

Photography from West to East: Clichéd Image Exchange and Problems of Identity

Patrick Vauday

What are the preferred subjects of mass photography? We will not go far wrong if we hazard this reply: the Self and the Other. The popular practice of photography does not much go in for nuance: it has taken as its watchword the distinction between *gens de Soi* and *gens de l'Autre* which Robert Jaulin once used as the title of one of his books on ethnology.¹ The self, that is, one's own, those close to one, familial space and the familiar space of identity and recognition. The other, in other words, strangers, the space of distant parts, and the space of displacement where tourism increasingly frequently leads the inhabitants of richer countries. *Here*, in the first space, one is among one's own kind, "among ourselves", part of the same family through kinship or part of the same community through lifestyle and nationality; *here*, connivance rules, the unspoken word and the wink with the photographer who is "one of us", and so one does not generally hesitate to expose oneself, that is, open up to their lens. *There*, in the second space, one is in a foreign country, amongst others, whose costumes and customs are photographed;² *there*, the more polite rule of the smile and the presentation of the self for others holds sway, one is more engaged in the process of representation and adopts a pose for the photographer rather than exposing oneself to their lens. The most widely disseminated version of this dual polarity of popular photography is the souvenir photos of the family album, on the one hand, and the holiday photos brought back by tourists from their various excursions abroad, on the other; a version which illustrates one of the most spontaneously practised photographic montages, consisting of having oneself photographed in a distant country against a typical scenic background or emblematic monument of the country visited.

These photographs basically say only one thing, that the space between the self and the other is so well demarcated that there could be no place there for journeys other than those which brought Ulysses back to Ithaca, to that land of home and family where the faithful Penelope's hope triumphed over the seductive song of foreign sirens. Is that really the case? Is it really the same Ulysses who returns to Ithaca, and is it the same shore he reaches at the end of his odyssey? We know only Ulysses' version of his journey, the epic account of his legendary travels which is simultaneously that of his people: in short, we know only the Greek version. But what happens when the gaze of the self and the other makes a detour via the foreigner's gaze? This question of transformations brought about by the encounter with the other can, it seems to us, be enriched by a detour through photography, from its invention to the period of its simultaneously popular and cosmopolitan diffusion. What do we become in the age of photography, and what happens to the split between the Self and the Other?

Photographic expropriation

Rimbaud's famous formula, "I is another", is contemporary with the invention and rise of photography. Because of the mechanical recording device which characterizes the camera, one is quick to see in photography the accomplishment of what could, before it, at least in the Western tradition, only have been an inaccessible idea: that of an exact reproduction of reality, unencumbered by the subjectivity of the human gaze and its prejudices. Finally, reality was restored to itself in the objectivity and positive character of its appearance, such as the all-too-imperfect human gaze could not view it. The French language gives still greater credence to this version of history because in it the same word designates both the optical apparatus for taking the photograph (*l'objectif*, the lens) and the exact depiction of reality (*l'objectivité*, objectivity). Now, far from being the final word in a tradition taking shape as a technical achievement which it only remained to perfect, photography inaugurated an entirely new history which its first awkward steps and the imitation of the images of the past could not hide. This should not be surprising when we remember Marx's observation that history most often invents the future by taking as its model a past with which it is in the process of breaking. Roland Barthes saw clearly that this was the case with photography when he demonstrated that, beyond a technical revolution, it was a case of a veritable psychological and philosophical revolution in the representation of the self and the Other. Similar in this respect to the magician who distracts the spectator's attention from the manipulation he performs by producing, in its turn, a spectacular but meaningless gesture, photography introduced, willy nilly, something quite different on the stage of history from what it appeared to do there: under the show of technical progress to which it is too often reduced, notably in the identical reproduction of the individual, is in fact concealed the production of a new human subject, of another subject whose relation to itself was to be profoundly transformed.

