

METAMORFOZA ÎN MANGEA JAPONEZĂ ȘI COMUNICAȚIA COTIDIANĂ

METAMORPHOSIS IN JAPANESE MANGA AND OUR DAILY COMMUNICATION

Toshiyuki SADANOBU
Kobe University, Japan

Abstract:

In Japanese-language manga, a “metamorphosis” is often observed in that, in a single frame, a manga character uses a language or appears in a way that is completely different than in the previous frames, while the character then continues on as before from the following frame as if nothing at all had changed. The present paper attempts to clarify, via a deepened understanding of daily conversation, the backdrop for such “metamorphoses,” which can be difficult to comprehend for readers from different cultural backgrounds. The main claim of this paper is that our communication world is replete with responses to “characters” whose intentions we do not like; “metamorphosis” is one type of “play” using such characters. If this is a valid conclusion, then there must be a fundamental reinvestigation of views of traditional communication as based on intention.

Cuvinte cheie: *manga, metamorfoza, limbaj Japonez*

Keywords: *manga, metamorphosis, Japanese Language*

1. Introduction

In the *manga*, “Doraemon,” of Fujiko F. Fujio (Vol. 7, p. 159, 1975, Shogakukan), a frame shows the character Nobita pleased with himself as he has fooled Doraemon into giving him an item from the future; in this frame, he uses a polite phrase when speaking, all alone, to himself: “Kore wa taihen na mono desu yo (This is a splendid thing indeed!).” In Figure 1, the portion circled is “desu”; thus, the expression used is the polite form of “is.”



[Fig. 1: Nobita, talking to himself using a polite grammatical form.]

Why would Nobita use a polite form when talking to himself, with no one else present?

In the *manga*, “Patariro!,” of Mineo Maya (Vol. 4, p. 11, 1980, Hakusensha), the main character, Patariro, has made great fun at the expense of a character named Maraihi. To Maraihi’s reply, “*Tsubure anpan*” (“[You look like a] crushed red-bean bun!”), Patariro makes a retort (Fig. 2).

Patariro is a child, but in the frame where he makes his “retort,” he thrusts in using Kansai dialect: “*Erai iwarekata yanke ware*” (“That’s a bold and cruel thing to say [literally, “way of speaking”], you dolt!”). Suddenly, a knife scar has appeared on Patariro’s cheek, a cigarette holder is hanging from his mouth, and he’s wearing sunglasses and a very flashy coat—he has metamorphosed into a type of Kansai area *yakuza* (“gangster”). In the next frame, however, he has returned to his original child’s figure (who uses ordinary language).



[Fig. 2: Patariro (at right) making his retort to Maraihi (at left) in *yakuza* costume with *yakuza* language.]

The above-described kinds of “sudden inter-frame metamorphoses” found in *manga* must surely cause confusion to worldwide *manga* readers, appearing as insoluble puzzles.

So just what do these metamorphoses signify?

Why do readers who speak Japanese as their native language readily understand such changes, without considering them at all puzzling?

A detailed investigation shows that this is not a problem solely of *manga*, but instead one that crosses through literary works and even into daily communication.

The present paper makes no argument regarding translation itself, but instead presents considerations on the “metamorphosis” problem of Japanese linguistic culture that is difficult for persons of other cultures to understand. Via this, the desire is to demonstrate a further depth in the translated culture.

2. The necessity of a concept of “the character”: Limits of the intentional view of communication

Humans are social animals. Every day, we evaluate each other in our groups (“herds”): we are concerned how others will evaluate us, and as we rise or fall in their estimates, we feel concomitant happiness or sadness.

Yet the term “evaluate” can be used in various ways, such as in a judgment of an item (“This food is delicious/unsavory”), of an ability (“That person is a good/bad singer”), of a person (“That person is handsome/beautiful/earnest/vulgar”), etc. Of these, the most important for us is the evaluation of persons.

