Drawn to the light: Cinematic and Performative Ecologies in Stan Brakhage's *Mothlight* (1963) and Eiko Otake's *Night with Moths* (2019)

Tina Wasserman

Abstract:

The purpose of this essay is to explore the evocative use of moths within cinematic and performative contexts. To do so, two moving image works were chosen, each framed within in a comparative context to the other: the first, the historic and iconic masterwork of avant-garde cinema by the legendary filmmaker Stan Brakhage titled *Mothlight* (1963), and the second, a contemporary performance video titled *Night with Moths* (2019) by the interdisciplinary movement-based artist, Eiko Otake. With their attraction to light, along with their fluttering, nocturnal flights, moths seem to have a strong kinship with not only the moving images of cinema, but also with the movement focus of dance and performance. Indeed, the very presence of moths in both moving image works, invites us to witness compelling cinematic and performative collaborations that move across species and ecologies.

Key Words: cinematic, performative, ecologies, movement-based work, moths, botanicals, materialities, dance, bodies

Moths and cinema share certain expressive traits. Although such commonalities found across so great a divide as those between living biological beings and inorganic technical processes might appear outwardly implausible, each invites comparison to the other. Indeed, an essential attribute to both is darkness: moths are known to become active at night and, through much of its history, cinema was uniquely expressed by the illuminated projection of moving images inside darkened theatres. Nevertheless, while both are largely darkness oriented, each is animated by light. Although mostly nocturnal, moths are known to be drawn toward sources of illumination. Likewise, in both its historic photochemical form and its current digital configuration, cinema is twice reliant on light, both in the registration of its images on to light sensitive material–whether silver coated emulsion or electronic sensors–and in the subsequent screening or streaming of those images. Moths and cinema share another unlikely connection. Each is known for their ability to evoke captivating movement: for moths, it is the graceful flutter of wings, and for cinema, it is the illusionary quality of moving images that travel across a phantasmagoric screen.

With these similarities established between such seemingly dissimilar phenomena, the purpose of this essay is to explore the evocative use of moths within cinematic contexts. To do so I have chosen two moving image works–one historic, the other contemporary–each framed within a comparative context to the other. The first is the iconic masterwork of avant-garde cinema *Mothlight* (1963, 16mm, silent, 3 minutes, 13 seconds). Uniquely constructed by the legendary filmmaker Stan Brakhage (1933-2002), it has often been described as having more similarities to collage than to the dominant narrative focus of cinema during the era in which it was made. Indeed, Brakhage himself wrote about the work that he had planned it as a "purely collage film."[1]

The second more contemporary work is the performance video titled *Night with Moths* (2019, sound, 17 minutes, 34 seconds) by the "movement-based interdisciplinary artist" Eiko Otake (b. 1952),[2] The piece was created and choreographed by Eiko in collaboration with Joseph Scheer, an artist who works extensively with moths and, additionally, with Rebekkah Palov, who provided the camera work while assisting Eiko with the choreography and editing of the piece.

The International Journal of Screendance 14 (2024) https://doi.org/10.18061/ijsd.v14i1.9632

I use the term "ecology" here in several expansive and generative directions. In general, with reference to the environment itself, I am perhaps most closely aligned in my thinking with the Greek etymological origins of the word itself, "oikos," which translates to "dwelling," "habitation" or "house." Using the term as such, I mean to imply communities of living organisms–whether animal or botanical–and their relatedness, interaction and interconnectedness to one other, as well as to the physical environments in which they reside. With reference to the particular focus of this essay, I use the term "ecology" more broadly to describe imaginative eco-systems that are engaged in, or engaged by, artistic production and reception. In this sense *Mothlight* and *Night with Moths* become, respectively, cinematic and performative artmaking ecologies that are engendered through the energetic, creative and innovative interaction between human-animal-botanical beings and the environmental-mechanical-structural elements which surround them. Participants, witnesses, viewers, beings, structures and mechanisms are all implied in these ecologies.