As Barthes observed, "photography is the future of myself as another"³: for the first time in history, people had the opportunity to see themselves from outside as an Other, to become the object for themselves. In passing from the status of subject to the status of object, people lost their familiarity with themselves and became foreign to their own consciences; photography produced people who were like strangers to themselves, Others who no longer belonged to themselves and whose image, circulating from that point onwards, offered them, as things, to the anonymous eye of any- and everybody. Sartre's famous description of the ego which proves its unsupportable "objectification" under another's gaze without a doubt finds there one of its conditions of possibility.⁴ The gaze of which Sartre speaks is not in fact that embodied in a particular person who is actually looking at us, but the abstract gaze that the objective mechanism of the camera gives material form and that characterizes a permanent potential for image transfer; the personal gaze which comes from "somebody", stamped with the subjectivity which makes it distinctive, contrasts with the mute impersonality of the second which comes from "nobody" in particular, and which, for Sartre, precedes it. However, far from being a non-temporal specific of the human condition, as Sartre appears to believe, the impersonal gaze is, with other factors, one of the historical effects of the invention of photography.⁵ From then on, the self was no longer what it thought it was, it was this *alter ego* that, whether it likes it or not, produces objective reality for the Other, by which it is identified, which circulates and passes from hand to hand, which remains alive without it – the self

without itself, as it were – and which, bizarrely, survives it, always young when it is old, living when it is dead.

The revolution was not, in fact, inconsiderable. The painted portrait continued to be tainted with subjectivity, marked as it was by the painter's style. Moreover, it celebrated the subject more than it expressed it: the celebration of the absolute originality of its model simultaneously participated in a ritual of social distinction reserved for an élite. Photography was at once more democratic and comparative – in a trivializing sense, that is: if it specifically identifies individuals (think of identity photographs) it is in order to relate them better (at least in a virtual sense) to each other and bring the resemblances and differences into play within a social whole. As for the image in a mirror, apart from the fact that it is to a greater or a lesser extent controlled by its model and does not separate itself from it to enter into circulation, it is not, because of its characteristic inversion, identical to the image which the Other sees. After the brief but decisive episode of the daguerreotype which still operated like a silvered mirror (the subject is reproduced there as if in its mirror), photography very soon produced images of the self from the viewpoint of the other. Whether one wants it or not, even in the photographic self-portrait, it is always someone other than oneself that is photographed and who takes the photograph.

Indigenous images and exotic images*

Photography directed towards oneself or one's own, what one might call "indigenous" in the etymological sense of the term,⁶ thus produces the strange paradox of converting the intimacy and familiarity of the self at home with itself into an exteriority that eludes the subject. Made at first sight in order for the subject to take possession of itself through its image and to be able to offer it for distribution to intensify its presence and transmit it beyond the self, photography ultimately turned to the expropriation of itself. To be convinced of this, one has only to look again at photographs from a long while back: what has been experienced without distance, lived in and revisited in the present, becomes entirely Other with the passage of time, like the remains of a civilization that has already disappeared and is lamented but to which one no longer belongs; one no longer recognizes oneself in this body, in this posture, this smile, or these clothes which nothing in the world would make one wear again. The moment celebrated by photography has lost the absolute originality of its unique appearance to take its place with all the rest in the passage of historical time and the museum of past lifestyles. Whence the sad impression that can be left by the photography of intimacy thrown into the public arena and of a sanctuary violated, in the image of those ruined houses encountered on the edge of building sites which show passers-by out-of-date wallpapers and unfashionable colours, done for their hidden inhabitant. What had been a lifestyle choice, a value shared in the familiarity of kinship or the social group becomes nondescript archive and document for comparative study; identity is no longer affirmation of the self or of the communal "us", but the assignation of place and type in a social typology.

It is no different with peoples and cultures; the gaze of cultures upon each other transforms them. Beneath the gaze of the other, such and such a practice or custom about which there was no question – cannibalism is a good example⁷ – becomes other, that is,

most frequently, primitive, archaic, or quite simply ridiculous; there is then no other alternative to dissimulation or display, embarrassment or defiance, and in both cases the loss of spontaneity which characterized the old way of being. One of the most perverse effects of the intercultural gaze is to lead a culture to self-caricature: simplified, crudely reduced to a few features that are more significant than others for the gaze of the Other, it loses diversity and perhaps the conflictual nature which made it living.

