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The study of kana 仮名 development has only begun in the last fifteen years, with much scholarship focused upon discerning either the Heian origins of kana or such later developments as furigana 振り仮名 (phonetic guides) and spelling rules. However, these perspectives have largely overlooked a key moment in Japanese writing history: in 1900, the Meiji government standardized the kana, from hundreds of possible variant graphemes to the forty-six used today, one symbol per sound. From then on, what had commonly been known only as kana were divided into two groups: hiragana 平仮名, the standard set, and hentaigana 変体仮名, the set of all non-standard graphemes. This standardization represented a seismic shift in Japanese writing culture, affecting everything from education to aesthetics, and yet it occurred without any bureaucratic debate—or, it seems, any post-legislation public outcry. This study addresses the apparent incongruity by examining a variety of primary sources for evidence of a pre-Meiji acceptance of a standardized set of graphemes, before the official standardization in 1900. Arguing from this evidence, a convincing case is made that the kana made standard in 1900 had been historically recognized as distinct from all other variants, despite there being no demonstrable difference in their use in context. This project, by closely examining long-neglected sources, sheds new light on the issue of pre-modern Japanese script usage.
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SYMBOLS & DEFINITIONS

**Grapheme**: A written unit corresponding to a certain unit of speech.

Any grapheme placed between `<equivalence symbols>` is to be analyzed visually rather than “read” for sound, while alphabet letters placed between `/slashes/` are intended to be read for their sound value.

EXAMPLE: The *kana* grapheme `<か>` represents the sound /ka/.

Variant graphemes expressing the same sound value may be used in *complementary distribution* or in *free variation*, depending upon the rules of the writing system in question. English capital letters, for example, are used in complementary distribution; there are writing situations in which they must be used, and those in which they should not. In pre-modern Japanese writing, variant *kana* were used in free variation, although there were patterns of usage.

**Mora**: A unit of speech-sounds, consisting of either an optional initial consonant plus a vowel, or of a final consonant. *Hiragana* and *katakana* are moraic writing systems; the only final consonant in Japanese is /N/. Throughout this study, unless otherwise noted, “mora” may be interpreted interchangeably with the phrase “sound value.”

**Kana 仮名/Hiragana 平仮名/Hentaigana 変体仮名/Itaigana 異体仮名**: Though the term *hiragana* was used before 1900, it was most often used in order to distinguish it from *katakana*. The non-*katakana* moraic graphemes were more frequently called simply *kana*. *Hiragana*, in the modern period, is a term so bound to the forty-six standard graphemes that using this term may cause confusion. Japanese scholars use the terms *hentaigana* and *itaigana* to avoid this, but in the interest of minimizing the usage of
unfamiliar terms, in this study the terms “kana,” “kana variant,” “variant kana,” and occasionally “variant grapheme” will be employed on a case-by-case basis when referring to the pre-1900 writing system. The term hiragana will be reserved for the post-1900 standardized writing system. Katakana, whose development is not nearly so complicated and which seems to have needed no official standardization, will be referred to as katakana throughout, regardless of time period.

**Jibo 字母**: Also known as jigen 字源, honji 本字, or genji 元字, these are the kanji from which kana are derived. The term jibo will be used throughout.

EXAMPLE: The jibo of <あ> is <安>.

---

1 Satō 1989, p. 257.
CHAPTER 1
PROJECT ORIGINS AND METHODOLOGY

This project had its origins in coursework-related research. When I encountered for the first time the Edo-period propensity for playing with the intersection of sound and image in Shikitei Sanba’s 式亭三馬 comedic, serialized kokkeibon 滑稽本, I was intrigued. Not only did Sanba employ rebuses in his writing, which called attention to the semantic-phonetic origins of kanji through simple pictures of concrete objects; he also made serious attempts at written records of dialect differences in spoken Japanese. For this reason, he is studied perhaps more frequently by historical linguists than by Edo scholars. However, it was not the dialects themselves that intrigued me, but Sanba’s attempts to write them down.

Japanese writing does not lend itself well to the accurate recording of sound differences. Native Japanese has a highly restricted phonetic inventory, with five vowel sounds (contrary to popular belief, English has twelve), and about fifteen consonants, depending upon the dialect and the level of detail (English has twenty-four). When kanji were borrowed from China, their pronunciations were substantially modified to suit Japanese phonology, resulting in on’yomi 音読み or Sino-Japanese (SJ) pronunciation. As the Japanese sought to use Chinese to write their own language, however, they ran into a problem: because Chinese is not an inflecting language, they had little need for graphemes that indicate grammar. Japanese, an inflecting and agglutinating language, has “root and stem words,” particularly verbs, whose “stem” endings change depending upon the grammatical function of the “root.” Kanji are useful for signifying the semantic meaning of the root, but useless for indicating which grammatical stem grows from that
root. In response to this, at some point in the late Nara or early Heian (9th cent. A.D.), the idea of kana was developed.

*Kana* is an elegant solution to a problem with both aesthetic and practical elements. In the culture and political climate of the time, eliminating kanji would have been unpopular. However, the pre-kana solution to writing Native Japanese (NJ), *man’yōgana* 万葉仮名, was too complex. Under the *man’yōgana* system, any kanji could be used for its semantic or phonetic value, with no way to tell which. The situation was further complicated by the fact that kanji had by now gained NJ phonetic value, as well as SJ. For example, the kanji <歯>, “tooth,” is pronounced /ha/ in Native Japanese and /shi/ in Sino-Japanese. In a sentence written in *man’yōgana*, it could mean “tooth” or “teeth,” or it could be used for a phonetic value of /ha/ or /shi/ with absolutely no semantic value. The *kana* innovation was to write the phonetic-value kanji in *sōsho* 草書, cursive script, and to leave the semantic-value kanji in *kaisho* 楷書, standard script, or *gyōsho* 行書, running script.

*Kana* have one major flaw: they represent a moraic writing system, typically found in languages with small phonetic inventories and few syllable-final consonants. (For example, part of the difficulty of deciphering the Ancient Cretan Linear B script was that its scholars, primarily European archaeologists, were unfamiliar with the concept of moraic writing.) Moraic writing systems are frequently misidentified as “syllabic” writing systems, but morae are not syllables. In fact, some scholars claim that syllabic writing is so unusual that there is only one indisputable case of a syllabic writing system,

---

2 Fox 2013, p. 134-141.
the Yi writing of China. This is because in a syllabic writing system, a different individual grapheme would be required to write /cat/ and /can/, /cut/ and /cot/, etc. Such a writing system would be inefficient to the point of uselessness, even in a language with a tiny phonetic inventory. However, syllables can be divided into morae, meaning that a syllable which is composed of an initial consonant, a vowel, and a final consonant would be divided into (consonant + vowel) (consonant), resulting in two morae. Therefore, a moraic writing system would have a single grapheme to write /ca/, and for the final consonants /t/ and /n/. Such a writing system is substantially more flexible and useful than a syllabic writing system. However, a moraic writing system falters when it comes to accommodating new additions to the phonetic inventory, whether from foreign loanwords or from the natural evolution of the language. While an alphabet, which has separate graphemes for consonants and vowels, can simply introduce new combinations of graphemes for an unfamiliar sound value (<sh> to write the consonant written in the International Phonetic Alphabet as <ʃ> comes to mind), the graphemes of a moraic system represent combinations of consonants and vowels indivisibly. Hence, Shikitei Sanba’s difficulty: how to indicate differences in the pronunciations of vowels and consonants in a conversation between an Edo woman and a Kyoto woman?

Sanba’s solution was diacritics. To record /tottsan/, Edo “papa,” he wrote <とっさ。 אני>, because there is no kana for /tsa/, only for /tsu/. (Modern Japanese convention would probably write it <トッツアン>.) Throughout his comedic works can be found examples of this kind of playfulness with written conventions. Fascinated, I began to look in other Edo-period popular fiction, wondering how widespread such experimentation

---

might be. There was not much, as I found out: Sanba was evidently in a class by himself when it came to this topic. As I read, however, I began to notice something else that piqued my interest. Though I had studied manuscript Japanese, with its welter of variant kana, I had never had the opportunity to examine such a large corpus of primary sources before. I found that I needed my hentaigana dictionary less and less: among the vast number of possible kana, the popular fiction I was examining used only a limited number, so they were becoming readily recognizable.

Curious, I began to do some secondary research. I wanted to learn how the reading audience of a writer like Sanba may have been taught to confront the complexity of their native writing system, in hopes that that might shed some light on why a writing system with no official standards seemed so standardized nonetheless. To my surprise, I found nothing on that topic. When I expanded my search, I discovered how new the field of Japanese historical graphemics, shokishi, really is: so new, in fact, that my research will be the first in the field in English.