While both artists use moths as their primary material, and within a moving image context, it is critical to note here that each work comes out of distinct artistic practices and eras. Although born decades apart, and with Eiko's artistic practice extending more deeply into the twenty-first century (Brakhage died just at the outset of the twenty-first century), I would nevertheless identify both artists' work as occupying similar concerns that gripped numerous avant-garde practices during the second half of the twentieth century. More complex to explore in depth here, it is nevertheless important to underscore that much avant-garde practice of this era was noted for dismantling and disassembling classic, realistic and traditional modes of narration and artistic expression in order to hybridize traditional concepts of art but also, importantly, to explore stripped-down ontologies of various artistic genres–whether performance, sculpture, cinema, painting and more–and to interrogate, in part, deep, existential ontologies of being, seeing, moving, living and more. In addition to their use of moths to structure each work, perhaps the most significant connection I can make between these two artists is the relevance of their chosen mediums to *movement* itself. To be sure, cinema itself is often described as an art of movement: its name is derived from the Greek word "kinema" (movement). Logically then, the moniker of cinema, as an art form of moving images is simply, "the movies." Similarly, movement is a foundational element in performance and dance. In defining herself as an artist and dancer, Eiko has emphasized movement as one of the essential attributes in her work, writing: "There are many ways of being an artist. I like movement of mind, of myself, of others. I like movement in wind, trees, animals, waves and mountains."[3] It is easy to see why both artists would be drawn to using moths in their perspective works as they are not only resonant with the moving images of cinema but also with the movement focus of dance and performance. Indeed, all three subjects included in this inquiry here–that is, moths, cinema and performance–engage in various expressive incarnations of movement, a phenomenon that equally binds them all together.

Nonetheless, movement itself, as articulated in each piece functions in decidedly different ways. For the most part, except for the minimally perceptible movement of trees and the agitated motion of the hyacinth branches Eiko holds in her hands, it is human and insect movement that animate the performance in *Night with Moths*. This is apparent whether it is the expressive movement of the human body or the environmentally influenced movement of the moths. Quite oppositely, although *Mothlight* is a film that is constructed with insects as its subject matter, movement is enacted entirely through the driving force of cinema itself. Thus, the mechanical movement-making function of cinema must be distinguished from any kind of human or insect derived movement.[4] Yet it is important to point out here, that whether or not a film is assembled out of the static photo-chemical frames of historic emulsion-based celluloid or out of the coded digital pixels of newer technologies, cinematic movement is always an illusionary construction.[5]

Indeed, one of Brakhage's goals was to liberate cinema from its entanglement with illusionism, whether it was related to cinema's formal elements or to Hollywood's escapist content. Born in 1933, Brakhage came of age during the seminal years associated with the North American avant-garde film movement, becoming one of its most prodigious forces between the 1960s and early 1980s. His work illustrates the experimental energy that would inhabit avant-garde film at the time, exemplifying the seismic changes inaugurated across various art movements of the mid-twentieth century. Described by the film critic J. Hoberman as a "would-be poet, shameless visionary, self-dramatizing expressionist,"[6] Brakhage was, nonetheless, one of the most important avant-garde filmmakers of the second half of the twentieth century. Insisting that cinema was something much more than commercial entertainment and storytelling, Brakhage focused on the specific visuality of the filmic medium. At the time, composed as it was from photochemical, emulsion-based celluloid strips, cinema's ontologies and materialities became, for him, a crucible for seeing, for vision and for perception itself, in all its incarnations whether internally or externally formed.

