Classical Film Style and Classical Literature: History and Temporality in the Screenplays of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō

Thomas LaMarre

Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, U.S.A.

Among Japanese writers, Tanizaki Jun'ichirō showed an exceptionally early and intense engagement with moving pictures. By the mid-to-late 1910s, Tanizaki had begun to play explicitly with cinema and cinematic experience in his fiction. A number of stories used moving pictures as background, or commented on the effects of film, or experimented with the style of transcriptions of films prevalent in cinema journals. Prominent examples are "The German Spy" (*Dokutan*, 1915),[1] "The Magician" (*Majutsushi*, 1917),[2] "The Siren's Lament," (*Ningyo no nageki*, 1917),[3] and "The Tumor with a Human Face" (*Jimensō*, 1918).[4] At the same time, as film journals started to make their appearance in Japan, Tanizaki read them avidly, eventually contributing to their debates. Of particular interest is his essay "The Present and Future of Moving Pictures" (*Katsudō shashin no genzai to shōrai*, 1917),[5] in which Tanizaki criticizes the current state of the film industry in Japan and makes proposals for its future.

In 1920, Tanizaki suspended work on his first serial novel, *Kōjin* (*Siren*).[6] Abandoning this novel, Tanizaki announced that he would henceforth devote his energies to film production with the newly formed Taikatsu Studios (Taishō katsuei kaisha), where he had been hired as a literary consultant, largely to lend artistic prestige to their productions. Tanizaki, however, threw himself into film production with an energy that far exceeded expectations, working closely with director Thomas Kurihara (Kurihara Kitarō), who had recently returned to Japan after a stint in Hollywood working on Thomas H. Ince's productions.

Kurihara and Tanizaki collaborated on four films in less than two years, *Amateur Club* (*Amachua Kurabu* 1920),[7] *The Sands of Katsushika* (*Katsushika sunago* 1920), *The Night of the Doll Festival* (*Hinamatsuri no yoru*, 1921),[8] and *The Lust of the White Serpent* (*Jasei no in*, 1921),[9] none of which survive today.[10] Three screenplays survive as published in journals, as well as a "film play" entitled *Murmur of the Moon* (*Tsuki no sasayaki*, 1920).[11] Although Tanizaki worked primarily as a screenwriter, contemporary accounts indicate that he also became quite involved in film production, contributing constantly to the direction of actors on the set.[12] Moreover, with the third film, *The Night of the Doll Festival*, he assumed much of the direction at his home in Yokohama. After about two years in film production, however, a number of developments conspired to put an end to Tanizaki's film career: the financial failure of Taikatsu Studios, the poor health of Thomas Kurihara, and probably Tanizaki's own ambitions.

In these two years in film production with Kurihara, Tanizaki apparently became adept in the new art of screen writing. Accounts vary, but apparently, with the first screenplays,

Amateur Club and *The Sands of Katsushika*, Tanizaki's collaboration consisted mostly of developing a film treatment, that is, a draft of the film story. Kurihara then transformed Tanizaki's treatment into screenplay form. Indeed, with *The Sands of Katsushika*, Tanizaki later claimed that the Kyōka's story was so innately cinematic that he simply gave a copy of the story to Kurihara.[13] By the time of their third production, *Night of the Doll Festival*, however, Tanizaki proved capable of writing a screenplay that clearly conforms to what is now commonly called the "continuity style."

What first demands attention is how Tanizaki utilizes cuts, fades, and irises in *Night of the Doll Festival*. Generally, fades and irises establish greater lengths of time than cuts. Tanizaki uses fades and irises to establish the passage of time between different sequences, between morning, afternoon, and evening, for instance. He also uses them to establish distinct sites of action, such as the home and the kindergarten. Once these times and places are established or framed, he deploys cuts within a sequence, using these shorter, instantaneous links to stitch all of these actions together within a sequence. He can then begin to crosscut actions taking place at the same time elsewhere (provided these places are first established distinctly), a technique Tanizaki styled "cutback" or *kirikaeshi*.[14]

Second, he carefully indicates the direction of movement for actors. This is to assure that, as one cuts from shot to shot of a continuing action, the action appears continuous. This is especially important when crosscutting from one action to another, that is, between parallel, simultaneous scenes. When one returns to an action, it must appear to continue from where the point where one left it. In sum, to move back and forth between simultaneous actions, one must visually establish their locations and assure continuity in the actions at each location. In effect, the continuity style allows one to frame an action, which enables unambiguous crosscutting between actions. The idea is to avoid forms of discontinuity that would confuse viewers or distract their attention from the action on the screen.

Finally, Tanizaki also provides indications for long, medium, and close shots, as well as for "special effects" such as overlap dissolves, coloration, or puppets and dolls (as with the scenes of transformation of the women at the waterfall in *The Lust of the White Serpent*). Such indications would be less welcome from a screenwriter today, since they are more in the domain of the director, cinematographer, or producer. Tanizaki's consistent use of them is a sign of the extent to which he took interest in all aspects of film production. Not only at the opening of the published version of *The Lust of the White Serpent* but also in "Film Technique" (*Eiga no tekunikku*, 1921),[15] Tanizaki shows a penchant for introducing technical terms associated with moving pictures. It serves, too, as a reminder that there could be considerable overlaps between writing, producing, and directing in the Kurihara and Tanizaki's collaborations, as in much of film production at the time.

In any case, the conventions for establishing, matching, and crosscutting actions, taken together, are typically referred to as the continuity style, for the emphasis falls first and foremost on producing a strong sense of continuity within and between sequences. Above all, the continuity style insists on unambiguous orientation in space and time, providing a sort of map or blueprint for film production. One might think of such conventions as various frames that can then be combined into stable architectures. While they are somewhat rigid in their insistence on unambiguous orientation, they did present certain advantages in Tanizaki's context. In the case of his screen adaptation of *The Lust of the White Serpent*, such conventions

allowed him to transform a rather brief and meandering story into a well balanced and stable cinematic architecture. What is more, they allow for a certain degree of latitude in film production, making it easier for filmmakers to shoot scenes out of sequence and reassemble them during postproduction without fear of forgetting key scenes or losing coherence, which was necessary for the on-location shooting for *The Lust of the White Serpent*.

All in all, the script for *The Lust of the White Serpent* demonstrates that, in the course of his two-year collaboration with the Hollywood-trained Kurihara, Tanizaki had mastered or internalized the conventions of the continuity style, which were in keeping with the dictates of the "Pure Film Movement." Let me digress to introduce, briefly and schematically, the "Pure Film Movement" (*jun eigageki undō*).

In the mid-1910s, when Tanizaki began to pen film-inspired stories and essays on *katsudō shashin* or "moving pictures," the term *eiga* or "cinema" had yet to become prevalent. It was around the mid-to-late 1910s, in Japan much as in Europe and America, that there emerged a new awareness of moving pictures as a form of entertainment distinct from other kinds of spectacle such as peep shows, magic acts, theatre, and so forth. Histories of Japanese cinema allude to this transformation by noting a general shift in terminology from "moving pictures" to "cinema."

As the term cinema became prevalent, there also emerged a new sense of film as an object of knowledge.[16] Film journals began to appear, and in their pages short essays arguing for film reform in Japan started appearing with greater urgency alongside the film summaries, news and publicity.[17] In these new journals emerged discussions of the special qualities and virtues of moving pictures. Such discussions not only served to generate a new awareness of cinema as a distinct art. They also advocated specific reforms in cinematic style and film production in Japan, reforms that coalesced into what became the Pure Film Movement. Tanizaki read such journals and even published essays that allied him with the reforms advocated by Pure Film reformers, who are often considered the pioneers of modern cinema in Japan.

Recall that, among the stylistic "advances" advocated by the Pure Film reformers were analytic styles of editing, variations in shots, realistic or naturalistic acting, the elimination of *katsuben*,[18] and a detailed screenplay. Such reforms were calculated to focus attention on the space of the screen, as *the* space of narrative. Crucial was the insistence on a screenplay written in advance of film production. It is the screenplay above all that was to assure continuity, spatio-temporal orientation, and overall coherence. The screenplay furnished a sort of architectural plan.

