



SILVA IAPONICARUM 日林

FASC. XXXI • 第三十一号

SPRING • 春

2012

Adam Mickiewicz University
Chair of Oriental Studies, Department of Japanese Studies

Jagiellonian University
Institute of Oriental Philology, Department of Japanese and Chinese Studies

University of Warsaw
Faculty of Oriental Studies, Department of Japanese and Korean Studies

Posnaniae, Cracoviae, Varsoviae, Kuki MMXII

ISSN 1734-4328

Drodzy Czytelnicy.

Niniejszy regularny zeszyt kwartalnika *Silva Iaponicarum* 日林 ukazuje się w przerwie w ciągu serii zeszytów specjalnych. Poświęcamy go problematyce filmoznawczej oraz językoznawczej.

Kolejny, specjalne wydanie kwartalnika ukaże się jako tegoroczny zeszyt letnio-jesienny.

Niezmiennie oczekujemy na artykuły do kolejnych regularnych wydań kwartalnika *Silva Iaponicarum* 日林.

Kolegium redakcyjne

E-mail: silvajp@amu.edu.pl

Poznań-Kraków-Warszawa-Kuki, marzec 2012

Dear Readers,

This regular fascicle of the *Silva Iaponicarum* 日林 quarterly is issued between a series of several special edition fascicles. It is devoted to the cinema studies and linguistics.

The next edition of the quarterly will be issued as this year's summer/autumn fascicle.

We await contributions for the incoming editions of the *Silva Iaponicarum* 日林 quarterly.

The editorial board

E-mail: silvajp@amu.edu.pl

Poznań-Cracow-Warsaw-Kuki, March 2012

読者のみなさまへ

本号は、季刊誌 *Silva Iaponicarum* 日林の定期号です。前と後には、特別号が刊行されます。この号には、映画学と言語学の問題をめぐる論文を掲載しました。

次の *Silva Iaponicarum* 日林は本年度夏・秋号合併号として刊行の予定です。

それに続く定期号にご投稿ください。お待ちしております。

編集委員会

E-mail: silvajp@amu.edu.pl

2012年3月 ポズナニ・クラクフ・ワルシャワ・久喜

***Silva Iaponicarum* 日林**

Kwartalnik japonistyczny / Quarterly on Japanology / 日本学季刊誌

ISSN 1734-4328

Liczba kopii: 100 / Hard copies: 100 / 部数: 100 部

THE ELECTRONIC VERSION IS THE PRIMARY VERSION OF THIS PERIODICAL

Kolegium redakcyjne / Editorial board / 編集委員会

Redaktor naczelny / Editor in chief / 編集長

Dr. Arkadiusz Jabłoński, Adam Mickiewicz University

Dr. Beata Bochorodycz, Adam Mickiewicz University

Dr. Maciej Kanert, Adam Mickiewicz University

Dr. Iwona Kordzińska-Nawrocka, University of Warsaw

Dr. Stanisław Meyer, Jagiellonian University

Dr. Kōichi Kuyama

Dr. Anna Zalewska, University of Warsaw

Rada naukowa / Research council / 研究顧問会

Prof. Romuald Huszcza, University of Warsaw, Jagiellonian University

Prof. Agnieszka Kozyra, University of Warsaw, Jagiellonian University

Prof. Alfred F. Majewicz, Adam Mickiewicz University

Prof. Mikołaj Melanowicz, University of Warsaw

Prof. Ewa Pałasz-Rutkowska, University of Warsaw

Prof. Eстера Żeromska, Adam Mickiewicz University

Silva Iaponicarum
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza
Katedra Orientalistyki, Zakład Japonistyki
ul. 28 Czerwca 1956 nr 198
61-485 Poznań, Poland
E-mail: silvajp@amu.edu.pl
www.silvajp.amu.edu.pl

SPIS TREŚCI / CONTENTS / 目次

Dawid Głównia The Zigomar Scandal and the Film Censorship System in Japan	11
Aleksandra Jarosz Polysemic Values of Native Japanese Lexemes in the Light of <i>wago</i> Heterography	34
STRESZCZENIA / SUMMARIES / 要約	53
AUTORZY / CONTRIBUTORS / 投稿者	56
PRACE NADSYŁANE / FOR CONTRIBUTORS / 投稿	58

The Zigomar Scandal and the Film Censorship System in Japan

Scandal is a Janus-faced phenomenon. Perceived in general categories as a conscious performative practice or unintended effect of certain circumstances, it (almost) never fails to draw attention, elicit discussion, and – in some cases – contribute to transformations in socio-cultural and institutional order. On the other hand, its particular, historically rooted manifestations tend to devaluate and become obsolete in quite a short period of time. Today it is hard to imagine a person who would be shocked by *The Catcher in the Rye*, and it is even more difficult to regard transgressive cinema in the style of John Waters as anything more than a tasteless joke. Social context, historical background, zeitgeist – these are the keywords in the analysis of scandals, both past and present. No less important is the issue of spatial – geographical and cultural – distance. What might be viewed as outrageous in the perception of one society may not even be worthy of perfunctory interest, let alone any kind of serious debate or preventive actions in another. Although this is most evident at a transcontinental level, where cultural differences are significant, it may also be observed in the case of societies which are part of a larger cultural group. One can easily exemplify this by pointing out Italian exploitation movies, easily produced and exported, but then blocked *en masse* by British film censors (the ill-famed list of so-called “video nasties” banned by the *Video Recordings Act* of 1984).

The scandal caused by the Japanese premiere of French *Zigomar* series is worthy of an in-depth study because of its far-reaching consequences for both the Japanese movie industry and Japanese discourse of cinema. To comprehend its essence requires analysis of its context(s): historical, political, social, cultural and legislative. Only then we will be able to answer the question: Why did this series – perceived as harmless entertainment and appreciated both by mass audiences and members of intellectual and artistic circles in Europe – elicit such disgust, outrage, dread and hysteria in Japan. The problem is complex and can be discussed with reference to a set of interrelated issues:

a) the shaping of modern Japan and policies regulating transformation from an anachronistic decentralised feudal country into a centralised industrial nation-state, determining both short and long-term goals of these processes and defining means which might contribute to their achievement.

- b) the transformation and diversification of lifestyles and leisure activities of modern Japanese people, particularly the emergence of the cinema as a form of mass entertainment,
- c) the development of the Japanese movie industry and its gradual transition from an exhibition-oriented model (in which theatre owners play a dominant role) into a production-oriented model (in which movie producers play a dominant role),
- d) reflection on the immanent properties of the cinema – its uniqueness in comparison to the pre-existing media,
- e) the press and its relations with the cinema,
- f) the evolution of legislative discourse applied to the cinema and its censorship.

In the following parts of this article I will concentrate on three key issues: the state's policies toward the cinema, the media storm triggered by the press, and the transformations within the scope of the legislative system.

From Detectives to Masterminds of Crime: Crime Film Serials

Theatrical film serials, identified as one of the precursors of the modern television serial (Stachówna 1994: 73), emerged at the turn of the first and the second decade of the twentieth century. This internally diverse formula is a testimony to the movie industry's transition from a one-reel film model (approximately 15 minutes in length) into cinematographic products not only longer but also more complex in terms of plot, narrative strategies and structure.

Within the formula of the film serial we may distinguish two variants: the film series, composed of relatively independent films connected solely by the main character and general theme, and the theatrical serial, in which one main story arc is divided into a number of episodes. These films were screened in chronological order, usually biweekly but sometimes on a more irregular basis. A separate issue is the structure of particular movies constituting the film series. Despite being intended as a generic whole (that is: a single movie), for technical reasons they were divided into several episodes, each equivalent to one reel of film. This allowed film entrepreneurs to screen them both as a feature film and serial. For example: the first installment of the *Fantômas* series – the three-episode *Fantômas: In the Shadow of the Guillotine* (*Fantômas I: À l'ombre de la guillotine*, 1913) – could have been exhibited in one movie theatre as a multiple-reel feature film while in another in the form of weekly episodes: *The Theft at the Royal Palace Hotel* (*Le Vol du Royal Palace Hotel*), *The*

Disappearance of Lord Beltham (La Disparition de Lord Beltham) and *By the Guillotine (Autour de l'échafaud)*.

The French serial film has developed a number of models such as literary adaptation, melodrama or crime film. The latter emerged in 1908 when Victorin-Hippolyte Jasset, an Éclair employee, created a six-episode series *Nick Carter, The King of Detectives (Nick Carter, le roi des détectives)*, based on American dime novels issued in France by the German publishing house Eichler. In the following years Jasset wrote and directed a number of Nick Carter sequels and series in others genres. With the premiere of *Zigomar, King of Thieves (Zigomar, roi des voleurs)*, held in September 1911, Jasset revolutionised the formula of the crime film series by introducing a new type of hero. In contrast to Nick Carter, protector of law and order, Zigomar was a thoroughbred mastermind of crime. It is worth noting that the cinematographic turn toward criminals had its source in literature where similar change had been initiated at the end of the twentieth century by Ernest William Hornung, Arthur Conan Doyle's brother-in-law. He acknowledged, that the formula of the detective novel had become tired with overuse and so re-vitalised the genre by focusing on the criminal instead of the lawman, thus bringing to life the character Arthur J. Raffles – a gentleman safe cracker. (Gunning 2005: 256-257). Zigomar himself was originally a literary character appearing in the serial novel published by the Paris-based newspaper *Le Matin*.

Although Zigomar and Carter were fighting on opposite sides of the barricade they shared certain similarities: both were used to utilizing various camouflage techniques and seemed to be preternaturally invulnerable and able to overcome death (this was archived by a narrative device in which what seemed to be a definitive demise at the end of previous episode was redefined in a sequel as something less than fatal) (Gunning 2004: 136-137). Nick Carter had appeared in the first installment of *Zigomar* and its follow-up, *Nick Carter versus Zigomar (Zigomar contre Nick Carter)*, released on March 20, 1912. One year later, Zigomar returned for the last time in *Zigomar the Eelskin (Zigomar peau d'anguille)*. As the series was highly lucrative, *Zigomar the Eelskin* was not intended as its finale. This is indicated by the film's quasi-open ending in which Rosaria – Zigomar's henchwoman – smiles and blinks toward the camera implying that their apprehension by the authorities is only temporary. Sequels, however, were not produced, because Léon Sazie, author of the literary original, sued Jasset and Éclair for excessive alteration of the source material (Abel 1998: 367).

After Jasset's death the formula was further developed by Louis Feuillade, a Gaumont employee. The main attraction of his *Fantômas* film series (1913-1914), adapted from novels by Marcel Allain and Pierre Souvestre, and serial *The Vampires* (*Les Vampires*, 1915-1916) was a sinister master of deception clearly inspired by the Zigomar character. *Judex* (1917-1918), his second most famous serial, featured a masked avenger who fought crime employing a number of unorthodox methods, including camouflage in the style of both Nick Carter and Zigomar. The practice of copying elements of pre-existing plots and characters present in these works can be derived directly from *Fantômas*'s literary original, as due to the demanding contractual obligations (one novel of over 380 pages per month) Allain and Souvestre used to create similar stories, recycle elements of their previous projects and plagiarise intrigues from adventures of Arsène Lupin, Joseph Rouletabille and Zigomar (Waltz 2000: 52-53).

The immense popularity of crime film serials almost immediately spread beyond France's borders. Soon film companies in other countries adapted the new format and began producing their own serial films such as – to name just a few – the British *Lieutenant Daring* (1911-1914), the Danish *Dr. Gar El Hama* (1911-1918), the Italian *Za La Mort* (1914-1924) and the American *The Iron Claw* (1916).

Unexpected Success, Unintentional Scandal: *Zigomar* in Japan

The formula of the crime film was introduced to Japan by *Zigomar, King of Thieves* which opened in Asakusa's Kinryūkan theatre on November 11, 1911. What is interesting is that initially its importer – the Fukuhōdō company – had been reluctant to release the movie and decided to do so later, only to fill in a gap in its theatres' repertoire created by the shortage of other products due to problems with shipping. Back then, however, the importing of movies that would then subsequently be left on the shelves was not all that extraordinary.