Working from a place of artisanal singularity and hands-on tactility, Brakhage not only worked with the filmic medium by traditionally recording moving images with a camera, but he also used the film strip itself as a material surface on to which he painted, scratched, drew, incised and more. It is important to stress that he did not invent this practice. In point of fact, many such techniques had already been used and tested in cinema. One thinks of Georges Melies' hand-processed application of vivid color to his film *Trip to the Moon,* made in 1903, or Len Lye's experimental 1935 film *Colour Box,* in which he painted directly on to 35 mm film stock. Brakhage, however, added a new dimension to this kind of practice: he used the film strip as a surface on to which he attached the physical fragments of organic matter itself. Remarkably, *Mothlight* (1963) is a film constructed out of the biological remnants of moth wings, flower petals, spliced blades of grass, twigs, leaves, and seeds. The process by which Brakhage constructed his film signaled a radical shift in the way one could think about cinema. As a camera-less, hand-processed film made without any photographically recorded footage, *Mothlight* profoundly altered cinema from a medium primarily constructed out of recorded photographic images to one that accommodated any kind of imprinted physical matter, virtually "turning celluloid into a plastic medium."[7] Hoberman would write of Brakhage that he "was neither the first filmmaker to eschew the camera nor the first to scratch patterns into, or glue objects to, the film emulsion. He does, however, seem to have been the first to fashion a movie entirely from actual flora and fauna."[8] Because of its profound departure from standard filmmaking practices, many legendary anecdotes have circulated about the making of this extraordinary film. Perhaps the most pointed, is that the film was born out of the impoverished economic situation in which Brakhage found himself in the early 1960s. Film scholar P. Adams Sitney writes:

> When he had no money to buy film stock, he conceived the idea of making a film out of natural material through which light could pass... Brakhage collected dead moths, flowers, leaves, and seeds. By placing them between two layers of Mylar editing tape, a transparent, thin strip of 16mm celluloid with sprocket holes and glue on one side, he made *Mothlight* (1963).[9]

Watching this astonishing film, the viewer witnesses cinema as truly artifactual. As the projected strip of imprinted matter unravels on the screen, the viewer marvels at the fleeting yet evidential quality of the images. Earthy tonalities of browns, burgundies and greens create a vivid palette. Translucent moth wings flicker by as if in flight while the botanical traces of seeds, twigs and petals create an ecology of matter. Flattened floral silhouettes flash as verdant shapes of webbed wings and leaf veins shimmer past. Luminous grasses pulse across the screen. Everything moves at once, incongruously abstracted and recognizable at the same time. The work is not only significant in the history of film, but also gorgeous

and intoxicating as well. Brakhage himself recognized *Mothlight*, as a film "of indescribable beauty and perfection" further claiming, that it was "what is easily the most perfectly formal work I have yet made."[10]

Made almost six decades later, but also with "flora and fauna," Eiko's piece *Night with Moths* (2019) is a striking nocturnal performance that provides us with a worthy comparison to Brakhage's earlier work. Eiko is known for her decades-long interdisciplinary work that engages the performative body. Beginning in the 1970s, and for more than forty years thereafter, she was known with her partner Koma as the interdisciplinary performance duo "Eiko & Koma." Their performance collaboration was noted "for works that were slow and austere, using a minimal degree of movement"[11] and "treasured for their stark, startlingly slow excavations of stillness and shape while time gradually passes."[12] At an important point in their career, recorded media began to figure in their performative pieces, as dance historian Rosemary Candelario points out: "Eiko & Koma began to make and screen what they call media dances or dances for camera in the early 1980s."[13]

In the last decade, particularly since 2014, Eiko has continued on as a solo artist while also, at times, collaborating with numerous other artists. In one of her most extensive series in recent years, *A Body in Places,* Eiko has engaged her performative self within more than seventy diverse sites that range from the quotidian (Philadelphia's 30th Street Station) to the haunting (Brooklyn's Greenwood Cemetery during the Covid pandemic). Perhaps the most arresting ongoing project she has engaged with since 2014 is *A Body in Fukushima,* "the extensive and expanding collaborative project"[14] between herself and the historian and photographer William Johnston. Travelling to the disaster ravaged site in Japan more than five times since 2014, the project has not only engendered Eiko's emotionally raw and grief-stricken on-site performances, but also a film, book, photographs and music, all of which trace, witness and mourn the ruins, remains and results of the 2011 Tōhoku region earthquake, tsunami and subsequent Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant disaster.

