This chapter proposes to illustrate the following thesis: that beyond their inherent ephemerality, media paratexts matter for the historically resilient mode of media presence that they propose. While much of what Jonathan Gray has proposed to call “off-screen studies”\footnote{Gray, Jonathan. “Off-Screen Studies.”} has so far focused on exploring how media paratexts, in the words of Barbara Klinger, “produce multiple avenues of access to the text”,\footnote{Klinger, Barbara. “Off-Screen Studies: Film Paratexts and the Production of Access.”} I wish here to focus on a meta-ability of media paratexts to frame not merely the narrative or the text, but the text-reading activity itself. As Gérard Genette has proposed,\footnote{Genette, Gérard. “Paratexts.”} film paratexts are best analyzed as “a zone not just of transition, but of transaction.” I contend that their transactional nature is essentially playful, self-reflexive, and participatory—a mode of media reception that has opened up, and continues to open up the spaces of everyday life to the presence of media fictions. Clearly, such meta-ability to receive media as an engaging game must form a key aspect to a project of understanding how audiences inhabit and enjoy the spaces of “cinematic heterotopia”, “the expanded space beyond the confines of the movie theatre”\footnote{Wickham, Phil. “The Cinematic Heterotopia: From the Ephemeral to the Perpetual.”} where media fictions may be encountered through such ephemeral marketing practices. Indeed, as Phil Wickham reminds us for cinema ephemera, it is likely because of their very ephemerality—their status of disposable productions that mainstream cultures have long deemed “inferior” to the texts they advertised, and unworthy of serious analysis—that ephemera may penetrate, unseen, deep into audiences’ everyday lives, becoming this persistent surround that links movie magic with the everyday to become “a backdrop to the routines of ordinary life.”\footnote{Wickham, Phil. “The Cinematic Heterotopia: From the Ephemeral to the Perpetual.”} What follows is thus an attempt at an original contribution to the still nascent field of historical off-screen studies\footnote{Gray, Jonathan. “Off-Screen Studies.”} by
focusing on how ballyhoo promotional stunts influenced the very act of engaging with cinema fictions in the 1920s, and, beyond the 1920s, with media creations in general.

Ballyhoo film marketing stunts of the 1920s are unique paratexts in several aspects. First, they are uniquely ephemeral. Different from a lot of paratexts that are mostly textual and visual (posters, written advertising, books, trailers, etc.), these are performance-based “epiphenomena” that exist only during performance. “Ballyhoos” are, essentially, street media events, organized before or during the release of a feature film at a local theatre by the theatre manager. Beyond their brief moment of public display, their only relay in the 1920s comes either from local newspapers that may mention the chaos they have induced in local streets, or from national professional publications for movie theatre managers that publish best-case descriptions of “successful” stunts (Motion Picture News, Exhibitors’ Herald, Motion Picture World, Film Daily...). The range and diversity of these paratexts is in itself astonishing. “Ballyhoo” designates first simple parades of marketing material: a giant cardboard likeness of a Tyrannosaurus Rex driven around Montgomery, Alabama, for the release of The Lost World (Harry Hoyt, 1924). Slightly more complex, the parade may be closer both to its circus origins and to the diegetic world of the films portrayed: a jazz band parading around Minneapolis followed by five race-horses for the release of the horse-themed picture Checkers (Richard Stanton, 1919), “a full-blooded Cherokee Indian [sic] as ballyhoo man” standing on his “pinto pony” for the release of the Universal western In the Days of Buffalo Bill (Edward Laemmle, 1922) in Brooklyn, or, as late as 1926, a girl on horseback, wearing green, who “[rides] about the city [Philadelphia] and [launches] featherweight arrows bearing handbills for the theatre” for the release of Pathé’s serial The Green Archer (Spencer Gordon Bennet, 1925) at the local Family theatre. Press agents such as Harry Reichenbach however quickly moved on from such techniques to propose more elaborately staged events, rapidly imitated by exhibitors around the country, thus expanding the range of ballyhoo: from
merely two people “discussing loudly where they would go for the evening” and mentioning *Over the Hill to the Poorhouse* (Harry F. Millarde, 1920) playing at the Lyric theatre in New York to the famous hiring of a live lion discovered in the room of a gentleman named T. R. Zann at the Belleclaire hotel, also in New York, or the fake kidnapping of star Clara Kimball Young by “Mexican” bandits that Reichenbach still in 1920 declares to newspapers he has already planned, with the full support of US President Wilson, their creativity seems to know no bound and is in no way restricted by the very short shelf-life of such stunts.