Because so much emphasis fell on narrative coherence in the Pure Film Movement, such reforms are sometimes described in terms of the rise of narrative film. Rather than a simple emergence of narrative, however, such reforms are best seen as a transformation in narrative, in its form and its effects. For instance, as Komatsu Hiroshi and Charles Musser have argued, the crisis in film narration announced by the Pure Film movement had less to do with making films tell coherent stories than with producing film narratives that required less knowledge and participation from the audience.[19] Or, to put their argument another way, the idea was to make the film narrative autonomous of the context of reception.

Tanizaki presented many of these arguments in his first essay on cinema, "The Present and Future of Moving Pictures." If he decried the use of *benshi* or *katsuben* (with the exception of Somei Saburō[20]), it is because the film story had to be autonomous of their interpretative

banter. Above all, the Pure Film reformers wanted the film to stand alone, as completed in the studio, as an invariable and independent object, autonomous of the vagaries of reception. Otherwise, how could a film be exported and profitably received in other contexts? Given such a view of film, it is not surprising that Tanizaki so frequently likened film to the plastic arts — to sculpture, to carved signature seals, to dolls. A moving picture was to become a stand-alone object, an objet d'art. And it was the conventions mentioned above that were designed to produce stand-alone film narratives. Close attention to establishing distinct sites of action, and to the sequencing of actions, allowed filmmakers to crosscut actions, and assured that the story on the screen did not need any additional explanation at the site of reception to be made intelligible to viewers. Of course, it was still possible to use *katsuben*, provided they did not completely derail the story, as Tanizaki argued in "Present and Future of Moving Pictures." Nonetheless, it is clear that the internal coherence of film narrative is of the utmost importance, above and beyond *katsuben*. And, needless to say, it is the emphasis on story that spurred new studios like Taikatsu to hire a writer to Tanizaki as a literary consultant.

Taken as a whole, the consolidation of such conventions for narrative film is often said to mark the emergence of "classical film style" in the American context. Together with Janet Staiger and Kristin Thompson, David Bordwell in particular is credited with centering film history and film analysis on the establishment of the classical film style, which he associates with the Hollywood studios. Miriam Hansen provides a nice description of Bordwell, Staiger, and Thompson's characterization of the classical style: "thorough motivation and coherence of causality, space, and time; clarity and redundancy in guiding the viewer's mental operations; formal patterns of repetition and variation, rhyming, balance, and symmetry; and overall compositional unity and closure."[21] The conventions advocated by the Pure Film reformers largely accord with Bordwell's description of the classical style. Indeed, the emphasis on establishing distinctive sites of actions and on coherent and causal sequencing of actions in *The Lust of the White Serpent* seems to fit perfectly with classical style. Maybe this is not so surprising in light of Kurihara's Hollywood training and the Pure Film reformers' general interest in European and American developments in cinema.

Yet, if Hansen and many others challenge Bordwell's emphasis on the classical style, it is because it generates a number of theoretical impasses. Bordwell's analysis tends to posit an absolute control of narrative within Hollywood studios and to seek alternatives outside it. He sees certain Japanese directors, such as Ozu and Mizoguchi, entirely in terms of their difference from the classical style.[22] Their distinctive styles are construed in terms of modernist innovation, even though in the context of the Japanese film industry, such styles might have been quite "classical," as it were.[23] In brief, Bordwell's model does not deal well with difference: you're in the American control room, or you're not. Still, in the context of the history of Japanese film, some interesting questions arise from his difficulties with geopolitical difference. Should the establishment of conventions like those seen in Tanizaki's screenplays be seen as an *extension* of the classical film style then emerging in Hollywood? Or should one look at such conventions as *variations* on the Hollywood style, or *transformations* of it? Or is it more appropriate to see Tanizaki's conventions as *alternatives* to the classical Hollywood style?

In this context, I would like to stress how Tanizaki's screenplays follow from the guidelines of pure film and accord with the emerging classical film style. I will not emphasize their differences from, say, the Hollywood style coalescing at the same time. My emphasis also comes partly from the lack of extensive, comparative research on the history of screenwriting in the 1920s, in Japan, Europe and America, which is monumental task awaiting future researchers. In the absence of such research, it is difficult to establish national traditions in screenwriting or schools within nations. In any event, there are points of contact between Japan's Pure Film reforms and the Hollywood classical style. The Pure Film reformers pushed to establish screenplay conventions inspired by American and European procedures. And Kurihara trained with Thomas Ince, providing a direct connection to Hollywood styles. Generally, Pure Film reformers call attention to the importance of international conventions, and for them the crucial difference does not fall between Japan and America. It comes between the past and present, or present and the future, of Japanese cinema (whence the title of Tanizaki's first film essay). In other words, the establishment of pure film is first and foremost a problem of global modernity, of a break with the past. The geopolitical dimension quickly follows, in the form of national cinema, insofar as Pure Film reformers also dreamed to create a Japanese cinema, a national cinema for export. Needless to say, in the early 1920s, such an entity was an aspiration not a reality. If one focuses on the outcome, on the later establishment of national cinema without looking at the problem of modernity, however, one overlooks the cosmopolitan environment of filmmaking in the late 1910s and early 1920s, and the very strangeness of this cosmopolitanism, in which local productions are to be consumed globally, in which Japanese films are not necessarily just for the Japanese market but for international reception.

Bordwell's theory of the classical style has the advantage of making clear that the emergence of cinema is a problem of modernity. He is content, however, with a rather rudimentary diffusion model that recalls modernization theory, in which the Hollywood classical style travels to other locales, to be imitated, or transformed, or resisted. When he considers it at all, Bordwell seems to think primarily in terms of imitation or resistance, in terms of consolidation or disruption of the classical style, that is, in terms of American-style modernity or disruption of it in other contexts. He doesn't deal with the double consciousness or ambivalence of cosmopolitanism.

For my part, if pushed on this question, I would say that it makes more sense to see Tanizaki's film work in terms of variations on or transformations of a global modernity, rather than to posit national boundaries and national cultures as the primary sites of difference, fixed in advance. I don't see the interest of *The Lust of the White Serpent*, for instance, primarily in terms of a break with Western modernity. Insisting on a complete rupture would seem rather odd, too, in view of Kurihara's Hollywood training and Tanizaki's admiration for American and European cinema. This is not to say that there is no geopolitical trouble whatsoever. The boundaries of national cinema, however, are still in flux in the early 1902s. More fundamental is the temporal problem of modernity, where the boundaries of the nation are continually opened and negotiated. In brief, in Tanizaki's use of a continuity style that verges on the classical film style, I see a very modern problem, that of the spatialization of time. While the spatialization of time is not incompatible with the nationalization of cinema, it allows

an approach to national cinema that does not assume a certain configuration of national boundaries in advance. The geopolitical boundaries that derive from the spatialization of time invariably betray a degree of cosmopolitan ambivalence, or in Tanizaki's case, ambivalence about Japan's past.

In a fine analysis of Izumi Kyōka's story *The Sands of Katsushika* (*Katsushika sunago*), Joseph Murphy deals with a similar problem. He shows how Kyōka's work makes use of parallel actions and cutbacks, much in the manner of the filmmaker D. W. Griffith, who is credited with the development of montage that allowed for crosscut or parallel actions in early cinema. What is interesting about Murphy's account is that he does not attribute the cinematic quality of Kyōka's story to the influence of film on Kyōka (indeed Griffith's montage came years after Kyōka's story). Rather he attributes it to the emergence of modern time. He argues that this new narrative technique appeared independently in Kyōka and Griffith "because both were dealing with a qualitatively new situation: the emergence of a new 'time of the meanwhile' shared by artist and audience alike."[24] Both Griffith's and Kyōka's use of simultaneous parallel actions or cutbacks engaged an emerging consciousness of "homogeneous time, being gridded over the Meiji landscape through transportation, communications and print technology advances."[25] In other words, Murphy identifies a problem of modernity, that is, of the production of what Walter Benjamin called "empty, homogeneous time."