**Methodology and Chapter Organization**

Chapters 1 and 2 comprise an expanded introduction from two different perspectives, each of which will be equally necessary as a foundation of background knowledge with which to interpret the information presented in Chapters 3 through 5. In Chapter 1, I introduce the field of graphemics, or writing systems scholarship, paying particular attention to the recently-developed Japanese area of graphemics, known as shokishi. I present a review of the most relevant literature in the field, and then explain the significance of this study as an addition to the field.
Chapter 2 provides an overview of the Japanese writing system, examining the most common narrative about script development in Japan and identifying the areas in which that narrative is inadequate. Another, briefer review of literature is presented, this time of works in English which cover some aspect of the Japanese writing system, and yet cannot be classified as graphemics scholarship for a variety of reasons. Pre-Meiji writing system usage and education is examined in some detail, and the Meiji debates about script reform are also discussed.

When it came to selecting primary sources for analysis, I recognized the importance of narrowing the data set to a specific type of text in order to control as many variables as possible. I chose to examine お稲荷物 往来物, Edo-period textbooks frequently used in 寺子屋, primary schools for commoners. The catalogue of twenty-five お稲荷物 and other educational materials that I have compiled, and my analysis of their content, form the core of this study; however, because the catalogue is immensely detailed and occupies a great deal of space, I have chosen to append it rather than to include it in the main body of the text. The catalogue thoroughly outlines the publication information, formatting, and kana usage of each text, and provides high-resolution images of relevant pages. In Chapter 4, I analyze the texts comparatively, drawing connections between texts based on publication date, location, intended audience, and formatting.

In Chapter 5 I discuss the implications of the information presented in Chapter 4 and the Appendix. I offer possible explanations for the patterns discerned, present reasonable speculation about the relationship between the continuing diversity of the writing system and the lack of debate about kana reform in the Meiji Period, and note a
few questions for further research. I also call attention to the growing importance of worldwide open-access initiatives to modern humanities scholarship.
CHAPTER 2

SHOKISHI: THE STATE OF THE FIELD

In the Western world, the study of writing systems is a recently defined interdisciplinary academic field, attracting linguists, psychologists, codebreakers, and language scholars of all stripes, who are still largely “isolated within their own separate disciplines.” Indeed, Writing Systems Research, the only journal dedicated to this field, only began publication in 2009. Currently, the bulk of the English-language research is being conducted by linguists in the United Kingdom and in Germany. Most of the available scholarship is comparative, and synchronic; that is, treating all historical periods at once, or as essentially the same for the purposes of the research topic. Researchers seem to intend either to illuminate specific aspects of the Roman alphabet, or of possible rules governing a hypothetical “universal grammar” of all writing systems. The problem with this comparative, synchronic approach is that it favors breadth over depth, with well-intentioned scholars at times ignoring historical evidence that could be helpful in proving or disproving their theories, simply because coherent, detailed explanations in European languages of the historical development of non-European writing systems are difficult to come by.

In some respects, academic interest in writing systems has a far longer history in Japan and China than in the West. The first Chinese-character dictionaries were developed over two thousand years ago, and an immense amount of scholarship over centuries has been dedicated to various aspects of the usage of Chinese scripts in the

---

5 See, for example, Weingarten 2011 and Neef 2012.
various Chinese dynasties, Korean kingdoms, and Japan. Modern scholarship on the subject, however, has been characterized as the branch of study “farthest behind” (mottomo okureteiru 最も遅れている) in the field of kokugogaku 国語学 (Japanese language studies) in Japan. Much the same as in English, where “no two writing system researchers seem to use the terms ‘writing system,’ ‘script’ and orthography’ with exactly the same meanings,” in Japan there is no consensus on the appropriate name for scholarship relating to “moji, hyōki, shoki no shi,” 文字・表記・書記の史, the history of graphemes, inscription, and scripts. Following Yada 2004, therefore, I will hereafter use the term shokishi, “script history,” to refer to the diachronic study of Japanese script, specifically kana.

In both Japan and the West, the question of the aims and goals of writing systems research has been the subject of much discussion. In particular, this question has often been raised: Must research on writing systems always be dedicated to illuminating something about the spoken language, or are there merits to be found in studying a writing system simply for its visuality? In essence, this question is one of orthography, the rules of “proper” writing, versus graphemics. To take an example using the Roman alphabet, the scholar working from an orthographic perspective may make a comparative study of the usage of uppercase letters in English and German, while the graphemically-

---

6 For a Japanese philosophical and educational perspective on kanji, for example, see any of the works of Shirakawa Shizuka. Chiang Yee’s works on Chinese calligraphy provide a different perspective, particularly when it comes to art by Japanese calligraphers; his entries for the Encyclopedia Britannica on the subject make for entertaining reading.
10 This is a term that Cook et al should have included in their quote above. Neef 2012 (p. 218) observes that the interchangeable terms graphemics and graphematics have been used with vastly differing definitions stretching back to the 1920s.
inclined researcher would be more interested in the mere existence of uppercase letters as a phenomenon. (The Roman alphabet as used in English does not have twenty-six letters, as is commonly understood—it has fifty-two graphemes, used in complementary distribution depending upon word- or sentence-initiality. This is quite unusual among the world’s writing systems.)

In historical Japanese, the question is far more complicated than in almost any other written language. There is certainly merit in examining historical orthographical rules—rekishiteki kanazukai 歴史的仮名遣い, whose establishment is attributed to Fujiwara no Teika 藤原定家 (1162-1241)—in relation to classical Japanese phonology. However, when presented with the vast arsenal of variant kana available for pre-Meiji writers to take advantage of, a focus on orthography alone can be myopic. No orthographical or phonological rules governed the use of variant kana; the choice was entirely at the discretion of the scribe. As Yada notes, the notable rises and declines in the usage of specific variants across time were not likely to have been driven by any linguistic function.\(^{11}\)

In a sense, the pre-Meiji kana situation can be likened to a hypothetical situation in which, rather than only upper- and lowercase, the Roman alphabet had three or more entirely unrelated graphemes for each consonant and vowel, to be used in free variation according to the aesthetic whims of the writer. In such a case, the disadvantages of a strictly orthographical approach to scholarship should be clear. However, perhaps because even among Japanese scholars the relative importance of variant kana to the study of historical Japanese writing is still being debated, writing systems scholars

\(^{11}\) 2004, p. 42.
outside Japan seem entirely unaware of the phenomenon. The journal articles Neef 2012 and Weingarten 2011, mentioned above, use Japanese script in comparison with other writing systems but make no reference to its historical development. The general introductions Rogers 2005 and Robinson 2009, each of which devotes a chapter to Chinese script and a chapter to Japanese, make no mention of it; even Habein 1984 and Seeley 2000, both of which are chronological surveys of writing in Japan from its introduction to its post-World War II reforms, do not touch on it, and neither does Lurie 2011, which focuses on literacy in the Nara and Heian Periods. However, it can be argued that none of the latter three are intended to make a study of the writing systems in and of themselves, but rather of the relationships between writing systems, literature, and literacy. In fact, the most detailed examination of variant *kana* in English comes from Frellesvig 2010, whose focus is Japanese historical linguistics. Variant *kana* and pre-modern Japanese orthography are therefore of interest to him more for their value in determining early Japanese phonology than for themselves; however, he takes more interest in writing systems development than any other linguist.

The example of the overlook of pre-1900 Japanese script sheds light on the importance of interdisciplinary cooperation in making the grand universalist goals of Western writing systems researchers into a reality. How many other writing systems are being analyzed only in their current forms, under the mistaken assumption that because the Roman alphabet has changed comparatively little in two thousand years, most other scripts will have had similar patterns of historical development?

For a general overview in English of a linguistically-based method of writing systems scholarship, Rogers 2005 is exceptional, covering every major category of
writing system in some detail and making an effort towards a more comprehensive
comparative typography of writing systems based on orthographic depth. His chapter on
Japanese is thorough, although not touching at all upon the issues of historical *kana*. The
neat categories in which he places types of graphemes (paralleling linguistics in their
names, such as *allograph, polygraph, polyphone, morphogram*) do not work well for the
modern Japanese writing system and would most likely collapse when applied to Edo-
period *kana*. (Unfortunately, Rogers passed away in 2009, or I would have contacted him
for his thoughts on the matter.)

Also in English, the journals *Writing Systems Research* and *Written Language &
Literacy* provide a fascinating view of the breadth of the field, although Japanese script is
made mention of only rarely in any of the articles I have examined, and variant *kana*
ever.

Japanese scholarship on the subject is, as is to be expected, more detailed. The
works of Komatsu Hideo 小松英雄 established the field of *shokishi*, eventually resulting
in the comprehensive volume of Komatsu 1998. Maeda Tomiyoshi 前田富祺 expanded
upon Komatsu’s foundational work in Maeda 1992, in the past two decades, Konno
Shinji 今野真二 has published studies on numerous topics associated with *kana*, with the
most extensive being Konno 2001. And, more recently, Yada Tsutomu 矢田勉 has
proven himself perhaps the most prolific scholar in the field. His most recent publication,
Yada 2012, is probably the most detailed and comprehensive text on the subject of
*shokishi* to date. Beppu Setsuko 別府節子, whose main topic of study is the history of
calligraphy, has done valuable research on the under-studied subfield of pre-Edo
*shokishi*, as in Beppu 2000.
Satō Nobuo, a historical linguist/linguistics historian affiliated with Fukushima University, makes a brief but superior overview of the field in Satō 1989, covering the development of *hiragana* and *katakana*, and comparing them to *man’yōgana* usage. He also includes a section on *sōgana* and its relationship to *hiragana*. Satō devotes a fair amount of space to the existence, derivations, and usage of *hentaigana*. He is the only one of the secondary sources to pay much attention to educational materials, including pre-regulation Meiji-period elementary textbooks. However, he avoids Edo sources, moving back in time from early Meiji to Kamakura, and using for his primary sources mainly literature (such as the *Tosa nikki* and the *Kokin wakashū*) rather than educational materials.