Exotic photography, which developed very quickly concurrently with indigenous photography, once the volume and the ease of use of the material permitted it, is a good example. Directed, as its name shows, towards the foreign and the outside, it became the powerful instrument of the curiosity of Western cultures for other peoples, sometimes to feed racial prejudice, sometimes to enlarge the circle of "La grande famille des hommes" (the great family of man).⁸ Providing more than abundant evidence of this are the photographic documents, which embellished scholarly books on history and geography as much as illustrated magazines with a mass audience; a narrowly ethnic vision inspired these images of the Other mixed together in one and the same visual identity which most frequently confirmed the caption accompanying them. It is not surprising that photographs of this kind fed "publicity", as it was then called, by preparing for it *clichés* in both sense of the word,⁹ which it had only to grab to spread across the market.¹⁰ It goes without saying that exoticism fed the Other and that among people who had access to photography there was a huge exchange of *clichés*, still understood in both senses of the word.

But although photography could reproduce the cultural prejudices rather than the reality that was within range of its lens, thus proceeding to an ideological naturalization of culture to which the technical process gave greatest credit, it was not, however, condemned to the mystification of the real under cover of its simple reproduction. Just as in the realm of indigenous photography, it transformed the vision of the human subject, for better and for worse, by giving for the first time in history equal visibility to each individual whatever their status, for peoples in contact with each other it became an issue for self-representation. The exchange of *clichés*, which we have mentioned, led not only to the confirmation and reinforcement of prejudices; the collision of mutual images also led to questions as to the mode of being oneself in a common world no longer divided into shadowy national fortresses one against the other. There is one example which translates particularly well the power and complexity of transformations brought about this field by the diffusion of photography: that of Japan.

Japan captured by photography

*In Japan there are photographs of the kind we have; only they are of Japanese, living in Japanese houses.*¹¹

Using the expression of André Rouillé, who applies it to the contemporary period, Japan is an excellent "observatory for photography"¹²; we would add that it is still more so for the historical period known as "modern", which began for this country in the second half of the nineteenth century. It was in effect more or less at the same time that the country opened itself up once more on a broad scale to the world, took the modern "turn" of the Meiji era and received the European invention of photography. A few dates

to anchor our ideas: 1839, official announcement by the voice of Arago of the invention of photography and the decision to make it a public gift to humanity; 1848, introduction of the first camera to Japan; 1867, start of the Meiji era which opened the way to modernization and westernization after two centuries of turning in on itself that had severely restricted contacts with abroad; 1872, the first official portrait of the Emperor Meiji by Kuichi Uchida.¹³ There was, therefore, an entirely unique situation, achieved after more than two centuries of siege mentality and jealous preservation of identity, in a country essentially withheld from the gaze of the Other, which was opening itself up to the world at the very moment when a new way of self-exposure was being invented. It is no exaggeration to speak of a veritable “rediscovery” of Japan through photography, not only by Westerners short of exoticism but also, in a more interesting way, by the Japanese themselves, who were very rapidly and very skilfully to seize the recent invention to “self”-photograph and to produce an image of themselves and of their country.¹⁴ Where these gazes crossed, a new identity was formed.