We are very intense in our thoughts about how we ourselves are evaluated as persons. Whatever the case, we all want to be thought of as “that good/handsome/beautiful/sexy person,” while no one wants to be that of as “that bad/vulgar/ugly person.” This sentiment is constantly with us; never once do we discard it, when we are selecting clothing, putting on make-up, at work, or even telling a joke (of course, that is not the entirety of our inner beings).

What is important here is that a personal evaluation differs from an evaluation of an item or ability in that the former involves a “dislike of intention” (i.e., of intended effect).

For example, in an item evaluation such as “This food is delicious,” no one would be offended (in most cases, anyway) to learn that the chef had made an effort to evoke that sense of “deliciousness” in the customer—in other words, that the “deliciousness” was a result of an intention. In the same way, in an evaluation of an ability, such as “That person is a good singer,” no offense whatsoever would be taken even if that “goodness” was the actual intention of the singer.

Yet such is not the case in an evaluation of a person, such as “That professor is a magnificent person.” Here, if it is discovered that the “magnificence” felt was the result of an intention and effort made so as to be evaluated as “That really magnificent person,” then thereafter, that professor will no longer be considered a magnificent person.

An evaluation of a person is a type of evaluation of a natural entity, such as “That mountain is really something”—intentions are not tolerated here. For example, when one has made a statement evaluating someone as “That person is a *Botchan*’ (an ingenuous person),” then the tag “*Botchan*” means that even though that person is acting “normally,” from another perspective, he is [worthy of being called] a “*botchan*.” Similarly, a “good person” is one whose “normal” behavior is seen by another person as being that of a “good person.” In each case, the person being evaluated is none other than “normal,” and has no intention of being thought of as a “*botchan*” or as a “good person.” Certainly, the intention might be there, but it must never be seen from the “outside.”

In the second volume of “*Sasameyuki*” (English: “The Makioka Sisters”) by Junichiro Tanizaki, there is a short portion where it is stated that one woman, Sachiko Makioka, has an unpleasant feeling towards a person called Okubatake. The reason for this “unpleasant feeling” is not because Okubatake is a rude, rough, or immoral person, but because his talking style is irritatingly slow, thus making him seem like the *botchan* (here, “spoiled”) son of a large, important family.

However, it is a fact that Okubatake is really the *botchan* of a large and important—although ruined—family, and Sachiko is well aware of that. The unpleasant feelings of Sachiko towards Okubatake do not stem from a sense that Okubatake, being actually poor, still continues to “assume a false identity” as the *botchan* of a large, important family.

In “*Sasameyuki*,” Sachiko dislikes Okubatake’s way of speaking because she sees therein the pretentiousness of the “lordly” manner of a large family’s “*bon-bon*” (*botchan*).

Certainly Okubatake’s slow speaking style was the result of his having been brought up in luxury in a large, important family, and his “lordliness” was not something unforgivable. What Sachiko could not forgive was his intentional way of speaking slowly, with his idea that, “My languorous way of speaking is chic, as it really evokes the feeling that I am a *botchan* from a big family.”

Of course, Okubatake never reveals his intention of “acting a part.” Without knowing that Sachiko has “seen through him,” in response to the question from another, “Mr. Okubatake, you truly speak slowly,” he would, without doubt, have responded with feigned surprise: “Oh, really? You don’t say!”

If it had turned out that Sachiko’s suspicions of Okubatake’s intentions were untrue, then Okubatake would have had to feel completely sorry for her; yet, whether or not her suspicions were in fact groundless, Sachiko had no other choice but to trust her feelings concerning the people around her—such is how we live, and we are all the same here, ourselves and even Okubatake, too.

There is yet another man appearing in “*Sasameyuki*” who is forced to bear with a lowered esteem due to the obviousness of his intentions. In a visit of comfort after a flood, this character makes the effort to be the first to arrive in Ashiya from Osaka; he greets Sachiko, and then, with a tearful voice, he cries when finding that her daughter is safe, “Oh, To-chan (literally, “daughter”), this is so wonderful!” This behavior of Shokichi is nothing other than his acting the part of a “good person.” In Sachiko’s eyes, he appears as “that man who ordinarily has so much to say, with so many expressions” who now “deliberately speaks with a nasal voice.” Shokichi is simply going to run into this kind of situation, when he so patiently controls his voice so as to be sobbing as he expresses his relief at the safety of To-chan.

