

# The figure of the fan in negotiations between literary and film culture in 1920s' Japan

Autor(en): **Murphy, Joseph**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen  
Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société  
Suisse-Asie**

Band (Jahr): **53 (1999)**

Heft 2: **Rethinking urban and mass culture in 1920' and 1930' Japan :  
representations, politics, identities, and subject formations**

PDF erstellt am: **13.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147458>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern. Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

## THE FIGURE OF THE FAN IN NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN LITERARY AND FILM CULTURE IN 1920s' JAPAN

Joseph MURPHY, University of Florida

Since the 1970s it has become commonplace to speak of the writer in Japan as a media personality, focus of a synergistic brand expansion between publishing, print and electronic media and an ever-expanding prize system, with success determined as much by photogenic good looks and savvy niche marketing as by the quality of the writing.<sup>1</sup> The loss of relevance of the Akutagawa Prize since the late 1970s and loss of meaning in the very distinction between serious and popular literature that once secured its prestige point to a virtually complete undoing of the semiautonomy from market and mass media that once defined the persona of the writer, and the literary world as an artistic field. Behind this transformation from the modern paradigm of the writer, identified by Masao Miyoshi as the “accomplice of silence,” alone in his four-and-a-half mat room, whispering in the ear of a silent, solitary reader to the noisy media star of today is the negotiation of literature with the mass media that have emerged continuously over the course of the twentieth century, a process iterated today in advance of digital multimedia.<sup>2</sup> Yet, though it is no longer even mildly provocative to call the writer a media personality, it still ironically grates the sensibilities to think of the reader of literature as a “fan.”

The misty beginnings of the long transformation of the writer to star persona can be sought in the 1920s, when literature began full-scale negotiation with the emerging mass media of the twentieth century. But it is the way the figure of the fan drops out that is of particular interest in charting the changing character of literature in Japan's cultural landscape. This bespeaks a certain unevenness in literature's integration into the media age, an investment in the processes of distinction retained even in the age when “se-

1 See “Sakusha” in ISHIHARA et al. 1991, pp. 70–75; and WATANABE 1992. On the declining relevance of the Akutagawa Prize, see “Akutagawa shō no rakujitsu” in *Aera*, vol. 9, no. 1 (1996), pp. 46–52.

2 See MIYOSHI 1974. A concern to track and resist this transformation, and resistance to the loss of “gravity” in postmodern literature is visible in Miyoshi's subsequent work, especially MIYOSHI 1991.

rious literature” (*junbungaku*) is a term used only by historians. This article will locate the appearance of the fan on the margins of this discourse at a certain privileged moment, in a series of interviews (*taidan*) between writers and movies stars that were a regular feature of the journal *Eiga jidai*. Drawing on research in the emerging field of fan culture, I will argue that the forms that figure assumes in the consciousness of producers recorded here reflect the universal anxieties aroused by mass culture wherever it appears. The fan stands in as a threatening figure for the heteronomous concerns of the mass market brought to bear on a semiautonomous literary field.

#### The movement of cinema into the cultural field

The late Taishō and early Shōwa period is a privileged point in investigating the relation between the literary and film worlds in Japan for a number of reasons. In 1920, there were 470 fixed movies theaters in Japan, which was one-fiftieth the number in the United States, and an attendance rate below one visit per person per year (Anderson 1992:272–277). Though this gives a sense of relative market size directly after World War I, the scale is probably not quite so drastic, as the United States had thousands of low cost, low attendance theaters in small towns, a role filled in Japan by “roadshows” taken by traveling *benshi* to temples, shrines, and other makeshift venues in every corner of the country.

By 1930, though, there were 1392 registered theaters in Japan, and attendance was up to three visits per person per year. The dramatic increase in infrastructure and absolute numbers for movie attendance over this ten year period was overlaid by a precisely symmetrical decrease in the share of the domestic market by films produced in Europe and America. J. L. Anderson encapsulates the trend and the point of reversal: “From the mid 1920’s, the market share of foreign films continued to decrease even as the total movie audience was increasing. Japanese movies became dominant in the domestic market by 1925 and held on to their major share until the 1970’s.” (Anderson 1992:276)

Besides its statistical growth, it is in the 1920s that film begins to make itself felt as a force in Japan’s cultural field, coexisting with older, established forms like theater and literature, in a competitive relation but within a clear hierarchy of legitimacy. The terms literary field and cultural field refer the discussion to a set of procedures that can be culled from Bourdieu’s

work on the field of cultural production (Bourdieu 1983; 1993; 1994). Field for Bourdieu is a way of capturing artistic and cultural production less as the atomized project of individual writers and artists than as a complex set of competitive social interactions which organize the activities of producers and secure a certain autonomy from raw economic demands through the circulation of specific capitals. The notion of the field as a pattern of forces organizing the activities of writers, artists, and publishers is a good way to approach the emergence of a mass medium like film because of the way it captures the contradictory demands of mass appeal and artistic legitimacy. We can provisionally sketch the cultural field in Japan of the 1920s as follows:




Fig. 1: Sketch of cultural field in 1920s' Japan

Some considerations that help in reconstructing the cultural field at this point in time, which can be thought of as a diagram of the positions, and the forces brought to bear on the activities of cultural production, include the following: First is the status of film as an unconsecrated medium. Satō Tadao has written that film, which in its first decade was regarded as little more than a sideshow curiosity, had by the 1910s come to be regarded as “a base cultural form threatening the theater.” (Satō 1995, vol. 4, *nenpyō*) That is to say, in the 1900s, film was not really an entity in the cultural field in the sense that it produced no effects. In the 1910s, though, we begin to see proclamations by the Tōkyō Theater Guild (representing both *kabuki* and *shinpa*) forbidding its members from appearing in film, prescribing specific sanctions against those who do ranging from fines to expulsion from the guild. In this we see one of the central tensions of the cultural field, between the specific capital of cultural legitimacy represented by established arts, and the economic capital circulating through the new mass media. But what

is also visible is the movement of film from a technical curiosity producing virtually no effects in the field in the 1900s, to an unconsecrated genre producing pronounced effects in the 1910s.

In contrast to this is the status of modern literature, specifically the novel, which had by 1910 firmly established itself as a consecrated pursuit. This in itself is a change, as novel-writing was regarded as a questionable occupation for much of the Meiji period. But a number of factors including long-standing efforts by the Meiji state to 'reform' literature and the arts in line with European models, and the pursuit and research of the novel by prestigious academics such as Shōyō and Sōseki, combined to rewrite the position of literature such that by the end of the Meiji period it was firmly established as a legitimate cultural pursuit. A general stock-taking of this trend is visible after the Russo-Japanese war leading to the unprecedented invitation of prominent literary figures to a party held by Prince Saionji's Useikai in 1907, the inclusion of a chapter on literature in Count Oguma Shigenobu's *Fifty Years of New Japan*, a volume published in 1909 in English announcing the 'arrival' of the Meiji state, and the establishment in 1911 of an Imperial Commission on Literature (Oguma 1909; Okazaki 1957: 29–33). This consecration by the state is monumentalized by the cultural field with the publication of the first *Gendai Nihon bungaku zenshū* (*Collected Works of Contemporary Japanese Literature*) by Kaizōsha in 1926.

Further, the late Taishō period is a time when literature itself becomes increasingly implicated in the heteronomous concerns of mass publishing, with explosive growth in the number of journals after World War I with circulation above 100,000 copies per issue, the segmentation of the periodical market to supply a variegated urban population, and the success of the *enpon* (penny-classics) and other strategies for marketing the backlist in literary titles providing a proliferation of venues for the writer to produce, not for other producers, but for a consumer. (Maeda 1989:98–114)

The 1920s, then, appears as a moment when the heteronomous concerns of an emerging mass publishing market, and the competitive appearance of the visual mass medium of film overlap and begin to resonate in constructing the space of possibilities for cultural producers in older, consecrated arts like literature. Hence it is no accident that, according to Maeda Ai in *The Construction of the Modern Reader*, "[i]n the end of the Taishō period, the phenomenon of a mutual interaction between literature and film became especially pronounced." (Maeda 1989:195)

The record of positions-taking in *Eiga jidai*

What distinguishes the journal *Eiga jidai* or *The Age of Film* from the inundation of other film journals launched in the late Taishō and early Shōwa period is the high level of participation of established writers, who clearly invested a great deal of energy in its pages, in surveys, interviews, round-table discussions and feature articles. Launched one year after Kawabata Yasunari's *Bungei jidai* in 1926, and published monthly for a period of five years, *Eiga jidai* precisely captures the point where a film world on a steeply rising trajectory begins inflecting the cultural field for older, established arts. *Eiga jidai* proposes itself as an object worthy of serious inquiry because of the systematic way it records an interaction between the *bundan* and the film world, and I have come across no equivalent venue where all the different stresses and strains implied in the relations between literature and film, in age and cultural legitimacy, levels of education of the participants, between a male-dominated literary world and a female dominated star system, forces the model of the cultural field is designed above all to register, are embodied with such explicitness and such clear editorial direction.