Murphy thus finds something analogous to classical film style in the stories of Kyōka. He suggests that this is what attracted Tanizaki to Kyōka as "ideally suited to cinema," and spurred Tanizaki to pursue a film version of Kyōka's *Sands of Katsushika*. Later comments by Tanizaki on the topic of narrative tend to support Murphy's hypothesis. In his debates with Akutagawa over the "plotless novel" in 1927, for example, Tanizaki argues the importance of "plot" or "storyline" (*suji*) in the novel. He writes, "The appeal of the plot, in other words, is the method of construction, the appeal of structure, an architectural beauty. . . . What is most lacking in the Japanese novel is this capacity to construct, the ability to put together geometrically variously interwoven plot lines."[26]

Tanizaki argues for coherent structuration and organization of the novel, in a way that recalls the conventions of classical film style, particularly in its calls for interweaving plot or story lines. In fact, his insistence on geometrical, architectural forms of compositional coherence in the Japanese novel is entirely consonant with the classical film style appearing in his screenplays. In this respect, his later remarks to the effect that Izumi Kyōka was the most Japanese of writers in no way contradicts his sense of Kyōka as ideally cinematic.[27] *Tanizaki develops a sort of "classical" style that owes more to cinema than to classical literature.* This is particularly evident in *The Lust of the White Serpent*, which Tanizaki styled as "the first attempt at a classical piece in pure film style in Japan."[28]

In *The Lust of the White Serpent*, Tanizaki uses the conventions of the continuity style to introduce crosscut actions into his adaptation of Ueda Akinari's tale. Throughout the screenplay, Tanizaki carefully establishes sites of action, meticulously indicates direction of movement of actors, all in order to assure unambiguous orientation of the spectator, which lays the ground for a climax based on interwoven actions. Tanizaki then rewrites the end of *The Lust of the White Serpent* in a manner reminiscent of an adventure serial. (Today we might think of this style as typical of the Western, but the Western had yet to be identified as

a distinctive genre as this time.) The screenplay cuts back and forth from Toyoo under attack by the serpent, to the race to bring the priest from the temple in order to exorcise the serpent. There are various feints and false endings. A first monk fails to exorcise the demon and dies. The second monk, Abbot Hōkai, sends his surplice ahead of him, which surplice Toyoo must hold over the possessed woman's body in order to quell the possessing spirit. Only at the last minute does the Abbot Hōkai arrive to capture the evil serpent. Thus, Tanizaki introduces suspense into the narrative. Will the priest at the temple arrive in time to save Toyoo from the serpent at home? The crosscutting between parallel actions accelerates, increasing suspense and building to the climax.

Of course, Tanizaki is only able to produce suspense by spatializing time. That is to say, he uses temporal markers (irises, fades, and cuts) primarily to establish different places and causal relations between them. And he is careful to match actions, to assure that when he cuts back to an action, the actor or actors are still moving in the same direction. One result is of this framing of action is a reduction of movement to continuous, causal action. The scenes at the temple, for instance, must be at once visually differentiated from, yet causally linked to, those at home. Temporal markers are used largely to delineate space, and the story moves through time causally. As Bordwell himself has noted, however, the price of this mode of cinematic representation is the reduction of action to causality, and of time to space. In effect, the continuity style produces space; it spatializes time. It produces empty, homogeneous time. In this respect, it is a structure of modernity.[29] Empty, homogeneous time is also a structure of the modern nation insofar as nations must establish a unitary timeframe within their borders; different locations cannot sustain different times if trains, for instance, are to run according to schedule.[30] It also recalls the structure of modern history, with its imposition of a neutral temporal grid onto global history, such that everything can be dated and periodized; and radically different, previously separated worlds come to coexist as so many parallel actions.

This is precisely Murphy's point in his demonstration of an analogous structure of temporality in the films of Griffith and the novels of Kyōka. He sees both of them responding to the modern imposition of empty, homogeneous time onto the realm of daily experience. In Murphy's view, their use of crosscut actions allowed them to deal directly with anxieties produced by the imposition of a modern structure of time. Thus the experience of crosscut actions for viewers and readers was one that permitted them a certain sense of mastery. Murphy writes, "The successful assembly of the story space and time from the discontinuous narrative spaces then would provide the audience a degree of mastery and cognitive satisfaction that might not be available in the dizzying tumult of daily life."[31] In other words, Murphy suggests that the appeal of parallel action, in literature and cinema (and one might add history), lay in its evocation and resolution of the temporal antinomies associated with the rise of the modern nation. People experienced a certain temporal disjuncture with the advent of modern time, because echoes of other times and places persisted alongside with the empty, homogeneous time imposed by modernization. Spatio-temporal confusion resulted from the sudden simultaneity of different times and places. The ability to assemble heterogeneous narrative spaces into a coherent whole allowed for cognitive satisfaction insofar as it at once acknowledged and managed heterogeneity.

Now, a great deal depends on whether one stresses an experience of cognitive satisfaction or of cognitive disjunction with the advent of empty, homogeneous time. A great deal depends on whether one sees classical film style, for instance, as repeating or resolving the tensions of modern time. There is profound ambiguity here, because the spatialization of time seems to imply a sort of double consciousness implicit in the experience of modernity. On the one hand, Walter Benjamin, who first described empty, homogeneous time, saw it as a potentially revolutionary and even redemptive disjuncture. For Benjamin, it implied a complete dissolution of narrative that might force people rethink their relation to the past and to each other. On the other hand, Benedict Anderson associates the production of empty, homogeneous time with the formation of national consciousness or nationness, particularly through newspapers and novels; suddenly, one can imagine that the diverse events and people in the nation somehow coexist in a single national space-time. Ultimately, the temporal structure of modernity implies at once regulation (via homogenization) and disruption (via de-hierarchization), that is, a general de-differentiation of diverse temporal frames of reference. Modern structures of temporality thus verge on a paradoxical experience of time.

Tanizaki seems especially fond of this paradoxical experience, of the shock it entails. Recall that, even as he championed many of the modernizing dictates of the Pure Film Movement in "The Present and Future of Moving Pictures," he explored their dizzying and perplexing effects in "The Tumor with a Human Face." In that story, he explored the paradoxical experience of the globe implicit in the Pure Film ideal of Japanese films for global export. He played with the uncanny dimension of a cosmopolitan world in which one might be at once Japanese and not Japanese. The result was a terrifying yet ambivalent sense of Japan in the world. In the story, Tanizaki extends to the spatialization of time within moving pictures to the world of moving pictures (film production) and then to entire world. While the spatialization of time may produce nations with national communication networks and national cinema, it inscribes a paradoxical experience of national borders and identities: Japan is everywhere and nowhere. Similarly, the classical film style might allow for a paradoxical experience, but one more closely linked to temporal structures (for instance, the past and present, or tradition and modernity). Typically, however, film studies do not highlight the tensions, contradictions, or paradoxes implicit in the classical film style. They associate it with narrative closure, fixed identities, and thus social regulation, as if the classical film style were national cinema tout court. Is it not possible for the classical film style to reprise the dizzying coexistence of temporalities in everyday life in such a way as to make them appear as shocking contradictions? How could it completely remove such contradictions anyway?

Scott McQuire looks for the sources of the emphasis on cinematic regulation, as a historical tendency in film theory. He writes, "Where many early critics stressed cinema's disjunctive impact on human perception, more recent accounts have tended to emphasize cinema's role in the production of a unified spectator-subject."[32] Crucial for McQuire is the difference in theoretical focus among earlier writers. He continues, "Where the earlier writers were struck by the potency of the cinematic displacement of the embodied eye, later analyses have concentrated more on the systematic structuring of this 'primary' identification as the means to achieving a particular form of narrative closure." More importantly, however, "these differences testify to a marked reassessment of cinema's potential for catalyzing social

and political change."

Where commentators today often take issue with cinema as a mechanism of social conservatism (whence Aaron Gerow's brilliant reassessment of the Pure Film Movement as a means of constructing and policing a normative film experience[33]), early writers frequently looked at the potential for political awakening or cultural subversion. Such shifts in attitude are complex. On one level, as McQuire reminds us, there is "the gradual naturalization of cinematic perception over the course of this [twentieth] century: where once it shocked, cinema now saturates habitual ways of seeing." On other level, there is "cinema's imbrication in the emergent culture of mass spectacle, symbolized on the one hand by the rise of Hollywood, and, on the other, by the experience of fascism." In sum, where the shock of cinema initially promised transformation and revolution, subsequently the naturalization and standardization of cinematic perception came to be equated with mechanisms of regulation and control.