In such a case, it is not merely enough simply to have the reasonable thought that “This speaker is controlling the tone of his voice when he communicates his feelings to another person.” Rather, it is exactly here where we find the need for a concept of a “character” (i.e., an image of a person) whose intention is truly distasteful, when we observe, in our daily communication acts, words exchanged in such a manner (not including, however, cases where a speaker is intentionally trying to evoke a “style” in his/her changed way of speaking).

This type of pretense on one side—“I’m going to ‘play’ myself as an ingenuous character so as to obtain the desired praise of my person. Yet will this intention be ‘seen through’ (inferred) by another person?”—plus the intuitive grouping on the other side—“Is what I’m hearing/seeing this person’s true character? Or is he/she feigning a part?”—can be said to be, perhaps, a kind of always present “secret strife” in our daily conversations.

3. Community-origin characters

What type of “character” a person is perceived as will differ, of course, according to the observer. We see this clearly when we are talking about a “character” supported by a larger community, as with “a Tokyo-ite” or “an Osaka-ite” (respectively, someone from the region where Tokyo dialect is spoken, and someone from the region where Osaka dialect is spoken). Below, these will be referred to as “community-origin character(s),” to easily distinguish them from the “magnificent professor,” the “*botchan*,” and the “good person” discussed above, who will be referred to as “individual-origin character(s).”

It is again in “*Sasameyuki*” where we find a segment that evokes this idea of a “community-origin character” (Vol. 1, 1944). This will be examined in the section below.

Mrs. (Madame) Nifu was a calm woman whom Sachiko had known for a long time. Yet that day, there was nothing calm about her. The way she used her eyes, curled her lips, and the way she held her cigarette with her middle finger and index finger—in her presence, Sachiko felt that Mrs. Nifu’s character had suddenly, somehow, changed for the worst. Just what had happened with Mrs. Nifu?

In fact, that day Mrs. Nifu was accompanied by Mrs. Sagara, a “woman who was, in the Tokyo manner, crisp and sharp about everything,” and Mrs. Nifu was speaking in the Tokyo dialect!

Among the women (wives) of the Hanshin (Osaka-Kobe) area, Sachiko was considered as one who could use Tokyo dialect virtually perfectly. Yet even though Mrs. Nifu herself was an Osaka-ite (literally, “child of Osaka”), she had spent her women’s junior college years in Tokyo, and she certainly did have many acquaintances from Tokyo. Still, here she was, talking an impeccable, swift-spoken Tokyo dialect, to the extent that it made Sachiko wonder how she could “to such an degree”—“She seems like a completely different person, and I can’t feel relaxed.” Sachiko even went so far as to think: “I’m starting to sense a ‘shallowness’ in things said with a Tokyo dialect,” and, “I’m getting irritated listening to her talk.”

As shown in this example, words are not merely a medium. It is not at all the case to say that, so long as the contents are communicated, it doesn’t matter if those words are spoken in Tokyo dialect or Osaka dialect.

Whether or not Mrs. Nifu spoke in Tokyo dialect or in her usual Osaka dialect was a problem concerning her “character,” and the issue of whether or not she “seems like a completely different person” is also one of character.

In the setting of “*Sasameyuki*” in the Hanshin district—and, especially, Ashiya—at the early Showa period (Showa Era, 1925–1989), the “Tokyo-ite” character brought into play by Mrs. Nifu must have seemed especially vulgar and aggressive. Surely in today’s Hanshin district, the attempt to speak “common Japanese” and not Osaka dialect in places where a large number of people gather, or even the speaking of Tokyo dialect itself, would not be considered in the same way as it used to (with the exception of certain settings). In the more than half century that has past since that time, the background to such changes that have occurred in the Hanshin district are, of course, the

penetration of “common” language (with Tokyo dialect as its nucleus) into the Hanshin District, and the accompanying decline in the “status” of Osaka dialect.