At that time it was a common practice within the Japanese movie industry to either import movies *en masse* without their prior screening (which was based on the assumption that every multiple-film package would contain some films of low commercial value but also a few potential blockbusters), or delegate a company's representative abroad in order to acquire the most promising foreign movies (which reduced the risk of importing worthless products, but also entailed greater operational costs).

In this particular case, Fukuhōdō applied the second strategy - *Zigomar, King of Thieves* was one of the movies purchased by its employee Suzuki Yō whilst on a business trip to London. The company management

however was less than enthusiastic about the movie. Up to this date there is no consensus among film scholars regarding the reasons for the management's reluctance to screen *Zigomar, King of Thieves* (Makino 2001: 58-61). Most sources suggest that company owners were concerned about the film's criminal subject matter and the risk of police intervention. Nevertheless, some scholars – e.g. Yoshida Chiezō – indicate that they simply found such an unorthodox picture devoid of any entertainment (hence: commercial) value and that during the test screening some of the executives fell asleep out of boredom. Whatever the reasons for withholding the premiere, the fact remains that it turned out to be an unexpected success and the source of the first scandal experienced by Japan's fledgling movie industry.

As initially no-one had forecasted the movie's success and exhibitors had no experience in promoting such products, Yamamoto Kichitarō – manager of Kinryū-kan – applied an unconventional marketing strategy. Not only did he introduce the *karakana* title – *Jigoma* (ジゴマ) for the first time in the history of the Japanese film industry, but he also ordered his employees to prepare billboards filled solely with Zigomar's face and a caption with the character's name. A noteworthy fact is that a similar approach had been previously adopted in France during the marketing of both Zigomar's literary and film cinematographic incarnations. The publication of Léon Sazie's novel was preceded by a publicity campaign which used posters inscribed solely with Zigomar's name. The first advertisements of the film adaptation contained only a contorted face on black background shouting "Zigomar" (Gunning 2004: 137-138).

The film's marketing strategy, based on minimalism and mystery, turned out to be spot on – vast crowds of intrigued spectators flooded Kinryūkan and the theatre noted a record-breaking opening. The scale of *Zigomar's* success may be demonstrated by pointing out that the film's theatrical run was extended to over a month and a half despite the fact that at that time an average cinema's repertoire was changed on a weekly basis, and that the theatre's daily income varied from 800 to 1,000 yen, which is extraordinary in itself as Kinryūkan's rent was 600 yen per month. Perhaps it is even more spectacular if we consider that, with the price of admission set at 50 sen, the total number of daily visitors had to vary from 1,600 to 2,000. According to recollections of Fukuhōdō's executive of the time, Kobayashi Kisaburō, the net profit for the monthly screening of the film was about 8,000 yen (Makino 2001: 58-59).

Japanese studios recognised the commercial potential of crime films and began to capitalise on Zigomar's success by creating local imitations such

as *New Zigomar* (*Shin Jigoma*) produced by M.Pathé, *Japanese Zigomar* (*Nihon Jigoma*) and *The Record of Zigomar's Reformation* (*Jigoma Kaishinroku*) by Yoshizawa Shōten and *Great Detective Zigomar* (*Jigoma Daitantei*) by Fukuhōdō. The main difference between the strategies of Japanese producers and their Western counterparts was that the former did not even bother to pretend that they were not plagiarizing original work by changing their villain's name, as the risk of copyright infringement lawsuit was virtually non-existent (despite the existence of copyright law there were no formal copyright enforcement agencies in Japan up to 1925 [Yecies, Shim 2006: 4]). The popularity of Zigomar was so great that on the night of October 4, 1912 four of the major movie theatres in Asakusa were showing one of the Japanese variations on the character (Gerow 2010: 54). A few months earlier, the Japanese audience had an opportunity to see the second installment of the original series, which premiered in Japan on May 1, 1912. The phenomenal success of Zigomar did not pass unnoticed by the publishing industry and soon movies were followed by their novelizations and independent works inspired by them.

This period of liberty, however, did not last for long. The Zigomar craze drew the attention of bureaucrats and intellectuals and thus a debate on cinema and its alleged negative influence on minors began. Although this opinion had been articulated for the first time in educational circles at the beginning of 1911, it gained wider resonance only after educators were joined by the press which initiated a campaign against Zigomar-like films and urged for them to be banned. A key role in these activities was played by the *Tōkyō Asahi Shinbun* newspaper.

The newspaper's campaign was carried out in two stages. The first was initiated in February 1912 by the publication of a ten-part series of articles entitled *Motion Pictures and Children* (*Katsudō shashin to jidō*) (Salomon 2002: 141). At this point Zigomar was not singled out directly, as the threat was defined as a general category of cinema as a whole. This situation changed on October 4, 1912 with the commencement of a publication of an eight-part series of highly critical articles devoted solely to the Zigomar phenomenon. The argumentation of the critics ran along several lines which will be discussed in more detail in the following parts of this article. At this point it is sufficient to indicate that it focused on the cinema's supposed ability to inspire audience members to commit copycat crimes based on what they had seen on screen.

The press achieved its goal. On October 9, 1912 the Tokyo Metropolitan Police enacted a ban on the screening of movies featuring the Zigomar character or inspired by them, but allowed films that had already acquired

permission for screening to stay in theatres' repertoires until the 20th of October (Gerow 2010: 55). Tokyo's example was soon followed by other cities. Although Zigomar disappeared from screens, he did not leave the minds of the Japanese people. The popular fictional mastermind of crime tended to resurface in subsequent press articles and discussions on the necessity of developing more efficient censorship procedures, which led to the establishment of autonomous and centralised regulations in the field of film censorship.

Due to the switch of interest from specific title(s) to the problem of general film regulations, anti-Zigomar sentiments gradually weakened to a point where in September 1914 *Zigomar the Eelskin* was screened in Japan. However, this happened with a relatively long delay after the film's French premiere which was held on March 21, 1913. What is more, prior to releasing the film to the public the importer had engaged in auto-censorship, mainly within the scope of intertitles.

At this point it is necessary to emphasise that restrictive censorship (or *post factum* censorship, as opposed to preventive censorship) applied to the cinema was not anything new in Japan. First references to such practices come from 1897 when the police in Tochigi Prefecture issued a ban on Edison's *Annabelle's Butterfly Dance* (1894) on the grounds of public morality. (Makino 2001: 47-48) The uniqueness of Zigomar's case lies not in the fact of the enactment of a ban but its premises and consequences.

As I have noted in the first part of article, the scandal that arose around the *Zigomar* film series is worthy of an in-depth study precisely because of its profound consequences for both the Japanese movie industry and Japanese discourse of cinema. If the whole affair had concluded with the banning of the problematic productions it would have been nothing more than historical trivia. At best it might have served as yet another one of the countless illustrations of the problem of cultural differences. The "Zigomar Scandal" may be perceived that way too – after all it is a fine and clear example of how exactly the same product is evaluated differently by members of two different societies – but then its analysis does not exceed the realm of banality. In contrast, when treated as a whole, with all of its prerequisites and effects, it emerges as one of the turning points in the history of Japanese cinema.

Condemned before Proven Guilty: Sources of the Scandal

The first installment of the *Zigomar* series stormed the Japanese screens at a critical moment in the emergence of the cinema as an independent medium. To a certain extent, the scandal that followed the boom in crime

films was less the effect of the properties, both actual and alleged, of the original production and its imitation, than of a more general atmosphere surrounding the cinema and the gradual changes in its perception. Had a similar film arrived in Japan three years earlier, it would have most likely been removed from the screens without extensive media coverage, the movie industry would have treated it as an element of occupational risk, the authorities would not have devoted further attention to this matter, and – what is most important – issuing a ban would not have provided an impulse for the systematic transformation of film regulations.

By the beginning of the 1910s it had become obvious that the cinema was neither a mere technical novelty nor a short-lived sensation, but a permanent component of the modern world. The first permanent movie theatres came into existence in Japan at the beginning of the twentieth century, usually by the transformation of previously existing facilities – e.g. Kinki-kan had been converted from a live theatre to a film theatre in 1900 (Desser 2000: 10), three years later the same happened to Denki-kan, originally established as a hall where the phenomenon of electricity (jap. “denki”) was presented (Domenig 2010; High 1984: 31-32). By the end of 1912 in Tokyo alone there were – according to various estimates – from 40 to 70 permanent cinemas (Salomon 2002: 144), not to mention temporary movie theatres and facilities that screened films in addition to other forms of entertainment, such as *kabuki*, *yose* (寄席, Japanese variation of the vaudeville) and *rensageki* (連鎖劇, “chain-drama” – hybrid performative art developed in the first decade of the twentieth century which integrated short film segments into live theatre). The rapid expansion of infrastructure was the response to the steady but swift increase in popularity of cinema as a form of leisure in terms of both average number of admissions and social diversification of audience.

Although cinema was recognised as a permanent facet of the social landscape, it was still an enigma in terms of its properties. As the existence of the new social phenomenon could not be denied, the centre of gravity of the ontology of cinema switched to questions such as „What is it?” and „What does it do?”. It is necessary to emphasise that these dilemmas were not exclusive to Japan. Japanese scientists were conducting experiments on the hypnotic properties of cinema and its impact on children’s sleep (nightmares and somnambulism) at the same time their Western counterparts were engaged in similar research. (Hase 1998: 92-94)

The second decade of the twentieth century was a time of in-depth reflection on the psychological and social properties of cinema. After a few years of speculating how movies affect the human psyche Hugo

Münsterberg published his conclusions in 1916 on the pages of *The Photoplay: A Psychological Study* (Helman 2010: 21-28). Around the same time Vachel Lindsay reflected on the social properties of the cinema (Lindsay 2000: 116-125, 139-144, 150-160) and later argued that its most significant function is the ability to convert diversified masses into a uniform American nation, claiming that:

The whole nervous psychology of the American race has (...) been completely revolutionized. More and more hieroglyphics and more speed, are making one nation of all the tribes and tongues under this government, and really making them one separate tribe (Lindsay, Lounsbury 1995: 235).

Discussion about the educational and socialisation potential of cinema was also present within the movie industry. David Wark Griffith used to say that “film can impress upon people as much of the truth of history in an evening, as many months of study will accomplish” (Rosenstone 2006: 11-12). A little bit earlier, on Japanese soil, Gonda Yasunosuke came to similar conclusions. In *The Principles and Applications of Moving Picture* (*Katsudō shashin no genri oyobi ōyō*, 活動写真の原理及応用) he baptized cinema as “a vehicle for the new civilization” and foretold its role as a medium that concurrently provides masses with entertainment and increases their knowledge. Among the Japanese works devoted to the social aspects of cinema it is worth mentioning *The Study of the Mass Entertainment* (*Minshū goraku no kenkyū*, 民衆娯楽の研究) published in 1920 by Tachibana Takahiro, in which he analyzed relations between the cinema and issues such as education, crime, legislation, juvenile problems and social conventions (Iwamoto 1987: 131).

The scandal that arose in Japan around the original *Zigomar* and its imitations cannot be fully explained solely by pointing out the changes in cinema’s status and the parallel interest of scientists in its socio-psychological aspects. After all, analogous trends appeared in Europe and USA and yet they were not followed – at least at that time – by such ferocious criticism of the new medium and demands for its rigorous control. What is more, the *Zigomar* series was highly popular in nearly all Western countries. So far in this article, we have explored the sphere of the context, not the direct sources of the scandal. These ought to be sought in two interrelated yet relatively independent issues: the authorities’ ambitions to utilise cinema to achieve political goals and the activities of the press.

At the threshold of the Era (1868-1912), the Japanese authorities faced a serious dilemma concerning the shape of the new – at that time: nascent – Japan. The key issue was the relation between desirable transformations in the spheres of politics, economy and technology and socio-cultural changes. The most important question was whether becoming a modern state and obtaining a strong position in the international arena requires the ubiquitous acceptance of western customs. Using the terminology proposed by Samuel P. Huntington (1996: 72-76) we may say that Japan’s solution to this problem was embarking on a path of “reformism”, an intermediate model between the two extremes – “rejectionism” (rejection of both modernization and Westernization) and “kemalism” (acceptance of both trends; term coined after Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’s socio-political reforms of Turkey in 1920s and 1930s).