Recently, many scholars of early and silent film have tended to look at cinema more with the eyes of early theorists. As a result, greater emphasis falls on how cinema disrupts received modes of perception, and how it transforms social relations. Commentators thus tend to focus more on cinema as it emerged (on its novelty) rather than on its subsequent regulation (its domestication). Needless to say, this study of Tanizaki owes a great deal to such a shift in emphasis. In fact, it seems the most fitting stance insofar as Tanizaki's film work from the late 1910s and early 1920s retains a strong sense of the novelty and transformative potential of cinema. His film work does not fit tidily into histories of the social regulation of perception. For these reasons, I find in Hansen's work in particular an important challenge to Bordwell's ideas about classical film style. She questions his cognitive model by introducing the idea of the "optical unconscious."[34] In other words, even if there is a classical style that entails conscious control (and cognitive satisfaction), it is riddled with internal difference. There is the movement of the unconscious beneath those controlled cognitive surfaces. The film industry may indeed strive to organize and master the senses, to introduce an unambiguous orientation of the spectator's perception. Yet this would result in complete boredom. The film industry must also shock and thrill the spectator, which means it must open less controllable relations to the screen.

In effect, Hansen calls attention to the problem of depth of field. Bordwell envisions a thoroughly successful flattening, spatializing, and closing of the narrative dimension of cinema, a complete reduction of action to causality, and of time to space. Hansen, however, alludes to an optical unconscious, a perceptual depth that continues to strike spectators, a sort of affective shock that enables continued perceptual transformation. A different problem now appears (or the problem appears differently), that of the relation between affect and narrative.

Previously, in the discussion of Tanizaki's "The Tumor with a Human Face," I explored the tension in his story between affect and narrative. Because in that story cinema entailed a collapse of perceptual distance that allowed the film strike and even kill the spectator, the question arose of how to narrate that cinematic shock. Can it be narrated at all? Rather than envision an end of narrative, "The Tumor with a Human Face" played with new narrative structures (or with old structures in a new way). It presents two stories and two worlds (that within the film, and that of film production via the actress who pursues its

mystery). Cinematic shock served to break down the boundary between the two worlds at crucial junctures, resulting in worlds that continually mesh yet remain slightly out of joint. Such a narrative cannot be said to contain affect or to succumb to it. Nor does it recognize contradictions only to resolve them. Rather, it at once registers and "raises" the shock of cinema to another level; it follows it into another register, that of narrative. Narrative, then, allows as much for cognitive dissonance as for cognitive satisfaction or control.

Now, despite the shift in emphasis in early film studies toward the problem of affect, commentators tend generally to treat affect in opposition to narrative rather than look at the tension or interaction between them. It is as if Bordwell's treatment of narrative has proved so powerful and persuasive that narrative itself must be handled with suspicion, as if narrative itself were synonymous with regulation, with the fixing of a subject position, or with cognitive mastery. I see cinema and narrative differently. In fact, part of the interest of the screenplays and film stories of Tanizaki is that they encourage a different approach to cinematic narrative. They demand another look at the problem of the spatialization of time in the classical film style. Narrative has come to be equated with a spatialization of time that begins with the continuity style of the screenplay. Narrative has thus come to be construed as synonymous with regulation, control, cognitive mastery, and the production of fixed subjects — in opposition to affect, the optical unconscious, perceptual depth, novelty, transformative practices, and even difference in general. Cinematic narrative, however, should be seen as a middle ground, as playing between regulation and transformation. Of course, it is still possible to construe film narrative as a problem of mass culture, as *regulated difference*, particularly as regards the problem of studio genres. Nonetheless, even if one construes the classical film style as a form of regulated difference, one still needs to understand how narrative makes for difference to begin with. Let me look again at Scott McQuire's discussion of film narrative in order to reconsider this problem.

McQuire writes of an unsettling shadow that stained the cinematic dream of luminous perfection. His discussion calls attention to how the movement of the camera threatened to blur film's visual acuity and accuracy, thus undermining the ability of cinematic images to capture the finest gradations of light and shadow, to render the world in all its depth and detail. For McQuire, the cinematic dream was one of perfect objectivity, of the ability of the cinema to capture reality without any subjective embellishment or imperfection. Cinema promised to capture all reality, for all time, and deliver it to an all-knowing and all-seeing subject. It was as if cinema had a supremely indexical relation to reality, as if reality left something of itself on film, to be transmitted directly to future generations. The movie camera promised to provide the perfect historical record, an inexhaustible source of incontestable documents, which would culminate in perfectly objective historical knowledge.

If shadows fell on this dream, it is because there are inherent limitations to the camera. One would need an infinite number of cameras running at all times to assure that one filmed the crucial events, events whose importance can only be known retrospectively. Moreover, the camera (or cameras) must, after all, be placed somewhere. It cannot be everywhere in advance. Thus, inevitably, the camera imparts a point of view. Its point of view differs, however subtly, from that of the woman or man who uses it. It is not simply that the camera is monocular, or that it imparts certain effects of depth that are not exactly that of the human eye. There is a

sort of camera's eye view, which becomes particularly evident when the camera moves.

McQuire stresses that it was the movement of the camera that threatened the dream of perfect indexicality, its luminous objectivity. He emphasizes how the movement of the point of view undermines the viewer's ability to organize, objectify, and control what she or he sees: "Because movement subverts the repose of the viewer, cinema necessarily interrupted the lines of recognition which placed the subject at the center of geometric representation."[35] Subjective mastery of the field of vision becomes difficult. If things continue to move, and perspectives to shift, how can one gain objective knowledge of the world? In other words, McQuire implies that the movement of camera disrupts the formation of stable subject position often attributed to the geometric or depth perspective, a visually ordered and mathematically regulated space presented as a window on the world for an unmoving, centered subject.

Of course, so-called geometric representation or Western depth perspective may not be so simple as McQuire implies. After all, many of the classical examples of geometric perspective provide two points of view on the scene, playing with the tension that arises between the two viewing positions.[36] This became particularly evident in Baroque styles. Moreover, although a full discussion is beyond the scope of this book, I should mention that the use of a fixed camera in early moving pictures, particularly for filming stage productions, often resulted in a doubled viewing position. The camera eye was placed at odds with view of the theatre audience for whom the play was first designed. In other words, a doubleness of perspective may haunt even the allegedly static viewing position of overly theatrical films denounced by the Pure Film reformers.[37] Likewise, although Noel Burch aptly sees the flatness and tableau-like surfaces of early film as profoundly different from the motionless voyage into screen space of later films subject to what he called the "institutionalized mode of representation,"[38] one can still imagine a sort of "surface depth" or "movement on the surface" in early cinema. Simply put, there can be tension and thus movement within the visual field even without movement of the camera. Nonetheless, McQuire's point is well taken. The movement of the camera makes especially visible and palpable the insecurity of the viewing subject, challenging his or her ability to organize the visual field coherently.

McQuire argues that the spectator's placement at the center of things had to be "reformulated on a new plane: that of narrative." It would be by means of narrative that the unsettling dynamism of cinema would be harnessed and controlled, which entailed reformulating rather than undermining what McQuire calls "the conceptual space of realism." In other words, McQuire detects two kinds of movement in cinema, the disorientating movement of the camera and the re-orientating movement of narrative. Narrative restores what camera movement threatens, the geometrically positioned and stabilized subject. In effect, McQuire teases out a tension between affective disorientation and subjective re-orientation in cinema. Then, as already discussed above, he follows this tension to another level, that of theories of film. Where early film theorists stressed disorientation and disruption (and thus saw the revolutionary potential of cinema), later theorists emphasized orientation and regulation (mass control and regulated difference). Ultimately, he argues that one must look at the complex interactions of these two tendencies.

While I agree in many respects with McQuire, what strikes me as odd is the tendency to place narrative entirely on the side of regulation and control. Isn't narrative actually the site of

complex interactions between these two tendencies, between disorientating and (re)orientating tendencies? Granted that the continuity style insists on unambiguous orientation, and the classical film style tends toward narrative closure, are there not many kinds of orientation and closure, with very different, and maybe unsettling relations to ends and origins?