Yet what I would like to discuss here is of a different nature than these matters. Namely, why would Mrs. Nifu so simply make the character transition from “Osaka-ite” to “Tokyo-ite” without being aware of the great damage it was doing in terms of the severe “downgrading” of her estimate as a person?

One part of the answer has already been discussed. That is, Mrs. Nifu’s command of Tokyo dialect was due to her many acquaintances with Tokyo-ites, plus the fact that on that day she was having a conversation with a Mrs. Sagara, “a woman who is, in the Tokyo manner, crisp and sharp about everything.” Similarly, all of us are often “caught up by” the way of speaking of our conversational partner, and we are often “drawn in” by that way of speaking.

In fact, there is a scene (“*Sasameyuki*,” Vol. 3, 1947–48) where, in a conversation at a later date with Mrs. Nifu, who is again speaking Tokyo dialect, Sachiko herself starts to speak “somewhat drawn in by the Tokyo dialect.” And in the midst of a flood crisis, when a neighbor, a German named Mrs. Schultz, talks to Sachiko in “broken” Japanese with statements such as “(I heard that your To-chan school is safe.) You are certainly relieved!” and “(It seems that you don’t know if you’re elder daughter is safe or not.) Your worries, I understand them. I have sympathy for you,” Sachiko answers herself in stilted Japanese, “Thank you very much” (“*Sasameyuki*,” Vol. 2, 1947)—Sachiko herself is thus someone who is easily “drawn in” (literally, “hooked in”).

Yet Sachiko is not lured in by the Tokyo dialect in the conversation with Ms. Sagara that is at issue here. Rather, “When I am with this woman, instead of being somehow attracted by it—instead, I feel a kind of ‘shallowness’ for the things spoken of with Tokyo dialect. I willingly refrain from using it, and instead try to speak using my local language.”

This movement in a different direction from a partner is a kind of distancing similar to that which occurs between two magnetic north poles or two south poles; as this is a kind of “repulsion,” I shall call this “repulsion.” This “repulsion” contrasts with the “attraction” in the same direction as one’s partner that occurs such as when a north magnetic pole and a south pole are attracted to each other. Just as we observe such “attractions,” we also experience such “repulsions” in our daily conversations.

Now, if Sachiko had feelings about the Tokyo dialect whereby it sometimes attracted her and sometimes repelled her, why was Mrs. Nifu (at least as she is depicted) so easily drawn in by Tokyo dialect, with no repulsion?

This is because while Mrs. Nifu was highly skilled at Tokyo dialect, Sachiko was not. Conversely, one could say that Sachiko was not skilled at Tokyo dialect because of her repulsions, while Mrs. Nifu was skilled because of her attractions. It cannot be determined which was a cause and which a result.

The example of garlic can be used here. Suppose that everyone has eaten a meal replete with garlic. Since all are eating, no one smells the garlic. It is only a person who comes from outside the room who smells the garlic.

Tokyo dialect is a kind of garlic. The cultural area of the Tokyo dialect is a room where everyone eats garlic, a “garlicky room.” No one in this room can smell the garlic.

Mrs. Sagara lives right in the middle of the garlicky room, and thus cannot smell the garlic. She simply speaks and behaves “ordinarily.” Yet the garlicky smell is so strong to Sachiko, who lives outside of the room, that she cannot tolerate it. She just cannot get over her image of it as being pretentious and “distasteful.”

Certainly Mrs. Nifu, who grew up in Osaka, might have “shrunk away from” Tokyo in her initial days while she was attending women’s junior college there. Now, however, she was halfway a “resident” of the “garlicky room,” and was barely aware of Mrs. Sagara’s garlicky smell. Such had become “normal.” Thus, she could enter the garlicky room without hesitation. And therefore, she had become skilled at “garlic” dialect—that is, Tokyo dialect.