*Eiga jidai* is a sedate journal, with advertisements and unobtrusive black and white stills confined to the first few pages, remarkable for the balance it achieves in the ensuing articles between the literary and film worlds. It is difficult to get a clear picture of its demographics and circulation figures, but from the fact that a reader's poll on favorite director's in the second issue drew 2000 responses, while a reader's poll on favorite actresses three years later drew over 15,000 responses, and from the fact that there are no *rubi*<sup>3</sup> in the first issue, but that *rubi* begin to appear in the fourth issue, we can infer a respectable and expanding circulation, and a change in the editor's image of their target readership from the intelligentsia to the general educated reader.

From the first pages of its inaugural issue, whose ringing editorial statement, "The Age of Film has arrived!" is followed with an essay by Kikuchi Kan entitled, *Film and the Literary Arts*, the call was for interaction between the film world and the literary world on a level of parity. As Kikuchi put the case in representing the literary side, "the *bundan* needs to respect beyond

3 Hiragana annotation beside Chinese characters, used as a reading aid in more popular journals.

the narrative base the modes of expression that form the essence of film art. At the same time, the people of the film world need to respect the literary component that forms the base of existing cinema.” (*Eiga jidai*, vol. 1, no. 1:15)

The call for a frank exchange based on mutual respect and professional parity would seem to imply that *Eiga jidai* would serve as a site for dialogue between writers and directors. But what emerges in its surveys, articles, interviews and roundtable discussions are rather writers and stars. Perhaps the best embodiment of this choice for representing the respective fields is in the series of *taidan* between overwhelmingly male writers and female stars that were a popular feature of the journal from the first issue (*Ichimon ittō-roku*, from *Eiga jidai*, vol. 1, no. 1).

Below is a sample of the writers and stars paired up for these *taidan* (*EJ* = *Eiga jidai*):

	<i>bundan</i>	Film Stars
<i>EJ</i> , vol. 1, no. 1	Kikuchi Kan	Kurishima Sumiko
<i>EJ</i> , vol. 1, no. 2	Kume Masao	Tsukuba Yukiko
<i>EJ</i> , vol. 1, no. 3	Tanizaki Jun'ichirō	Okada Yoshiko
<i>EJ</i> , vol. 1, no. 4	Yamamoto Yūzō	Mizutani Yaeko
<i>EJ</i> , vol. 1, no. 5	Osanai Kaoru	Satsuki Nobuko
<i>EJ</i> , vol. 1, no. 6	Satomi Ton	Hanabusa Yuriko
<i>EJ</i> , vol. 3, no. 3	Nagai Kafū	Matsui Chieko
<i>EJ</i> , vol. 3, no. 5	Kubota Mantarō	Sakai Yoneko
<i>EJ</i> , vol. 4, no. 1	Izumi Kyōka	Umemura Yōko
<i>EJ</i> , vol. 4, no. 3	Yoshiya Nobuko	Hayashi Chōjirō (Hasegawa Kazuo)

These are major writers, all of whom with the exception of Yoshiya Nobuko have volumes in the 1926 *Collected Works of Japanese Literature* (one of the few products advertised within *Eiga jidai*'s pages), and first rank female stars at the height of their celebrity.<sup>4</sup> One can think of a series of conversa-

4 Izumi Kyōka, *Gendai Nihon bungaku zenshū*, vol. 14; Nagai Kafū, vol. 22; Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, vol. 24; Satomi Ton, vol. 29; Kume Masao, vol. 30; Kikuchi Kan, vol. 31 and Osanai Kaoru, vol. 35. Kaizōsha's advertisements for the series in *Eiga jidai* boast an "eye-popping low price" and enough masterpieces "to keep you amused for the rest of your life!"

tions between first rank writers in the United States and Hollywood stars to get an idea of the magnitude of the personalities involved with the proviso that in 1920s' Japan, the persona of the writer occupied a much greater place in the public imagination, while film did not yet have the unquestioned cultural importance it enjoys today.

Though it is amusing to imagine an encounter between, say, John Dos Passos and Barbara Stanwyck, or Nicholson Baker and Sharon Stone, there are a number of reasons why one might predict in an encounter engineered between the male *bundan* elite and female actresses a stilted and predictable exchange. The writer occupied a doubly privileged position (male, literature) and the actress a doubly subordinated position (female, film), and these base axes of difference were further reinforced by discrepancies in age and educational attainment.

The first is that in Taishō journalism, despite a highly articulated and rapidly expanding market in women's magazines (*fujin zasshi*) addressing a growing urban middle-class with unprecedented access to higher education for women, in virtually all journals with circulation figures in the 100,000 range a curious division of labor can be found to obtain between the sexes with regard to public discourse.<sup>5</sup>

Mary Beth Norton has called "the distinction between public and private realms and the association of public (for example, government) with male and private (for example, the home) with female," one of the most important organizing strategies of the modern world (Norton 1998). The proliferation of women's magazines from 1917 in Japan in one sense challenged this, offering public space for expression by women and for discussion of women's concerns. Yet one can see the same division of labor effected within the magazines themselves, with a phalanx of male authorities brought in to discuss weighty topics like politics and civil law, to issue advice and warnings about childcare and family as they relate to national polity, while female writers were relegated relatively personal communications of advice and sympathy to the reader on issues relating to domestic reproduction.