The reformist attitude of the authorities was clearly visible in rejecting the radical postulate “Escape Asia, Enter Europe” (*datsua nyūō*, 脱亜入欧), coined by Fukuzawa Yukichi, in favour of “Japanese spirit and Western technology” (*wakon yōsai*, 和魂洋才), derived from the writings of Yoshizawa Tadayasu. The most important consequence of adopting this ideology was an attempt to create the new Japanese citizen – one that was able to assimilate Western knowledge, efficiently operate Western technology, and actively contribute to the process of modernization, yet faithful to the Japanese spirit, tradition and established relations of authority.

The ideological framework that laid the foundations of the new Japan was broad and complex, yet for the purposes of this article it is sufficient enough to point out three of its elements. The most important was the concept of *kazoku kokka* (家族国家, family-state) which transposed family relations, especially in the scope of hierarchy and authority, first on the level of the nation (the emperor as the head of the family, citizens as obedient children) and later the whole of East Asia (Japan as the head of the Asian family). As rapid economic and technological progress required citizens willing to acquire new skills and delay gratification, the government propagated the doctrine of self-improvement or self-cultivation (*shūyō shugi*, 修養主義) and the cult of success (*risshin shusseshugi*, 立身出世主義). All these actions were aimed at the formation of national identity and the implantation of the ideals of the nation’s mission.

The political and intellectual leaders of the Meiji Restoration soon realised that popular culture could be used to achieve policy goals. Thus, the elites postulated the elevation of popular entertainment and its utilization as a

means of education and enlightenment. Before cinema came to Japan this postulate had been implemented into *kabuki* theatre which – according to advocates of its reform – was to become “the classroom of the unlettered” (High 1984: 30).

Towards the end of the 1870s Ichikawa Danjūrō IX and Kawatake Mokuami introduced an experimental form of *kabuki* – *katsurekigeki* (活歴劇), “living-history plays” or “plays where history is brought to life”. The basic idea of *katsurekigeki* was to place greater attention on the historical accuracy of plays in terms of the course of events, characters and costumes. It set a precedence in the world of Japanese theatre by allowing outsiders to contribute to the creative process when two historians provided data for the play devoted to the life of Tokugawa Ieyasu (Powell 2000: 8).

Theatre reform movements of the 1880s and 1890s, however, argued that the new didactic function of *kabuki* should not be limited to providing audiences with factual knowledge. In particular, the Society for Theatre Reform (*Engeki Kairyōkai*, 演劇改良会) established, among others, by the then Prime Minister Itō Hirobumi, Foreign Minister Inoue Kaoru and Minister of Education Mori Arinori, and chaired by Itō’s son-in-law, Suematsu Kenchō (Poulton 2010: 3), underlined *kabuki*’s edifying function and perceived it – after the necessary elimination of stage indecency and elements incompatible with the new socio-political order – as a theatre of moral inspiration. The government articulated similar aspirations in the field of literature which was appreciated by a significant portion of intellectuals.

The idea of utilising entertainment for educational purposes was fully developed in the conception of “popular education” (*tsūzoku kyōiku*, 通俗教育) introduced by Komatsubara Eitarō, Minister of Education in the second cabinet of Katsura Tarō (1908–1911). In contrast to the radical ideas of these of theatre reformers who perceived *kabuki* as a school for the illiterate, popular education was envisioned not as an independent way of obtaining knowledge and morals but as supplementary to formal education. Originally, Komatsubara and his associates intended to limit the legislative and administrative measures related to the concept of *tsūzoku kyōiku* entirely to those with a positive character – the promotion of desired trends in film-making and the recommendation of works recognised as educationally valuable. This, however, proved to be insufficient.

In the last year of his tenure, Komatsubara founded Popular Education Investigation Committee (*Tsūzoku Kyōiku Chōsa Iin Kai*, 通俗教育調査委員会) in order to explore the possibilities of the educational use of popular

literature, public lectures, lantern slides (*utsushie*, 写し絵) and motion pictures. In November 1911, the committee published a preliminary report of its findings which contained, among other things, information about inspection procedures of motion pictures and the measures of promotion of those found educationally valuable. The initiation of the process of obtaining the committee's approval remained in the remit of movie producers, marketers and exhibitors. According to newly developed provisions they were required to file an application accompanied by a copy of the film and its documentation (the catalogue description and transcription of narration delivered during the screenings). Movies which had received the committee's authorization (in some cases after necessary alterations) could bear the seal "Approved by the Popular Education Investigation Committee" and their titles, along with the names of applicants, were to be made public through the official law gazette *Kanpō* (官報) (Makino 2001: 52-53).

The recognition of popular culture as an educational platform able to promote positively valorised values, knowledge, attitudes and habits is inextricably linked with the opposite observation, that is the recognition of the possibilities of its negative impact on both individuals and society – the promotion of values conflicting with the existing social order, the transfer of dangerous knowledge, the legitimization of undesirable attitudes and encouragement for undertaking activities contrary to the interests of the authorities. From the government's perspective, popular culture was able to effectively fulfil its tasks only after eliminating its harmful elements. Hence, the third section of the committee's report urged for an introduction of the negative means of cinema's control in terms of both a film's content and screening conditions. Among the problems diagnosed by the investigation committee were the inappropriate hygienic and moral conditions in theatres, exposure to improper Western customs, uneducated film interpreters and indecent songs accompanying the projection (Salomon 2002: 146). Thus, the conclusion of the film section stated that everyone should be encouraged not to show movies to children and in cases when this was impossible it was necessary to obey the various points of caution (Makino 2001: 54-55).

Although the committee was successful in achieving some of its plans (e.g. in 1912 *Kanpō* began to publicise titles of movies considered educationally valuable), its activities did not gain wide resonance. Since its foundation, the committee had struggled with staff and infrastructural shortcomings resulting from a too hasty involvement in the film inspection. Far more important, however, was the fact that by the time the committee solved its

internal problems the public debate over the cinema had already switched to more restrictive areas. Under pressure from the press, the Tokyo Metropolitan Police twice – in 1912 and 1917 – issued film regulations focused on preventive censorship and the restrictions of movie viewing by certain segments of the audience. Paradoxically, the Popular Education Investigation Committee had provided press discourse with arguments against the cinema, but the latter – mainly because it used more categorical statements – had a far greater impact on the public debate and relegated the issue of the educational potential of film to its outer edge.

Before discussing the activities of the press it is worth noting that the Ministry of Education never abandoned hopes for the active use of the new medium nor ceased to develop new soft means of guiding the production strategies of film companies and repertoire choices of cinema managers. In 1920, the ministry introduced the Film Recommendation System (*Eiga Suisen Seido*, 映画推薦制度) in which movies that were recognised as especially valuable were promoted in the ministerial gazette and were given the privilege of special screenings. The best of these movies were annually awarded with the Medal for Superior Films (*Yūryō Eiga Shōhai*, 優良映画賞牌) (Salomon 2002: 150-151). The practice of public recommendation of films contributing to the development and elevation of “national culture” (*kokumin bunka*, 国民文化) was upheld even after the introduction of the Film Law (*Eiga hō*, 映画法) of 1939 under which the authorities obtained new prerogatives including a license to order the production of films on a specific topic. This is, however, quite a different story, so let us leave the problem of the ministry’s ambitions and focus on the second, more direct, source of the “Zigomar Scandal”.

The motives behind *Tōkyō Asahi Shinbun*’s furious reaction to the popularity of the *Zigomar* films still raise serious doubts. Its criticism of the cinema corresponded with the anxieties of many contemporary intellectuals of the time, especially those from educational circles, yet its scale seemed to be disproportionate to the actual problem. The newspaper did not limit itself to reporting on the controversy surrounding the cinema but contributed if not to its elicitation then at least to its intensification. There is no doubt that even without the complicity of the press, the system of film censorship would have eventually been developed and introduced, however, it would have been a much more drawn-out process. Hence it is reasonable to ask about the causes of the newspaper’s engagement in the campaign against the *Zigomar* film series and cinema in general.

It is probable that some journalists actually shared the concerns of educators. Nevertheless, what seems to be more important is a particular

economic factor – strong competition, both internal and external, within one medium (press) and between different media (press and cinema). In the first case the key issue is the specificity of the *Tōkyō Asahi Shinbun* which at that time tended to utilise a series of techniques characteristic to *yellow-journalism*: large number of illustrations, attention-grabbing headlines and sensational content of the articles. Although this observation is useful in explaining the form of the newspaper’s attack on cinema it has far less explanatory value with reference to its purposes. A more comprehensive understanding of that matter requires a discussion on the relations between the press and the cinema in that period.

By the beginning of the 1910s it became clear that cinema would soon become an equal rival to the press in the fight for Japanese souls and yen. The press, which had so far perceived itself as the sole mass-medium, faced the risk of losing customers. Thus, it made an attempt to polarise society into two categories: (press) readers and (film) spectators. The first group was valorised positively, while the second was attributed with solely negative traits in terms of both intellectual capabilities and morals. From *Tōkyō Asahi Shinbun*’s viewpoint, the cinema’s clientele differed from the rest of society from the start and the movies actually only intensified these differences. A picture of audiences almost abnormal in character, possessing addiction-prone personalities, and similar to “ants swarming around a piece of sweet sugar” (Gerow 2010: 58) emerged from the newspaper’s reports. The paper distanced itself – and consequently its readers – from regular movie-goers lacking in the spheres of intellect, emotions and morals. As “prisoners” of cinema were unable to free themselves due to their immanent infirmity, taking care of them became something of a moral imperative for enlightened citizens.

Tōkyō Asahi Shinbun’s criticism referred to three separate issues: the specificity of the movie industry, the conditions of film screenings, and the immanent properties of the cinema. The newspaper presented an image of the movie industry as a highly competitive environment where beating competitors and breaking previous box-office records were to be achieved at any price. Journalists also claimed that the entire space of film consumption was organised in such a way as to allow a joint attack on all of the spectator’s senses (first dazzling lights and strong colours, then almost complete darkness, a repulsive smell and a cacophony of sounds) even before screening, leading them to a state of mental unbalance and preparing them for the film’s hypnotic influence. This, in turn, was possibly due to a unique feature of the cinema, absent in other media, namely the ability to “surpass” fiction and turn it into reality. Enhanced by

the conditions present in cinema auditoriums, film was a form of “stimulation” (*shigeki*, 刺激) able to bypass the filtering functions of reason and directly affect the viewer’s character (ibid.: 55-58).

The newspaper’s crowning argument for the restrictive control of cinema was the claim that watching movies about Zigomar encouraged viewers, especially minors, to commit copycat crimes. “Once you see Zigomar, you cannot call it a detective film, but rather a film promoting crime or a film glorifying criminals” – ranted the author of an article published on October 7, 1912 (ibid.: 55). The best indicator of this rhetoric’s strength is the fact that it set the tone of Japanese film scholarship for several decades. Still, in 1979, Tanaka Jun’ichirō categorically stated that the screenings of films devoted to Zigomar resulted in production of scores of juvenile offenders (Makino 2001: 60). It was not until the systematic analysis of press articles from the 1910s, conducted over the last three decades by scholars such as Fujio Shigeo, Hase Masato and Aaron Gerow, that these opinions could be verified.

Fujio Shigeo argued that it is impossible to find a single article published before the removal of Zigomar films from the screens that directly ties them to any real crimes – that kind of association existed only in the minds of the journalists (ibid.: 61). Even after the enactment of the ban, newspapers tended to use generalities rather than give specific examples of the felonies inspired by Zigomar. What is more, even if they did so, these examples raise reasonable doubts. Hase Masato points out two such articles, published respectively in *Chūgai Shōgyō Shinpō* on October 15, 1912 and in *Jiji Shinpō* on October 25, 1912, reporting on the arrest of juvenile thieves fascinated by the fictional French robber, one of whom had even adopted the alias “New Zigomar” (Hase 1998: 90). In-depth analysis of the articles’ content, however, leads to the conclusion that none of the apprehended youths could have learned criminal techniques from the “demoralizing” productions – not only did they have a different *modus operandi* but they also embarked on a path of crime before they had the opportunity to see movies with the Zigomar character.