Also of interest in the same edited volume as Satō 1989 can be found Sasaki 1989. This appendix to the main text presents a limited set of texts, examined in depth, spanning the history of *kana* usage. Sasaki, a professor of *kokugogaku* at Kyoritsu Women’s University, takes as her texts a Heian Period manuscript of *Akihagijō*, a Kamakura and a Muromachi manuscript of *Tosa nikki*, a Kamakura manuscript of *Sarashina nikki*, the Edo-period *jōruri* script *Meido no hikyaku*, the early-Meiji elementary textbook *Jinjō shōgaku dokuhon*, and Higuchi Ichiyō’s working manuscript of *Takekurabe*. For each text, Sasaki catalogues the variant *kana* being used, arranging the variants of each sound value by frequency of use. From this bird’s-eye view of one thousand years of *kana* use can be seen a very general trend in favor of fewer variants per sound value.
The development of Japanese writing is frequently boiled down to the barest essentials: Chinese kanji 漢字 arrived in Japan with Buddhist monks from Korea in the sixth century; for the next hundred years or so, all writing was done in Chinese; eventually, a method was developed of representing Japanese phonetically using cursive forms of kanji, and this became known as hiragana 平仮名 or simply kana 仮名; someone figured out how to combine kanji and kana, representing meaning and sound respectively, in order to distinguish the large number of homophonous words; Japanese continued to be written in this manner for hundreds of years; after the Second World War, the number of kanji in use was limited to about two thousand, making literacy more achievable. This narrative is misleading on any number of points, most of which have been corrected or clarified by scholarship in Japanese and English over the past few decades. One point, however, continues to be overlooked, and perhaps the point done the most disservice by the simplified narrative: that is, that the development of hiragana was not nearly so straightforward as this explanation suggests, and that it was not only for the kanji that limitation was necessary. In order to correct this deficiency, I will now offer a more detailed narrative of Japanese script development, with special focus on kana.

The first attempts to adapt Chinese writing systematically to Japanese syntax had taken place by the end of the 6th century, shortly after kanji were introduced.12 This writing system is known as man’yōgana, in reference to the most famous work written using it, the Man’yōshū 万葉集. Man’yōgana operates on the principle that kanji have

both phonetic and semantic elements, and that these two components are not bound to
each other, but may be separated. In fact, the Chinese language uses this principle as well, when it employs characters “as phonetic signs to represent foreign words.”\footnote{Shimizu 1986, p. 7.}

However, no analogue is possible in Chinese for the opposite situation, in which the characters are used as semantic signs, representing the meaning of a Japanese word while giving no clue to pronunciation. In \textit{man’yōgana}, these two functions of Chinese characters are used interchangeably to write Japanese.

Thanks to this innovation, a sentence written in \textit{man’yōgana} “superficially resembles a text written in Chinese; however… the text is likely to be unintelligible to a Chinese reader.”\footnote{Encyclopedia Of Japan, s.v. “Kana,” accessed online via JapanKnowledge, December 5, 2013.} For example, take this line from poem 729 of the \textit{Man’yōshū}. In modern Japanese script, this would be written <玉ならば手にも巻かむを>, and pronounced /tama naraba te ni mo makamu wo/. In English, a basic translation would be, “If you were a string of beads I would wrap you around my arm.” In \textit{man’yōgana}, it is written: <玉有者手二母将巻乎>. To both the Chinese and the modern Japanese reader, this looks like gibberish, but it is not. The table below shows the analysis of the \textit{kanji} usage.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Kanji} & 玉 & 有 & 者 & 手 & 二 & 母 & 将巻 & 乎 \\
\hline
\textbf{Pronunciation} & tama & nara & ba & te & ni & mo & makamu & wo \\
\hline
\textbf{Usage} & semantic & semantic & phonetic & semantic & phonetic & phonetic & semantic & semantic \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Usage of \textit{Kanji} in \textit{Man’yōgana}}
\end{table}
The Chinese reader may be skeptical of the characters analyzed above as “phonetic” characters, but “it may be argued… that the sounds the Japanese adopted were those enunciated by the Koreans...whose leadership in guiding the Japanese in building their early state of Yamato has been a matter of record.”

In general, the characters used for sound represent grammatical particles, while those used for meaning represent nouns and verbs. In one case, the two characters 将巻 are used for their meaning as one unit. In classical Chinese, the 将 indicates the volitional aspect, with 巻 (“to wind”) as the main verb. The Japanese reading, makamu, is the volitional inflection of the verb maku (“to wind”). This indicates another interesting and complicated part of man’yōgana: it still does not always accurately record Japanese grammatical structure, but sometimes writes certain grammatical forms as if they are in classical Chinese and expects the reader to know to read the characters in Japanese word order. This may be interpreted as a pre-kana attempt to indicate grammar using kanji, the ineffectiveness of which was referenced above in the Introduction.

The reason why this system is so complicated is that “the two languages are fundamentally different in structure: whereas Chinese words are monosyllables, Japanese words often consist of several syllables, and, whereas Chinese is an isolating language, Japanese is an inflected language.” Chinese writing suits the Chinese language so perfectly that it should be obvious that such a different language as Japanese could not use it without significant adaptation. However, the man’yōgana method of adaptation was so complicated and counterintuitive that only a few generations after the Man’yōshu was compiled, the way of reading it had been lost.

---

Beginning in the late ninth century, examples begin to be seen of a new kind of writing. Some reference works refer to this as sōgana 草仮名 in order to differentiate it from hiragana, but what exactly is being differentiated is unclear. Satō 1989 claims that sōgana is kana being employed to represent kanji\textsuperscript{17}—an exactly opposite situation from the origins of kana—but later admits, “however, regarding the difference [between kana and sōgana], there are points of ambiguity, and it is difficult to make absolutely clear.”\textsuperscript{18}

On the other hand, Habein describes sōgana as a midway point between kana and man’yōgana, in which the kanji were written in cursive, continuing to be employed for both phonetic and semantic purposes. She notes that the graphemes continued to be written separately, in contrast to kana, which were frequently connected. She also points out that all extant manuscripts written in sōgana were composed by men, whereas kana was known in the Heian Period as onnade, “woman’s hand,” and it was not considered seemly for men to use it.\textsuperscript{19} Either way, if it truly existed separately from kana, sōgana was clearly an intermediary between the man’yō and kana systems, and faded out of use as kana became widespread.

Kana arose from the realization—whose realization is unknown, though tradition holds that it was the calligrapher-monk Kūkai\textsuperscript{20}—of the necessity of differentiating the characters intended to be read for meaning, from those intended to be read for sound. As indicated by the usage of the character 草 in the word sōgana, this writing system differentiated phonetic graphemes from semantic graphemes by writing the phonetic

\textsuperscript{17} Satō 1989, p. 257.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, p. 280.
\textsuperscript{19} p. 25.
\textsuperscript{20} Encyclopedia of Japan, s.v. “Kukai.” Accessed online via JapanKnowledge, December 5, 2013. In modern times this tradition has been thrown into disrepute, mainly due to lack of written evidence of kana usage in Kūkai’s time. (Habein 1984, p. 25.)
graphemes in sōsho—in Chinese, cao shu, “grass style.” In this most simplified, cursive calligraphic style, almost all defining elements of the characters disappear, leaving graceful loops and curving lines. However, this does not mean that there are no rules in grass style. The various elements that make up each character are made cursive in specific ways, making it possible (though still not easy) to tell one character from another. Although some stylistic evolutions occurred after the adoption of this method, and the way the graphemes were used continued to be developed and refined, there is no question that Chinese grass style calligraphy is the parent of Japanese kana. In fact, cao shu forms of some jibo that are indistinguishable from kana can be found in Chinese manuscripts dating back to the Jin Dynasty (265-420 AD). Satō speculates that Japanese calligraphers, encountering this “extreme” (kyokutan) form of cursive and, recognizing its potential, applied the concept to man’yōgana to develop kana.21

As the Heian name for the writing system, “women’s hand,” suggests, kana was initially seen as a writing system simple enough for women to learn, an alternative to Chinese. At this point, man’yōgana had not been used for a hundred years. The early Heian Period was a time of great fascination with all things Chinese, so apparently the lack of a method for writing their native language did not particularly trouble literate Japanese men. It was mainly women who chose to use kana as an alternative to Chinese characters when writing Japanese. When interest in native Japanese poetry arose again, however, kana began to be used more and more by men as well as women. Within one hundred years or so, prose began to be written in kana as well, and frequently in combination with kanji—the kana being used for grammatical functions such as particles

and inflections, and the *kanji* being used for meanings. This method of fusing the two scripts became known as *kanji kana majiribun* 漢字仮名交じり文.