When one looks at some of the Japanese writers who experimented with film through literary narrative in the 1920s, many of them seem to find in cinema a way to dismantle or destroy received narrative orientations. This is especially true of the New Sensation School (*shinkankakuha*), a group of writers loosely gathered around the journal *Bungei jidai* (Literary Age) and the writer Yokomitsu Riichi. Much like their European contemporaries, these Japanese writers highlighted the tension between affect and narrative (or between sensation and narration), exploring the way in which cinematic fragmentation and montage shattered traditional narrative form, allowing for new narrative experiments. Similarly, their careers underscored the coexistence of two social tendencies around cinema, namely, revolution and conservation. Some of the writers who were initially attracted by the revolutionary capacity of cinematic affect to disrupt entrenched forms of narrative (notably Kawabata and Yokomitsu), later "returned" to national traditions and set themselves up as its most conservative custodians.

In relation to the literary experiments with cinema of New Sensation School, Tanizaki's insistence on the appeal of structure, of geometrically interwoven plot lines, of architectural narratives, is exceedingly interesting. Tanizaki wrote in response to Akutagawa Ryūnosuke who delighted in narrative fragmentation apparently inspired by cinematic montage, as a challenge to received forms of narrative coherence, albeit differently from the New Sensation School.[39] Yet Tanizaki's defense of narrative structuration does not simply place him on the side of received conventions and socially conservative forces that would fix a subject position. Rather his defense of plot shows not only a better grasp of how film works but also an awareness of a certain problem implicit in construing montage as pure fragmentation (Akutagawa), or of construing film narrative largely in terms of blocks of sensation (Yokomitsu). Such cinematic constructions run the risk of detotalizing narrative in such a way as to call for new modes of totalization. While Akutagawa's experiments with fragmentation are often considered as somehow related to his suicidal tendencies, Yokomitsu provides a prime example of an avant-garde writer whose experiments with dismantling narrative did not prove incompatible with politically reactionary tendencies.

In comparison, Tanizaki's film work situated him less in the realm of avant-garde experimentation than in the mainstream of filmmaking. Even though his last film in particular, *The Lust of the White Serpent*, has subsequently been construed as an avant-garde experiment, Kurihara and Tanizaki wished to produce a commercially successful film. Moreover, in comparison with other writers, Tanizaki was deliberately, even studiously indifferent politically, not only refusing allegiance with literary circles or movements but also rejected political ideologies generally. Recall his noncommittal remarks at the close of "A Viewing of *Dr. Caligiri*," where he writes, "Realism is fine, too, as is Romanticism, and diabolism, naturalism, humanism, and classicism as well; all the schools [of cinema] will enter into competition, and just as in literature, each will put forth beautiful flowers."

One consequence of Tanizaki's politically indifferent, middle-of-the-road stance was

a keener sense of narrative as a middle way. By middle way, I don't mean a classicism that finds the golden measure or balance between extremes. Rather, this middle way understands the relation between "modernist" disruption and "traditionalist" consolidation of the subject, steering a path between them toward other possibilities. Tanizaki is well aware that traditionalism is a form of modernism, that cinema may be more classical than classical literature. Simply put, his middle way faces the paradoxical coexistence of polarized tendencies rather choosing one or the other. In particular, in learning the classical architectures of the continuity style, Tanizaki encountered the paradox of modern temporality.

Initially at least, the production of spatialized time can be quite a thrilling experience, allowing for geometrically interwoven parallel actions, for chase sequences and unbearable suspense. Continuity also imparts a sense of control of events and promises a tidy outcome, which can result in boredom and stagnation. At heart, however, continuity is a thrill and a bore.[40] It implies a disturbing experience, since certain temporal relations must first be broken to allow one to build these architectures of time. For instance, in the final scenes of *The Lust of the White Serpent*, the screenplay alternates between sites that had once implied very different experiences of time, the home and the temple. Parallel action sunders both sites from their traditional frame of temporal reference. In other words, underlying the thrilling sequences based on supreme continuity is a fundamental discontinuity, a rupture with the past. In other words, there is an affective "depth" amid the general flattening and spatializing, a temporal unconscious if one wishes. This "depth" must somehow work its way through narrative.

Above I mentioned that placing narrative entirely on the side of the spatialization of time encounters a problem, akin to that of the depth of field. In effect, the continuity style must flatten different temporalities in order to interweave them within a single, empty, homogeneous time. How then does one create an experience of temporal depth in this "flattened" field? One solution is to make historical or period films, to shift the burden of temporal depth onto historical recreation, that is, onto the authenticity of artifacts. Tanizaki clearly toyed with this problem of historical recreation, as his concern for period hairpieces indicates. Indeed, his essay "Miscellaneous Observations on Cinema" suggests that part of the appeal of *The Lust of the White Serpent* lay in the ease of historical recreation. He wrote, "With respect to hairpieces, it is easier to manage the Heian period than the Warring States period, which is easier than the Tokugawa period."[41] Moreover, from the time of his earliest essay on moving pictures in 1917, he expressed a desire to film on location in and around Kyoto, which he and Kurihara did with *The Lust of the White Serpent*. Nevertheless, it is clear that Tanizaki's interest in the costumes and architectures of the Heian period was not entirely a matter of historical recreation, in the sense of a meticulously accurate recreation of historical details. In the screenplay, he writes, "It will suffice to use costumes and manners appropriate to the Heian period without being absolutely precise." After all, the original story, written in the Tokugawa period, is not particularly concerned with historical accuracy vis-à-vis Heian Japan. Tanizaki's evocation of Heian Japan in *The Lust of the White Serpent* is rather like his use of unusual Chinese characters and elements of Chinese prose style in the story, "The Mermaid's Lament," which was inspired by Italian historical epic films: such a use of characters gives a feeling or flavor of ancient China, with more or less accuracy. In brief, Tanizaki is interested more in historical evocation, in evoking a feeling of ancient Japan, than

Thomas LaMarre

in recreating it per se.

Still, in terms of temporal depth, historical evocation remains rather flat, so to speak. It easily falls into simple exoticism, into consumption of antique flavor. While Tanizaki's works generally do not shy from exoticism and Orientalism, his is not a simple exoticism. *The Lust of the White Serpent* is, after all, a ghost story, and the very aim of a ghost story is not to soothe but to shock. In other words, Tanizaki does not aim to evoke a past for easy consumption. Rather, he wants the past to strike viewers, to shock them. Yamamoto Kikuo suggests that the period costumes of *The Lust of the White Serpent* were intended to appear strange and unfamiliar in the manner of Expressionist films, and the film may have used odd, "unnaturalistic" styles of acting.[42] Although it is difficult to verify Yamamoto's suggestions (gleaned mostly from Tanizaki's review, "A Viewing of *Dr. Caligari*"[43]), Tanizaki's admiration for such protoexpressionist, protohorror films as *The Golem* and *The Student of Prague* lend weight to Yamamoto's suggestion that *The Lust of the White Serpent* drew on expressionist styles.

In sum, above and beyond historical recreation or historical evocation, in *The Lust of the White Serpent*, Tanizaki strove for a terrifying experience of time out of joint, rather than a controlled historical relation to the past. This time out of joint is nonetheless a kind of historical relation. Although it takes the "uncontrollable" form of the uncanny, it nonetheless implies a structure of relation. It is as if the classical narrative architectures of the continuity style had so thoroughly spatialized and flattened time that an experience of time could only return as one of shock, terror, obsession, or dreadful fascination. Shock, however, does not happen in spite of the narrative architectures of time but within and through them. Narrative architectures are supposed to raise the shock of temporal discontinuity to another power.

Now, apparently, at ten-reels, with its long sequences and slow pace, the film taxed the attention span of viewers. Rather than shock them, it bored them. Still, it is clear that the film aimed to startle viewers with the use of double exposures, coloration, film speed, and other special effects. Although in a way that proved commercially unsuccessful at the time, the film also strove to generate an odd experience of time by working between different temporal rhythms. The screenplay alternates between leisurely, even redundant sequences, with well-established, geometrically ordered locations and actions on the one hand, and on the other hand, rapid transformations, sudden revelations, chases, and a finale (the exorcism) with cross-cut actions that build in tempo toward a resolution, much in the manner of an action film or Western. In other words, even though the screenplay spatializes time in order to produce unambiguous spatio-temporal orientations, the overall architecture seems divided. Consequently, its pacing feels off. Of course, this could be attributed to faulty craftsmanship. Yet, structurally, the screenplay moves in two different directions, deliberately. And it plays between different temporal frames, expressly.