Eiko and Koma were both born in post-war Japan. With their focus on slow, measured movements and the sometimes twisted distortions of their bodies, it is easy to see the scarred traces of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in much of their work. Eiko's interest in the social and cultural effects of the atomic bomb on postwar Japanese society was academically formalized in 2007 when she received a master's degree from the Individualized Study Graduate Program at New York University's Gallatin School. Her concentration was in postwar Japanese Literature writing a thesis titled "Atomic Bomb Literature."[15]

One senses this continued concern and interest with particular acuteness in Eiko's performances at Fukushima where she provides on-site acts of mourning and movement that address the wounds humanity has inflicted on the environment, on other species and on itself since the splitting of the atom in the 1940s and the dawn of the nuclear era in which we now must live. Dance critic Gia Kourlas writes that she uses "her slender, seemingly vulnerable body as a vessel to embody trauma, fragility and desolation" within "sites of suffering or turmoil.[16] Eiko's performances in these damaged locations trace the remains of trauma that linger in places and in bodies across generations. Eiko underscores this when, in an essay titled *Why I Dance,* she writes: "Massive violence shakes us.... and the upset caused by it lingers in the space. That is history."[17]

Night with Moths, is presented as a "two screen video installation,"[18] Vertically layered, with one screen above, the other screen below, the work appears to be one long take that is cut into two segments, with the top screen appearing to be the later part of the single take and lower screen, the earlier part.[19] This appears to be so because in the top screen, Eiko's white shirt is always open, but in the bottom screen her shirt is closed, then torn open toward the end of the piece. The vertical screen configuration challenges

one's sense of linear chronologies. Appearing stacked like this, the simultaneously depicted double screens alter the foreword moving, horizontal vector of "normal" time, shifting it more clearly into the space of a preternatural temporality. Performing in a wooded setting at night while grasping white hydrangeas as she moves, it is only Eiko's face and upper body that appear framed before the camera. The deep darkness of the forested night, however, is powerfully transformed into an otherworldly space by the presence of a large light bulb placed upon a tripod. Drawn to the illumination the light creates, a throng of moths flock to the scene.

Almost translucent against the incongruously lit nocturnal scene, the moths appear spectral. While Eiko strikes at the night air with the hydrangeas, moth wings and flower petals mirror one another in a ghostly dance. Darting about or settling into stillness, Eiko seems, at times, to be aware of the moths' presence, while at other times, she appears to move past them into quiet meditative poses, as if she is emotionally feeling the space rather than outwardly seeing it. A few minutes into the piece, on the bottom screen, a moth lands on the side on her face. Settling there, the moth spreads its wings like a fan. They perform a kind of inter-species pas de deux for several minutes until Eiko turns her head slowly, and then almost touching the moth with her finger, it flies away. Her movements appear simultaneously expressive, distressed, agitated, and anguished. Throughout much of the performance, the lighted tripod is mostly offscreen, although the emanating light it creates is clearly visible. At other times it is depicted as slightly onscreen, with Eiko making contact with it during the performance. In this way, the obvious artifice of the situation–that is, the presence of artificial lighting, used to draw in the moths–is never made to be invisible.

While the presence of "flora and fauna," and, in particular, the presence of moths resonates across these two moving image works of art, there are significant differences between them as well. Perhaps most significant is the fact that while Brakhage's film was constructed from the remains of dead moths, Eiko's performative video features living moths. Before making *Mothlight,* however, Brakhage had expressed an interest in filming live moths to include in his work. In a letter he wrote to his friend and colleague, the poet Robert Kelly, he outlined how this curiosity began. While working in his studio one day, Brakhage discovered a large moth flying about. Describing it to Kelly as a "a gigantic multi-colored beauty," he wrote he was intrigued by "the moth itself, its movements, particularly when it began settling first on one then another strip of film hanging beside me."[20] Continuing in the letter, he related how he later "photographed this moth in extreme close-up as it fluttered against the window glass, with the specific idea in mind to use those images in *Dog Star Man*."[21] Brakhage further explained to Kelly, that he was not only interested in filming live moths, but that the construction of movement in his work since the late 1950s had been inspired "by moth flight" and that he had always been engaged more generally in "thoughts, observations, and study....on the flight of the moth and moth sight."[22]

In spite of his wish to film live moths, the reality of doing so proved to be too difficult for Brakhage. However, just as the idea of recording living moths came to him while he was working in his studio, so too did the idea of filming dead moths.[23] This occurred while working on his film at night when Brakhage noticed the moths' deadly nocturnal attraction to the light sources in his studio space. Brakhage would later recall in an audio recording that "these crazy moths [were] flying into the candlelight and burning themselves to death."[24] In a painstakingly laborious and exceptionally inventive process, Brakhage then collected the moth carcasses for the film he envisioned. Writing to Kelly, he explained: "all moths whose wings were being used in the film had been collected from enclosed light boxes and lamp bowls."[25] Thus, instead of shooting footage, as would normally happen in the production phase of filmmaking, the unusual production process for *Mothlight* consisted of collecting moth remains that were left at the illuminated source where they had died.