Media hype led to the creation of factoid – unverified belief in the criminogenic properties of the cinema. It is still unclear whether the press did it premeditatively or had simply over-interpreted facts by correlating two independent phenomena. The most radical position on that issue is presented by Hase Masato who claims that:

“The truth is that the *Tokyo Asahi Shinbun* and other newspapers invented the existence of *Zigomar* copycat crimes,

and the police subsequently banned this movie on the grounds of these papers' fabricated reports" (ibid.: 92).

Zigomar's Legacy: Japan's Film Censorship System

Whatever the reasons for the printed media's engagement in the anti-Zigomar campaign, the fact remains that its long-term effect was a fundamental transformation in the operating conditions of the Japanese movie industry. The introduction of the ban on *Zigomar* films was an *ad hoc* action, a decision made in the heat of the moment. However, the discussion that surrounded it convinced the authorities about the necessity of more systematic changes in the area of film regulations. It was recognised that the then-present legislative system was not just ineffective in terms of censorship but in general inadequate to regulate the new medium. After journalists had rebuked the police for allowing the *Zigomar* films to be screened in the first place, a representative of the Tōkyō Metropolitan Police explained:

At police headquarters looking at the original story of the French *Zigomar*, it was thought that there was nothing much to it. Even among works of this kind, if you inspect the moving picture license, you would think it is only a kind of child's play. That's why we approved it up until today thinking it had no effect on public morals. However, looking at the actual film, there is a world of difference from the explanation in both the scenery and the characters (Gerow 2001: 10).

In other words: the institution responsible for the censorship procedures gave permission to exhibit the film none of its members had ever seen. What is extremely important, however, is that no functionary neglecting his duties could be blamed as the source of this situation was purely systematic. Pre-existing regulations applied to the various forms of entertainment and art were thoughtlessly transposed to the cinema and did not require watching a theatrical play, spectacle or show before authorising its public performance – it was sufficient enough for the censor to familiarise himself with its summary, transcription of dialogues and narration script. After the outbreak of the “Zigomar Scandal” it became clear that this model was inadequate for the medium of film and that the censorship procedures had to be based on the principle of prior screening. This revolutionary approach was the consequence of the realisation that “moving pictures” are characterised by the lack of coherence between

fabular, textual and visual spheres. Movies depicting criminal activities were supposed to have an impact on audiences precisely because, despite condemning the crime by intertitles, narration and general storyline, visual images alone send contradictory messages, were open to different interpretations or even “tore” themselves away from the film and independently affected the mind of the spectator.

The concept of the cinema as an autonomous phenomenon, characterised by significant qualitative differences from the other media, was developed only after a lively debate on its negative properties and the necessity to implement effective means of its control. We may even say that the cinema had been identified as the problem before it was identified as the cinema. As Aaron Gerow notes:

The history of discourse on the moving pictures in Japan as a specific object began only with the realization that [previous] discourse was inadequate to define or accommodate its object. Such a realization itself was not sufficient to generate a discourse on the motion pictures: it had to be linked to a description of the medium as a social problem in need of solution. (Gerow 2010: 65)

Fundamental reorientation in terms of film regulations after the “Zigomar Scandal” was not limited to the constation that censorship procedures ought to be based on the prior screening of the film. In fact it required the *creation* of film regulations which were *de facto* non-existent at the time as well as the unification and centralization of general censorship provisions as previously they remained in the remit of local authorities. It is sufficient to say that prior to the outbreak of the scandal there were no nationwide laws relating exclusively to the cinema. Certain aspects of the cinema subjected to various nationwide legislative acts such as the *Copyright Law* of 1889 (amended in 1910), the *Copyright Regulation Procedures* of 1910, the *Publication Law* of 1893, *Regulations for Advertising* of 1911, the *Military Vehicle Protection Law* of 1899 and *Rules for Military Ports* of 1900, nonetheless none of these acts were designed specially for the cinema. As for censorship: the only nationwide rules of this type were custom regulations which prohibited the importing of works (including films) desecrating the dignity of the imperial house, inciting the abolition of the system of private property, documenting the activities of international communist groups *etc.* (Makino 2001: 48-50).

As the cinema had not yet been identified as a medium of immanent properties requiring the development of independent regulations, initially it had been located within the legislative area relating to live theatre and *misemono* (見世物). *Misemono* (literally: “show” or “exhibition”) is a complex conceptual category coined in the Edo period (1603-1868) in reference to the diverse performative practices presented in roadside tents and at stands. This broad term accommodated, among other things, juggling tricks, acrobatic shows, storytelling, amateur theatre (“beggar’s *kabuki*”), *saiku* (細工, fancy craftsmanship), freak-shows (“demon girl”, “bear boy”, “testicle girl”), exhibitions of exotic animals (tigers, camels, elephants) and presentations of Western technical novelties (telescope, X-Ray) (Markus 1985). Shortly after its arrival in Japan, films were shown both in live theatres and *misemono* stands.

The decentralization of the censorship system meant that the smallest unit able to issue and enforce its own regulations was a local police station. While it worked in less urbanised prefectures and smaller towns it proved to be inefficient in the bigger cities, as in extreme cases the differences in the regulations occurred already at the level of city districts. What is more, as the license for screening was not respected in juridical areas other than those in which permission was given, the same film was usually subjected to at least several independent censorship procedures.

The process of the development of centralised regulations coincided with the general policy of the Meiji government aimed at a gradual transformation of the remnants of the feudal clan system, local in its nature, into a modern state based on centralized bureaucratic apparatus. There is no doubt that this process would have eventually encompassed the cinema but it would have happened much later, after more urgent issues were dealt with. The “Zigomar Scandal” led to a reevaluation of priorities by identifying the cinema as an important social problem.

Although the defectiveness of excessive decentralization of film censorship had been noticed in some places prior to the Zigomar case – as evidenced by the fact that the police headquarters in Toyko and Osaka had issued similar internal guidelines for moving picture regulations subsequently in October 1910 and July 1911 – it was not until the press campaign was launched that the activities leading to the development of nationwide film censorship rules were intensified. On October 13, 1912 the *Tōkyō Asahi Shinbun* published Tokyo’s police internal guidelines. According to these rules no screening permission should be given to films that fall into at least one of these categories:

1. Based on a story which has as its essential point matters dealing with adultery.
2. Elements having a tendency to support or make attractive the means and methods of crime.
3. Elements extending into cruelty.
4. Elements extending into obscenity, or those that feature matters dealing with love that in particular are feared to incite feeling of lust.
5. Elements tending to deviate from morality, which are feared to give rise to mischief among children, or which prompt ill feelings.
6. Elements which recklessly satirize current affairs and are feared to harm public peace. (Makino 2001: 65)

As Aaron Gerow underlines:

The sections covering adultery, cruelty, obscenity, and morality differed little from the theatre regulations in force at the time. What had changed in confronting the problem of film was the perception that cinematic works could not only offend established sensibilities or directly harm public morals but also strongly induce objectionable behaviour in spectators, especially in certain sectors of the audience. This was a problem thought specific to cinema (Gerow 2010: 63).

These guidelines had an interim character and as such were merely the starting point for the development of legislative acts that tended to treat the cinema in a more comprehensive manner. The first of such acts was the *Rules of the Management of Motion Picture Entertainment (Katsudō shashin kōgyō torishimari kisoku, 活動写真興行取締規則)* enacted by the Tokyo Metropolitan Police in August 1917.

Although the basic criteria for application examination differed slightly from those present in previous internal guidelines, greater emphasis was put on the fact that the basis for the evaluation should be the film's prior screening. New regulations introduced a licensing system for the film narrators, yet three more years had to pass until police started to execute it by holding certifying examinations (Fujiki 2006: 78). Film theatres had to be segregated, with separate seating sections for men and women, and the billboards were to be controlled by the police in order to prevent

misleading or salacious advertising (Freiberg 2000). Initially, all of the feature movies exhibited in theatres had to be classified into one of two categories – *kō* (甲), allowed to be viewed by spectators aged fifteen or older, and *otsu* (乙), suitable for audiences of all ages. This requirement, however, was dropped in 1920 due to the lobbying of film business representatives who allegedly registered a decrease of up to fifty percent in the number of customers (Salomon 2002: 149-150). As can be seen, the architects of the *Rules of the Management of Motion Picture Entertainment* tried to encompass all aspects of cinema – from film content, through its narration, to conditions of screening. Soon, the remaining 46 prefectures adopted regulations based on Tokyo's provisions, however nearly all of them deviated to some extent from the source model.

For almost eight years film censorship remained in the remit of the prefectural authorities. However, the rapid growth of the movie industry eventually induced the Home Ministry to centralise and standardise film regulations. Thus, in May 1925 *Motion Picture Film Inspection Regulations* (Katsudō Shashin “Furumu” Ken'etsu Kisoku, 活動写真「フィルム」検閲規則) were announced. The conduct of film inspection was delegated to ministerial officials. After the obligatory viewing of the film and the reading of its narrative script they decided whether it was suitable for screening or not. Permission was given for a period of three years and was binding throughout the entire country (Kasza 1993: 55). In contrast to their predecessors, the 1925 regulations did not contain articles devoted to conditions in movie theatres, audiences and narrators. As Aaron Gerow notes:

The 1925 censorship codes were the first in Japan to truly define the moving picture text as separate from the realm of exhibition (...). National censorship in effect declared exhibition irrelevant in judging the meaning of film (Gerow 2001: 27).

Demarcated Boundaries: The Movie Industry and New Regulations

Film regulations of 1917 and 1925 may be perceived as predecessors of more restrictive Film Law (*Eigahō*, 映画法) of 1939 by which Japanese government guaranteed itself total control over the film industry and subordinated cinema to the goals of national policy. On the other hand, despite obvious differences in details and circumstances, introduction of film censorship system was universal trend in the history of every national cinema which – at least to some extent – contributed to the establishment

of marute and rationally managed film industry. Thus analysis of enactment of 1917 and 1925 film regulations solely in the categories of political interests inevitably leads to excessive simplification.

Paradoxically, at this stage of development of Japanese film regulations (1910s and 1920s), the biggest winner was not the government – which obtained a means of control over the medium that was able to mould public opinion and serve as a propaganda tool – but the Japanese movie industry. This statement may be contested by some readers as currently – especially in the Western societies – censorship is negatively valorised as a tool for social control and the suppression of freedom of expression. However, we must keep in mind that at that time the Japanese film industry – apart from some marginal exceptions – was not interested in contesting the dominant culture and ideology promoted by the authorities. Its ambition was purely and simply money-making. The introduction of a centralised film censorship system, based on unambiguous criteria, was in the industry's interests as it reduced the risk of investment in products that would not generate profits.

With the gradual formation of the studio system, modelled after the American pattern, this issue became more and more urgent. Rising production costs imposed thinking on a national scale which was hindered by the risk of not obtaining permission for screening (reduced by legal clarification) or obtaining it only in certain prefectures and cities, which was eliminated by the centralization of the law. What is more, as the requirement of applying for screening permission in the event of changing the location of a film's screening was removed, film companies gained greater flexibility in managing their products due to the significant reduction of time when they could not be used.

More importantly however, movie producers and importers finally knew what kind of films they could safely manufacture and distribute. Just as the scandal is a Janus-faced phenomena, the demarcation of boundaries is a Janus-faced activity – on the one side it is an undeniable restriction of freedom, yet on the other it is a pure form of defining the scope of liberty. "I forbid" is inextricably linked with "I permit". The enactment of centralised regulations reduced the area of ambiguity and allowed the Japanese film industry to rationalize its business strategy. After May 1925, no transgression could claim to be unconscious any longer.