The screenplay begins by presenting the two sons of the fisherman Takesuke, Tarō and Toyoo, who are filmically given as two types. Tarō works in the sun and open air, while Toyoo studies book in dim interiors. Tarō enjoys his rustic trade, Toyoo longs for the capital with its darker desires. This basic opposition between light and dark not only establishes types but also structures the story. It is in the darkness of a stormy night that the Manago, the seductive serpent woman, first appears to Toyoo, who has taken refuge in a fisherman's hut. When,

the next day, Toyoo seeks the residence of the seductive woman whose face he cannot forget, he enters into a world of darkness, and the crucial scenes take place amid "huge and terrible shadows." In other words, in a manner fairly common in Tanizaki's work, the screenplay is structured around a tension between the everyday world of sunlight and the fantasy world of shadows. The two realms are established distinctly, and the story is that of Toyoo's changing relation to the world of shadows. Because he is of shadows himself (a bookish lad who yearns for the capital), he is easily drawn into Manago's world. Subsequently, however, learning of the dangers of her world (she is a malevolent spirit, a serpent!), Toyoo reconciles himself to the everyday world, marrying a sweet, sunny woman (Tomiko). Shadows, however, will not be so easily dispelled, and the serpent woman takes possession of his wife Tomiko's body. Only a timely exorcism will save Tomiko and Toyoo from the serpent's clutches.

This narrative architecture based on two visually and spatially distinct types of worlds allows Tanizaki to play with their relationship structurally, architecturally. The budding conventions of film narrative, especially of the action serials that Tanizaki enjoyed, makes viewers expect a development in the rhythms of crosscutting between the two realms. And one expects resolution or closure, the triumph of light or of shadows — typically, the triumph of light. To some extent, Tanizaki's screenplay doesn't disappoint. It builds toward the final sequence with crosscuts. It moves back and forth with increasing rapidity between the serpent attacking Toyoo and the search for the priest who can save him. And there is a sort of triumph of the forces of light and good: the priest exorcises the serpent and saves Toyoo. But then, the wife dies. A shadow falls on the triumphant ending. The final scene is a funeral not the joyous reunion of husband and wife. Clearly, Tanizaki preferred a more ambivalent ending, reluctant perhaps to dispel the realm of shadows.

In sum, although his screenplay uses the continuity style quite deftly and faithfully to structure different realms and to bring their relationship to closure, the resolution is somewhat ambivalent in its darkness. Yet is not just the ambivalent, darkish ending that troubles the careful structuration of screenplay. It is the sense that the architectures of time do not construct a stable relation to the past, a straightforward temporal succession. It is as if the spatialization of time had begun to thwart forward movement and causal temporality, to spiral in another direction.

The establishment of visually and spatially distinct realms of action also results in two temporal frames. On the one hand, the world of light is that of the contemporary world, at once the world contemporary to Toyoo (Heian Japan) but also that contemporary to viewers as they follow his adventures. Although this is a past world, it is a knowable world, one that can be evoked and situated historically. It can be structured and framed. On the other hand, the world of shadows is that of another past, in a sense deeper than the past visually familiar to viewers. Although Toyoo tries to flee from this past, it will not let him go, because it fascinates him, seduces, and terrifies him. In other words, this deeper past cannot be structured and framed. It is a past within the past that disrupts the viewer's ability to frame the past. Although the film apparently failed (or may have all too well succeeded in disorientating viewers to its commercial detriment), it is clear that the screenplay aims to produce such a shock, to confront the viewers with a terrifying, disorientating experience of the Japanese past. Just as Toyoo experiences the revenant Manago with a mixture of dread

and desire, so the viewer is to experience the shadows of the past on screen with fascination, with attraction and repulsion at once.

What does this attempt to produce that past as shock say about the problem of film narrative architectures? Given the careful, conventional structuration of Tanizaki's screenplay, is it possible to speak of shock at all? Or should one speak of the emergence of a classical style guaranteed to spatialize time and thus to regulate difference, to resolve antinomies, to harness and manage shock? Is this all about the narrative mastery of the experience of time out of joint?

The problem of mastery becomes especially relevant in relation to gender. There is something disturbing about the way in which Tanizaki embodies the shocking threat to the man in the body of a seductive woman. Much in the manner of the classical film style as Laura Mulvey sees it,[44] *The Lust of the White Serpent* could be said ultimately to contain the shock of the past by fetishizing and punishing the female characters. For instance, the screenplay lingers fetishistically on the different beauties of the two women, on the sweet and sunny Tomiko versus the dark and mysterious Manago. Then, in the end, not only does Abbot Hōkai exorcize the predatory woman serpent, but also the possessed wife dies. It is as if the magnified, idealized images of women generated a kind of anxiety. (Mulvey refers to this as a threat of castration, due the possibility of men identifying with the female image.) The death of the woman punishes her for her overtly sexualized appearance, erasing male anxiety over his movement of identification toward such images.

In other words, to the problem of the narrative mastery of the disorientating effects of cinema (perceptual collapse or unsettling shifts in viewing position), Mulvey adds the problem of masculine mastery of women. For Mulvey, it is not just a matter of feeling cognitive satisfaction through the ability to produce parallel actions that manage the anxiety evoked by modern simultaneity of different temporalities. In many ways, *The Lust of the White Serpent* meshes with her interpretation. Although her account is often reductively psychologistic, her analysis calls attention to the ways in which Tanizaki's screenplay tends to displace such anxieties onto female characters. After all, in Tanizaki's screenplay, men together contain the terror of seductive women. And there are hints of a masculine transcendence of the (feminine) flesh: while initially Toyoo studies with a ritual master because he wishes to leave the country for the capital, in the end he desires to severe earthly connections, to purify himself spiritually, in response to his hair-raising encounter with womanly seductions.

Nonetheless, without discounting the dimension of masculine narrative mastery, I wish to signal that narrative remains a site of complex interactions. That complexity appears above all in a temporal register, as a problem with time that also troubles gender. The first moment of temporal shock in the screenplay occurs when Toyoo returns to Manago's residence by daylight with an imperial guard. So magnificent the other night, her residence lies in ruins by day. In effect, viewers are supposed to see at once the magnificent nighttime residence and its daytime ruins. It is through such ruins that Tanizaki's architectures of time begin fully to express their temporal paradox. In ruins, we see at once the past and present. Ruins better evoke a sense of the past than any restoration. In these ruins, too, are glimmers of the imperfections and accretions that later come to define pastness for Tanizaki, the darkness of jade, the griminess of traditional interiors, a tinge of racial darkness under radiant surfaces of

whiteness, a flash of perversity through modest exteriors. These are moments of doubleness, of ambivalence about the past and present, rather direct expressions of Tanizaki's desire to restore or recreate the past.

In addition to ruins, there are other moments in *The Lust of the White Serpent* when two different realities, night and day, dream and reality, past and present, coexist for an instant. Tanizaki's favorite techniques, dissolves and double exposures, play an especially important role. There are, for instance, the scenes (189-191) in which the sweet and lovely face of his second wife Tomiko, seen in closeup, dissolves into a closeup of Manago's face. In effect, the coexistence of two persons within one image presents a coexistence of two tendencies and two temporalities within woman, which ultimately ruin her. Double exposure also functions as a kind of temporal chiasmus. It at once links and divides the two temporal frames. It is the degree zero of the parallel actions afforded by the spatialization of time. Rather than controlled alternation between visually and spatially distinct realms, the double exposure shows both worlds at once. Causal matches on action give way to simultaneity, and rather than narrative mastery, narrative turns back on itself, unable to move forward.

For Toyoo, the experience of double exposure results in madness, for he experiences the "good wife" in ruins, which imparts the shock of the past that will not pass. Analogously, for the spectator, double exposure is to produce an experience of the degree zero of historical evocation. The spectator sees at once what is contemporary and what is past, which is in fact how history always works. But here it is suddenly and shockingly clear that history arrives only as an experience of time in ruins.

In effect, at these moments of double exposure, of time in ruins, one sees how the continuity style of Tanizaki's screenplay intensifies the spatialization of time to the point where incommensurable times seem to coexist, defying and disrupting the continuity style's meticulous, reductive management of movement. The resulting moment of temporal hybridity (a kind of madness) entails a struggle against the destruction of time. It strives for another experience of temporality in which everything does not move forward causally and return to its place, in which light does not simply triumph over the darkness of the past. Narrative no longer moves forward to its end but circles an origin that eludes it, an origin that appears suddenly, shockingly, yet remains unrecognized and unrecognizable. It is with these zones of temporal dissolution that Tanizaki tried, quite literally, to magnify an insane experience of eternity. Ultimately, *The Lust of the White Serpent* suggests that, for the moderns to preserve an experience of time, their only recourse is its ruin.