Osaka dialect is a kind of “garlic” just like Tokyo dialect is. Actually, Mrs. Sagara had requested her friend, Mrs. Nifu, to “show her for once a true ‘Kansai-type’ woman,” and had come to meet Sachiko for that purpose. In the eyes of Mrs. Sagara, it was Sachiko who was projected as the “resident of the garlicky room.” Even today, it is not rare for a Tokyo-ite to talk about their “experiences of Osaka” by saying something like, “When I went to Osaka, sure enough, everyone was speaking in Osaka dialect,” or, “It was just like watching a *manzai* comedy team (duo)”; one can imagine that the way of talking and behaving of Sachiko—representing the Kansai cultural area of more than a half century ago—truly “smelled!”

What is being described here is something that applies to all dialects, and to all languages.

English, Chinese, French, Romanian—they all have their own peculiar “odor.” What doesn’t “smell” is the Japanese language only. Yet once a Japanese person had gotten used to living abroad, the appearances and sounds of Japanese tourists visiting his/her district would certainly have their own peculiar “Japanese-ish odor.”

Learning a certain language is to enter into the “peculiarly smelling” world of that language. As we are drawn in, we become used to the smell, our olfactory sense is dulled, and the language then becomes “normal”—this could even be called a “key” in the learning of languages.

In this section, discussion was made regarding characters who stem from a community (“Tokyo-ites” from the Tokyo dialect society, and “Osaka-ites” from the Osaka dialect society). The point here was that these community-origin characters have something that can’t be seen except when viewed from outside of that community. For example, the “Tokyo-ite” character cannot be seen from within the Tokyo dialect society, as that character is “normal” therein. The “smartness” or “pretentiousness” of the “Tokyo-ite” character can only be seen when he/she “steps outside” of his/her community.

However, the characteristic of appearing “normal from inside, yet ‘seeable’ from outside” is not something unique to community-origin characters. As seen in Section 2 above, this applies also to individual-origin characters. Although in one case, the “inside” is a person’s own heart and mind, and in the other case, “inside” means inside the community, there is nothing fundamentally different about these character types.

4. The way characters “appear”

Next, summary will be made of the ways a character “appears,” although there will more than a few portions that overlap with the above.

Fundamentally, a character appears unintentionally in the form of his/her being “normal from inside, yet ‘seeable’ from outside.” “Character” is not what is portrayed to the communication partner; instead, it is one’s “true nature” that is revealed—that “leaks through,” as it were—unrelated to that speaker’s intentions. It is anticipated that this true nature will not change, even though a person’s style may change flexibly according to the relationships between conversational contents and partners, and in accordance with the particular setting.

Although intentions are secretly at work in a character’s “appearance,” once a character’s feigned intentions have been “seen through” by another person, then such a “revealed” person must suffer the same fate as the two pitiful men in “*Sasameyuki*” described above. Such feigned intentions—more directly, the fact of a character’s “metamorphosis”—can serve as material for criticizing another person, as described below.

In “*Horoki*” [English: “Vagabond’s Song”] (Part 1, 1930) by Fumiko Hayashi, there is a portion that describes how a man that the protagonist (“I”) has been living with returns to his village. Nothing is heard from him thereafter, and when inquiries are made, it is discovered that the man has changed his mind about marriage due to the opposition of his family. Although the protagonist is, of course, shocked and feels despair, she makes no criticism of the man’s morals. What is instead depicted, time and again, is the transformation that has occurred in the man between the time they were living together and how he appears now—namely, his “metamorphosis of character.”

The same man whom she had thought so “gallant” during the time they lived together, the man who had said, “Just come, and believe in me,” had changed completely into a “weak-willed man,” one who, at the sudden appearance of the protagonist, “winces” and “droops his head” while listening “without saying a word” to the speech of his father.

This man, once she left behind her gift of candy and is returning home, comes after her, saying that his mother has told him to return the candy, and even after she has thrown the gift into the sea, he still “follows after,” “ever quiet as a dog.”