References

Abel, Richard. 1998. *The Ciné Goes to Town: French Cinema, 1896-1914*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

- Desser, David. 2000. "Japan." In G. A. Kindem, ed. *The International Movie Industry*. Illinois: Southern Illinois University.
- Domenig, Roland. 2010. *A place with a view of the tower - Asakusa as a movie district* (<http://www.tokyoedoradio.org/Project/Symposia/Symposium03/Symposium03-keynoteSpeechDomenig/Symposium03-keynoteSpeechDomenig.html>)
- Freiberg Freda. 2000. "Comprehensive connections: The film industry, the theatre and the state in the early Japanese cinema". *Screening The Past* 11 (<http://www.latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/firstrelease/fr1100/ffffr11c.htm>)
- Fujiki, Hideaki. 2006. "Benshi as Stars: The Irony of the Popularity and Respectability of Voice Performers in Japanese Cinema" *Cinema Journal* Vol. 45 No 2, 68-84.
- Gerow, Aaron. 2001. "The World before the Images: Criticism, the Screenplay, and the Regulation of Meaning in Prewar Japanese Film Culture." In D. Washbourn, C. Cavanaugh, ed. *Word and Image in Japanese Cinema*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gerow, Aaron. 2010. *Visions of Japanese Modernity. Articulations of Cinema, Nation, and Spectatorship, 1895-1925*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Gunning, Tom. 2004. "The Intertextuality of Early Cinema: A Prologue to Fantômas." In R. Stam, A. Raengo, ed. *A Companion to Literature and Film*. Maiden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gunning, Tom. 2005. "Detective Films." In R. Abel, ed. *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Hase, Masato. 1998. "Cinemaphobia in Taishō Japan: Zigomar, delinquent boys and somnambulism." *Iconics* Vol. 4, 87-101.
- Helman, Alicja. 2010. "Hugo Münsterberg." In A. Helman, J. Ostaszewski, ed. *Historia myśli filmowej* (History of Film Thought). Gdańsk: Słowo / Obraz Terytoria.
- High, Peter B. 1984. "The Dawn of Cinema in Japan." *Journal of Contemporary History* No. 1, 23-57.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Iwamoto, Kenji. 1987. "Film Criticism and the Study of Cinema in Japan." *Iconics* Vol. 1, 129-146.
- Kasza, Gregory. 1993. *The State of the Mass Media in Japan 1918-1945*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lindsay, Vachel. 2000. *The Art of the Moving Picture*. New York: Modern Library.

- Lindsay, Vachel. Lounsbury, Myron. 1995. *The Progress and Poetry of the Movies: A Second Book of Film Criticism by Vachel Lindsay*, London: Scarecrow Press.
- Makino, Mamoru. 2001. "On the Conditions of Film Censorship in Japan before its Systematization." In A. Gerow, A. M. Nornes, ed. *In Praise of Film Studies: Essays in Honor of Makino Mamoru*. Yokohama: Kinema Club.
- Markus, A. L. 1985. "The Carnival of Edo – Misemono Spectacles from Contemporary Accounts". *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* Vol. 45 No 2, 499-541.
- Poulton, M. Cody. 2010. *A Beggar's Art: Scripting Modernity in Japanese Drama, 1900-1930*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Powell, Brian. 2000. *Japan's Modern Theatre. A Century of Continuity and Change*. London: Japan Library.
- Rosenstone, Robert A. 2006. *History on Film, Film on History*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Salomon, Harald. 2002. "Movie Attendance of Japanese Children and Youth. The Ministry of Education's Policies and the Social Diffusion of Cinema, 1910-1945." *Japonia Humboldtiana* 6, 141-166.
- Stachówna, Grażyna. 1994. "Seriale – opowieści telewizyjne" ("Serials – Television Stories"). In D. Czaja, ed. *Mitologie popularne: Szkice z antropologii współczesności* (Popular Mythologies: Essays on the Anthropology of Contemporaneity). Kraków: Universitas.
- Walz, Robin. 2000. *Pulp Surrealism: Insolent Popular Culture in Early Twentieth-Century Paris*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Yecies, Brian M., Shim, A. G. 2006. "Lost Memories of Korean Cinema: Film Policy During Japanese Colonial Rule, 1919-1937." *Asian Cinema* No 14(2), 75-90.

Polysemic Values of Native Japanese Lexemes in the Light of *wago* Heterography

In this paper I would like to reflect upon the polysemy of the native Japanese lexicon, also known as *wago*, as seen through the linguistic phenomenon of heterography. First, heterography will be briefly discussed, as this topic has been rather scarcely discussed in linguistic works outside Japan. Afterwards, I am going to provide a few examples of heterographic *wago* lexemes and analyze their heterograms from the semantic angle in order to indicate what differences in the meaning of a lexeme can be displayed via heterography.

What is Heterography?

Heterography can be translated as *dōkun'iji*, which refers to the phenomenon of different Chinese characters sharing the same *kun* reading within the Japanese writing system. However, the very term *heterography* itself might have a broader meaning to it, as it also embraces the Japanese term *dō'on'iji*, or different Chinese characters sharing the same *on* reading. Nevertheless, the sole object of my interest will be the part of heterography that comprises the *wago* lexemes, or the *kun* readings of Chinese characters. Below I quote the definition of the *dōkun'iji* type of heterography given by Sasahara.

“Among Chinese characters used in the Japanese writing system there is a group of such characters that share a common *kun* reading. Those readings sound the same and have similar meaning. We call this group the *dōkun'iji*.” (Sasahara 2008: 154)

Upon such a definition, however, there emerges a need to clarify slightly more strictly what exactly the expression ‘similar meaning’ refers to. In that respect I decided to set the boundary of ‘similar meaning’ and ‘dissimilar meaning’ between polysemy and homonymy. Yet this presents the further difficulty of grasping precisely the difference between the two. Definitions of both terms seem to be abundant and it is not an easy task to indicate what the formal differences between polysemy and homonymy should be, or even if there should be any, since some scholars doubt

whether there is any sense to distinguish one from another¹. However, since this discrimination seems crucial to the topic presented in this paper, I am going to borrow just one definition of polysemy and follow it throughout this discourse.

The aforementioned definition of polysemy was created by Kunihiro². He states wherein that a word should be called polysemic in case it meets all the following conditions: first, all of the ‘sub-meanings’ share the same phonetic value; second, the ‘sub-meanings’ all belong to the same word class and share an identical inflectional paradigm; third, all of the ‘sub-meanings’ are mutually related, or share the same ‘phenomenon element’ (*genshōso* in Japanese). On the other hand, if at least one of the aforementioned conditions is not met, then the given word (or, to be more exact, the lexeme) actually stands not for one single yet polysemic word, but for a plural number of homonymic words, whose meanings are perceived by the speakers of the given language as unrelated. The ‘phenomenon element’ is thought to be such an element of the extralinguistic world that is bound to the usage of the word and can be an object of human cognition. It could be for example a phenomenon, an event, an object or an activity; whatever it is, it should be a common feature for the speaker's perception of all the lexeme's ‘sub-meanings’, as well as the starting point for most of the meaning alternations within the lexeme, based on such techniques as metaphor or metonymy.

It is a task for a lexicologist or a lexicographer to decide if a given set of homophonic meanings should be thought of as a single polysemic lexeme or as multiply homonymic lexemes. Unfortunately, I am neither, and therefore due to my lack of appropriate competence and for the sake of keeping the paper concise I am going to rely in this regard on the lexicographic resources available to me. Which is to say that, when a given set of meanings (and heterograms, for that matter) is featured in a dictionary under the same entry, I shall consider it a single lexeme, whereas in the opposite case I will deem the set of meanings to be homonymic.

Such a lexicographic way to discern between polysemy and homonymy makes it possible and even convenient for a student of Japanese writing to disambiguate between the ‘pure’ (polysemic) heterography and the ‘apparent’ (homonymic) heterography. On the other hand, this disambiguation does not suffice in terms of the more universal aspect of

¹Polański 1999: 447.

²Kunihiro 1997: 175 – 176; Kunihiro 2006: 4 – 5.

heterography, i.e. the whereabouts of heterography as a phenomenon which may occur not only in the Japanese writing system, but in each and any writing system in general, be it phonetic or semantic. In this respect, I find there is a need to build a definition of heterography that would not be limited just to a translation of the Japanese *dōkun'iji* term, and would acquire a more general meaning.

One should assume that heterography is an antonym to homography, which also happens to be defined as the variation of homonymy within the graphic layer of a language³. Consequently, if homography refers to separate, different lexemes (i.e. different semantic-and/or phonetic-wise) sharing a single graphemic form, then heterography in its 'pure', actual shape should refer to one single lexeme differentiated by its various written forms. Obviously, the most vulnerable to this kind of heterography would be the semantic elements of a writing system (and since the semanticity of the Japanese writing system ranks very high, it is only natural that the graphemes of the system should be relatively prone to acquire some heterographic counterparts). Still, that is not to say that a solely phonetic sort of heterography – which means that the graphemic alternations are only made within the seemingly phonetic, non-semantic signs⁴ – does not exist; compare discrepancies between the spelling of British English and American English lexemes like 'colour – color' or 'flavour – flavor'.

It seems to be an appropriate point of argument to decide whether homographic lexemes can or cannot be of the same or related meaning, or if they can be homophonic. In my opinion a proper solution to this issue would be defining the two categories of 'quasi-homography', comprising all the lexemes of exactly the same spelling regardless of whether they are homophonic, homosemic or not, and 'pure' or 'strict' homography, wherein lexemes may belong on condition that they are neither homophonic nor homosemic. With heterography, then, it should be the opposite; a 'strictly' or 'purely' heterographic lexeme is consistent both in terms of the meaning (the 'sub-meanings' conveyed by the heterograms all belong to a single lexeme) and the phonetic form. This approach to the main characteristics of heterography and homography is summarized in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1. Comparison of the basic lexical features of homography and heterography.

³Polański 1999: 239; Lyons : 173 – 173.

⁴Cf. *phonetic semantic sign* and *phonetic non-semantic sign*, Gelb 1963: 250.

	homography	heterography
graphemics/spelling	+	-
phonetics/pronunciation	-	+
semantics/meaning	-	+

Legend: mark + means 'the same', mark – means 'different'.

All in all, the kind of heterography I intend to deal with in this paper comprises heterographic forms of writing a single lexical unit, with all the forms bound by a similar meaning. On the one hand, the Japanese writing system is a highly semantic script with a large number of characters conveying not only the sound, but also the meaning of the decoded unit of the language (be it a morpheme, a group of morphemes or even a whole lexeme; on the other hand, the Japanese language is phonetically quite simple, with the definite majority of V or CV syllable structures and limited ways in which the phonemes may be combined to form a syllable, hence the large number of homophonic lexemes in Japanese. Thus, an environment appropriate for heterography is created. Furthermore, it is due to the polysystemic nature of the Japanese script that the heterography of *wago* lexemes is possible. The Chinese characters used for writing *wago* lexemes have their own semantic values, originating from the initial meaning of the Chinese lexemes which they were used for. These semantic values are hardly ever equal to the meaning of *wago* lexemes which these characters denote within the Japanese writing systems. Usually the rather broad, polysemic meaning of *wago* lexemes stands in contrast towards the precise, more detailed meaning of the Chinese characters; as a result, the meaning of a single Japanese *wago* lexeme can often be conveyed by multiple Chinese characters, depending on the context or the semantic environment of the lexeme in the written text. These discrepancies between the Chinese-originated graphemes and the Japanese lexemes seem the ultimate and most instrumental factor generating the heterography of native Japanese lexemes, even though obviously there may also be many other reasons that made *wago* heterography a flourishing and vital part of the Japanese writing system.

Possible Origins of *wago* Heterography

When speaking of the origins of *wago* heterography, one has to be aware of the fact that it would be difficult to pinpoint any universal golden rule to

fully describe the phenomenon. There may be a few general factors that create a favourable environment for *wago* heterography; yet, in order to know which factor or factors have taken place in case of a particular lexeme, one needs to study each individual case separately. Bearing that in mind, let us proceed to figure out what some of these factors may be.

It has already been mentioned that the most crucial and explicit reason for *wago* heterography occurring is that the semantic range of a *wago* lexeme is hardly the same as the semantic range of a Chinese character (or characters) used to represent this lexeme graphically. More often than not, the case is that the meaning of the lexeme is broad enough for at least a few different Chinese characters to fit within it, and so the tradition allowing the writing of one single lexeme with a number of according characters of more precise meaning has developed.