While the behavior that drew moths to his studio lights was described somewhat scornfully by Brakhage as "crazy," it is scientifically known as "positive phototaxis." The explanation for this activity remains somewhat mercurial, especially since proximity to bright light sources often lead to moth fatality. However, many biologists now believe that this behavior may be related to the moth's own evolutionary development. It is likely an evolutionary adaptation, as well, that moths mostly function in nocturnal settings, a behavior developed, in part, to avoid diurnal predators. As nocturnal beings, moths' most likely use the brightness of the moon and stars to navigate their flight patterns in a process known as "transverse orientation." As geographer Matthew Gandy writes, moths are "effectively compelled towards light by their neural networks."[26] Moths, therefore, instinctively move toward any kind of light, whether it is the moon or stars, as part of their evolutionary history–which biologists guess to be around 190 million years–or toward the newer artificial lights of the Anthropocene–which some scientists believe began during the Industrial Revolution, around 200 years ago, others that it began around 1950. Millions of years of evolutionary behavior has, in this sense, altered into new movement patterns predicated on shifts in the moth's environment.

Thus, whether because of lightboxes and "lamp bowls" placed in a studio workspace or because of a bright bulb placed on a tripod within a nocturnal forest, moths appear in both Brakhage's film and in Eiko's performance precisely because they were drawn to illuminated light sources. In each work, however, the moths appear in two distinct forms: that is, as vivid but dead matter in Brakhage's film, and, oppositely, as living participants in Eiko's performance.

Yet, creating a clear distinction between the dead matter of Brakhage's film and the living movement of Eiko's performance is perhaps too simplistic. Indeed, set at night, the ghostly palette of Eiko's performance suggests something more complex. The shrouded tone is set, in part, because the color white is threaded throughout the work. The white hydrangeas, the white shirt she wears, and the lit, whitened, bodies of the flickering moths as they congregate into the frame all create a spectral, even deathly aura to the performance. The very darkness of the woods, as well as the mute trees that appear like silent witnesses also contribute to the elegiac quality of the performance. At times, Eiko's melancholic movements seem to articulate a tragic sense of loss, whether it is the loss of habitat, the loss of indigenous knowledge of the woods, or the loss of women themselves, who were historically persecuted and burned as witches for their long association with the forest and its healing medicinal plants. The anxiety of environmental degradation resounds as well in this pensive performance, reminding us we may be posed to lose these wild and beautiful spaces as we move deeper into the human-made era of the Anthropocene.

At the same time, however, the piece invites a kind of joyous wonderment. This has to do, in part, with the use of sound in the video, which records the lively acoustic diversity of the nocturnal forest. Nighthawks, owls, crickets, frogs and the rush of night breezes abound, powerfully contradicting the assumed hush and repose of night into an ensemble of sound, movement and liveliness. Eiko's piece seems to suggest that while sacred forested spaces are vulnerable, they are still clearly alive, teeming with animate activity. This kind of contrast between trauma and endurance reverberates across Eiko's work, as historian Andrew Szegedy-Maszak has written, for example, of her performance in *A Body in Fukushima*, that it stands as a testament to "fragility but also resilience."[27]

One might argue that a similar contrast echoes across Brakhage's film *Mothlight* as well. Known for choosing to work without sound throughout much of his career, the film is significantly silent. Working with dead moths, the silence of the film underscores its connection to deathliness. Silence is itself often associated with death. As film theorist Christian Metz once noted, the prominent attributes of the

photograph, "immobility and silence....are not only two objective aspects of death, they are also its main symbols, they *figure* it."[28]