As *kana* became more widespread, new calligraphic styles developed, the better to serve its unique qualities. While in Chinese-style cursive, the characters are typically written as though each character must fit inside an imaginary box, *kana* calligraphy can connect multiple graphemes into long strings, and each individual *kana* can stretch or shrink, horizontally or vertically. This style is called *renmentai* 連綿体, “linked silk thread form.” Sometimes, particularly when writing poetry, the brush is not lifted until it reaches the bottom of the page. In prose, the brush is commonly lifted at the end of a sentence, and some calligraphers lift it between each word.

While the aesthetic of poetry continued to be all-*kana*, the aesthetic of prose allowed for usage of *kanji*, as mentioned above. In order to differentiate the *kanji* from the *kana*, the *kanji* were often written in Chinese-style cursive, *gyōsho* running script, or even *kaisho* standard script. Some calligraphers even used the different styles to indicate whether to read a character in Sino-Japanese or Native Japanese. For example, the character <国> may be written in *sōsho* when it should be read with the NJ pronunciation /kuni/, but in a compound like <中国>, when it should be read with the SJ pronunciation /chūgoku/, it might be written in *kaisho*.

This writing system, cumbersome though it was, spread throughout Japan in a way that *man’yōgana* never did. It continued to be used until the Meiji Period, the late nineteenth century, and during the Edo period, literacy in Japan may have been at a fairly
high level in comparison to the rest of the world, although it is difficult to prove this conclusively.

Soon after the Meiji Restoration, however, it became clear that the Japanese writing system needed serious reform. For a rapidly industrializing nation, a high rate of elementary-level literacy is essential to productivity, and the *kana* presented just as much of an obstacle to this goal as did the *kanji*. This should be obvious even from the bare-bones narrative presented above: any given phoneme (/a/, /ka/, /sa/, etc.) can be represented by numerous *kanji*. Who chose which ones to write in cursive as *kana*, and how did they make their decisions? In fact, no such choice had ever been made. While some variants were more common than others, at least in theory any *kanji* could become a *kana*, particularly at the dawn of *kana* development, and the result was that there were between three and twenty different graphemes representing each phonetic unit. This was potentially a grave impediment to widespread literacy at a functional level. From a political and diplomatic perspective, as well, the Japanese writing system was an obstacle. Its complexity made it very difficult for foreigners to learn, and it doubtless appeared primitive and needlessly convoluted to Westerners accustomed to graphemically simple writing systems.

Furthermore, soon after the start of the Meiji period, movable type began to make a comeback. Wooden movable type had arrived in Japan in the sixteenth century, followed shortly thereafter by copper movable type, and both were used on a small scale. However, both the aesthetic of the time and its artisanal economy seem to have encouraged the dominance of woodblock printing over movable type. Woodblock printing handled the multitudes of variant *kana* ably, precluding any motivation to

22 August 1994.
streamline the writing system on the publishing side; furthermore, with higher-level literacy still largely confined to the upper classes, no evidence of a popular demand for reform can be found. In the Meiji period, though, with the rise of modern industry, metal movable type was reintroduced, and this time the technology took root. Until the kana were standardized and the Chinese Minchō 明朝 typeface was adapted for Japanese use,²³ however, it was more common for texts printed with movable type to be written in a mix of kanji and katakana. This is frustrating for the modern reader, but was surely much more so for the reader accustomed to woodblock-printed text.²⁴

Due to these industrial and economic concerns, it was obvious that something needed to be done about the writing system. Debates erupted in Meiji scholarly and political circles that would take years to be resolved—only to be reignited during the postwar years, although that subject has been well-researched²⁵ and is well beyond the scope of this study. Some “radicals,” including Minister of Education Mori Arinori 森有礼 (1847-1889, held office 1886-1889), advocated abolishing the entire Japanese spoken language and using only English;²⁶ the members of the Rōmaji no Kai preferred to keep Japanese, but to write it in an alphabet; the Kana no Kai wanted to abolish kanji and use only kana. None of these proposals were adopted, but examining some of them in more detail, particularly those relating to kana, can be enlightening.

²³ Komiyama 2000, p. 324.
²⁴ Kamata 2012b.
²⁵ In English, for example, see Unger 1996.
²⁶ Swale 2000 frequently cites the Meiji perspective on Mori as a radical and even foolhardy Westernizer, for example on p. 56; however, he takes pains to argue that this view was at odds with Mori’s political philosophy, which he characterizes as “eminently pragmatic and gradualistic,” p. 43. Mori would later be vilified by post-World War II commentators for implementing the statist educational system that would foster the imperialist sentiments that led to that war. Swale also takes issue with this characterization of Mori, p. 184-87.
In an 1884 proposal\textsuperscript{27} for a reformed Japanese writing system that used only \textit{kana}, Miyake Yonekichi 三宅米吉 (1860-1929) of the Kana no Kai recommended winnowing the unwieldy traditional writing system down to one grapheme per mora. As could be reasonably expected, given the sheer number of \textit{kana} variants in common use at the time, several of Miyake’s choices for standard \textit{kana} differ from the set that would finally be standardized in 1900. In fact, with between three and twenty possible variant \textit{kana} per mora, and no immediately obvious preference for a “one variant per mora” system evident in the pre-Meiji corpus, what surprises is how few of Miyake’s suggestions differ from the eventual regulation.\textsuperscript{28} Miyake’s proposal gives no explanation or rationale for his choices; neither does the proposal from the Imperial Educational Society’s Commission for Script Reform,\textsuperscript{29} whose recommendations would eventually be made the standard in Monbushō Directive No. 14. Furthermore, the standardization seems to have been met with very little public disagreement, as is strongly evidenced by the fact that when the article standardizing the \textit{kana} was deleted from the regulation only eight years later (with no explanation), there was no return to the former situation of multiple variants per sound value. With the exception of the post-World War II institution of \textit{gendai kanazukai}, which eliminated the phonetically-redundant graphemes for /wi/ and /we/, the \textit{hiragana} have continued to be used in accordance with the 1900 standardization until the present day.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{27} Miyake 1884.
\textsuperscript{28} Monbushō Directive No. 14.
\textsuperscript{29} Ketsugi.
\textsuperscript{30} Satō 1989, p. 264.
CHAPTER 4

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS OF PRIMARY SOURCES

When beginning my work with primary texts, I first examined a large set of Edo-
period editions of the widely-used composition textbook *Teikin ōrai* 庭訓往来. My
intention was to confirm that the *kana* chart in the edition (Cat. No. 13) that I originally
discovered in my preliminary research was not an isolated incident. I theorized that the
best entry point into such a question would be to examine all of the available editions of
the same text for similar inclusions, before broadening my search. This method had the
added benefit of demonstrating exactly how much variation in content was permitted
under the same title.

The data set I chose was the set of results produced by the search term “teikin” at
Waseda University Library’s Kotenseki digital archive. From this, I narrowed the list
down to cover only those texts whose main text was *Teikin ōrai* (as opposed to different
texts with similar titles such as *Onna teikin ōrai* 女庭訓往来, etc.), and whose intention
could be assumed to be elementary-educative (as opposed to commentaries such as *Teikin
ōrai shō* 庭訓往来抄 or *Teikin ōrai kōshaku* 庭訓往来講釈). I ended up with a total of
fifty digitized texts to analyze. Out of those, seven contained *kana* charts, a proportion of
about fifteen percent—not conclusive of anything, but enough to confirm that the first
*kana* chart I discovered was in fact not an isolated incident.

Once I had concluded my observations of the *Teikin ōrai* editions, I set about
finding more *kana* charts in other ōraimono. I quickly learned that apart from *Teikin ōrai*,
*Shōbai ōrai* 商売往来, and to a lesser extent *Nōgyō ōrai* 農業往来, it became difficult to

---

31 Homepage at [http://wul.waseda.ac.jp/kotenseki/](http://wul.waseda.ac.jp/kotenseki/).
find examples of texts that were reprinted by different publishers over the course of many years. Furthermore, おりもの are not frequently-studied material, so the cataloguing and digitization of collections of おりもの is not a priority at most institutions. This meant that many of the texts that included kana charts had only one or two copies available digitally. Eventually, however, I came up with a set of twenty-five texts, drawn from the collections at Waseda University, Gakugei University, Hiroshima University, and the National Diet Library. A detailed catalogue of these texts, with high-resolution images, can be found in the Appendix. This set of twenty-five primary source texts provides a multitude of intriguing information. It should be emphasized that this is not a small selection of a larger group of texts that include kana charts. These are all the texts including kana charts that could be uncovered in the time allotted. Without question, the small size of the data set makes definitive conclusions difficult to draw. However, one conclusion is clear: each of these texts contains a kana chart which, whether in Iroha or A-KA-SA-TA order, comprises almost the exact same set of kana, sometimes referred to in the surrounding text as shinji 真字 or shōji 正字. Furthermore, this set corresponds precisely to the set that Miyake Yonekichi suggested as a standard set, as cited in Chapter 2. As standardized in 1900, and still in use today, the hiragana are identical to the charts in the primary sources, with the exception of /e/, which modern standard hiragana writes using the grapheme <え> derived from the jibo 衣, as opposed to the pre-1900 grapheme derived from <衣>. Only one chart (No. 4) deviates in any respect from this standardizing trend, which I call “proto-standard.”