He is depicted more as a pitiful “creature” than as an evil person who has broken a solemn promise—yet for a male, this may be the harshest of all evaluations.

Why so wretched? Because his character had not stayed uniform, but had changed. The indication of inconsistency in another person’s character leads one to despise that person, and this has effects that go beyond an appeal to mere morality.

Thus, in the Japanese language society, the discovery of a “character change” can serve as a strong source for attacks on that person. Yet here, due to a sense that the person is to be sympathized with, one also observes a refraining from making such indications of “character change,” so as not to trample on the weaknesses of that person.

In “*Kusa no Hana*” (English: “Flowers of Grass”) (1954) by Takehiko Fukunaga, the character Shiomi, who has a lung illness, is living an “aloof” life in a sanatorium. Yet he has had a dramatic past: when he was in another sanatorium, “B,” he had made a suicide attempt; he is also a Christian. A patient from Sanatorium “B” shares this information with the novel’s protagonist, starting with, “Well, I really shouldn’t be talking about this, but . . .,” after which he tells Shiomi this “interesting story.” The protagonist, who has had interactions with Shiomi, is surprised, stating: “This is not at all like Shiomi. It’s like I’m hearing a story about a different person”; thereafter, the protagonist refrains from bringing up this story with Shiomi.

Here, what the patient from Sanatorium B feels interesting and the protagonist senses something “bad” about knowing is nothing other than signs of a “character metamorphosis.”

Discussed thus far were cases where a character’s failure to stay consistent were considered shameful. Yet in the context of “play,” a character change is nothing to be ashamed of—indeed, since any such change is “play.”

At least at the time of writing this paper, one can find on the Internet a sentence like, “*Sessha doraibu ni itte kita de gozaru*” (“I went for a drive”). Here, the “samurai” character is evoked by the use of terms like “*Sessha*” (the term used by a samurai in speaking of himself) and “*de gozaru*.” Surely the writer does not spend his entire daily life playing this “samurai” character. At least the writer cannot have played “samurai” character at the stage of “going for a drive” (because a samurai never drives a car). In other words, this “samurai” character as expressed in the above sentence has only been temporarily evoked. While this is indeed a changeover from the author’s original character, it is allowed, as it is “play.”

Another case found not rarely on the Internet is the evoking of a “Heian era aristocrat” character via the use of such terms as “*maro*” (used when referring to oneself in the Heian era) and “*de ojaru*” (or, this may be the evoking of the protagonist of the animation “*Ojarumaru*” (also known in English as “Prince Mackaroo”) who is modeled himself on a “Heian aristocrat” character). People who write in this manner do not live their entire daily lives playing such a “Heian aristocrat” character. Rather, this character is temporarily evoked, and represents a changeover from the author’s “original” character. Yet, again, such is permitted as it is “play.” (Let me add here that this “*ojaru*” is not actually a term of the Heian aristocracy. As stated by Kinsui (2003), “*ojaru*” is a term that was used by Kyoto commoners from the Muromachi era into the Edo era. The idea that Heian aristocrats spoke using the verb-ending, “*-de ojaru*,” is nothing other than a false image we in the contemporary Japanese language society hold regarding Heian aristocrats. Yet this is not to be laughed at as something foolish. It is this image that enables the sense of “*ojaru*” to be somehow or other communicated in our contemporary Japanese language society.)

This “character change as a type of play” is not something that has just started recently due to an irregularity that has crept into our language. Instead, it can be said that we Japanese have been making such “play”-type character changes continuously from olden times.

For example, in “*Kataku no Hito*” (English: “House on Fire”) (1961–75) by Kazuo Dan, the lover of the protagonist (“I”) usually says such feminine things as “Well? Isn’t this attractive?” In one scene, however, she suddenly sits cross-legged, slaps both her thighs, and bursts out with, “Hey, wouldn’t you like to take me (*ore*) as your bride?” She thus pushes the issue of marriage while evoking a *yakuza* character. While this might not be a perfect match for today’s sense of humor, this is considered to be a “humorous demonstration” of her mental worries and impatience. In other words, this is a type of “play.”