For example, the February 1919 issue of *Fujin gahō* (*Ladies Illustrated*), an upscale monthly with a circulation of 300,000 whose extensive fron-

5 *Fujin kōron*, and Hiratsuka Raichō's venerable *Seitō* are notable exceptions, however their circulation figures were both typically below 10,000.



tispiece illustrations advertise a middle-class preoccupation with status and social advancement, includes a full slate of serious political discussion, written by male writers to whose name is attached a title of the form “XX *hakase*” indicating authority in the public sphere. Hence an article on “The Future of Women’s Education,” is by XX *bungakushi* (Doctor of Literature); “Our Entire Body is Public Property,” is by XX *hōritsugaku hakase* (Doctor of Law); an “Exchange on the Problem of Women’s Employment,” is recorded between a Doctor of Letters and a “Waseda University Professor”; and a report on “Women Laborers in Mining” is given by the Director of the Ministry of the Interior. Articles by women on the other hand tend toward first-person accounts of domestic matters, troubles with in-laws and servants, particular advice on child education, nutrition, medicine, “How to Make Lobster Salad,” etc., and the writers carry no academic or official affiliation. This division of labor tends toward the comical in the lower class *Fujokai* (*Women’s World*) of the same month, where one finds a stiff declaration on “Household Renewal and the Woman’s Responsibility” by an Interior Ministry official juxtaposed with tabloid-like articles by female writers such as “The Cave-man of Sugamo” or “Young Woman Driven to Suicide,” and frank discussion of social problems like domestic violence, alcoholism and suicide.

Hence despite a consistent and sophisticated concern with public matters in women’s magazines from this period and increased space for female expression in regard to socially mandated feminine concerns, when it came to pronouncing on public matters the voice in Taishō journalism remains that of male authority.

Secondly, interaction between the film and literary world in journalism of the period tended to lack this sense of dialogue as well, lapsing into formalities structured by the hierarchy of legitimacy in the case of meetings between the writers and directors. Hence, in the visit of Mizuguchi Kenji to *bundan* elder statesman Izumi Kyōka in 1929 on the occasion of Mizuguchi’s adaptation of Kyōka’s long novel *Nihonbashi*, details of language and deportment all put Mizuguchi in the position of the supplicant, while Kyōka pronounces at will on cinematic aspects of the film. Despite Mizuguchi’s status in the film world as a first-class director, Mizuguchi goes to Kyōka, and not the other way around (*Eiga jidai*, vol. 6, no. 2:46–50).

Somewhat later than the period in question, hence all the more surprising given the steadily increasingly recognition of cinema’s status as art is a

moment in a *zadankai* including Shiga Naoya, essayist Okuno Shintarō, novelist Ozaki Kazuo, and the director Ozu Yasujirō. At the point in question the participants have been discussing the problem of dialect in movies, and Ozu is explaining how an actor's dialect and the standard Japanese (*hyōjungo*) in movies can interact. In the course of illustrating a number of examples, Ozu is doing imitations of provincial accents, and amid the general laughter he contrasts the following using different voices:

“*Oi, ocha o kudasai.*”

and “*Oi, ocha motte koi.*”

both being ways of saying “Hey, get some tea over here.”

A 68 year old Shiga, who has been almost silent up till now, suddenly wakes up and replies,

“*O-chan motte koi ja nai no.*”

Shiga has played on a pun between “*ocha*” (tea) and “*O-chan*” (a nickname for Ozu) to insert Ozu into the (gendered) position of the one being ordered to bring tea. This little “joke” between artists both active during the Taishō and early Shōwa period, speaks volumes of the relation of a first rank writer to a first rank director (Okuno et al.:133–136).

Hence in the context of late Taishō and early Shōwa journalism, encounters between male and female, and film and literature tended to be organized by clear hierarchies. Given the enormous status differences between the doubly privileged position of male-writer and the doubly denigrated position of female-actress, one might expect these status hierarchies to reinforce and produce a rather dull exchange. But instead the *taidan* are lively and informal, full of surprises and frank exchange, with the female participants solicited and given space to express their opinion about not domestic but professional matters. Here, where the stakes are often precisely the privilege of speaking on professional matters, is a curious necessity for the participants to recognize each other. Though in pairing these privileged and highly educated male writers, a clear majority of whom are Imperial University graduates, with female stars in an occupation still tinged with associations of vulgarity the editors of *Eiga jidai* likely had in mind primarily a publicity ploy, the *taidan* end up being exactly the kind of frank exchange on a level of professional parity envisioned by the editorial statements in the

opening issue, and stand the test of time better than the more self-consciously theoretical and critical articles that make up the bulk of its pages.