Japan seen from the West: from a taste for the exotic to a taste for the Japanese

A dominant feature of nineteenth-century Europe, the taste for exoticism found a natural extension in photography. It seems that curiosity about some foreign countries was fed by the contrast which they offered with a Western world jolted from its traditions by the effects of the industrial revolution; to paraphrase Marx in *The Communist Manifesto*, exoticism was the almost inevitable accompaniment of the mindless reign of capital and the market, the nostalgic expression of a lost identity that one hoped to recover in the other. From this viewpoint, Japan was the ideal lost object: a strong civilization violently revealing its differences but with great refinement, a noble antiquity maintained through isolation in a remarkable state of freshness, in short, the Sleeping Beauty waiting for her Prince. Japan then became the “lovely little thing” with whom the Europeans were infatuated, the Europeans whose behaviour in this respect was like that of adults rediscovering their childhood toys; struck by the aesthetic taste of the Japanese and their sophistication in relation to objects and clothes, they intended to put them under glass like a sacred relic which it would be forbidden to touch. The Japanese woman, reduced to the geisha, was evidently destined to be well placed there to play the role of the doll. In France, Pierre Loti, with *Madame Chrysanthème*,¹⁵ was the writer of this piece of exoticism, to the tempo of Western nostalgia, the fashion for which he unleashed at the end of the century. His description of the Japanese woman is an eloquent illustration of this:

At that moment I had a very charming impression of Japan; I felt as if I had fully entered this little imagined artificial world that I knew from lacquer- and porcelain-painting. It was so exactly that! These three little seated women, gracious and dainty, with their slanting eyes, their big, shell-shaped chignons, smooth and shiny; and this little ceremony on the ground . . .¹⁶

One should not be surprised to find it, trait for trait, in photography, so to speak: from the literary portrait to the photographic portrait, as it were, or vice versa, the inspiration is the same, that of a backdrop that diverts a tradition that is not understood to make it conform to the “fantasmatic” image in which the Other makes itself.¹⁷ The destiny

bestowed upon Japanese women by photography points to the essential remit of the “rediscovery” of Japan by the Western public, that of the cliché imposed upon a different reality as a condition of its appropriation. Photographic exoticism operates like the market which conditions supply according to demand: it stimulates photographers to produce for export the expected images, the scenes of a typical kind of a timeless Japan whose foreign clientele were demonstrably partial.¹⁸

A double consequence resulted. The first concerned the Westerners, at least most of them: their thirst for “japanoiseries” gave a bitter taste to the scenes which unsettled exotic clichés and showed Japan in transformation. Nothing illustrates this better than Pierre Loti’s description of “some Japanese (happily still few in number) trying their hand at wearing a morning coat; others, contenting themselves with adding a bowler hat to their national dress from which long wisps of their straight hair escape”.¹⁹ It is clear that what he manifestly denied men, the right to change, of which the adoption of Western costume was the visible sign, he would also deny women should they think of imitating them, which they had not failed to do as a result of the impetus given by the Empress who as early as 1886 appeared for the first time in a Western-style dress, at the same time as a movement in favour of Western coiffure for women developed.²⁰ Going against the current of the real Japan, in any case, the complexity of the movement under way eluded Loti’s nostalgic gaze, and one can understand how, as he was out of touch with reality, he ended up repatriating “his” exoticism to his house at Rochefort, where, tired of lengthy voyages, he reconstructed it in the images of his dreams and organized famous celebrations in costume to give them a semblance of life.²¹ The first paradox is that, in rediscovering Japan at the moment when it was renegotiating its relationship to history according to the future, the West made use of photography to fix a past which was in the process of changing and, in some respects, disappearing. The second consequence concerns Japanese photographers themselves, who very quickly and very skilfully mastered the new technique.²² They were to avail themselves of a modern intention to produce and sell images of the past and, in order to do this, to some extent stay close to the reflection of themselves and their country that the Westerners sent back to them; in looking at themselves in the mirror held out to them by the Other, they gave the impression of simultaneously becoming a stranger to its gaze, even if one admits the role – important to a greater or lesser degree depending on the photographers – of a well-understood commercial strategy.