However, Brakhage's work is not photographic: it is cinematic. And cinema powerfully reproduces the illusion of lifelikeness through its very structuring of movement and moving images. Thus, although he worked with silence and used dead moths, *it is the living force of cinema itself* that brings his film closer to Eiko's living performance. Indeed, working with the biological remains of the moths, Brakhage true wish was to "reanimate" them. As an artist working with the medium of film, Brakhage understood that there was no better mechanism to do this than through the animate, moving images of cinema. Of the process, Brakhage stated:

> Here is a film that I made out of a deep grief....Over the lightbulbs there's all these dead moth wings, and I ... hate that. Such a sadness; there must surely be something to do with that. I tenderly picked them out and start pasting them onto a strip of film, to try to... give them life again, to animate them again, to try to put them into some sort of life through the motion picture machine."[29]

Hence it was precisely through the moving images of cinema itself that Brakhage believed he could resuscitate dead moths into animate creatures again, writing that "the simulation of life" would occur through "the eventual unwinding of this film."[30] It was a process Hoberman would call "radiant mummification," writing that, "If cinema is primarily the art of animation–restoring or creating movement, conjuring ghosts, and bringing inert matter to life–then little *Mothlight* is pure cinema: life transmuted into light and motion."[31]

Returning to the comparison with which we began this inquiry, between moths and cinema, Hoberman evocatively writes of *Mothlight:* "Don't these onrushing moth wings signify the very ephemerality of the cinematic image?"[32] With their attraction to light and their fluttering, nocturnal flights, moths have a strong kinship with the movement focus of dance and performance and, indeed, the moving images of cinema. What better creature to use in these two richly poetic moving image works than moths? Their presence in both invites us to witness compelling ecological collaborations across species, environments and mechanisms, whether they are used as organic remains that are revivified into cinematic movement, or as living collaborators that are invited into a nocturnal forest dance.

Biography

Tina Wasserman, Ph.D. is a full-time faculty member in the Visual and Material Studies Department at The School of the Museum of Fine Arts at Tufts University. She has published articles, essays, and book chapters in various journals and presses including *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, *Holocaust Studies: A Journal of Culture and History*, *Afterimage*, *Streetnotes, Wallflower Press* and *Intellect Books* among others.

Notes

1. Brakhage. *Metaphors on Vision:* n.p. (See also, for example, descriptions of Brakhage's collage process by J. Hoberman in "Direct Cinema" and P.A. Sitney in *Visionary Film.*)
2. Eiko Otake Web Site. Accessed August 2, 2023. https://www.eikootake.org
Going forward, I will refer to her as "Eiko" as she prefers being identified professionally by her first name in order to create continuity with her long performance history in the duo "Eiko & Koma." This preference was articulated in email dated August 14, 2023