Secondly, and despite this inherent ephemerality, their intersection with audiences’ everyday lives is uniquely powerful. Ballyhoo stunts are disruptive, border on the chaotic, and veer easily into the objectionable. Their very definition implies heightened visibility: in a cluttered media environment, they are masters at engaging audiences. They pry everyday spaces wide-open with their outpouring of fictional characters and situations, and impose participation to their carnival-inspired schemes. *Motion Picture News* describes the following “effective street ballyhoo” for the 1922 release of *When the Desert Calls* (Ray C. Smallwood, 1922). The Cameo theatre sends a truck filled with “real” Sahara sand and a sign that reads: “This is Sahara Desert sand, as shown in the (…) picture *When the Desert Calls* now playing at the Cameo theatre. Five dollar gold pieces and other U.S. coins—real money—are buried in this sand. You are welcome to come up and dig for the money, which is yours when you find it.” The sign is typical street ballyhoo: it carries vital information to see the film (where and when), blurs the line between a (fictional) prop (the fictional Sahara) and a (real) element (real sand)—and carries with it clear potential for social mayhem. And so it proves, when the cart “accidentally” falls to the side and the sand ends up blocking Times Square: “the sign on the truck (…) caused pandemonium, and, with a mad rush, men and women alike dug into the sand.(…) For an hour and a half, during the greatest Saturday rush period, traffic was held up at New York’s most important corner, while pedestrians dug with much laughter,” the
magazine reports, approvingly. In a similar vein, O. D. Oakley, the manager of the Regent theatre in Ottawa, Canada, is proud to report in 1924 that for his campaign for *Little Old New York*, his street ballyhoo—arranging with the local Fire Department to have the fire-bell rung at key intersections in the city—has landed him in court: “Summoned to appear in court for blocking traffic and ringing fire-bell on hand-pump on Main street without permission. (...) Newspapers got story of arrest. (...) Case thrown out of court. No fine imposed. (...) Reproductions made of summons for publicity purposes with copy posted in outside lobby.”

In this quest for visibility, the potential for pranks in questionable taste is not left unexplored: a Ku Klux Klan-dressed figure, for instance, is arrested in Madison, Wisconsin, as he “arouses some alarm” riding through town “masked, wearing white robes”: “he turned out to be an advertisement for *One Clear Call* (John Stahl, 1922), news of which was in the Sunday morning papers.” Just as problematic for the time is this advice, published in *Motion Picture World* at the height of the 1919 Red Scare for the exploitation of the anti-Bolshevik pamphlet *Bolshevism on Trial* (Harley Knoles, 1919): “Run an extra show at night. Have a special showing for school children. Work all of the crowd stunts. Then put up red flags about town and hire soldiers to tear them down if necessary, and then come out with a flaming handbill explaining that the play is not an argument for anarchy. Have the bills ready printed that you may get them out quickly, or the idea may boomerang. Work out the limit on this and you will not only clean up but profit by future business.”

Clearly, ballyhoo stunts relish their ability to organize extraordinary events in ordinary settings and confuse participants with an onslaught of fiction into everyday spaces. And complaints and comments about the confusion induced by such fictional outpourings are rife in the 1920s. West Coast theatre manager Harold Franklin, having just signed for the distribution for upscale Paramount films, finds them in 1927 inherently “distasteful”—though he mentions having “a group of Indians camped in the grounds of Central Park” for the
release of *The Covered Wagon* (James Cruze, 1923) as an example of a successful and tasteful stunt.¹⁹ For movie columnist Laura Mason, such media phenomena define singularly modern spaces of life: “living grows more complicated every day,” she writes in 1924. “When you see an almost-murder, a near-kidnapping or a rather-real fire, don’t scream or turn pale, just shrug your shoulders in a bored, sophisticated sort of a way and murmur: ‘what ever will these exploitation men think of, next?’”.²⁰ This already (in 1924!) blasé, post-modern shrug of media indifference is precisely the issue. Film ballyhoo stunts participate to what Anne Cronin, analyzing outdoor advertising in modern cities, has called the “mediatization of public space”. For Cronin, outdoor ads have transformed the experience of the city into “an experience of a dreaming city, where snatches of images, text and advert structures form a mass of non sequiturs, a clamorous semantic backdrop to people’s material encounters with urban places.”²¹ 1920s ballyhoo stunts clearly belong to an archaeological variantology of such “mediatization,” by proposing that public city-spaces be opened to playful, fictional transformations, and that media imaginaries also belong there. Yet, as movie paratexts involved in the reception trajectory of a film narrative, they also offer more. Their “zone of transaction” is far more continuous than the dazzling clutter of conflicting advertising messages and their ephemeral “non-sequitur” approach. Through them, if the city “dreams,” it is a dream to be continued inside the movie theatre, a dream to be soon embodied somewhere else—on the screens of the city.