This generally prevalent misunderstanding was not exclusive, however. Beyond the exchange of *clichés* already mentioned which occurred, as it were, with eyes shut to the reality being formed, there was a flux, a much more interesting circulation in images which genuinely bridged the two worlds and, by this act itself, produced a salutary jolt to their respective identities. Japan, seen from Europe, was not only a reverie tinged with nostalgia; it was the object of an authentic discovery by European artists and enthusiasts. “Japan-ism” should not be confused with “japanoiseries”. When, on the initiative of Félix Bracquemond who introduced Hokusai to France in 1856, Japanese prints were revealed to the Impressionists, it was no common-or-garden flirtation on their part, but the sign of a true encounter between their aspirations and those of the oriental masters; to such a degree, moreover, that one of the first critics to write about the Impressionists, Théodore Duret, believed that “the Japanese were the first and the finest Impressionists”.²³ Originating in the seventeenth century, the tradition of the *ukiyo-e* artists (literally, “painting of

the floating world", that of earthly and ephemeral pleasures) to which Hokusai belonged, foregrounded the secular subjects, intensely ordinary and anonymous, of everyday life, together with an airy way of handling them through space, line, and colour. The Impressionists' enthusiasm meant that they had found masters from whom they would learn what European academic painting denied them. It was a breath of fresh air, a deep breath, which was to clear a salutary empty space in the bric-à-brac of decadent official painting; a liberation to which another painter, Gustave Courbet, bore witness with, among other instances, *The Wave* (1870), which inevitably brings to mind Hokusai's famous print, *The Breaking Wave off the Coast at Kanagawa*, but, above all, *The Woman with the Podoscaph* (1865), whose presence in the Ishizuka Museum in Tokyo has a particular significance in terms of mutual recognition. Another act of homage, this time explicit, of one great master of modern European painting to Japanese art, is that which Manet slips into the *Portrait of Émile Zola* (1867–1868) in painting a print besides a reproduction of *Olympia* above the artist's desk. Just as the Japanese painters could be receptive to the influence of the Dutch masters before the closing-off of their country in the seventeenth century, the French painters, receiving the inheritance of "the painting of the floating world" of which Hokusai and Hiroshige were the exquisite flowering, acknowledged that the Japanese artists had by no means slept in the shadow of their secular traditions. We should add that, conversely, the masters of the *ukiyo-e*, who were not – in comparison with painters – held in very high esteem in their own land, were ultimately re-evaluated in the eyes of their compatriots. The discovery of an aspect of Japan virtually unknown to the Westerners was therefore coupled with a rediscovery of their own country by the Japanese themselves.

In this connection we should remember that, as Claude Lévi-Strauss had already observed in *Race et histoire*,²⁴ the line of progress does not speak with a single voice, nor is it continuous, that progress in the field of production techniques as was the case in Western Europe at the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries can hide stagnation, indeed regression, in other spheres, and that one culture can be creative in one area while another culture can develop in another. As a result of this motley pattern, he also added that cultural transfers definitely did not follow the trajectory which simplistic minds imagine going in one direction from a "developed" civilization (of which, of course, they were part) to a "less" or "underdeveloped" civilization which would have everything to learn from the former. The most specific example of the acclimatization by the Japanese of the invention of photography was to supply in turn, if necessary, a striking illustration of this.

Photography's discovery of Japan

The Europeans were quick to cry "Thief" about the Japanese who were to take everything from them, to imitate, improve, and finally put it on a business footing with universally acknowledged success. This legend has died particularly hard in relation to photography. Admittedly, the Japanese did not invent the camera and photographic techniques, and in the mid-nineteenth century they were a very long way from doing so; on the other hand, as a result of their pictorial tradition, notably that of engraving and print-making, they most certainly had the means to make excellent use of it. Their infatuation with the