---

32 Frellesvig 2010 notes that charts of the A-KA-SA-TA type, referred to as onzu 音図, are intriguing in that they “involve a substantial phonographic and phonological analysis and systematization of the letter categories defined in the Iroha,” but that “onzu remained in the realm of scholastic and academic writing until late in the Edo period” (p. 177).
Eight of the texts contain charts for variant kana as well as the proto-standard. The formats of these charts are various, but in all cases the variants can be found later in the text than the proto-standard. From this evidence, and from the repeated references to the proto-standard set as shin or shō for "true," it can be interpreted that the kana of the proto-standard chart took precedence over the variants. In one case, No. 6, the variants are referred to as shin 新 for "new." However, regardless of the format of the kana chart, or the presence or absence of a variant chart, the main text always includes variants. In many if not most cases, the variants are used more frequently than the proto-standard kana, particularly when the text is written in kanji kana majiribun. There are more or fewer variants present in the main texts, possibly depending upon the target audience of the text. Texts such as No. 19, written for a better-educated audience, have extensive arrays of variants; text No. 5, written a century later for a lower class of reader, utilizes a very narrow set. Most texts fall somewhere in the middle. Take, for example, Figure 1, an ōraimono from 1705, which has no kana chart and is written in kanbun with furigana attached to each kanji.33 In the first column of this page, the particle wa, which according to

---

33 Shotōzan tenarai kyōkunsho, high-quality scans available through Hiroshima University Institutional Repository.
orthographical rules is always written with a grapheme that represents the sound value /ha/ in all other cases, is written with a variant, <ハ>, derived from the jibo <八>. All other sound values, on their first appearance, are written using the proto-standard kana, with variants often being used for their second appearance in the same column. In the first column, this can be seen with /su/ and /mi/, both of which are written using the proto-standard kana first, and then using variants in their second appearances. None of the variants used in this text are uncommon, however, and for the most part the number of variants is restricted to two per sound value. A person with a low level of education could likely read this text without immense difficulty, thanks to the presence of the furigana.

The kana charts take various formats across the twenty-five texts, but there are several formats that are especially common. I will discuss these below.

Multiple-Form

Figure 2. Cat. No. 16, an example of a multiple-form kana chart.
Six of the twenty-five primary texts include with each *kana* some number of complementary means of writing the same sound value. This type of chart frequently has a title along the lines of ___*tei iroha*, in which the blank is a digit. (*Tei* is a common Edo-period SJ pronunciation of 体 “style,” pronounced *tai* in modern SJ.) The primary sources with this format of *kana* chart span the chronology of the catalogue, from No. 10 (1840) to No. 23 (undateable, but estimated early- to mid-Edo period). The typical layout for a chart of this type involves the proto-standard *kana* set, the *katakana*, and the *jibo* for either the *kana* or the *katakana* (where they differ). Beyond these three foundational *tei*, one or more of the earlier styles of Chinese script may be present, such as *reisho*, greater seal, or lesser seal. No particular pattern can be found in terms of the target audience for

![Image](image_url)

*Figure 3. Cat. No. 14, a multiple-form chart.*
texts with charts of this type; while four out of the six texts have furigana or kanji kana majiribun throughout the main text with a limited array of variants, the remaining two are written in kanbun, indicating a scholarly audience.

Of particular interest is No. 14, Figure 3. Probably the most intriguing of the primary sources discovered, this text purports to display the *Iroha* in kana, katakana, “ancient” (ōko 往古) script, Chinese, Sanskrit, Han’gul, and the Roman alphabet. In practice, however, only the two kana scripts are without error. The “ancient” script is just bizarre; it is unclear why the Chinese characters given differ from the man’yōgana of the *iroha*, unless the author intended to make a list of Chinese characters that were not used in Japanese at the time; the Sanskrit and Han’gul are laughable; and the alphabet letters are not present at all, although given the Kansei-period publication date, it is possible they were originally present and were censored.

The existence of the multiple-form chart indicates that *jibo* were considered important to know, give or take the occasional mistakenly-identified *jibo*. It also suggests that older forms such as seal script were of interest to Edo people despite their limited usability.

**Standard Plus Variants**

This style of chart, found in Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5, is not seen before the very late Edo period and into the Meiji. In one chart can be found the proto-standard *kana* (written large and bold) and one or more variant *kana* per sound value (written small and fine). This certainly suggests that at this point in history, the proto-standard graphemes were being emphasized over the variants. I speculate that only the proto-standard set were
being taught for writing purposes, with variants generally being relegated to “reading-only” status.

The choice of variants in these charts is counterintuitive to say the least. In some cases, unusual and complex variants are listed while their more commonly used cousins are left out, as noted in the catalogue entry for No. 1. No. 5 has the most comprehensive collection of variants per sound value, including some extremely rare ones.

Figure 4. Cat. No. 1, a late-Edo/early-Meiji classroom poster.
Two Charts

Nos. 6, 8, 13, and 25 each have two charts:

- one composed of the proto-standard kana, and
- one composed of selected variants. These “variants-only” charts may include only one variant per sound value, as in No. 6, or they may prefer to identify several variants for some sound values and none or only one for other sound values, as in No. 8. In either case, the variants presented in these charts are frequently dramatic and unusual, unlikely to be used even in the main text of the source in which the charts are to be found. It is possible that the purpose of such a chart may be reference, or even simply aesthetics, rather than education; however, without further inquiry into the uses of ōraimono both in schools and at home, such arguments remain in the realm of speculation.

Headings With Content

A third common type of chart is one in which each proto-standard kana grapheme becomes a heading for a brief commentary, poem, or other type of content. In No. 25, a scholarly work, the content is an extensive commentary on each grapheme’s origins, which probably merits translation in a future project. In No. 24, Figure 7, each kana...
heading becomes the first syllable of a different *waka* poem. Perhaps these *waka* were intended to be used as mnemonic devices, memory aids to recall the writing of the graphemes; perhaps the graphemes, in the well-known *Iroha* order, were mnemonics intended to encourage memorization of the the poems. In No. 8, each heading is followed by a sentence or two identifying the *jibo* of the proto-standard grapheme and a few more. Whatever the content, the headings provide valuable evidence of the importance of the proto-standard set of *kana*. The implications of this discovery will be discussed in Chapter 5, the concluding chapter.
CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The question I began doing my research in order to answer was a simple one: Why was there no debate over the selection of the standard hiragana in 1900? While it is difficult to lay claim to the proof of a negative, the evidence found in the primary sources points to the answer that the kana standardized were in fact historically considered to be in a class by themselves. In every kana chart but one (No. 4), the kana were identical to those chosen by the standardization committee, with the exception of /e/. While in practice, there was no distinction in usage between the kana usually placed in the charts and those that were left out, it is clear from the evidence that, by the Edo Period, there was a difference in the way these proto-standard kana were being considered.

Naturally, this discovery opens the field to many more research questions. From the graphemics perspective, the existence of such a complex writing system, which contained within itself the seeds of its own simplification, lends itself to some very intriguing discussions. Is historical Japanese script unique in its complexity, or are there more writing systems that have not yet been studied in enough detail for the full import of their historical developments to be grasped? Graphemics in its current form tends to examine writing systems synchronically, but the hentaigana phenomenon makes a convincing case for a diachronic approach.

From the perspective of Bakumatsu and Meiji studies, more work can be done on examining the primary sources from the great writing system debate. Until the present, most scholarship in English has focused on genbun itchi, kanji limitations, and the possibilities of a rōmaji system. Not much focus has been had on the decision to keep the
kana and limit them to one grapheme per mora. It is clear from the Edo-period evidence that the limitations had a historical foundation, but some support from Meiji-contemporary sources would bolster the argument further.

Finally, in the field of pre-modern Japanese studies, the answers to the most important questions may be found. First, how far back can the existence of this limited set of kana be found? And, second, where did its limitation come from? Enough preliminary evidence has been found to suggest an answer to the second question: two of the primary sources\(^{34}\) state that the iroha no moji were first written by Kūkai. It is by no means more than speculation, but it would make sense that the graphemes believed to have been invented by the saint would take special place among the variants. The description of the variants as “new” in No. 6 certainly suggests that Edo-period readers believed the proto-standard set to have been developed first, and that the other variants were invented later, by other people borrowing a good idea.

Of course, the Iroha poem itself dates to a later period than Kūkai lived; not only is there no evidence of kana usage during his lifetime, but the Iroha’s phonological patterns suggest that it was only written after the great phonological shift of the eleventh century—far too late for it to have been written by Kūkai. Therefore, the first question becomes important. Being able to trace this idea through time may lead us to the person who came up with it, whether it be the early kokugaku scholar Keichū, one of the early Edo-period government leaders, or before them as far back as Fujiwara no Teika. The answers to these two questions may require a life’s work to find.