The mediatization of public spaces through film ballyhoo stunts, in other words, raises yet another question: the issue of what modern media and communication studies, reflecting first on immersive virtual reality technologies, then on digital technologies in general, have proposed to call “presence”, or “tele-presence,” commonly defined as “the experience of media as ‘real’ or non-mediated.”²² Media objects derived from the immaterial ghosts of the screen, ballyhoo stunts are nonetheless loud, visible, and concrete presences in 1920s
American city-spaces. The issue, then, is more precisely to understand what it is that is being made present to audiences through such stunts. What is it of the film worlds they embody that they indeed offer as concrete experiences?

Indeed, all across America and the 1920s, in towns large and small, fictional characters routinely appear at street-corners. To fully work as ballyhoo, they need first be surprising, and thus their fictional link remains unexplained. An old lady is thus spotted one morning in 1919 in downtown Pittsburg, regularly stopping her car and theatrically marveling at all the wonders the city has to offer, “naturally drawing a large crowd”, notes the Motion Picture News—a character, it turns out, from a soon-to-open Universal film, The Right to Happiness, about a family of Russian Jewish immigrants coming to the U.S.A. and discovering its modern wonders. In Lichtfield, Minnesota, “a weather-beaten, aged man in tattered clothes” is found walking the streets with a sign reading “I am looking for My Boy”: movie fans aware of upcoming releases may guess that he is none other than the old sea captain who, in the movie My Boy distributed in 1922 by First National, adopts an “orphan” played by Jackie Coogan. Even more theatrical, three “Turks”, “dressed,” according to the description of the stunt left by its designer Harry Reichenbach, “in lavish splendor from pompoms to aigrets and from sea-green trousers to gold-crescented turbans,” arrive in 1920 in a New York hotel, the Hotel Majestic, claiming they are “looking for Sari, the Virgin of Stamboul”, and demand to see the former U.S. ambassador to Turkey, Henry Morgenthau—who is not amused and calls them, undiplomatically, “a fake”. But Morgenthau, not an avid fan of the movies, does not know that the Universal film The Virgin of Stamboul (Tod Browning, 1920) is, as the stunt is played, still to open at a local film theatre. On July 18 of the same year, near Central Park lake, the New York police find a hat and a bag belonging to one Miss Yuki. Investigations into what looks like a case of suicide find no trace of the body, however. But this is because Yuki Onda is a fictional character in the Universal movie The Breath of the
Gods (Rollin S. Sturgeon, 1920) that opens near Central Park at the Astor theatre on the same day. Un-amused, New York authorities vow to “run down publicity fakers” and propose adoption of a new law creating criminal liability for any false information provided to the police. Their efforts, if successful, fall short of stopping the practice. In 1922 again, in nearby Newark, NJ, police find clothes near a canal, with a note that reads: “I entered a blind bargain with Dr. Lamb on his promise that, through an operation making use of a monkey gland, youth and health would be restored to me. He failed, and this is the result.—Robert Sandell.” An investigation follows, with front-page coverage in the local papers about this mysterious “blind bargain”—until the Goldwyn film A Blind Bargain (Wallace Worsley, 1922, with Lon Chaney as the mad doctor), opens at the local theater.

Two points seem particularly important when analyzing such practices, their mode of presence, and their narrative integration. First, it is less fiction than fictionality as a mode that is proposed for experience. These are no trailers, offering audiences some sort of coherent (albeit not necessarily faithful) entry into the film narrative. They are “pseudo-events” through which fiction comes to town. As paratexts, they are singularly negligent in introducing audiences to the narrative worlds they hail from. This is true even when the ballyhoo is used to deploy specific characters or objects seemingly derived from the diegetic world of the film—the closest these stunts ever come to performing their paratextual function of “framing the narrative.” The “old man” looking for “his boy” in Lichtfield is clearly derived from the character of the sea captain of the movie; but the ballyhoo overemphasizes the emotional connection which it foregrounds to the detriment of every other element of the narrative (the immigrant boy, the rich aunt actively looking for the boy, the immigration officers who wish to send him back to Europe). At least the Miss Yuki that the New York City police actively seeks in July 1920 sounds Japanese and appears to have committed suicide as in the movie (though nothing in the stunt suggests the spy element so prominent in
the narrative and the tensions between duty to the heart and duty to the traditions that underlines the whole dramatic structure of the movie). But the Robert Sandell who also appears to have killed himself in Newark has little in common with the fictional character of *A Blind Bargain*: not only is the experiment in the film meant to turn him into a monkey and not bring him youth, but the film character escapes before any harm is done and does not kill himself. Though ballyhoo characters appear to have slipped straight out of film narratives, they tend to slip out of character in their encounter with everyday worlds through the ballyhoo stunts: there are Turkish characters in *Sari, the Virgin of Stamboul*, but the plot never travels to New York, and the villain is looking for Sari’s American husband, not her—and he certainly does not try to meet with the ambassador. And movie Tarzan will not appear in New York before MGM’s 1942 *Tarzan’s New York Adventure,* contrary to one T.R. Zan who brings a lion to the Belleclaire Hotel in 1920.31