process, among professionals as much as amateurs, clearly testifies to this. To parody – and no doubt also caricature somewhat – a well-known slogan of a great Japanese brand, we could say that the Europeans did what the Japanese had in a sense dreamed of.²⁵ We have seen how the stream of *ukiyo-e* was turned towards the production of images of the secular world, whether landscapes and minute details of the natural world or popular scenes depicting the ordinary life of people going about their work or pleasures, or of “reserved” quarters; it also celebrated geishas and famous actors who were the object of a veritable cult sustained by widespread diffusion of their image. There was thus a predisposition for a kind of instantaneousness in everyday life capable of sketching in a few suggestive but indubitable lines a paradoxically fleeting reality and, to put it more accurately, in the Japanese expression, “floating”. However, is it not true that photography, if not the instantaneous portrait of a reality perpetually changing in the flux of appearances, is an art of the banal and the ephemeral, as Jean-Marie Schaeffer has described it?²⁶ The Japanese word for photography is *shashin*, literally “the reproduction of reality”; it is the very expression that Baudelaire used to excommunicate photography and exclude it from the temple of art. Mistakenly, in our view. The art of the Japanese print suggests in which sense one should understand this reproduction which, moreover, Baudelaire correctly denounced as the height of scientific positivism, the coldest and flattest exactitude possible, at least when it was not inspired by an artistic vision. By reproduction should not be meant, it seems to us, the exact reflection, the conformist copy, the death mask of reality, but its reaffirmation or, better still, its living and entrancing repetition. We should actually remember, following Kirkegaard, and counter to a persistent prejudice, that there are two sorts of repetition: “bad” repetition, which stems from powerlessness and fatigue, which only caricatures what is repeated, for instance, the same old throbbing chorus which reduces the song to a poor vocal device, and “good” repetition which restores life and gives fresh impetus to what is valid in its nature in an everlasting first time, like the catchy refrain that makes the song’s heart beat. Reproducing reality, that is, producing it afresh like the wave in the Hokusai print already mentioned that remains, and will always be, terribly threatening; although it threatens the fishermen in their boats, it is also what carries them, hope and danger inextricably intertwined. Perhaps that is what photography reproduces: the imminent reproduction of a constantly threatened existence?

Photography has been much reproached for killing its model, for having transformed its subject into an object in order to observe it or preserve it better. The fact that Barthes has magisterially and mournfully evoked this “room of the dead” that is photography should not make us forget the title of his book, *La chambre claire*²⁷; there is also light and clarity in photography. The images of Japanese photographs gathered together in the Schilling Collection²⁸ bear witness to this light and to this will which tells of the true restoration of things, which calls them to return once more to the gaze of those who met them. They bear the mark of secular piety. We should not be surprised to find a taste for the pictorial, as this was also fashionable in the photographic practice of the West; the first great Japanese photographers, who had, like a proportion of their European colleagues, come from the world of painting and engraving, did not hesitate on occasion to retouch such-and-such a view of Fuji-Yama by discreetly adding a delicate swathe of clouds or, here and there, a more appropriate colour. With its luminous drawing style and pastel colours, Japanese photography from the Meiji period found itself complicit

with an art which aimed to produce reality in the simple beauty of its appearances. In conformity with the very living tradition of *ukiyo-e* which was not dedicated to the celebration of eternal Japan, it was in a position to give an account of the changes which affected the very real world of appearances and constructed the new unaccustomed and composite space of modern Japan: the sudden appearance of the signs of westernization and modernization, especially in costume and in the towns, were suddenly seen to appear.

The Japanese rapidly adopted photography because they recognized themselves in it, but also because in a sense it recognized them. At the same time as it confirmed the value of an artistic tradition in extending it, it went well beyond that. Photography destined for export was not only an alienation for the Western gaze, it was also a way of becoming conscious of what was ultimately swallowed up in the collective unconsciousness and of saving from oblivion practices which without it would have left no trace. By projecting an image of the Japanese reality in a medium which was soon going to be the currency of visual exchange of the whole world, it set about existing outside its secular traditions and its frontiers by inscribing itself in the cosmopolitan landscape of cultures. By bearing witness to its own changes and contradictions, it demonstrated the complexity of an identity open to the world and to the Other.²⁹

Patrick Vauday
Paris

Translated from the French by Juliet Vale

* As in the article title, the author makes play here with the double meaning of *cliché* in French, meaning both "image" and "cliché". (Translator's note)