It is no coincidence that native Japanese lexemes can often be expressed by numerous Chinese characters, depending on the context and the semantic environment of the lexeme within the text. Japanese and Chinese are two completely different languages in terms of their typology; while Chinese is isolating and analytic, Japanese is agglutinative and synthetic. It is only natural, therefore, that in Chinese a single morpheme may form an independent meaningful unit – or a lexeme – way more often than it is the case in Japanese. These single-morphemic words in Chinese are represented accordingly in the writing system by single characters. However, it would be fair to assume that this fact itself should not result in the gulf between the Chinese and the Japanese lexemes as far as their semantic range is concerned. Such typological differences do influence the morphology and the syntax of lexemes, but the written representation of their meaningful lexical cores should be left intact, for as long as the two lexemes of two different languages are basically equal on the semantic level, then their written semantic representation should be the same, too, regardless of how many morphemes the lexemes of the respective languages consist of.

The key can be found in the phonological differences between Chinese and Japanese. Japanese is a language of a rather plain phonemic structure with its syllables being basically of the V and CV types only. The syllabary of *hiragana* comprises 108 various graphemic variations to express Japanese syllables in writing and this number could actually be taken for the total number of the syllables in the inventory of the Japanese phonemic system⁵. (The actual number of syllables in the inventory varies in different dialects

⁵That is if one counts the so-called syllabic nasal *-n* as a separate syllable.

and is said to range between 105 and 113.⁶) Moreover, in Japanese the tone of a syllable is also not distinguished. With such a scarce syllabic inventory accompanied by certain limitations of the possible linear combinations of the syllables in a lexeme, pervasive homophony seems inevitable. Furthermore, not only is the number of possible syllables that appear in an actual Japanese lexeme low, but also the average number of syllables a lexeme consists of is not very large either. *Wago* lexemes of five-syllable stems, such as the verb *hazukashimeru* 辱める ‘to insult, to put to shame’, or of six-syllable stems, such as the adjective *wazurawashii* 煩わしい ‘complicated, troublesome’ do exist, but they are few and far between. It is much more common for a lexeme to have a one or a two-syllable stem and a very vast, heavily polysemic, at times even contradictory, range of meaning. However, the Chinese phonemic inventory is contemporarily estimated to consist of about 400 syllables without marking the tone or as many as 1,277 including tonal differentiation⁷, which makes it more than ten times bigger in number than in the case of the Japanese syllabic inventory. Old Chinese, which was the base language for the characters adjusted to writing the Japanese language in the first millennium A.D., was supposed to be even more complex than it is today as far as the segmental and suprasegmental structure of a syllable is concerned. Therefore, given the isolating nature of the Chinese syntax, there was little need for creating either multi-syllabic lexemes or imposing a very vast range of meaning upon a single one-syllabic lexeme.

As a consequence, the lexical sub-system of the Chinese language consisted of a large number of a single-syllabic, single-morphemic lexemes of a very particular, precise meaning. As these lexemes were indirectly introduced into the Japanese language by means of their graphemic *kanji* representations, they clashed with the native Japanese lexemes, which were semantically broader and also relatively less abundant in numbers. As native Japanese translations were being assigned to separate Chinese characters in order to read them Japanese-wise in the Chinese texts called *kambun*, it gradually turned out that a single Japanese lexeme could be expressed by multiply Chinese characters, depending on the context and the precise meaning of the character that had been used. As the fixed sets of Chinese characters and their proper native Japanese readings became conventional, it was still common for a *wago* lexeme to be normatively denoted in more than just one semantic way. One of many such examples

⁶DeFrancis 1989:135.

⁷DeFrancis 1989: 116.

is the adjective *atsui* ‘hot’, which may be contemporarily written either 熱い or 暑い, the former meaning ‘the quality of tangible hotness’ and the latter meaning ‘the quality of hotness perceived due to the high atmospheric temperature’. There was no such discrimination between these two conceptions in case of the original Old Japanese lexeme *atsushi*. However, since both lexical and phonemical differentiation between the two had apparently existed in Old Chinese, it resulted in an analogous graphemic differentiation in Japanese, even though the original Japanese lexeme remained unified and the same. Although *atsui* in spoken Japanese refers to a ‘general quality of hotness’, the primary semantic values of the Chinese lexemes represented by the relevant Chinese characters make it obligatory to discriminate between the two aforementioned types of ‘hotness’ in the written Japanese.

Such a lexi-phonemical gap between Chinese and Japanese seems to lie at the core of the *wago* heterography, yet it is by no means the sole factor that makes this kind of heterography occur. Chinese characters themselves had had a very long (roughly about two thousand years) and complex history before they were incorporated as the base of the Japanese writing system. Therefore, the semantic range of single characters must have been much broader than that of the contemporary Chinese lexemes they denoted, as it presumably reflected the numerous changes the Chinese language underwent in the course of bygone centuries. The *kambun* texts read by the Japanese and in Japanese were written in the Chinese language as recorded in various periods and from various regions of China. One may assume that it made the semantic range of the single characters all the vaster, whereas Japanese – the language that was to be expressed with these characters – was relatively scarce lexically, with no previous record of literary tradition and having only the lexicon from one particular point of time to challenge the expressively powerful Chinese characters with their multi-century history of semantic development. This, too, should be considered one of the vital factors to have created a proper environment for the peculiar *wago*-style heterography.

Semantic Classification of *wago* Heterograms

First, it is necessary to indicate that the subject of this paper consists solely of those heterographic forms of *wago* lexemes that are written with at least one Chinese character. Therefore, the subject does not include the intersystemic heterography of transliterating a *wago* lexeme from its spelling in Chinese characters to *hiragana* or *katakana* syllabary and vice versa. Such heterography is to a great extent categorial, meaning that each

and every lexeme written with Chinese characters can also be written with the syllabaries (it does not necessarily always work the other way round, but still does in many cases). That is absolutely not to say that this kind of heterography is insignificant from the semantic angle; the graphemic form a lexeme might carry some relevant alternations to the reader's perception of its meaning depending on whether it is written in the *kanji* characters, *hiragana* or *katakana* syllabary. Nevertheless, here I would like to focus exclusively on the kind of heterography relating to the usage of the Chinese characters only. And so, if I analyze for example the graphemic forms of a *wago* verb *miru* 'to see', then the subject of the analysis will be the semantic differences of the forms such as 見る, 診る, 観る etc., rather than 見る, みる and ミル.

From the semantic point of view all *wago* heterograms may be divided into three following groups.

1) Group A – homophonic heterography, or pseudo-heterography. This group does not include various forms of writing ideographically the multiple meanings of one lexeme, but solely various forms of writing multiple homophonic lexemes. As such, it does not meet the definition of 'pure' heterography employed in this paper and it should not be called heterography in the strict sense of the term. This group involves such examples as *kaeru* 変える 'to change (something)' and *kaeru* 帰る 'to come back', or *kawa* 川 'a river' and *kawa* 皮 'skin'.

2) Group B – polysemic heterography. This group consists of such lexemes whose heterograms reflect the polysemic nature of the lexeme, expressing the diversity of its meaning relevant within the Japanese lexical system. One can make the assumption that if for a certain lexeme L a given heterogram x **cannot** be replaced in each and every textual situation with another heterogram y and vice versa, then it is a case of polysemic heterography. It is chiefly the heterograms of this group that will be the subject of my concern in this paper. This group contains such lexemes and its written forms as *sagasu* 探す 'to look for (something particular)' and 捜す 'to look for (something lost or unknown)', or *atsui* 暑い 'hot (about the weather)' and 熱い 'hot (about an object)', or *nioi* 匂い 'scent' and 臭い 'odour'.

3) Group C – monosemic heterography. The main difference between this and the previous group is that in this case either the alternations of meaning expressed by the various heterograms are not relevant to the systemic meaning of the lexeme or one given heterogram can be fully semantically covered by another. In other words, one may assume that if

for a certain lexeme L a given heterogram x can be replaced in each and every textual situation with another heterogram y, then x displays a monosemic relationship towards y in respect to the lexeme L. The lexemes and heterograms which belong to this group are well represented by the numerous heterograms of the lexeme *utau* ‘to sing’: 歌う, 謡う, 唄う, 謳う, 詠う and 唱う. Among these six heterograms 歌う plays the role of the main one, which is to say that it can be used in each and every context for the lexeme *utau* whenever it is normatively allowed to represent graphemically this lexeme with a Chinese character. The remaining five heterograms are optional; a user of the Japanese writing system is free to use them in their writing for stylistic reasons or to make the written expression more exact, and in so doing, to change the reader’s perception of the lexeme. Still, these heterograms themselves do not carry any significant or relevant alternations to the meaning of the lexeme, and as such their usage cannot be evaluated from a normative point of view.

Below I am going to conduct the proper analysis of a few heterographic lexemes in order to assess and explain how the multiple ‘sub-meanings’ of a lexeme can be manifested through heterography. The objects of my analysis will all be taken from the polysemic B group of heterography, since it is in this group that the various graphemic forms of a lexeme exhibit the diversity of the lexeme’s meaning which cannot be shown in the spoken register of the language unless accompanied by a suitable context⁸.

Heterography of the Verb *hanasu*

The *wago* transitive verb *hanasu* ‘to let sth go, to set sth free’ contemporarily may be written in two ideographical ways: 離す or 放す. Both introduce a slightly different approach to the meaning of the lexeme, which stems from the fact that whereas the form 離す focuses on the fact that there has been some kind of distance established between the subject and the object (i.e. the result of the action), the form 放す concentrates on the actual action of the subject letting go of the object. It might as well be called an opposition of the result vs. the action. Let us see how this basic heterographic distinction works within the frames of this verb’s polysemic meaning.

The basic meaning of the lexeme *hanasu*, which may as well be called its phenomenon element, is the idea of ‘making two or more things that could be stuck together fall apart’. It is this meaning that all the subsequent ‘sub-

⁸ I am going to base my analysis upon the following lexicographical sources: Akune 1994, Asada 2003, Kōjien 2008, Meikyō Kokugo Jiten 2008.

meanings’, which I am going to refer to as ‘meaning/semantic variations’ further on, are generated from. This basic meaning also contains a notion of opening a space between the object and some other argument of the verb; it can be inferred that in this concept of ‘opening a space’ the mind of the language user is focused upon the result of setting the distance, not upon the act of setting the distance itself. Consequently, for this basic meaning the heterogram 離す is used. It can be observed in the example sentences below.

1. *Kankaku o hanashite kyūkon o ueru.*

間隔を離して球根を植える。

‘To plant bulbs leaving a space between one another.’

2. *Hone to mi o hanasu.*

骨と身を離す。

‘To part the meat from the bones.’

This basic meaning generates a few other polysemic variations. For example, by shifting our so-called “mental focus”⁹ to see the basic meaning from a different angle, we reach the result of the action of ‘opening a space’ or ‘setting something apart’, which is ‘to tear something apart, to take something away (often forcibly)’. In this variation the heterogram 離す is also used.

3. *Kouma wa chibanare suru tomo naku oya kara hanasareru.*

子馬は乳離れするともなく親から離される。

‘A foal is taken away from its parents, even though it has not even been weaned yet.’

Another semantic variation is that of ‘setting something free’, wherein the object’s circumstances may belong to either of the two classes: it may have first been somehow bound or restrained and then released with the act of *hanasu*, or it may be something let loose by getting rid of some kind of surveillance or limitations. Either way, the object of this semantic variation is subjected to some sort of liberating action. It is here that the semantic variation can be interpreted in one of two heterographic ways. The form 放す concentrates the user’s mental focus on the fact of the subject letting go

⁹ Kunihiro 2006: 4 – 5.

of the object, while 離す directs it to the result of the object being set free or let loose. The difference is further emphasized in the examples below.

4. *Kono kōen de inu o hanashite wa ikemasen.*

この公園で犬を放してはいけません。

‘You must not let a dog run loose in this park.’

5. *Mō kimi o hanasanai yo.*

もう君を離さないよ。

‘I won’t ever let you go.’

6. *Boku wa ryōte o hanashite jitensha ni noreru.*

ぼくは両手を放して自転車に乗れる。

‘I can ride a bicycle with both hands off the handlebars.’