Indeed, in most ballyhoo stunts, the link with the narrative film world is loose, if not almost coincidental. Because the film *Manslaughter* (Cecil B. DeMille, 1922) features a car accident, Paramount proposes to exhibitors that they “send for a ballyhoo an automobile through the street throttled down to the lowest possible speed. It should be bannered to read: “I drive slowly and avoid ‘Manslaughter’”, or even to “get your mayor or police judge to sentence speeders to see the picture.” 32 Because one of the characters of Northwest drama *I Am the Law* (Edwin Carewe, 1922) is a Canadian mounted police officer, a fake police officer is made to patrol the streets of Gadsen, Alabama: “a motorcycle was secured and the bogu Chief turned into a speed cop. He chased and stopped autoists [sic], took their name and number, and then summoned them to appear at the Imperial theatre to see *I Am the Law.*” 33 An even more dramatic stunt is organized in Kansas City for the release of *In The Name of the Law* (Emory Johnson, 1922): “‘Stop! In the Name of the Law [sic]!’ As the sharp command rang out on the air yesterday afternoon, near Ninth and Walnut streets, pedestrians turned in
alarm to see a man, revolver in hand, feeling down the street with a policeman in close pursuit. (…) At the same moment an automobile filled with policemen came (…). In an instant eight policemen armed with riot guns jumped out (…). There was much excitement coupled with anxiety, as a fusillade of bullets was momentarily expected. But the only shooting that occurred was the shooting of a scene for a motion picture. (…) The scene will be shown in conjunction with In the Name of the Law.” Such stunts propose entry into circus-like fictional film universes, not framing of any narrative. They offer the concrete presence of fiction—of almost any fiction—into the routines of everyday city life.

The second important point is related. When pushing this presence of the fictional into everyday life, these stunts play on the public’s sense of what is, or is not, real. Their momentary, and playful, confusion between reality and the media fake updates Barnum’s “operational aesthetics”, forcing audiences to wonder, if only briefly: “is it real, or is it fake?” Are recruits, for instance, really being enlisted by the “petty officer” whom the Film Year Book of 1927 suggests should be on duty to man “a temporary recruiting station in the lobby” for the showing of any Navy-based movie? What is the nature of the ancient-looking stagecoach parked in 1926 in front of the Wigwam theatre in Reno, Nevada, during the showing of The Iron Horse (John Ford, 1924), and identified by a banner around it as a “famous stage-coach used in The Iron Horse”: a real prop from the film, a historical artifact, or a fake stage-coach put together for the ballyhoo? All ballyhoos, to some level, are executions of media hoaxes: they stage extraordinary, colorful and clearly fictional events in public spaces but mask (or ignore) the diegetic origin, and, if possible, force the public to interact—to follow the ballyhoo to the theatre, to answer or not a fake court summons, to accept to be given a fake speeding ticket. Like the literary hoaxes studied by Bryan Alexander, they enforce in their execution a “bimodal” mode of reception by distinguishing between two clear reception groups: those (hopefully the majority) who will play along, see
through the hoax, and enjoy the deployment of fictionality through their life, and others—usually, authorities—who fail to understand, or appreciate, the playfulness: a grumpy ex-ambassador, a serious New York District Attorney—or the mayor of Mattoon, Illinois, who bans any bull-fighting in his town after posters appear announcing the arrival of Juan Gallardo, “the world’s paramount toreador”—when in fact Gallardo is the name of a character in the upcoming *Blood and Sand* (Fred Niblo, 1922) with Rudolph Valentino, indeed a Paramount production. To be enjoyed, such stunts therefore require the faculty, in the words of Michael Leja, of “looking askance”—the ability, new by the turn of the 20th century, “to see skeptically, (...) to process visual experiences with some measure of suspicion, caution, and guile.” Without it, audiences will remain outside the magic circle of their play-spaces.