One might want to attribute this to a vague notion of the relatively liberal climate of Taishō Japan, but I have argued that a gendered notion of the public/private split, and a clear hierarchy between literature and film still obtained in the public space of journalism. The conditions for the freedom and space of play provided by the *Eiga jidai taidan* need to be accounted for in more specific ways. This appears to have first been in part the result of a conscious editorial decision relating to the protocols of the newly emerging *taidan* form: to cast the male writer in the role of the *taidan*'s facilitator, or *kikite*, part of an overall strategy in *Eiga jidai* to give a symmetrical space to female voices in its pages which I have examined at length in a companion study to this article (forthcoming). Such editorial decisions, both to pair the writer with the actress, and to assign the male writer the subordinate role, can be grasped as a force from *within the cultural field* (the space of producers) deciding in a rather conscious way to free the space of the *taidan*, and were likely part of a strategy to produce the writer as star by bringing in the gravity of the actress.

But the parity achieved in these *taidan* is also in part a result of the mediation of a third, shadowy figure appearing insistently on the margins, that of the fan (in katakana, *fuan*). In the *Eiga jidai taidan* we have fans writing letters, thronging public spaces, buying tickets, and otherwise attempting to appropriate the star. The writers reveal themselves as fans. What the figure of the fan reveals in a record of positions-taking by producers such as is found in these *taidan* is not the empirical spectator, but the intrusion of a force operating *between* the cultural field and the larger fields of power.

In her masterful exploration of modes of popular reception in early Hollywood film, Miriam Hansen refers to the introduction of an "autonomous dynamic" when fan behavior is brought into the consideration of culture.

The public dimension is distinct from both social and textual determinations of spectatorship because it entails the very moment in which reception can gain a momentum of its own, can give rise to formations not necessarily anticipated in the context of production. Such formations may crystallize around particular films, star discourses or modes of exhibition. . . . Although always precarious and subject to ceaseless—industrial, ideological—appropriation, the public dimension of the cinematic institution harbors a potentially autonomous dynamic. (Hansen 1991:7)

Embedded here is a questioning of the Frankfurt school assumption that, whether by a community of taste in the case of high culture or a corporate elite in the case of mass media, culture is imposed from the top down. In an important essay called *Fandom as Pathology*, Joli Jensen argues that this view of the dynamic of mass culture as either dictated by an educated elite, or manipulated by corporate concerns entails a major premise:

The fan is understood to be, at least implicitly, a result of celebrity—the fan is defined as a response to the star system. This means that passivity is ascribed to the fan—he or she is seen as being brought into (enthralled) existence by the modern celebrity system, via the mass media. (Jensen 1992:10)

But the assumption can be reversed, and the discourse of celebrity and fame understood as being driven by fan culture, a response to well-articulated fan desires. The ability of cinema to shake up existing cultural hierarchies clearly derives from its special relation to a mass audience, and the extraordinary economic power fan culture produces. The fan is a new force, controlled by no one, that appears historically with the advent of mass culture. As a historical exploration of fan culture, the generation of a star persona for writers, and a renegotiation of status in the cultural field that continues today, I would argue that Hansen's autonomous dynamic represents through the figure of the fan a force operating *between* the cultural field and the larger fields of power, and that one cannot understand the dynamic of this encounter between literature and film in the pages of *Eiga jidai* without granting this shadowy figure of the fan the agency required to effect.

Fan culture: Or, the relentless introduction of demand

When I do watch movies I watch obsessively, to the point where it turns my life upside down, and when I'm not watching I can go five, six years without watching a single one. If that's what you call a fan (*fuan*), I'd have to say I'm a hysterical, pathological, spasmodic fan.

Novelist Kimura Ki

"*Anata wa eiga o goran ni narimasuka*"

(Do You Ever Go to the Movies?), *Eiga jidai*, vol. 1, no. 1 (July 1926), p. 50

The fan makes a brief appearance in virtually every *Eiga jidai taidan* in one of two forms, the solitary fan engaged in excessive forms of devotion, or the fan as unruly mob, thronging the streets, shouting out names, buying tickets.

In both forms they are an object of scorn for the actresses and uncomfortable identification for the writers. The former figure, the solitary, excessively devoted fan emerges in a *taidan* between Yanagi Sakuko and the poet Yoshii Isamu in the April, 1928 *Eiga jidai*.