There is a scene in the drama, “*Haru no Kareha*” (English: “The Fallen Leaves of Spring”) (1946) by Osamu Dazai where, in the midst of a conversation between a young man and woman, suddenly they evoke the characters of “aged persons,” commiserating with “*Ananano niisanwa majimejakaranoo*” (“Your elder brother, he’s a serious one, indeed,”) and “*Anatano okusandatte majimejakaranoo*” (“Well, your wife is a serious one, too, that’s for sure.” This is permitted, as it is “play.”

While in the context of “play,” a change of character is nothing to be embarrassed about, a change of character must never be disorderly, despite its being “play.” As a fundamental principle, a change of character occurs such that is coupled with a communication behavior.

For example, in Makoto Shiina’s “*Aishu no Machi ni Kiri ga Furu noda* (Vol. 1)” (1981) (English: “Fog Over the Town of Sadness”), there is a scene where the protagonist, Mr. Shiina, undergoes a character change from “*boku*” (i.e., how a boy says “I” or “me”) to “*ore*” (i.e., how a man says “I” or “me”): “There, ‘*ore*’ arose quietly. No longer could I say ‘*boku*.’” What fostered this change was surely when Mr. Shiina (the protagonist), angered by the attitude of a person he had been conversing with, suddenly rose up to perform an action—that is, just when he was about to display a violent communication behavior.

In this same work, there is a further portion where a change is made from “*ore*” back to “*boku*.” Mr. Shiina explains that this is “Because [I’m] thinking about writing a story about love between a man and a woman.” When one is to write a love story using “*ore*,” then it is predetermined that the story must be “hard-boiled,” such as a story where the initial setting is a foggy wharf. When one thinks of one’s own behavior in a love story (this, too, is a communication behavior), the use of “*ore*” somehow seems inappropriate.

In other words, different characters have their own “specialist” communication behaviors. When a speaker is to perform a certain kind of communication behavior, the character who has the appropriate specialty is “put into play.” When one is to display violent communication behavior, then the “*ore*” character—whose expertise is violence—is evoked. When the “hardboiled” character just won’t work, then it is time to mobilize the “*boku*” character in its place.

There is yet another time in the same work where Mr. Shiina again changes character. Mr. Shiina’s friend, Shinsuke Kimura, to achieve his goal of passing the legal bar examination, has had a prefabricated building constructed in his yard that is made especially for him to study in. Mr. Shiina’s act of proposing to Mr. Kimura that “Let’s all rent an apartment and live together” is nothing other than a temptation to walk the path of wickedness. So how does Mr. Shiina accomplish this?

Mr. Shiina slides up to Mr. Kimura with a sidelong glance, and says seductively while pinching his knee, “Let’s go to a public bath (*sentō*) or somewhere, play *shogi* chess, and eat some *katsudon* rice, shall we?” This act is none other than the calling into play of a “woman in the bar and nightclub business (*mizu-shobai no o-neesan*)” character, with her specialty of “temptation” and “proposition.”

There is a scene thereafter where Mr. Kimura, who has allowed himself to be talked into this “sharing a place,” and has even accepted the cooking duties, makes the request: “I don’t want to get my shirts dirty, so the least you can do is buy me a cooking apron.” And when his request is

accepted, Mr. Kimura says things using a woman's language: "*Ureshii wa*" ("That makes me happy!"). Does not all that constitute Mr. Kimura's evoking of a "housewife" character, one of whose "specialties" is "being pleased at having an apron bought for her?"

Of course, surely the only times when an "ordinary" man would evoke a female character like "a woman in the bar and nightclub business" or "a housewife" would be jokingly with his friends (in other words, in a kind of "play"). When said man is to evoke such a female character, there is something inside him that tries to put the brakes on such behavior: "That's not good, not good. If I play such a part, I will feel unbearable shame as a man." Here, it is one's "true nature" that tries to stop the behavior (act), and it is this "true nature" that will feel the "unbearable shame" once such behavior has been displayed.