3. Eiko. "Why I Dance.": 72.
4. An interesting connection between insect movement, and movement such as it is implied in pre-cinematic recording devices can be found in the early experiments of scientist Étienne-Jules Marey, who, in 1868, "gilded the wing tips of a wasp....[which] would leave a luminous trace" across a blackened cylinder in order to indicate the successive flight pattern of its wings. The following year he constructed a mechanical insect to augment his understanding of insect wing movement. This would eventually lead to Marey's interest in photographically documenting animal movement and the invention of his chronophotographic gun in 1882, a pre-cinematic device that could record up to twelve frames per second. (see Marta Braun *Picturing Time,* pp 31-32.)
5. Theories and scholarly discussions around the issue of cinematic movement are complex and beyond the scope of this essay. I have addressed them more in depth in my essay: "Still Lives: Tableaux Vivants, Moving Images and the Digital Uncanny," *Quarterly Review of Film and Video,* Volume 40, Issue 5, 2023.
6. Hoberman. "Direct Cinema.": 482.
7. Frye. "Stan Brakhage."
8. Hoberman. "Direct Cinema.": 482.
9. Sitney. *Visionary Film:* 174.
10. Brakhage. *Metaphors on Vision:* n.p.
11. Szegedy-Maszak. *A Body in Fukushima:* n.p.
12. Kourlas. "Eiko Steps Away."
13. Candelario. "Bodies, Camera, Screen.": 80.
14. Eiko Web Site. Accessed August 3, 2021.
15. Eiko also holds an Honorary Ph.D. from Colorado College, which she received in 2020. Eiko Web Site. Accessed August 3, 2023.
16. Kourlas. "Eiko Steps Away."
17. Eiko. "Why I Dance.": 72.
18. *Night with Moths* was viewed through a private password on Vimeo. The information on Eiko's Vimeo page states: "This video shows how two different parts of videos are composed as a two-screen video installation." In my email correspondence with Eiko on August 14, 2023, she noted that the piece can also be viewed in a single channel/single frame context.
19. That the structure of the video is one long take cut into two segments was later confirmed by Eiko in an email on August 14, 2023.
20. Brakhage. *Metaphors on Vision:* n.p.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
23. In a strange coincidence, just as Brakhage found filming live moths too difficult, opting instead to film them after they were dead, the famous "naturalist," James Audubon also found drawing live birds too difficult. Consequently, he could only draw the birds after he killed them. Using a particular buck shot he invented (one that would pierce the skin of the animals without creating too much blood) he then staged them in "natural" settings to make them appear alive.
24. Brakhage. *By Brakhage.*
25. Brakhage. *Metaphors on Vision:* n.p.
26. Gandy, *Moth.*, 93
27. Szegedy-Maszak. *A Body in Fukushima,* n.p.
28. Metz, Christian. “Photography and Fetish.”: 126.
29. Brakhage. *By Brakhage.*
30. Brakhage. *Metaphors on Vision:* n.p.
31. Hoberman. "Direct Cinema.": 482. In using the word "mummification" Hoberman is, of course, referring to Andre Bazin's famous theories about the essential imprinting and preservationist properties

of photography and cinema, famously writing that the photograph "embalms time" and that cinema was "change mummified." (See Bazin, *What is Cinema?* Vol. 1:14–15).
32. Hoberman. "Direct Cinema.": 483.

References

Bazin, Andre. What is Cinema? Vol. 1, Trans. H. Gray. Berkeley, CA; Los Angeles, CA; London: The University of California Press, 1967.

Brakhage, Stan. *Metaphors on Vision. Film Culture.* Ed. Jonas Mekas, 1963. Excerpted in *Bomb Magazine* (September 22, 2017). Accessed August 21, 2023. https://bombmagazine.org

Braun, Marta. "The Writing of Life: The Graphic Method," *Picturing Time: The Work of Étienne-Jules Marey (1830-1904),* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1992.

Candelario, Rosemary. "Bodies, Camera, Screen: Eiko & Koma's Immersive Media Dances." *The International Journal of Screendance.* 4 (2014): 80-92. https://doi.org/10.18061/ijsd.v4i0.4522

Frye, Brian L. "Stan Brakhage." *Senses of Cinema.* 23 (December 2002). Accessed August 7, 2023. https://www.sensesofcinema.com

Hoberman, J. "Direct Cinema: On Stan Brakhage's *Mothlight." Artforum,* 51.1 (September), 2021: 481-483.

Gandy, Matthew. *Moth.* London: Reaktion Books, 2017.

Kourlas, Gia. "Eiko Steps Away From One Dance Partner, to Take on Many More." *The New York Times.* February 10, 2016.

Metz, Christian. "Photography and Fetish." *The Cinematic*. Ed. David Campany. MIT Press London: Cambridge, 2007.

Otake, Eiko. Web Site. https://www.eikootake.org

Otake, Eiko. "Why I Dance." *Dance* Magazine (October 2021): 72.

Sitney, P. Adams. *Visionary Film: The American Avant-Garde, 1943-2000, Third Edition.* Oxford University Press. Oxford: New York. 2002.

Szegedy-Maszak, Andrew. *A Body in Fukushima: William Johnston and Eiko Otake.* Exhibition and Event Brochure. Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut. February-May 2015.

Media

Brakhage, Stan. "Mothlight." 1963. *By Brakhage: An Anthology, Volume One. Criterion Collection.*

Otake, Eiko. "Night with Moths." 2019. Vimeo. Accessed July 10, 2022.