- Yoshii: I know it's a trite question, but how about it, do you get a lot of letters from fans?
- Yanagi: Tons of them.
- Yoshii: Do you answer each and every one?
- Yanagi: For the most part. If I didn't, the fans might get angry. Ha ha ha ha!  
... (ensues discussion of young fans leaving behind home and family in the provinces and showing up unannounced on her doorstep.)
- Yoshii: Do you have more male or female fans? ... Aren't there cases where male fans send you letters proposing marriage?
- Yanagi: Yes, there are.... That kind of person is, shall we say, a very devoted type, isn't he. (*Eiga jidai*, vol. 4, no. 4:86–88)

As an example of the latter, the unruly, collective fan, we can turn to a *taidan* between Kume Masao and Tsukuba Yukiko in the August 1926 *Eiga jidai*. After a discussion of the pleasures licit and illicit in the life of an actress, Kume asks if there are any drawbacks to being a movie actress:

- Kume: What about the drawbacks? What are the bad parts of being a movie actress?
- Tsukuba: Hmm ... the thing I hate the most about being an actress is when I go out walking somewhere and people start saying, "Oh look, it's Tsukuba Yukiko!" It depends how it's said of course, but in general that gives me the creeps. (*Eiga jidai*, vol. 1, no. 2:68)

Such an attitude is inconceivable in the intimacy of performer-audience relations in pre-modern forms of spectacle. In arguing that many of the conditions held to be specific to film spectatorship already obtained in early twentieth century theater, Ayako Kano sketches the appearance of a new subject position in modern Japan, that of "the passive though alert audience member, sitting straight forward in their chairs, prohibited from eating, drinking, conversing with their neighbors, and from engaging in social and sexual intercourse with the performers." (Kano forthcoming) Though in its darkened auditorium, illuminated spectacle, and "performance which addresses the spectator but is not addressed by the spectator," many of the conditions typi-

cally associated with the mass media are indeed in place in Taishō theater, it is a peculiarity of the cinema, the fact that the film image cannot be touched, that gives rise to the specificity of the modern star-audience relation. The metaphor of the actor or actress as celestial body posits an existence utterly out of reach, so far away from one's plane of existence you can never draw close no matter how much one yearns and grasps. Freedom from social and sexual constraints remains part of the modern star persona and a major point of identification in fan discourse, but unlike the kind of free intercourse between audience and performers implied for premodern theater, the mass-mediated fantasy of the movie star's free lifestyle is orchestrated by the metaphor as infinitely distant. It is in trying to bridge this gap that Kano's well-mannered modern spectator begins to take on the pathological nuances of the fan.

We may look at the *taidan* in the first issue, in which the independence, wealth and star power of a Kurishima Sumiko at the height of her popularity overwhelm Kikuchi Kan, to see the logic of fan discourse operating undiluted. Kikuchi inserts himself in the role of the fan from the start:

Kikuchi: Hmm, where shall we start. . . . You know you look quite different in person from the way you look in pictures.

Kurishima: Oh really? Everyone says so. . . . (*Eiga jidai*, vol. 1 no. 1:78)

There ensues a discussion of her career, professional history, of working conditions at the studios, of critical matters of staging, story construction, etc. In all matters Kurishima is frank, informal and opinionated. Her replies are sharp and crisp, she returns the questions in kind, and the tone is very much that of two professionals talking shop. A curious shift occurs, though, half-way through the *taidan*, when Kikuchi returns to the role of a fan. At this point, the dynamic between them seems to change.

Kikuchi: Well, it won't do to be getting overly analytical here. . . . You know, it may seem like flattery to say this in front of you, but I've actually liked you from a while back.

Kurishima: Really? How do you think I should take that? . . . (*Eiga jidai*, vol. 1, no. 1:81)

Kurishima displays a certain wariness at this admission, and Kikuchi begins ironically reproducing the universal discourse of fans in his questions, characterized in *Fandom as Pathology* as the intense and persistent interest in the minutiae of the star's life.

I especially liked talking about the Beatles with other girls. Someone would say, "What do you think Paul had for breakfast?" "Do you think he sleeps with a different girl every night?" Or, "Is John really the leader?" "Is George really sensitive?" And like that for hours. (Lewis 1992:87)

Now Kikuchi.

Kikuchi: What kinds of things does the average fan like to know about you? What other things do they ask?

Kurishima: It's a bunch of relatively trivial things, like, "What time do you get up in the morning," etc.

Kikuchi: So... What time do you get up in the morning?

Kikuchi: ... How about food? What kind of food do you like?

Kurishima: I like Japanese cooking too, but my favorite is Chinese.

Kikuchi: I wouldn't have guessed that to look at you.