There is a certain "coupling" made between communication behavior and character when one "mobilizes a character with a 'specialty' for the type of communication behavior that one intends to perform as a speaker." In many cases, this is under the control of one's "true nature," and the "coupling" may be hindered by this "true nature."

What has been described up to this point is the fundamental "coupling" of communication behavior and character whereby, when a speaker intends to perform a certain communication behavior, he/she evokes the character who has a "specialty" for such behavior.

This so-called "communication behavior" is not limited to the spoken word, that is, to linguistic behavior. In the example described above, included were the non-linguistic behaviors of "making a sidelong glance," "sliding up to," and "pinching his knee." Thus, the metamorphosis of a character is not limited to words, but may also extend to the effects of one's body ("body language").

Now we have laid the groundwork for clarifying the "metamorphoses" in the *manga* discussed at the beginning of this paper.

In "*Patariro!*" when Patariro makes his retort, the reason for his change into a *yakuza* outfit and use of *yakuza* language is this fundamental coupling of communication behavior and character. Here, the communication behavior of "retorting" is related to the "common sense" idea of the Japanese that "retorting" (talking back) is the specialty technique of *yakuza*. In his retort to Maraihi, Patariro invokes this "Kansai *yakuza*" character with its "retorting" specialty. Thus, here is a frame that has been influenced by aspects of both linguistic and non-linguistic (verbal and nonverbal) behavior.

So, why does Nobita of "*Doraemon*" use polite language when speaking to himself? This is because in this scene, Nobita will evaluate the item that he himself has managed to obtain. In his evaluation of this item, Nobita evokes the "expert" or "critic" character whose skill is evaluating things; this shows that he is going to make his appraisal accordingly, and all this is intended to double his happiness. Naturally, a specialist or critic speaks with polite language.

"*Doraemon*" is a "classical" *manga*, and thus no metamorphosis is detected in Nobita's appearance. If this had been in a relatively more recent *manga*, then Nobita might have been depicted, for example, with a beard, combing his hair back with his hand and smoking a pipe, or he might have been shown having a moustache and wearing Japanese traditional clothing to show that he was "doing first-class work." Here, his glasses could have shone with significance, showing that he had metamorphosized into a middle aged (or older) man of the intellectual class—a perfect look for an expert or critic.

Conclusion

The traditional view of communication considers "intention" as its base. However, our actual world of Japanese-language communication is filled with characters to whom we must respond, yet whose intentions we dislike (i.e., we find their apparent intentions "distasteful"). We Japanese have gone to the extent of developing a kind of "play" using such characters. Herein, a brief explanation was made of the author's concepts as of the current writing regarding the fundamentals of such characters.

Note: Concerning the annotation of person names such as “Okubatake” and “Nifu” in “Sasameyuki”, I followed Shincho Bunko.

Acknowledgements: This work was partially supported by the Ministry of Education, Science, Sport, and Culture, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (A), 19202013; (B), 19320060. This work is based on my invited lecture “Nihongo-no kotoba-to kyarakuta” delivered at the 13th Symposium on Japanese Language Education in Europe (Troy Culture Centre, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turley, 2008. Aug. 27).

Bibliografie

- Kinsui, S., 2003. *Vaacharu Nihongo Yakuwarigo-no Nazo*. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Sadanobu, T., 2007a. “Kyarajoshi-ga arawareru kankyō,” In Kinsui, Satoshi (ed.), *Yakuwarigo Kenkyu-no Chihei*, Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers, pp. 27--48.
- Sadanobu, T., 2007b. ““Hakken-no TA”-to hatsuwa kyarakuta,” *Gengo*, 36--12, Tokyo: Taishukan, pp. 40--47.
- Sadanobu, T., 2006. “Kotoba-to hatsuwa kyarakuta,” *Bungaku*, 7-6, Tokyo: Iwanai, pp. 117--129.
- Sadanobu, T., 2008--. “Nihongoshakai nozokikyarakuri,” (Sanseido Word-Wise Web.