7. *Uchi no ko wa yancha de, katatoki mo me ga hanasenai.*

うちの子はやんちゃで、かたときも目が離せない。

‘My child is so naughty I can never keep my eyes off of him/her.’

All in all, the semantic differentiation of the usage of both heterograms seems to rely chiefly upon the shift of the user’s mental focus relating to the lexeme’s semantic range. If one could conceptualize the meaning of the verb *hanasu* linearly, then the line should be clearly divided in two temporal sections: one referring all the action and circumstances preceding the act of *hanasu* and the other describing that which comes following the act of *hanasu*. The preceding section is expressed graphically with the heterogram 放す, and the following with the heterogram 離す.

Heterography of the Verb *arawasu*

Arawasu ‘to show, to present’ is a transitive verb of three normatively acceptable heterograms, at least as far as the polysemic type of heterography is concerned. These are the following forms: 表す, 現す and 著す. (However, according to the modern Japanese monoglotal dictionaries one more heterogram, which is 顕す, may be allowed for the verb *arawasu*. Nevertheless, since this heterogram is a monosemic variation of the heterogram 現す, meaning the former can be replaced in each and every context by the latter, it shall not be the subject of my concern here within this analysis.)

The phenomenon element of the lexeme *arawasu* is the concept of

‘something that has not been visible before and is becoming visible now’. Thus, the basic meaning of this verb, regardless of its transitive quality, stands for some sort of equivalent to the meaning of ‘to show up, to reveal itself’, usually with a strong nuance of inadvertence. This basic meaning is thoroughly expressed with the heterogram 現す.

1. *Kare wa sanjūnenburi de furari to sugata o arawashita*

彼は30年ぶりでふらりと姿を現した。

‘After 30 years had passed, he suddenly showed up again.’

2. *Kyodai damu ga kiri no naka ni zembō o arawashita.*

巨大ダムが霧の中に全貌を現した。

‘An enormous dam appeared from within the mist in its full shape.’

3. *Chichi wa okori o sugu kao ni arawasu.*

父は怒りをすぐ顔に現す。

‘My father’s anger immediately shows in his face.’

A secondary meaning variation stemming from the above is ‘to express, to show (thoughts, emotions)’. The fact that within this variation the act of *arawasu* is deliberate and intentional seems the most vital difference from the former, basic meaning. This semantic variation is represented by the form 表す.

4. *Sono keshiki no utsukushisa wa kotoba de wa arawasenai.*

その景色の美しさは言葉では表せない。

‘This view is too beautiful for words (it’s too beautiful to put it down in words).’

5. *Shushō wa ikan no i o arawashita.*

首相は遺憾の意を表した。

‘The Prime Minister expressed his feelings of regret.’

A prolongation to the semantic variation described above is the variation meaning ‘to mean something, to represent something to be a symbol of something’. It is probably the result of a conceptual assumption that if one intentionally expresses something, then there must be some kind of deliberate meaning behind this expression. Consequently, this deliberate meaning may take the form of an idea symbolized by the object of the verb

arawasu.

6. *Akashingō wa tomare o arawasu.*

赤信号は止まれを表す。

‘Red light means: stop.’

7. *Haiku wa kigo de kisetsu o arawasu.*

俳句は季語で季節を表す。

‘In the *haiku* poetry the season is represented by the season word.’

There is yet another semantic variation to this verb, presumably stemming from the ‘to express, to show something on purpose’ meaning. This variation possesses the meaning of ‘publishing, authoring (a book, a written work)’, which is one particular way of ‘expressing one’s thoughts or feelings’. The heterogram assigned to this semantic variation is 著す.

8. *Sono sakka wa tampen shōsetsu o arawashita.*

その作家は短編小説を著した。

‘This author has published a short story.’

All in all, the semantic structure of the verb *arawasu* seems pyramidal, with the three general meaning variations resulting subsequently from each other and the three heterograms meant to represent each of the variations. It is noteworthy that within the polysemic structure of this lexeme the usage of its heterograms should be so clear-cut, and that it could be roughly summarized with the relationship of: one meaning variation – one heterogram. Moreover, the separate heterograms seem to be clearly differentiated by the type of the object taken on by the verb. In the case of 現す, the object needs to meet the condition of being something that may be concealed or invisible, and then is revealed; it may often be something perceivable by the sense of sight, like a picture, a figure or a view, or something associated with the qualities of being ‘true’ or ‘real’, for example ‘one’s true nature’ or ‘one’s real form’. On the other hand, the object of the heterogram 表す is limited to one’s thoughts, emotions, or items that can play the role of a symbol, and it is vital that the object should be something to express on purpose, intentionally. With the form 著す the case is even simpler as its object may only be an item that can be published, such as a book.

Heterography of the Adjective *tōtoi* (*tattoi*)

The basic meaning of the adjective *tōtoi*, which is also listed under an alternative phonemical form *tattoi*, is the quality of being ‘precious, worthy’. This basic meaning is split into two sections due to the two heterograms – which are 貴い and 尊い – assigned to this adjective.

The heterogram 貴い carries the meaning of being ‘precious, valuable’, even sometimes in a ‘costly’ sort of way. Most probably the elementary meaning variation of this heterogram referred to the trait of ‘nobility’, as in the high classes of the society. This meaning is present in contemporary language as it can be seen in the example below.

1. *Genji ya Heishi wa tōku tennō ni tsunagaru tōtoi iegara da.*

源氏や平氏は遠く天皇につながる貴い家柄だ。

‘The clans of Minamoto or Taira are of a noble lineage which makes them the emperor’s distant relatives.’

This attributive idea of ‘nobility’ has presumably expanded its range to other attributes which may be associated with ‘nobility’, but it is not obligatory of them to always accompany this trait, and so they stand now as the separate meaning variation to the adjective of *tōtoi*. Those are the qualities of being ‘precious, valuable, costly’.

2. *Sono jiko ni yotte tōtoi jimmei ga ushinawareta.*

その事故によって貴い人命が失われた。

‘Because of this accident precious human lives have been lost.’

3. *Hosupisu no nichijō de wa ichinichi ichinichi ga tōtoi.*

ホスピスの日常では一日一日が貴い。

‘In everyday life at a hospice every single day matters (i.e. is valuable).’

The heterogram 尊い embraces within its semantic range the qualities of the subject being ‘respectable’, ‘dignified’ or ‘honourable’. The shared element with the heterogram 貴い seems to be the concept of ‘worthy’, yet in case of 尊い the user’s focus seems to be set upon a personal perception of that which evokes awe and deserves respect, whereas 貴い seems more like an objective estimation of what could be thought valuable.

4. *Amida-sama no tōtoi osugata o hagamu.*

阿弥陀様の尊いお姿を拝む。

‘To worship the awe-inspiring figure of Lord Amida.’

5. *Seinen wa kodomo o sukuō to shite tōtoi gisei ni natta.*

青年は子供を救おうとして尊い犠牲になった。

‘The young man ended up as a precious sacrifice when he tried to rescue the child.’

It is difficult to estimate without proper diachronic studies which semantic variation is primary to another, and as such ‘more basic’. However, I estimate that the quality of being ‘respectable’ is secondary to being ‘valuable’ or ‘precious’, as the former quality seems to be a metonymical result to the latter, i.e. an object may be thought respectful because of its being precious, but it is somehow more difficult to conduct such a conception the other way round. Nevertheless, it seems clear that the category of the subject referred to by both heterograms differs slightly. The subject of 尊い always seems either personified or representing some aspect of human (or personified) behavior. In case of 貴い it is some kind of more or less abstract concept rather than any kind of humanly attitude.

Heterography of the Noun *waza*

The noun *waza* ‘a deed, a skill’ is still another example of a lexeme whose meaning variations are clearly distinguished in the written language with its two heterograms: 業 and 技.

The basic meaning variation assigned to this lexeme is ‘a deed performed with a certain intention’, or in short ‘a deliberate deed’. However, in cases where *waza* is an object in the sentence, its subject does not have to be human – it may as well be anything else that is animated or personified. This basic meaning is depicted with the heterogram 業.

1. *Kami no naseru waza da.*

神のなせる業だ。

‘It is an act of God.’

2. *Konkai no haisen wa yudan no naseru waza da.*

今回の敗戦は油断のなせる業だ。

‘Negligence is responsible for the last lost war (the act of negligence made us lose the last war).’

3. *Kono komakai sagyō o konasu no wa yōi na waza de wa nai.*

この細かい作業をこなすのは容易な業ではない。
'It is no easy a task to complete this meticulous work.'

From this basic meaning stems another semantic variation, which refers simply to 'work' or 'occupation' as a narrowed field of the conception of 'a deed done on purpose'. It may be thought of as a synecdoche to the general, basic idea of *waza*. In this meaning variation the heterogram 業 is also used.

4. *Misugi yosugi no tame no waza.*

身過ぎ世過ぎのための業。

'A job to earn a living.'

Another meaning variation to this noun that stems from the basic meaning is 'a skill, a technique'. It might be perceived as a metonymic, temporal consequence to the fact of 'committing a deed on purpose', which is arriving to the point of 'obtaining the skill necessary to commit the deed'. This meaning variation uses the graphemic form of 技.

5. *Kore kara mo waza o migaitte ikitai.*

これからも技を磨いていきたい。

'From now on I want to go on polishing my skills.'

A peculiar approach to this aspect of *waza* is the meaning variation referring to 'a technique', applied solely in the case of martial arts, like judo or sumo. It is, thus, another example of a synecdoche creating a sub-meaning within the semantic structure of this lexeme, with its 'a martial arts technique' meaning intended to specify the kind of 'skill' embraced by the broader sub-meaning of this lexeme.

6. *Tamura no seoinage no waza ga migoto ni kimatta.*

田村の背負い投げの技が見事に決まった。

'Tamura performed the shoulder throw technique in a brilliant way.'

Again, also in case of the lexeme *waza* the usage of assigned heterograms is defined quite clearly with the polysemic differentiation of the lexeme's semantic range. The basic meaning of the lexeme is fully expressed by the written form 業, and so is one of the lexeme's metonymical meaning variation of 'work, occupation, profession', whereas some other secondary meaning variations are exercised by the form of 技.

Conclusions

As has been proved above, the polysemic type of *wago* heterography introduces clear semantic oppositions among the heterograms of a given lexeme. These oppositions reflect the lexeme's polysemic structure at least to some extent, since in case of *wago* heterography a single heterogram represents a part of the lexeme's semantic range (for example, one or a few of the lexeme's meaning variations) wherein it cannot be freely (i.e. maintaining the appropriate nuance of the meaning and the normative correctness) replaced with a different heterogram. In this respect one can infer that the polysemic type of heterography is normative, and the semantic distinction between a lexeme's graphic representations may be the subject of a lexicographic description.

Heterography seems essentially a universal feature of every full and natural writing system of the human world, although this assumption still needs more objective and comprehensive data to be justified. Obviously, since heterography stems from the semantic diversity of a single lexeme, the existence of the semantic elements of a given writing system is a necessary prerequisite for heterography to occur.

In case of the native Japanese lexemes known as *wago*, however, it is not only the inner semantic diversity of the lexical sub-system of the language that provokes the phenomenon of heterography. It is chiefly the discrepancy between the semantics of the Chinese characters used for writing the *wago* lexemes and the semantics of the said lexemes themselves that makes this kind of heterography so peculiar, imposing a graphemic distinction according to the meaning variations of a lexeme which are not expressed phonemically in the spoken register of the language. Different heterographic forms of a native Japanese lexeme display its polysemic values and also, to some extent, they represent its semantic structure.

In general, *wago* heterography may reflect the polysemic values of a lexeme in two manners: either as a representation of the native, immanent meaning variations of the lexeme or as a manifestation of the semantic nuances of the Chinese character(s) of interest imposed upon the given lexeme as its graphemic representation. However, since Chinese characters have been used for many hundreds of years for the graphemic representation of the *wago* lexemes, the characters and the lexemes tightly coexist and mutually influence each other's development so it may not be possible to clearly define the borderline between the aforementioned two manners of graphically manifesting and emphasizing a lexeme's multiple

sub-meanings. On the other hand, it is possible to determine whether the polysemic quality reflected in the heterograms is systemically relevant or not on the grounds of the lexicographical, noncontextual semantic range of the given lexeme. If the said quality is relevant, then one may be sure to think of the case as the polysemic type of heterography. If it is not, then the case is of monosemic heterography.