While a full history of those most inventive of movie promotional paratexts has yet to be written, it seems that ballyhoo stunts were progressively shunted from mainstream exploitation techniques in the 1920s to lower forms of B-grade exploitation cinema in the 1950s. Yet their “pervasive playfulness”—the sense that they offer that “everyday life is becoming interlaced with games”—has in recent years resurfaced, thanks to new digital technologies put to use in “pervasive games” such as Alternate Reality Games (ARGs) or in “prankvertising” promotional stunts. As such, 1920s ballyhoo stunts are of peculiar importance for an archaeology of the issue of presence that modern technologies, from Virtual Reality goggles to augmented reality devices, have rendered particularly acute. Their hoaxing of the media, in short, still haunts the media, and disrupts societies. Coming from a rich tradition of play in public places that would run from children’s street games to ballyhoo stunts to flash mobs, pervasive games still today run riots in modern cities with their unscheduled outpouring of media-derived fictions. The high-tech treasure hunt game *NIT 2000*, run in the summer of 1999, staged a scene at the WTC Marriott Hotel in New York that turned it, in the fictional world of the game, into a terrorist headquarters. Police were alerted
to the presence of suspicious-looking vials of nuclear waste discovered by hotel cleaners, though no charge were filed.\textsuperscript{43} Some seven years later, similar hoaxing of American public space was proving far more complicated to manoeuver. “Five teenage girls from Portage County face potential criminal charges after attempting to play a real-life version of \textit{Super Mario Brothers}”, local newspapers from Ravenna, Ohio, reported in April 2006. Their crime: deploying through the city streets seventeen large yellow bricks derived from the computer game, in imitation of an art project launched by Canadian artist Posterchild.\textsuperscript{44} The presence of media fictions, in this way, remains today a potentially dangerous and unreconciled zone of transactions.

Prankvertising, notably, has recently come to the foreground of communication practices as the most obvious recent evolution of forms of media hoaxing that ballyhoo stunts made popular as early as the 1920s. For film promotion, a spectacular example would be the otherworldly telekinetic powers demonstrated by an angered customer in a New York coffee shop in October 2013, all part of a promotion campaign for the upcoming release of the movie \textit{Carrie}.\textsuperscript{45} Crucially, such stunts are today relayed via YouTube, their popularity measured in the number of views recorded. Inspired by traditional TV forms of “punking”, these elaborate forms of advertising play directly on our supposed inability to visually process the increase in perceptual realism that new digital media offer. For the upcoming release of \textit{The Last Exorcism Part II}, customers at a beauty salon in New York were filmed as they were made to suddenly see glimpses of a dead girl in a mirror, momentarily unable, it seemed, to distinguish between the digital image and their own mirror reflection.\textsuperscript{46} One prankvertising stunt for LG TVs is even more explicit in putting into play the increase in perceptual realism that digital media today offer. An 84-inch HD TV is made to replace a window in an office where job applicants are being interviewed; images showing a comet hitting the city beyond the “window”, and the impact approaching the building, are projected on the TV; the applicants,
possibly actors, mistake this for real images, and panic. This video, posted on YouTube on 2 Sept. 2013, has so far been seen by more than 17 million people—thus ensuring dramatic brand exposure. In their mix of media magic and more traditional hoaxing, lying and manipulative though they may be, such prankvertising explicitly proposes audiences to play with the possibility of a sudden expansion of media imaginaries into real everyday life, and require that we still rehearse our skills at “looking askance”.

As these modern variants show, an understanding of 1920s ballyhoo stunts still matters to the study of media paratexts as they introduce a key dimension in audiences’ relationship to media worlds: the hoaxing of the media. The contemporary media literature on presence has so far insisted in defining it as the illusion of non-mediation in the experience of digital and/or fictional objects—defining presence, essentially, as illusion. What this research on film paratexts shows is that presence should be approached through the exact reverse prism as audiences work their way from paratexts to textual encounter, not as an illusionary psychological state where media vanishes, but as the concrete experience of media as a game. Media, indeed, does not vanish, but traces the magic circle where the game will be played. In the end, it is the nature of the presence that 1920s ballyhoo stunts propose that still matters today: the presence of playful fictionality within everyday spaces—a presence that modern media still deploy, from movie-inspired prankvertising stunts to transmedia film world expansions through ARGs. Media fictions, this study suggests, are, through ephemeral paratexts, made present in our everyday in a rather distinctive and historically resilient way: neither fully virtual nor fully real, they are a sort of embodied fictionality that transforms objects, buildings, streets, and people into active characters in the elaboration of modern spaces of heterotopia.
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