REFERENCES

Arroyo 1992
    José Arroyo. "Bordwell Considered: Cognitivism, Colonialism and Canadian
    Cinematic Culture," *cineACTION* (Spring 1992), pp. 74-88.
Azuma 2000
    Azuma Hiroki 東浩紀. In Murakami Takashi 村上隆. *Super Flat* スーパーフラッ
    ト. Madora, 2000.

Bernardi 2001

Joanne R. Bernardi. *Writing in Light: The Silent Scenario and the Japanese Pure Film Movement* Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2001.

Bordwell 1992

David Bordwell. "A Cinema of Flourishes." In *Reframing Japanese Cinema*, ed. Arthur Nolletti, Jr. and David Desser. Indiana University Press, 1992.

Bordwell and Thompson 1976

—— and Kristin Thompson, "Space and Narrative in the Films of Ozu," *Screen* (Summer 1976), 41-73

Burch 1979

Noel Burch. *To the Distant Observer: Form and Meaning in the Japanese Cinema.* University of California Press, 1979.

Burch 1990

——. *Life to Those Shadows.* University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Gerow 1996

Aaron Gerow. "Writing a Pure Cinema: Articulations of Early Japanese Film." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1996.

Gunning 1997

Tom Gunning. "An Aesthetic of Astonishment: Early Film and the (In)Credulous Spectator." In *Viewing Positions: Ways of Seeing Film*, edited by Linda Williams. Routledge, 1997.

Hansen 2000

Miriam Hansen. "The Mass Production of the Senses: Classical Cinema as Vernacular Modernism." In *Reinventing Film Studies*, ed. Christine Gledhill and Linda Williams. London: Arnold, 2000.

Harootunian 2003

Harry Harootunian. "Ghostly Comparisons." In *Impacts of Modernities*, ed. Thomas Lamarre and Kang Nae-hui. Hong Kong University Press, 2003.

Hasumi 1983

Hasumi Shigehiko 蓮實重彦. *Kantoku Ozu Yasujirō* 監督 小津安二郎. Chikuma Shobō, 1983.

Iwamoto and Saiki 1988

Iwamoto Kenji 岩本憲児and Saiki Tomonori佐伯知紀, eds. *Kikigaki kinema no seishun* 聞き書きキネマの青春. Libroport, 1988.

Jay 1988

Martin Jay. "Scopic Regimes of Modernity." In *Vision and Visuality*, ed. Hal Foster. Seattle: Bay Press, 1988.

Kern 1983

Stephen Kern. *The Culture of Space and Time, 1880-1918.* Harvard University Press, 1983.

Komatsu and Musser 1987

Komatsu Hiroshi and Charles Musser, "Benshi Search," *Wide Angle* 9:2 (1987), pp. 72-90.

LaMarre 2004

Thomas LaMarre, *Shadows on the Screen: Tanizaki Jun'ichirō on Cinema and "Oriental" Aesthetics* (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, 2004).

Lippit 2002
Seiji Lippit. *Topographies of Japanese Modernism*. Columbia University Press, 2002.
McQuire 1998
Scott McQuire. *Visions of Modernity: Representation, Memory, Time and Space in the Age of the Camera*. London: Sage Publications, 1998.
Mulvey 1985
Laura Mulvey. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." In *Movies and Methods 2*, ed. Bill Nichols. University of California Press, 1985.
Murphy 1995
Joseph Murphy. "Izumi Kyōka Today: Cinema, Antimodernity, and the Logic of Contestation in the Literary Field." Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1995.
Murphy
Joseph Murphy. "Japanese Film as a Critique of Hollywood Realist Narrative Cinema," www.clas.ufl.edu/users/jmurphy/Burchindex.html
Nakamura 2001
Nakamura Naofumi 中村尚史. "Kindai Nihon ni okeru tetsudō to jikan ishiki" 近代日本における鉄道と時間意識. In *Chikoku no tanjō* 遅刻の誕生, ed. Hashimoto Takehiko 橋本毅彦 and Kuriyama Shigehisa 栗山茂久. Sangensha, 2001, pp. 17-46.
Nornes
Abé Mark Nornes, "Notes for Noel Burch's *To the Distant Observer*," www.pears.lib.ohio-state.edu/Markus/Burch.notes.html
Ogasawara 1990
Ogasawara Takao 小笠原隆夫. "*Katsudō no sekai* sōkan no toshi ni tsuite"「活動之世界」創刊の年について. In *Nihon eiga shoki shiryō shūsei* 日本映画初期資料集成 vol. 3 (of 9 vols.), ed. Makino Mamoru 牧野守. San'ichi Shobō, 1990.
Rodowick
David Rodowick. *The Difficulty of Difference*. Routledge, 1995.
Stengers 1997
Isabelle Stengers. "Time and Representation," trans. Paul Bains. In *Power and Invention: Situating Science*. Minnesota University Press, 1997
Takemura 2001
Takemura Tamio 竹村民郎. "1920 nendai ni okeru tetsudō no jikan kakumei" 1920年代における鉄道の時間革命. In *Chikoku no tanjō* 遅刻の誕生, ed. Hashimoto Takehiko 橋本毅彦 and Kuriyama Shigehisa 栗山茂久. Sangensha, 2001, pp. 47-75.
Tanizaki 1921
Tanizaki Jun'ichirō 谷崎潤一郎. *Amachua Kurabu* アマチュア倶楽部. *Katsudō zasshi* 活動雑誌 7:6 (June 1921), pp. 150-55; 7:7 (July 1921), pp. 140-47; 7:8 (August 1921), pp. 134-38; 7:9 (September 1921), pp. 136-140; 7:10 (October 1921), pp. 108-109.
TJZ
———. *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō zenshū* 谷崎潤一郎全集. 30 vols. Chūō Kōronsha, 1981-83.
Wada-Marciano 1998
Mitsuyo Wada-Marciano. "The Production of Modernity in Japanese National

Cinema: Shochiku Kamata Style in the 1920s and 1930s," *Asian Cinema* (Spring 1998), pp. 69-93.

Yamamoto 1998

Yamamoto Kikuo 山本喜久男. "Hyōgenshugi eiga no shōgeki" 表現主義映画の衝撃. In Tokyo-to Bijutsukan 東京都美術館, et al., eds., *1920 nendai Nihon ten: toshi to zōkei no montâju* 1920年代・日本展：都市と造形のモンタージュ. Asahi Shimbun, 1988, pp. 179-181.

Yoshimoto 1991

Mitsuhiro Yoshimoto, "The Difficulty of Being Radical," *Boundary 2* 18:3 (Fall 1991), 242-257.

NOTES

[1] Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, "Dokutan," in TJZ, vol. 3, pp. 229-274.

[2] Tanizaki, *Majutsushi*, TJZ, vol. 4, pp. 213-244.

[3] Tanizaki, *Ningyo no nageki*, TJZ, vol. 4, pp. 185-212. For translation, see LaMarre 2004.

[4] Tanizaki, *Jinmensō*, TJZ, vol. 5, pp. 303-328. For translation, see LaMarre 2004.

[5] Tanizaki, *Katsudō shashin no genzai to shōrai*, TJZ, vol. 20, pp. 11-22. For translation, see LaMarre 2004.

[6] Tanizaki, *Kōjin*, TJZ, vol. 7, pp. 65-250. The story centers on two men, one recently returned from Shanghai, who attend the Asakusa Opera and encounter an actress who might have been involved in a strange event in Shanghai, but whose origins remain a mystery.

[7] Tanizaki 1921. See, too, *Amateur Club*, trans. Joanne R. Bernardi, in Bernardi 2001, pp. 269-299.

[8] Tanizaki, *Hina matsuri no yoru*, TJZ, vol. 9, pp. 409-426. For translation, see LaMarre 2004.

[9] Tanizaki, *Jasei no in*, TJZ, vol. 8, pp. 149-222. For translation, see LaMarre 2004.