References

- Akune, Suetada. 1994. *Katsuyō jizai dō'on dōkun'iji jiten* [a functional dictionary of Sino-Japanese and native Japanese heterograms]. Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobō (阿久根末忠『活用自在同音同訓異字辞典』柏書房).
- Asada, Hideko. 2003. *Reikai dōkun'iji yōhō jiten* [dictionary of the usage of native Japanese heterograms with explanatory examples]. Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan (浅田秀子『例解同訓異字用法辞典』東京堂出版).
- DeFrancis, John. 1989. *Visible speech. The diverse oneness of writing systems*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Gelb, Ignace J. 1963. *A study of writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Guiraud, Pierre. 1976. *Semantyka* [semantics]. Translated by Stanisław Cichowicz. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Hołda, Marcin. 2006. *Przymiotniki i czasowniki japońskie jako kategorie leksykalne* [Japanese adjectives and verbs as lexical categories]. Cracov: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Kitahara, Yasuo. 2008. *Meikyō kokugojiten* [the *Meikyō* dictionary of Japanese language]. Taishūkan: electronic edition (『明鏡国語辞典』北原保雄編 大修館書店).
- Kōjien dairokuban* [*Kōjien*, sixth edition]. 2008. Iwanami Shoten: electronic edition (『広辞苑第六版』岩波書店).
- Kunihiro, Tetsuya. 1997. *Risō no kokugo jiten* [an ideal dictionary of Japanese language]. Tokyo: Taishūkan Shoten (国広哲弥『理想の国語辞典』大修館書店).
- Kunihiro, Tetsuya. 2006. *Nihongo no tagi dōshi. Risō no kokugo jiten II* [polysemic verbs in Japanese. An ideal dictionary of Japanese language II]. Tokyo: Taishūkan Shoten (国広哲弥『日本語の多義動詞。理想の国語辞典 I I』大修館書店).
- Lyons, John. 1989. *Semantyka 2*[semantics 2]. Translated by Adam Weinsberg. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Miller, Roy A. 1967. *The Japanese language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Polański, Kazimierz (ed.). 1999. *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego* [encyklopedia of general linguistics]. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Sasahara, Hiroyuki. 2008. *Kun'yomi no hanashi. Kanjibunkaken no naka no nihongo* [about native Japanese readings of Chinese characters. The Japanese language within the cultural sphere of Chinese characters]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. (笹原宏之『訓読みのはなし。漢字文化圏の中の日本語』岩波書店).

Satō, Kiyoji 1985. *Jigi jikun jiten* [a dictionary of meanings of the Chinese characters and their native Japanese readings]. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten (佐藤喜代治『字義字訓辞典』角川書店).

Taylor, Insup, Martin M. Taylor. 1995. *Writing and literacy in Chinese, Korean and Japanese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dawid Głównia

The Zigomar Scandal and the Film Censorship System in Japan

The article discusses a scandal - its course, sources and consequences – that occurred in Japan in the 1910s following the premiere of the French crime film series *Zigomar*. The article's starting point is a synthetic introduction to the formula of French serial film, especially its criminal model. This is followed by a more detailed description of the Japanese premiere of the first installment of the *Zigomar* series – the importers initial reluctance to screen the film and its unexpected commercial success. The next part of the article discusses sources of the scandal triggered by the popularity of *Zigomar*: a meditation on the social properties of cinema, the media storm evoked by the Japanese press and the idea of “popular education” promoted by the Japanese government. It is followed by a discussion of the scandal's most important consequence – the gradual emergence of a centralized and autonomous film censorship system. The final part of article summarizes the impact of the *Motion Picture Film Inspection Regulations* on the Japanese movie industry.

Aleksandra Jarosz

Polysemic Values of Native Japanese Lexemes in the Light of *wago* Heterography

In this paper the author makes an attempt to introduce the phenomenon of heterography as well as the close affinity between heterography and the semantic system of a language. The subject described in the paper is heterography of the *wago* or native Japanese lexemes, which are graphically represented by semantic characters of Chinese origin, known as *kanji*. This author formulates a hypothesis that in case of the *wago* heterography, various graphemic representations of a single lexeme naturally exhibit its various polysemic values. Therefore, heterography introduces to the graphemic register of the language some sort of semantic opposition not indicated in the spoken register.

ダヴィッド・グウォヴニア

『ジゴマ』のスクンダルと日本の映画検閲制度

小論は、1910年代、フランス製犯罪映画シリーズ『ジゴマ』が封切られた直後に日本で起こったスクンダルとその原因、影響を論じるものである。論文冒頭で、フランスの連続映画の特徴、そのうち特に犯罪映画タイプを総括的に紹介する。次に、『ジゴマ』シリーズ第1作の日本封切りについて、より詳細に記述する。すなわち、当初輸入業者は映画上映に積極的でなかったが、それが思いがけぬ興行的成功を収めたことである。その次の章では、『ジゴマ』人気によって引き起こされたスクンダルの原因を論じる——映画の社会的特性についての考察、日本のメディアがかき立てた大論争、そして、日本政府が促進した「大衆教育」の理念である。それに続く章では、スクンダルの最も重要な影響、すなわち中央管理ならびに自主的な検閲制度が段階的に出現してきたことを取り上げる。論文最終章では、映画の監査規制が日本映画産業に与えた衝撃について、その要点を述べる。

アレクサンドラ・ヤロシュ

同訓異字を通しての和語の多義性

本稿は異形同音という現象を紹介すると同時に、異形同音と言語における意味的な体系との密接な関係も明らかにする。記述の対象は異形同音の一種である同訓異字で、同訓異字とは和語の漢字による表記として扱われる。一語の多様な表記法が自然にその一語の多義的な性質を反映する仕組みであるという仮説が立てられる。したがって、口頭語にないような意味的な対立が同訓異字を通して文語に導入される。

論文の前置きとして、「異形同音」の定義が簡潔に紹介される。異形同音はおそらく世界中の全ての自然で完全とした表記体系における普遍的な要素であり、同形意義の反義語であると述べられる。また、同訓異字が生じるためには2つの条件が整わなければいけない。それは表意文字による表記の条件と同一であるが、多義的な語を表

記する条件でもある。次いで、なぜ同訓異字が生じたか、考えうる原因も概括して明確にされる。日本語の固有語彙である和語とそれらを表記するために中国から導入されている多数の漢字との間に生じる意味上の相違が最も重要な原因として指摘される。

本論では同訓異字の分類に続き、いくつかの同訓異字である単語の意味的な分析が示される。その分類に基づく、同訓異字は同音的なタイプまたは表面的同訓異字、多義的なタイプと単義的なタイプという3つのグループに分けられる。本論において、分析の対象とされるのは、多義的な同訓異字に限られる。分析される単語は：動詞の「放す・離す」と「現す・表す・著す」、形容詞の「貴い・尊い」、そして名詞の「業・技」である。どの単語の場合でも、その意味的範囲が様々な「副意味」からなる多層的な構成として示される以上、それぞれの表記法を適切な副意味とリンクさせることにより、同訓異字を使えばどの類の意味的变化をもたらせるか判明される。その結果、同訓異字の多義的なタイプでは、単語の意味的範囲においてそれぞれの表記法が自分の意味分野を占領し、それぞれの表記法の使用が標準に基づくようなものであるという明確な結論を導き出すことができる。

AUTORZY / CONTRIBUTORS / 投稿者

Dawid Głownia

Graduated from the Jagiellonian University Institute of Sociology in 2008. Currently, a Ph.D. candidate at the Institute of Audiovisual Arts of the Jagiellonian University Faculty of Management and Social Communication.

Research interest: early Japanese cinema, relations between film, society and state, sociology of culture.

Aleksandra Jarosz

Graduated from the Adam Mickiewicz University Chair of Oriental Studies in June 2011. From October 2009 until September 2010 she studied at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies on account of the Japanese Ministry of Education (Monbukagakushō) scholarship. Currently, a Ph. D. candidate at the Adam Mickiewicz University Faculty of Modern Languages and Literature.

ダヴィッド・グウォヴァ

2008年にヤギェロン大学社会研究所卒業。現在、ヤギェロン大学経営・社会コミュニケーション学部博士課程に在籍中。

研究テーマ：日本の初期の映画、映画・社会・国家の総合関係、文化社会学。

アレクサンドラ・ヤロシュ

2011年6月にアダム・ミツキェヴィッチ大学東洋文化研究所日本学科卒業。2009年10月から2010年9月にかけて文部科学省日本語・日本文化研修プログラムの参加者として東京外国語大学に留学。現在、アダム・ミツキェヴィッチ大学新文献学部博士課程に在籍中。

PRACE NADSYŁANE / FOR CONTRIBUTORS / 投稿

1. Przyjmujemy niepublikowane gdzie indziej dokumenty w formacie MS Word, w objętości do ok. 40 000 znaków z włączeniem spacji. Wymagany język dokumentów do publikacji to angielski lub japoński. W innych językach przyjmowane są wyłącznie tłumaczenia japońskich tekstów.

2. Prosimy dostosować transkrypcję wyrazów japońskich do standardu Hepburna lub Kunrei, przy użyciu dostępnych czcionek. Transkrypcja wyrazów niejapońskich powinna być zgodna ze standardem *de facto* dla danego języka. Redakcja może zasugerować zmianę systemu transkrypcji tekstu.

3. Przypisy powinny znajdować się na dole strony.

4. Do tekstu głównego powinno zostać załączone krótkie streszczenie oraz informacja o autorze w języku angielskim i japońskim.

5. Komitet redakcyjny decyduje o dopuszczeniu tekstu do publikacji i powiadamia o tym fakcie autora.

6. Nadesłanie tekstu oznacza zgodę na jego publikację drukiem i na wprowadzenie do tekstu niezbędnych zmian edytorskich.

7. Teksty prosimy nadsyłać jednocześnie pocztą elektroniczną (wersja elektroniczna) oraz pocztą klasyczną (w formie drukowanej) na następujące adresy:

1. We accept documents unpublished elsewhere in MS Word format, not longer than 40 000 characters including spaces.

Documents should be in English or Japanese. Only translations from Japanese may be accepted in other languages.

2. Use available fonts to adjust the romanization of to the Hepburn or Kunrei standard. Words other than Japanese should be romanized according to the *de facto* standard for a given language. We may recommend the change of romanization system.

3. Footnotes should be included on the bottom of the page.

4. Main text should come with short summary and information on the contributor in English and Japanese.

5. The editorial board qualifies a text for publication and notifies the author of this fact.

6. It is understood that by submitting the text the contributors give their consent to its publication in print and to making necessary editorial changes.

7. We await both your e-mail (computer file) and snail mail (printed version) contributions at:

1. MS Word を用いて書かれた 4 万字以内の未刊行の文章を受領する。用いられるべき言語は英語または日本語である。ただし、日本語テキストからの翻訳については、他言語の文章も受領される。

2. 日本語語彙のローマ字表記は、ヘボン式または訓令式とし標準フォントを使用すること。日本語以外の語彙のローマ字表記は、各言語の標準に従う。編集委員会は、ローマ字表記規則の変更を求める場合もある。

3. 注釈はページ下に載せる。

4. 本文に要約と著者紹介を英語と日本語で付記すること。

5. 編集委員会は、投稿原稿の掲載の可否を決定し、その旨投稿者に通知する。

6. 論文は、投稿された段階で、委員会がそれを公刊し、編集上不可避の変更を行うことを許可したものと見なされる。

7. 原稿は、電子メール（電子文書版）と郵便（プリントアウト版）の双方で、下記に送付すること。

Silva Iaponicarum
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza
Katedra Orientalistyki, Zakład Japonistyki
ul. 28 Czerwca 1956 nr 198
61-485 Poznań, Poland
E-mail: silvajp@amu.edu.pl