Medienöffentlichkeit", Daily Press and Mediated Events', in H. Segeberg and C. Müller (eds), *Kinoöffentlichkeit (1895–1920) Cinema's Public Sphere (1895–1920): Entstehung – Etablierung – Differenzierung, Emergence – Settlement – Differentiation*, Marburg: Schüren, 2008, 44–65.

44 J. Timbs, *Curiosities of London: Exhibiting the most Rare and Remarkable Objects of Interest in the Metropolis*, London: David Bogue, 1855, 252–3.

45 For a discussion, see U. Heyd, *Reading Newspapers: Press and Public in Eighteenth-Century Britain and America*, Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2012.

46 P. Lundell, 'The Medium Is the Message: The Media History of the Press', *Media History* 1, 2008, 1–16.

47 M. McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964, 8.

48 W. J. T. Mitchell, 'There Are No Visual Media', *Journal of Visual Culture* 4, 2, 2005, 257–66.

49 T. Barnum, *The Life of P.T. Barnum* (1855), Buffalo, NY: Courier Printers, 1888, 318–19.

50 Ibid., 103, 106. For a further discussion, see A. Nyblom, 'Jennyismen 1845', in T. Forslid et al. (eds), *Celebritetsskapande från Strindberg till Asllani*, Lund: Mediehistoriskt arkiv, 2017, 29–52.

51 For an introduction to mediatization theory, see for example K. Lundby (ed.), *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences*, New York: Peter Lang, 2009.

52 A. Hepp, *Cultures of Mediatization*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013, 53.

53 S. Hjarvard, *The Mediatization of Culture and Society*, London: Routledge, 2013, 2.

54 Hepp, *Cultures of Mediatization*, 1, 2.

55 For a discussion, see A. Lilti, *The Invention of Celebrity*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2017, and H. Salmi, 'Viral Virtuosity and the Itineraries of Celebrity Culture', in H. Salmi, A. Nivala and J. Sarjala (eds), *Travelling Notions of Culture in Early Nineteenth-Century Europe*, Routledge: New York, 2016, 135–53.

56 D. Deacon and J. Stanyer, 'Mediatization: Key Concept or Conceptual Bandwagon?', *Media, Culture & Society* 7, 2014, 1032–44.

57 M. Ekström et al., 'Three Tasks for Mediatization Research: Contributions to an Open Agenda', *Media, Culture & Society* 7, 2016, 1090–108.

58 Thompson, *The Media and Modernity*, 5.

59 R. Darnton, 'An Early Information Society: News and the Media in Eighteenth-Century Paris', *The American Historical Review* 1, 2000, 1–35.

60 E. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Capital: 1848–1875*, London: Abacus, 1975; E. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire: 1875–1914*, London: George Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987.