For non-Japanese scholars to be involved in work of this kind at all, however, it is essential that open-access initiatives be broadened. This project would not have been

\(^{34}\) Nos. 12 and 16.
possible fifteen years ago, before the existence of the excellent Internet databases provided by Waseda University, Tokyo Gakugei University, and the National Diet Library. However, for the questions I have suggested above to be answered, far more primary sources are likely to be necessary. Due to the focus of most pre-modern Japanese scholars on fiction, such as *naraehon* and *kibyōshi*, the kinds of sources—*ōraimono* and other educational materials—needed for projects of this type are often the last priority for digitization. Meanwhile, the Japanese rare book collections at universities in Europe and North America are generally not digitized at all, and in many cases imperfectly catalogued as well. Without global efforts, projects of this kind will continue to be difficult to carry out to an appropriately high academic standard.
1. **Title:** *Irohazu* (伊呂波図)

**Author/illustrator:**

**Publisher firm name:**

**Publisher proprietor name:**

**Location:**

**Year:**

**Copy under analysis:** *Tokyo Gakugei University*

**Cataloguing number:** 375/IRO

**Image:**
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**Variants:**


### Notes: This chart, a wall chart for a classroom rather than a reference section in a book, presents in large, bold script the standard *iroha* (with the exception of 江). Beneath most of these graphemes, in smaller and finer print, can be seen at least one variant *kana* per sound value. In most cases, these are relatively common variants. In a few cases, the variant actually derives from the same *jibo*, but its shape is notably different. In a few more cases, the choice of variant is bewildering: why <万> for the sound value /ma/, for example, rather than <満>? Or <希> for /ke/, as opposed to the vastly more common <介>? And why no variant at all for /shi/, when the variant <志> is so frequently used in practice?
2. Title on title slip: Shōgaku dai’ichi kyō  Tsuzuriji hen 小学第一教 綴字篇

Title on title page: Same

Author: Katayama Junkichi 片山淳吉,35 Yokoyama Yoshikiyo 横山由清

Publisher firm name: Man’undō 万薀堂 / Kaibundō 魁文堂

Publisher proprietor name:

Location: Tokyo

Year: Meiji 6 (1873)

Copy under analysis: Tokyo Gakugei University

Cataloguing number: T1A11/80/Ka84

Other holdings:37 Cambridge University; Kochi University; National Institute for the Study of Educational Policy; Tsukuba University; Tokyo University; Nara Women’s University

Peritextual/extratextual material

Title page: Yes

Foreword: Yes, Yokoyama

Illustrations: Some

Ribbon: No

Afterword: No

Colophon: Yes

Furigana: Yes
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35 Three publications in NKSM, none of which are this one. Meiji-period Occident scholar (yōgakusha 洋学者)
36 68 publications in NKSM; Bakumatsu and Meiji.
37 http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA48801261
Usage: Inconsistent

Variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>阿</th>
<th>可</th>
<th>家</th>
<th>多</th>
<th>者</th>
<th>満</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>起</td>
<td>志</td>
<td>耳</td>
<td>飛</td>
<td>三</td>
<td>里</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>須</td>
<td>津</td>
<td>婦</td>
<td>無</td>
<td>累</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>介</td>
<td>勢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>免</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>登</td>
<td>能</td>
<td>本</td>
<td>越</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kana Chart

Location in text: Middle (thumbnail 17)

Title: *Hiragana shōhenji shū* 平仮名正変字集

Order: A-KA-SA-TA

Variants:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/l/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/y/</th>
<th>/r/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>阿</td>
<td>可</td>
<td>佐</td>
<td>散</td>
<td>多</td>
<td>堂</td>
<td>那</td>
<td>盘</td>
<td>滴</td>
<td>万</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>那</td>
<td>木</td>
<td>漠</td>
<td>达</td>
<td>万</td>
<td>万</td>
<td>万</td>
<td>万</td>
<td>万</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>那</td>
<td>木</td>
<td>漠</td>
<td>达</td>
<td>万</td>
<td>万</td>
<td>万</td>
<td>万</td>
<td>万</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>/e/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
<th>/o/</th>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/e/</th>
<th>/o/</th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>/e/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
<th>/o/</th>
<th>/a/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>伊</td>
<td>介</td>
<td>具</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>古</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>意</td>
<td>气</td>
<td>春</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>支</td>
<td>起</td>
<td>志</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>支</td>
<td>起</td>
<td>志</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>支</td>
<td>起</td>
<td>志</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>楚</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** There are two more charts, appearing before this one, that introduce the *sei* 正 and *hen* 変 graphemes separately. I chose to analyze this chart because its variants are more diverse.

**Additional Images**
3. Title on title slip: *Uimanabi* うひまなび

**Author:** Yanagawa Harukage 柳河 春蔭

**Publisher firm name:**

**Publisher proprietor name:** Jōshūya ???shichi 上州屋七

**Location:** Tokyo

**Year:** Meiji 2 (1869)

**Copy under analysis:** Hiroshima University

**Cataloguing number:**

**Other holdings:** Aomori Prefectural Library; Morioka City Community Center; Tochigi Prefectural Library; Tamagawa University; Fukui Prefectural Library; Nagoya City Museum

**Peritextual/extratextual material**

- **Title page:** No
- **Foreword:** No
- **Illustrations:** No
- **Ribbon:** No
- **Afterword:** No
- **Colophon:** Yes
- **Furigana:** Yes

**Usage:** Throughout

**Variants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/l/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/y/</th>
<th>/r/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>可</td>
<td>多</td>
<td>者</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>王</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kana Chart

Location in text: Beginning

Title: None

Order: IROHA

Variants:
Notes: To the untrained eye, the handwriting looks quite similar to that of No. 19. It has a similar layout as well, with the proto-standard *kana* larger and bold, and one or two variants beneath in smaller, finer script.

Additional Images
4. **Title on title slip:** damaged, probably *Ansei shinpan Teikin ōrai Zen* 安政新版 庭訓 往来 全

**Title on title page:** *Ansei shinpan Teikin ōrai Kan* 安政新版 庭訓往来 完

**Author/illustrator/calligrapher:** Mizoe Oryūsai 溝江 小笠斎

**Publisher firm name:** Kinzuidō 金随堂

**Publisher proprietor name:** Wataya Kihei 綿屋喜兵衛

**Location:** Osaka

**Year:** Ansei period (1854-1860)

**Copy Under Analysis:** Waseda University

**Cataloguing number (in case of link breakage):** 文庫 20 00440

**Other Holdings:** Postal Museum of Japan

**Peritextual/extratextual material**

- **Title page:** Yes
- **Foreword:** No
- **Ribbon:** No
- **Illustrations:** Decoration on title page, Zodiac animals on colophon page
- **Afterword:** No
- **Colophon:** Yes, possibly added later

**Furigana:** Yes

---

38 Although this particular edition of *Teikin ōrai* is not found in Koizumi 2001, six other texts of this author’s can be, with dates of 1857, 1865, 1864, 1847, and unspecified Ansei Period (1854-60). From these data the calligrapher’s active period can be deduced.

39 According to Marks 2011, active 1809-85. The family name was Maeda, and from 1876 this name was used in publications.
**Usage:** only on colophon page

**Variants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
<th>/e/</th>
<th>/o/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>多</td>
<td>三</td>
<td>三</td>
<td>子</td>
<td>子</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kana Chart**

**Location in text:** Colophon (glued to back cover)

**Title:** Gojūon sōtsū 五十音相通 (The fifty sounds in common use)

**Order:** AIUEO/A-KA-SA-TA

**Variants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
<th>/e/</th>
<th>/o/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes: The main text is in the “naked text” style: no ribbon, no furigana, with kunten only showing reading order. The colophon specifies saihan 再版 “reprint” after Wataya Kihei’s name, suggesting that the colophon (with kana chart) may be later than the Ansei original printing. The scant furigana usage on the colophon page contains 5 variants from the kana chart. The kana chart contains an additional 4 variations from modern standard hiragana, for a total of 9 variants present.

Additional Images

[Title slip]  [Title page]
5. Title on title slip: Daiji shinpan Teikin ōrai Zen

Title on slipcover: Goji kaisei Teikin ōrai Zen

Author/illustrator/calligrapher: Oieryū Sanseidō Shujin

Publisher firm name: Bunkōdō

Location: Edo

Year: unknown, but calligrapher published another ōraimono in Kyōho 5 (1721), while earliest (dated) extant Bunkōdō publication is Ansei 2 (1855).