Kurishima: What, that doesn't suit me either? (*Eiga jidai*, vol. 1, no. 1:82)

Discussion of certain points, such as money, fame, and freedom from social mores visibly inflects the space of the *taidan*. The monthly salaries of the actresses, their travel and bulging real estate portfolios is a topic of admiring discussion.

Kurishima: ... [dressing room conversation in the theater is pretty much a set matter], but if I run into someone in the dressing room at the studio, say Kawada-san (Kawada Yoshiko) or Hide-san (Hanabusa Yuriko), we'll say things like, "Oh, I was thinking I might buy some land somewhere and build a house," or something like that.

Kikuchi: Hmm, I'm impressed. (*Eiga jidai*, vol. 1, no. 1:81)

Beyond Kikuchi's impersonation, the anonymous fan appears as the lonely individual:

Kikuchi: ... Do you get a lot of love letters from fans? (*fuan kara no rabu retā*)

Kurishima: I do indeed.

Kikuchi: About how many do you get a day?

Kurishima: On average, about 30 per day, I'd say.

Kikuchi: Have there been some among them that have really touched your heart?

Kurishima: No. (*Eiga jidai*, vol. 1, no. 1:81)

And as the unruly mob:

- Kikuchi: People must really cause a scene when you go out walking.
- Kurishima: Yes, it's really a problem, people shouting, "It's Kurishima! It's Kurishima!" ... One day I thought I'd go strolling the Ginza with my father and it just got completely out of control. They were following after in a crowd yelling, "Hey, it's Kurishima! It's Kurishima!" or "Look! Kurishima's gotten collared by some detective!" It was really awful. (*Eiga jidai*, vol. 1, no. 1:82)

But in either case, reaps a scorn from the star that approaches the carnivalistic:

- Kikuchi: ... Haven't there been incidents where people have fallen hopelessly in love with you and killed themselves?
- Kurishima: When was it? Something about someone jumping to their death clutching my picture to their breast was in the newspapers? I really don't know what to do about that, to be honest, ha ha ha ha. (*Eiga jidai*, vol. 1, no. 1:82)

In *Fandom as Pathology*, Joli Jensen claims that both media and academic discussions of the fan are dominated by two figures: The fan as obsessed loner or loser, slipping over the edge, and the fan as mob out of control. For Jensen, these two figures correspond to two aspects of mass society theory, to wit, the view of mass society as atomized individuals cut off from traditional sources of identity, and mass media's dangerous influence over these unmoored masses. They are in each case not the empirical fan, but rather a figure for a certain anxiety (*fuan*) vis-à-vis the mass consumer.

We see in the star's reactions in the *Eiga jidai taidan* textbook representation of the modern fan as pathology in Jensen's sense. This is a new figure, different from both the theater patron and the modern reader. The nascent field of fan research is different from both the discourse of spectator subjectivity and empirical research into fan behavior that have dominated film studies (Bergstrom and Doane 1989). The fan here is not the statistically grasped "real spectator," nor an abstract position enclosed in the text or apparatus. It is rather a way to figure the active and sometimes frightening demand the consumer of mass culture brings to bear on the cultural field. These figures appear universally in discourse about the fan, not because empirical fans were like this, but because they betray an anxiety at the core of the phenomenon of mass culture, the consumer, and can function as a scapegoat by which our rational appreciation of culture and successful negotiation with the demands of modern culture is proved (Jensen 1992).



To investigate the figure of the fan does not purport to escape the perspective of the producers of culture, the writers, directors, critics and movie stars whose record is left in the pages of *Eiga jidai*. Empirical investigation into the fan's active appropriation of mass culture and literature as mass culture, through letter-writing, book and ticket buying, surveys, clubs and societies, etc. is an important task, begun for Taishō Japan by recent work on Taishō theater and the fans of Takarazuka (Kano 1995; Robertson 1998). But I am interested here in the way the figure of the fan works in the consciousness of producers. As to the question of how one grasps something like the "producer's consciousness," one can only answer by the interpretation of words and signs, or what Bourdieu calls "positions-taking." That is to say, the problem from the point of view of a hermeneutic analysis is that a new word appears in late Taishō discourse by cultural producers, the word "fan/*fuan*." By gathering instances of this new term, the present article hopes only to take a step toward seeing how it works, and what its significance is for the integration of literature into the twentieth century marketplace.