Notes

1. Robert Jaulin (1973), *Gens de Soi, gens de l'Autre* (Paris, coll. 10/18).
2. Tintin, the famous strip-cartoon character created by Hergé in the 1930s, is another example of this. Remember that this was a case of a young reporter whose investigations always led him to a foreign land which provided an exotic backdrop for adventures in which the colonial spirit vied with the taste for travel. Among many other titles, note *Tintin in the Congo* (1930); *Tintin in America* (1931); *Tintin in Tibet* (1960); all Hergé's books are published by Casterman.
3. Roland Barthes (1980), *La chambre claire* (Cahiers du cinéma, Paris: Gallimard, Seuil), p. 28.
4. J.-P. Sartre (1943), *L'Être et le néant*, Le regard, 3. 1. 4 (Paris: Gallimard), pp. 310–64.
5. Michel Foucault has also demonstrated the part played by medical knowledge in the historical establishing of the gaze: see Michel Foucault (1963), *Naissance de la clinique* (Paris: PUF).
6. From the Latin *indigena*, literally "what is born in the country"; botanists in particular make a distinction between indigenous and exotic plants.
7. Pierre Clastres (1972), *Les Indiens Guayaki* (Collection Terre Humaine; Paris: Plon).
8. The title of a big photographic exhibition held in the 1950s and commented upon by Barthes in *Mythologies* (1957).
9. In French, the word designates the material image of photography and what in poetry and the plastic arts are called "commonplaces", that is, ready-made images.
10. As with the advertisement very familiar to the French proclaiming the merits of a brand of cocoa with the figure of a good-natured African.
11. Pierre Loti (1996), *Madame Chrysanthème* (Paris: Kailash Éditions), p. 188.
12. André Rouillé (1990), "Japon, observatoire de la photographie", *La Recherche photographique* 9 (special issue on Japan).

13. On this historic point, see especially Koji Taki (1990), "Analyse d'une photographie politique: portrait de l'empereur", *La Recherche photographique* 9 (special issue on Japan); (1991), "The setting: nineteenth-century Japan"; "Early photographic techniques and their introduction to Japan", *Souvenirs From Japan: Japanese Photography at the Turn of the Century* (London: Bamboo Publishing).
14. Pierre Loti (1996), p. 112, refers to the very widespread practice in Nagasaki of sticking a photograph onto a visiting card.
15. First published in instalments in the newspaper, *Le Figaro*, then in book form in 1887. Puccini took it as the inspiration for his opera, *Madame Butterfly*. A naval officer, Pierre Loti first stayed in Japan in 1885, then a second time in 1900–1901.
16. Loti (1996), p. 36.
17. See, among other works, the photographs from the Schilling Collection reproduced in, *Souvenirs From Japan*.
18. See the photographs in the Schilling Collection: *Souvenirs From Japan*.
19. (1991) *Souvenirs From Japan*, p. 79.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
21. See Thierry Liot, *La maison de Pierre Loti à Rochefort, 1850–1923* (Éditions Patrimoines Média). Although the Japanese pagoda that Loti had rebuilt in his house at Rochefort has disappeared today, one can still see the Turkish interior there.
22. For this point, see *Souvenirs From Japan*, pp. 21–6.
23. Théodore Duret (1878), *Les peintres impressionnistes* (Paris: Librairie parisienne). Théodore Duret stayed in Japan from the end of 1871 to the beginning of 1873 when he came to know the country's art; see (1900), *Livres et albums illustrés du Japon réunis et catalogues par Théodore Duret* (Paris: Editions Leroux).
24. Claude Lévi-Strauss (1952), *Race et histoire* (Paris: Gonthier/Médiations).
25. An allusion to the slogan, "You dreamed it, Sony did it!"
26. Jean-Marie Schaeffer (1987), *L'image précaire* (Paris: Seuil).
27. Roland Barthes (1980), *La chambre claire*.
28. Reproduced in part in *Souvenirs From Japan*.
29. For aspects of Japanese photography since the Second World War, see especially (1990), *La recherche photographique* 9.