Copy under analysis: Waseda University

Cataloguing number: 文庫 30 g0004

Other holdings: None found

Peritextual/extratextual material

Title page: No (slipcover)

Foreword: no

Ribbon: yes

Illustrations: no

Afterword: no

Colophon: no

Furigana: yes

---

40 A title designating a master of a particular calligraphy style.
41 According to Marks 2011, the proprietor’s name is Yoshidaya Bunzaburō, family name Kimura. The firm, also known as Gyokuyōdō, was active 1804-85. He published several of Hokusai’s works.
42 Koizumi 2001 lists five of this calligrapher’s publications, none of which have dates more specific than Edo kōki (late Edo) or Meiji nenkan (Meiji Period). On the other hand, NKSM attributes only two publications to him, one of which has a date of Kyōhō 5 (1720). It is possible this was a hereditary title, or that this style of calligraphy become popular during the Bakumatsu and was subject to homages.
**Usage:** in ribbon only

**Variants:** (first 10 pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/t/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/y/</th>
<th>/r/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>可</td>
<td>多</td>
<td>八</td>
<td>者</td>
<td>滴</td>
<td>王</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kana Chart**

[Image of Kana Chart]
Title: Kana kakikae narabi honji 仮名書替並本字

Order: IROHA

Variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
<th>/e/</th>
<th>/o/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Main text has kunten 訓点 and okurigana 送り仮名, but no furigana. Format is “plain ribbon style”: a ribbon without illustrations and with largely scholarly content (i.e., lists of famous surnames and place names, with furigana); no illustrations, foreword or afterword.

The calligrapher, Sanseidō Shujin, has one publication listing in the NIJL database, which is dated to Kyōhō 5 (1721); however, Bunkōdō does not have any publications in either database dated before Ansei 2 (1855). This suggests either that the text is a reprint of a much earlier edition, or that it is an homage to the calligrapher rather than written by him.
While the chart presents many variant *jibo* for each phoneme, the heading for each group is the standard *kana*, apart from the variant /e/, which actually appears more commonly in kana charts than the /e/ that would be standardized. When compared to the furigana usage, however, it becomes clear that the standard kana used in the headings are not always the most commonly used in practice. In the first ten pages of the ribbon, there are no uses of the standard <か>, <た>, <に>, <は>, <ほ>, <み>, <れ>, or <わ>—only variants. Standard <す>, <ね>, and <ま> are used in free variation with their variant counterparts.

**ADDITIONAL IMAGES**

[Title slip]  [Slipcover]
6. **Title on title slip**: Shinpan *Yamato nichiyō hayagaku* 新版 大和日用早学

**Title at beginning of text**: the same

**Author/illustrator/calligrapher**: unknown

**Publisher**: unknown

**Location**: unknown

**Year**: Pre-Ansei Period (begins 1854)

**Copy under analysis**: Gakugei University

**Cataloguing number**: T1A0/74/134

**Other holdings**: One for sale at Oraimono Club.

**Peritextual/extratextual material**

- **Title page**: No
- **Foreword**: No
- **Ribbon**: No
- **Illustrations**: No
- **Afterword**: No
- **Colophon**: No
- **Furigana**: Yes

**Usage**: Throughout

**Variants**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/t/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/y/</th>
<th>/r/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>可</td>
<td>多</td>
<td>者</td>
<td>满</td>
<td>王</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kana chart 1

Location in text: Beginning

Title: None

Order: IROHA

Variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
<th>/e/</th>
<th>/o/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>介</td>
<td>遍</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>本</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kana chart 2

(Note: This is a composite image. The chart occupies two pages in the text.)

**Location in text:** Beginning, immediately after chart 1

**Title:** Shin iroha 新いろは ("new iroha")

**Order:** IROHA

**Variants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>阿</th>
<th>可</th>
<th>差??</th>
<th>多</th>
<th>那</th>
<th>者</th>
<th>満</th>
<th>屋</th>
<th>羅</th>
<th>王</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>起</td>
<td>志</td>
<td>千</td>
<td>尔</td>
<td>飛</td>
<td>見</td>
<td>里</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>具</td>
<td>春</td>
<td>徒</td>
<td>怒</td>
<td>婦</td>
<td>無</td>
<td>類</td>
<td>井</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>介</td>
<td>帝</td>
<td>遍</td>
<td>免</td>
<td>連</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>登</td>
<td>本</td>
<td>茂</td>
<td>路</td>
<td>越</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes: A few of the kana in chart 2 have the same jibo as their counterparts in chart 1, but they differ in style. Compare, for example, the い in chart 2 to the い in the title one line to the right. Both come from the jibo 似, but there were two acceptable ways to stylize it as a kana. In any case, despite the admirable number of variants presented in Chart 2, only eleven of them can be found in the main text. There are no variants used in the main text that do not appear in Chart 2. As is common in these charts, <江> takes the place of <え> in chart 1; <え> can be found where expected in chart 2.

ADDITIONAL IMAGES

[Title slip]  [Text immediately following Chart 2; “As for this IROHA, to learn it, you may know from the previous kana.” In other words, to read these kana, compare to the previous list.]
7. Title on title slip: [heading illegible] *Taizen shin dōji ōrai* 大全新童子往来

Title on title page: *Taizen dōji ōrai hyakkatsu* 大全童子往来百家通

Author/illustrator: Ryūshōdō 龍章堂 / Akatsuki Kanenari 暁 金成

Publisher proprietor name: Akitaya Taemon 秋田屋 太右衛門

Location: Osaka

Year: Kaei 5 (1852) reprint of a Tenpō 8 (1837) edition

Copy under analysis: Waseda Kotenseki

Cataloguing number: 文庫 30 G0254

Other holdings: Tsukuba University; National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics; Tokyo Gakugei University; Hiroshima University; Tokyo University (several copies); Postal Museum Japan; Kokugakuin University; Tamagawa University

Peritextual/extratextual material

**Title Page:** Yes

**Foreword:** Yes (題辞)

**Illustrations:** Yes

**Ribbon:** Yes

**Afterword:** No

**Colophon:** Yes

**Furigana:** Yes

**Usage:** Throughout

**Variants:**

<p>| /k/ | /s/ | /t/ | /n/ | /h/ | /m/ | /y/ | /r/ | /w/ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>可</th>
<th>多</th>
<th>者</th>
<th>満</th>
<th>王</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>尔</td>
<td>三</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>本</td>
<td>越</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kana Chart**

**Location in text:** Thumbnail 21  
**Title:** None  
**Order:** IROHA  
**Variants:** え＝江

**Notes:** This text also contains a *katakana* chart, similar to the *kana* chart in No. 3 above, in that it is organized in A-KA-SA-TA order with a heading indicating place of articulation at the head of each column. It is entitled *Goin sōtsū katakana no hajimari* 五音相通 片加奈の始原 [sic].
It is interesting to note how little attention is paid to line breaks in any of the IROHA-ordered kana charts under analysis. While Japanese does not have spaces between words, even premodern manuscripts nonetheless adhere, to varying degrees, to certain spacing standards—for example, words are not often divided between columns. When an inflected verb stem connected to a sentence-final auxiliary verb appears close to the end of a column, the auxiliary verb is frequently crammed into the space between that column and the next, rather than taking the typical place at the top of the next column. In the IROHA charts, however, priority tends to be given to having an equal number of kana in each column, despite that this results in clauses and words being divided between columns. See, for example, waka/ yo tare so tsune na/ ramu, rather than the expected division, waka yo tare so/ tsune naramu. This custom being so widespread suggests that the IROHA was being used as a chart, i.e. an organizing schema, rather than as a poem with a defined meaning.

ADDITIONAL IMAGES

[Title slip]
[Go’in sōtsū chart]
8. **Title on title slip:** Kanaji shō 仮名字抄

**Title on title page:** Kanaji shō Zen 仮名字抄 全

**Author/illustrator:** Saitō Hikomaro 齊藤彦麿 (著) / Emura Fumio 江邑文雄 (書)

**Publisher firm name:**

**Publisher proprietor name:** Okadaya Kashichi 岡田屋嘉七

**Location:** Edo

**Year:** Kaei 1 (1848)

**Copy under analysis:** Tokyo Gakugei University

**Cataloguing number:** T1A0/11/149

**Other holdings:** National Diet Library; Cabinet Library; Seika Bunko Art Museum; Tokyo University; Tohoku University; Tokyo Metropolitan Library; Mukyūkai Library

**Peritextual/extratextual material**

- **Title page:** Yes
- **Foreword:** Yes, Hikomaro
- **Illustrations:** No
- **Ribbon:** No
- **Afterword:** Yes, Emura
- **Colophon:** Yes
- **Furigana:** Yes

**Usage:** In bits and pieces throughout--interspersed with kanbun passages

**Variants:**

| /kl | /sl | /tl | /nl | /hl | /m | /y | /l | /w |

61
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>可</th>
<th>哥</th>
<th>多</th>
<th>八</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>志</td>
<td>尔</td>
<td>三</td>
<td>里</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>須</td>
<td>婦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>介</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>能</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kana Chart 1
Title: None

Order: IROHA

Variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
<th>/e/</th>
<th>/o/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Kana Chart 2
Location in text: Following Chart 1