## Bibliography

### *Eiga jidai taidan*:

- "Ichimon ittōroku. Kurishima Sumiko to Kikuchi Kan," *Eiga jidai* (1926), vol 1, no. 1, pp. 78–83.
- "Ichimon ittōroku. Tsukuba Yukiko to Kume Masao," *Eiga jidai* (1926), vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 66–71.
- "Ichimon ittōroku. Okada Yoshiko to Tanizaki Jun'ichirō," *Eiga jidai* (1926), vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 58–62.
- "Ichimon ittōroku. Satsuki Nobuko to Osanai Kaoru," *Eiga jidai* (1926), vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 75–79.
- "Ichimon ittōroku. Hanabusa Yuriko to Satomi Ton," *Eiga jidai* (1926), vol. 1, no. 6, pp. 74–79.
- "Ichimon ittōroku. Matsui Chieko to Nagai Kafū," *Eiga jidai* (1927), vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 91–97.
- "Ichimon ittōroku. Izumi Kyōka to Umemura Yōko," *Eiga jidai* (1928), vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 72–77.
- "Ichimon ittōroku. Yoshiya Nobuko to Hayashi Chōjirō," *Eiga jidai* (1928), vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 74–79.
- "Ichimon ittōroku. Yanagi Sakuko to Yoshii Isamu," *Eiga jidai* (1928), vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 83–89.

- “Akutagawa shō no rakujitsu,” *Aera* (1996), vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 46–52.
- ANDERSON, J. L. (1992). “Spoken Silents in the Japanese Cinema,” in Arthur NOLLETI and David DESSER (eds.) *Reframing Japanese Cinema*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 272–277.
- BERGSTROM, Janet, and Mary Ann DOANE (1989). “The Female Spectator. Contexts and Directions,” in *Camera Obscura* (Special Issue on the *Spectatrix.*), vols. 20/21, pp. 5–27.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre (1983). “The Field of Cultural Production. Or: The Economic World Reversed,” *Poetics*, no. 12, pp. 311–356.
- (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production. Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. Randal JOHNSON. New York: Columbia University Press.
- and HIDETAKA Ishida (1994). “Seminā. Bungakuba no seisei to kōzō,” *Bungaku*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 54–65.
- DYER, Richard (1986). *Heavenly Bodies. Film Stars and Society*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- HANSEN, Miriam (1991). *Babel and Babylon. Spectatorship in American Silent Film*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- ISHIHARA Chiaki (1991). “Sakusha,” in ISHIHARA et al. (ed.) *Yomu tame no riron*. Yokohama: Seiri shobō, pp. 70–75.
- JENSEN, Joli (1992). “Fandom as Pathology. The Consequences of a Characterization,” in Lisa A. LEWIS (ed.) *Adoring Audience. Fan Culture and Popular Media*. London: Routledge, pp. 9–29.
- KANO Ayako (1995). *Acting Like a Woman in Modern Japan. Gender, Performance, Nation, and the Roles of Kawakami Sadayakko and Matsui Sumako*. Ph.D. dissertation: Cornell University.
- (forthcoming). “Visuality and Gender in Modern Japanese Theater,” *Japan Forum* (Special issue on *Visuality in Modern Japan*).
- KIKUCHI Kan (1926). “Eiga to bungei,” *Eiga jidai*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 14–15.
- KIMURA Ki (1926). “Response in ‘Anata wa eiga wo goran ni narimasuka,’” *Eiga jidai*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 50–53.
- MAEDA Ai (1989). *Kindai dokusha no seiritsu*. Tōkyō: Chikuma shobō.
- MIYOSHI Masao (1974). *Accomplices of Silence. The Modern Japanese Novel*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- (1991). *Off-Center. Power and Culture Relations between Japan and the United States*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- MIZOGUCHI Kenji (1929). “Kyōka ni au,” *Eiga jidai*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 46–50.
- MURPHY, Joseph (forthcoming). “Economies of Culture: The Taishō *Bundan* Dallies with the Movies,” *Japan Forum* (Special issue on *Visuality in Modern Japan*).

NORTON, Mary Beth (1998). "Problems Facing Historians Today," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, vol. 45, no. 18, p. B7.

OGUMA Shigenobu (1909). *Fifty Years of New Japan*, 2 vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co.

OKAZAKI Yoshie (1958). *Japanese Literature in the Meiji Era*. Trans. V. H. Viglielmo, Tōkyō: Obunsha.

OKUNO Shintarō, OZAKI Kazuo, OZU Yasujirō and SHIGA Naoya (1989). "Tateyoko teidan," *Ozu Yasujirō sengoroku shūsei (1946–1963)*. Tōkyō: Firumu Āto sha, pp. 132–141.

ROBERTSON, Jennifer (1998). *Takarazuka. Sexual Politics and Popular Culture in Modern Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

SATO Tadao (1995). *Nihon eiga shi*, 4 vols. Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten.

WATANABE Naomi (1992). *Dentsū bungaku ni mamirete*. Tōkyō: Ōta shuppan.