[10] Significant portions of an early film by Kurihara Thomas, *Sanji Goto*, are extant (with the title *Narikin* in Japanese). The details of the film's production are unclear, but the predominant explanation is that Kurihara made the film in 1918, but under the name of his famous mentor, Thomas Ince. A recent exhibition entitled "The Japanese Film Heritage: From the Non-Film Collection of the National Film Center," which opened in the fall of 2002, presented *Narikin* as part of Japan's Film History.

[11] Tanizaki, *Tsuki no sasayaki*, TJZ, vol. 7, pp. 303-360.

[12] Remarks made by Tanizaki over the years are not always consistent, but he gives the impression that he started as a sort of concept man, developing ideas and rough drafts of stories for films. Kurihara transformed these into shooting scripts. This was the case with their first two collaborations, *Amateur Club* and *The Sands of Katsushika*. Apparently, however, Tanizaki quickly learned the art of screenwriting and penned *The Night of the Doll Festival* and *The Lust of the White Serpent* himself, as well as an unproduced "film drama" entitled *Murmurs of the Moon*. Thus these three scripts appear in his collected works. Apparently, above and beyond his work as a writer, Tanizaki was eager to participate in every aspect of film production. Benizawa Yoko, an actress who appeared in *Amateur Club* and *The Lust of the White Serpent*, recalls that Tanizaki played an important role on the set, giving advice to actors and encouraging all manner of trick effects. See her interview "Tanizaki Jun'ichirō and Taishō Katsuei," in Iwamoto and Saiki 1988.

[13] Tanizaki, *Kurihara Tōmasu no goto* (Concerning Thomas Kurihara) TJZ, vol. 22, pp. 192-95.

[14] Tanizaki, "Film technique" (*Eiga no tekunikku*), TJZ, vol. 22, pp. 119.

[15] TJZ, vol. 22, pp. 113-20.

[16] Building on the work of Makino Mamoru and other early Japanese film historians, Aaron Gerow

persuasively argues this point (Gerow 1996).

[17] The introductions to the recent facsimile reprints of the motion picture journals provide excellent overviews of such historical transformations. See, for instance, Ogasawara Takeo's introduction to the reprint of *Katsudō no sekai* for an overview of the shift in terminology from "moving pictures" to *eiga*, which shift implies an important practical and conceptual shift. See Ogasawara 1990.

[18] *Benshi* or *katsuben* were performers who provided live dialogue, narration, and commentary when silent films were shown in Japan. (Although Tanizaki used the terms interchangeably in his film essays, *benshi* denotes a speaker or performer, while *katsuben* specifically refers to the *benshi* who performed with moving pictures.) *Katsuben* were so important to movie audiences that they often got better billing than the stars. They began to decline in importance in the early 1920s as new filmmakers moved away from theater-derived cinema to make films with more elaborate mise-en-scène, editing and intertitles. Nonetheless *katsuben* remained popular in certain venues well past the rise of talkies.

[19] Komatsu and Musser 1987, pp. 72-90.

[20] Somei Saburō reached his peak of popularity in the 1910s at the Imperial Theater in Asakusa, where he was apparently renowned for his explications of Italian historical epics among other films, serving as the *katsuben* for *Antonio e Cleopatra* on its release in Japan in 1914.

[21] Hansen 2000, p. 336.

[22] Ozu and Mizoguchi have become the paradigmatic figures in establishing the modernist tendencies of Japanese cinema in contrast to the realist tendencies of Hollywood cinema. In addition to Noel Burch's analysis in *To the Distant Observer: Form and Meaning in the Japanese Cinema* (Burch 1979), Bordwell and Thompson's essays have contributed to the notion of a modernist, counter-Hollywood aesthetics of Japanese cinema. See Bordwell and Thompson 1976 and Bordwell 1992. For critical evaluation of this position, see Abé Mark Nornes, "Notes for Noel Burch's *To the Distant Observer*," www.pears.lib.ohio-state.edu/Markus/Burch.notes.html; Joseph Murphy, "Japanese Film as a Critique of Hollywood Realist Narrative Cinema," www.clas.ufl.edu/users/jmurphy/Burchindex.html; and Yoshimoto 1991, pp. 242-257. Hasumi Shigehiko's account of Ozu, in Hasumi 1983, highlights the relation with Hollywood cinema. Finally, José Arroyo brings out other geopolitical stakes in Arroyo 1992, pp. 74-88.

[23] See, for instance, Wada-Marciano 1998, pp. 69-93.

[24] Murphy 1995, p. 146.

[25] Ibid., 160.

[26] Tanizaki, "Verbiage" (*Jōzetsuron*, 1927), TJZ, vol. 20, pp. 69-166; cited in Lippit 2002, p. 44. Note that Tanizaki uses the same term (*suji*) to describe the storyline of *Caligari*.

[27] Tanizaki speaks of the pure Japaneseness of Kyōka in "The Pure 'Japaneseness' of 'Kyōka's world'" (*Junsui ni "nihonteki" na Kyōka sekai*, 1940), TJZ, vol. 22, pp. 336-38.

[28] Tanizaki phrases it, "Nihon ni oite saisho no kokoromi de aru jun'eigageki to shite no koten mono," TJZ, vol. 8, pp. 149.

[29] This, famously, is how Henri Lefebvre described modernity, as the production of space. Harootunian's reflections on this problem are found in Harootunian 2003.

[30] On this problem of time see Stengers 1997, as well as the essays in *Chikoku no tanjō*, ed. Hashimoto Takehiko and Kuriyama Shigehisa, especially Nakamura 2001 and Takemura 2001. Stephen Kern also provides a good introduction to the problem of modern time in Kern 1983.

[31] Murphy 1995, p. 161.

[32] McQuire 1998, pp. 70-1. Subsequent citations in this chapter are from the same pages.

[33] Gerow 1996.

[34] Hansen 2000, p. 336.

[35] McQuire 1998.

[36] Martin Jay provides a classic statement of the problem geometric perspective in relation to the establishment a fixed subject position in Jay 1988, pp. 3-23. The questions and answers that follow his discussion make mention of the prevalence of a sort of double perspective in certain schools of classical painting (24-27). Jacques Lacan's discussion of Holbein's *Ambassadors* also refers to troubling shadow that falls on the perfection of geometric perspective with its dream of a unitary subject, the stain of anamorphosis. See Azuma 2000, pp. 138-150, for a tidy overview of Lacan's argument as well as the Derridean critique of it.

[37] Recall Tanizaki's demands in "The Present and Future of Moving Pictures"—"not to copy theater for no good reason. Namely, do not subject moving pictures, which should be free and spontaneous as possible, to the narrow and artificial confines of stage performance."

[38] Burch 1990.

[39] Lippit 2002 provides an account of Akutagawa's attempt to disintegrate narrative in relation to cinema. His discussions of Kawabata and Yokomitsu likewise deal with the problem of fragmentation and retotalization.

[40] This parallels Tom Gunning's arguments about the mixture of credulity and incredulity of film spectators in Gunning 1997, pp. 114-133.

[41] Tanizaki, "Eiga zakkan," TJZ, vol. 22, pp. 98-102. *Eiga zakkan* first appeared in the March 1921 issue of *Shinshōsetsu*, the same journal in which Tanizaki's previous film essay "The Present and Future of Moving Pictures" (*Katsudō shashin no genzai to shōrai*, 1917) had appeared some four years earlier. See the translation in LaMarre 2004.

[42] Yamamoto 1988, pp. 179-181. Similarly, Benizawa Yōkō recalls a penchant for trick shots and camera work in Tanizaki's productions. See "Tanizaki Jun'ichirō to Taishō katsuei," in Iwamoto and Saiki 1988, p. 89.

[43] Tanizaki, "Karigari hakase o miru," TJZ, vol. 22, pp. 107-12. See translation in LaMarre 2004.

[44] Mulvey 1985. There have been a series of critiques of Mulvey's essay. See, for instance, Noël Carroll 1996. David Rodowick builds on Mulvey's insights into the visual organization of pleasure but suggests the possibility of other kinds of spectator, in "The Difficulty of Difference," in Rodowick 1995. Joseph Murphy provides some interesting reflections on the problems inherent in transferring Mulvey's critique of the male gaze to a Japanese context, in Murphy 1995, pp. 210-20.