In the next two sections, Reyes examines works by the first-generation Tagalog novelists, whose works range from the domestic, generally didactic and romantic, such as Nena at Neneng (Nena and Neneng), 1903, and Pusong Walang Pag-ibig (Heart Without Love), 1910, to the more historical and socially conscious, such as Pinaglahuan (Eclipsed), 1907. The didactic/romantic tradition, as seen in the works of Jose Sevilla and Rosario Almar, with their allegorical tendencies and ahistorical settings, entertained and instructed, following many of the conventions of the metrical romances. On the other hand, the works of socially conscious writers like Lope K. Santos and Juan Arsciwals attempt not only at a faithful reconstruction of contemporary society but also at an examination of the sociopolitical problems and their effects on the individual. They thus began the protest tradition in the Tagalog novel. The years before and during WWII saw the same two tendencies at work. Reyes explains the popularity of serialized novels, as well as the effects of commercialism, the rise of the short story, and cinema on the genre. She notes the predominance of romantic novels or novels dealing with personal relationships over more socially conscious works.

The next section discusses the emergence of modernism in the Tagalog novel during the 1940s and 1950s. Reyes studies such works as Pagkamulat ni Magdalena (Magdalena’s Awakening), 1958, Ginto sa Makiling (The Gold in Makiling), 1947, and Timawa (Freeman/Serf), 1953, highlighting their modernist features. The study argues that by the sixth decade, two traditions have been formed: one that derived from the traditions formalized in the works of the novelists of the 1920s and the other shaped by a more Western-oriented sensibility. Reyes then examines the dominant trends in the 1970s. The novel of personal relations persisted in the works of Mercedes Jose and Rosario de Guzman-Lingat. The protest tradition found a following in Mario Cabilling. Reyes concludes that although the traditional novel still predominated, there were attempts to inject modernist elements into the texts, specially those penned by novelists who began to write in the 1960s, such as Dominador Mirasol, Efren Abueg, and Edgardo Reyes.

NOTES ON PHILIPPINE CINEMA


This is a collection of critical essays as well as a transcription of Reyes’ 1984 documentary Vic Silayan: An Actor Remembers. The book contains 14 film reviews previously published between 1984 to 1987. They deal with Snake Sisters, Kapitan Inggo (Kumakain ng Bala) (Captain Inggo [Bullet-eater]), Merika (Merica), Isla (Island), Boatman, Virgin Forest, Bomba Queen, Miguelito: Ang Batang Rebelde (Miguelito: The Young Rebel), Scorpio Nights, Silip (Peep), Bagong Hari (New King), and Olongapo: The Great American Dream.

The essays include “Form in the Filipino Film,” “Myth and Philippine Cinema,” “Murder by Frame,” “Black and White in Color: The Lure of Komiks Movies,” “Does Political Repression Make Good Cinema?” “Images of Ourselves in Our Own Reality,” “Why Does Somebody Else Have to Tell the Story of Our Revolution?” and “The Aesthetics of the Short Film.” These constitute the author’s articulation of his approaches to the appreciation of cinema in general and that of the Philippines in particular. The first two average about 30 pages each.

“Form in the Filipino Film” draws significantly from the writings of David Bordwell in Classical Hollywood Cinema, Kristin Thompson’s Film Art: An Introduction, and W. TatarKiewicz’s “Form in the History of Aesthetics,” from The Dictionary of the History of Ideas. After discussing Sister Stella L. in the context of “classical Hollywood cinema,” Reyes opines that mainstream Filipino film has evolved its own narrative form, different from that of the Hollywood film. Hence, its conventions should not be seen as “flaws” but rather as “traits.” Reyes then enumerates four formal traits manifested in Philippine cinema: “a scene-oriented narrative, a tendency for overt representation, circumlocutory dialog, and a narrative that emphasizes the centrality of the star.”

“Myth and Philippine Cinema” has a five-part outline, consisting of the subtitles “Stranger Than Fiction,” “On Themes, Messages, Symbols and Realism,” “The World on Her Shoulders: Women in Melodrama,” “Macho Fantasies: Philippine Cinema’s Action Heroes,” and “Gay and Really Useful: Homosexuality and Philippine Cinema.” Here Reyes once more appropriates the same assertion in “Form in the Filipino Film” and suggests “myth in relation to a society’s value system as revealed by cinema” as an additional subject for study.
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