Title: None

Order: IROHA with some sound values left out

Variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variants</th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/t/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/y/</th>
<th>/r/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>阿</td>
<td>可</td>
<td>閑</td>
<td>佐</td>
<td>多</td>
<td>堂</td>
<td>奈</td>
<td>者</td>
<td>八</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>万</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>羅</td>
<td>王</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>散</td>
<td>起</td>
<td>志</td>
<td>丹</td>
<td>伊</td>
<td>耳</td>
<td>飛</td>
<td>悲</td>
<td>三</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>里</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>具</td>
<td>寿</td>
<td>須</td>
<td>数</td>
<td>津</td>
<td>徒</td>
<td>妻</td>
<td>布</td>
<td>無</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>遊</td>
<td>流</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>類</td>
<td>類</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>盈</td>
<td>要</td>
<td>化</td>
<td>氣</td>
<td>勢</td>
<td>亭</td>
<td>年</td>
<td>遍</td>
<td>免</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>連</td>
<td>麗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>衛</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>希</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>故</td>
<td>許</td>
<td>楚</td>
<td>所</td>
<td>登</td>
<td>能</td>
<td>本</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Some similarity with No. 7 above, in that it has two charts, the first with the proto-standard, the second with a variety of common and uncommon variant *kana*. This text, however, is more expansive, with little explanations beneath each grapheme in Chart 1, and more variants in Chart 2.
9. Title on title slip: *Shinpan eshō Tenaraijō Zen* 新版絵抄 手習状 全

**Author/illustrator:** None

**Publisher firm name:** Shōkabō 裳華房

**Publisher proprietor name:** Iseya Shiroki Han’emon 伊勢屋 白木 半右衛門

**Location:** Sendai

**Year:** Tenpo 14 (1843)

**Copy under analysis:** Waseda Kotenseki

**Cataloguing number:** 文庫 30 G0343

**Other holdings:** Kansai University; Miyagi Kyoiku University; Kitakami Library

**Peritextual/extratextual material**

- **Title page:** No
- **Foreword:** No
- **Illustrations:** Yes
- **Ribbon:** Yes
- **Afterword:** No
- **Colophon:** Yes
- **Furigana:** Yes

**Usage:** Throughout

**Variants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/t/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/y/</th>
<th>/r/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>阿</td>
<td>可</td>
<td>多</td>
<td>八</td>
<td>者</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>王</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td></td>
<td>志</td>
<td>尔</td>
<td>三</td>
<td>里</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kana Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
<th>/e/</th>
<th>/o/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location in text:</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order:</td>
<td>IROHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes: Considering how late the publication date, this is a very short text. Not counting the *kana* chart page and the colophon page, the text occupies only two and one half double-spreads. Typical variations in *kana* usage.
Title on title slip: Kashiragaki chōhō sūjō  Shugei jukujutsu teikinsho Nōmin nichiyō

Title on title page: Saishin hyakushō ōrai hōnengura 再新百性往来豊年蔵

Author/Illustrator: Tokusōshi 禿箒子

Publisher firm name: Kinshindō 綿森堂

Publisher proprietor name: Moriya Jihei 森屋治兵衛

Location: Edo

Year: Tenpo 11 (1840) reprint of a Kansei 9 (1797) reprint of a Meiwa 3 (1766) original

Copy under analysis: Waseda Kotenseki

Cataloguing number: 文庫 30 G0162

Other holdings: Numerous extant copies of various reprints; of this particular edition, Kyushu University; Gakugei University

Peritextual/extratextual materials

Title page: Yes

Foreword: Yes

Illustrations: Yes

Ribbon: Yes

Afterword: No

Colophon: Yes

Furigana: Yes

Usage: Throughout
### Variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/t/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/y/</th>
<th>/r/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>可</td>
<td>多</td>
<td>者</td>
<td>満</td>
<td>王</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kana Chart:

Location in text: Colophon page

Title: Santei iroha 三体いろは

Order: IROHA
**Variants:** /e/ 江

**Notes:** As with other texts that claim to list the *jibo*, in situations where the *jibo* for *katakana* and *hiragana* differ, the creator has occasionally chosen to provide the *katakana jibo* rather than the *hiragana*. See い和す. Also, in a few cases, the *jibo* provided does not match either the *hiragana* or the *katakana*. See つ（闘） and え（依）.

This is one of several texts that present the *iroha* in a number of different formats (*tai* or *tei体*).
11. **Title on title slip:** Sangaku ōrai saichibukuro Zen 三学往来才智袋 全

**Title on title page:** Sangaku ōrai Zen 三学往来 全

**Author/illustrator:** None given

**Publisher firm name:** None given

**Publisher proprietor name:** Kobayashi Rihei 小林利兵衛

**Location:** Osaka

**Year:** Bunsei 10 (1827)

**Copy under analysis:** Waseda Kotenseki

**Cataloguing number:** 文庫 30 E0444

**Other holdings:** Tokyo University; earlier editions at Miyoshi City Library, UC Berkeley, Hibiya Library, Postal Museum Japan

**Peritextual/extratextual material**

- **Title page:** Yes
- **Foreword:** Yes
- **Illustrations:** Yes
- **Ribbon:** Yes
- **Afterword:** No
- **Colophon:** Yes
- **Furigana:** Yes

**Usage:** Throughout

**Variants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/t/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/y/</th>
<th>/r/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>可</td>
<td>多</td>
<td>八</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kana Chart

Location in text: Near beginning of text (thumbnail 18)

Title: Katakana

Order: IROHA

Variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/t/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/y/</th>
<th>/r/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Though the chart is entitled Katakana, by virtue of there being hiragana glosses on each grapheme it works well as a kana chart as well. Only the usual deviation is present.
12. **Title on title slip:** Hiragana tsuki Teikin őrai kyōzokukai Bunsho... [damaged]

Author/illustrator/calligrapher: Eishōsai 容松斎 (active 1786-1808)

Publisher proprietor name: Iwatoya Kisaburo 岩戸屋喜三郎

Location: Edo

Year: Bunsei 13 (1816)

Copy under analysis: Waseda University

Cataloguing number: 文庫 30 g0014

Other holdings: None found

**Peritextual/extratextual material**

**Title page:** No

**Foreword:** Yes

**Illustrations:** In foreword

**Ribbon:** No

**Afterword:** No

**Colophon:** Yes

**Furigana:** Yes

**Usage:** Throughout

**Variants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/l/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/y/</th>
<th>/r/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>可</td>
<td>多</td>
<td>八者</td>
<td>満</td>
<td>王</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>起</td>
<td>尔耳</td>
<td>飛</td>
<td>三</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Title:
Not exactly, but the poem is introduced by a section (*iroha no yurai* 伊呂波之由来, “origins of the *iroha*”) which explains that it came from Kōbō Daishi.

### Order:
**IROHA**

### Variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
<th>/e/</th>
<th>/o/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>江</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
One of the texts that offers an explanation where the *iroha* comes from, although it remains unclear whether that refers only to the poem or also to these specific graphemes.
13. **Title on title slip:** [illegible]

**Title on title page:** *Teikin ōrai Terako dakara* 庭訓往来 寺子宝

**Author/illustrator/calligrapher:** Not listed

**Publisher firm name:** Shōyō shodō 逍遥書堂 reprint according to title page;

Gyokuzandō 玉山堂 according to colophon

**Publisher proprietor name:** Yamashiroya Sahei 山城屋佐兵衛

**Location:** Edo

**Year:** Not listed

**Copy under analysis:** Waseda University

**Cataloguing number:** 文庫 30 g0016

**Other holdings:** Waseda has second copy with different colophon (they say 1815);

JAIRO also has possible listing? Another possible one at Tōjō shoten

**Peritextual/extratextual material**

- **Title Page:** Yes
- **Foreword:** No, but a poem
- **Illustrations:** Yes
- **Ribbon:** Yes
- **Afterword:** No
- **Colophon:** Yes
- **Furigana:** Yes
  - **Usage:** In ribbon
- **Variants:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kana chart 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>可</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location in text: First page after title spread

Title: *Iroha no shinmoji* 伊呂波真文字 ("true iroha graphemes")

Order: IROHA
Variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/t/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/y/</th>
<th>/r/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/ /江</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also notes that ～ can be written with 反 or 閉, but does not offer kana renderings of the characters. Misidentifies the jibo of づ as 間, and notes, as above, that 門 can be used as well. え (江), め, and も note alternate characters as 衣, 妙, and 母 respectively. It is unclear in any of these cases whether the intended meaning is that this grapheme’s jibo is disputed, or merely that the same phoneme has multiple “true” (shin 真) kana. The second interpretation is more probable.

Kana chart 2
Location in text: Beginning, immediately following Chart 1

Title: Shūi 拾遺 ("gleanings")

Order: Begins in rough IROHA order, with unnecessary graphemes removed; order is completely abandoned halfway through. (/ha/, /ni/, /ni/, /ni/, /ho/, /ho/, /he/, /ru/, /wa/, /ne/, /na/, /na/, /ni/, /no/, /ma/, /ma/, /ke/, /ke/, /ko/, /te/, /te/, /hi/, [after this the IROHA order ends] /el/, /ha/, /ke/, /na/, /ka/, /ka/, /ta/, /sa/, /tsu/, /tsu/, /me/, /na/, /ni/

Variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/l/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/y/</th>
<th>/l/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>可ケ</td>
<td>佐</td>
<td>堂</td>
<td>那</td>
<td>南</td>
<td>盤</td>
<td>者</td>
<td>万</td>
<td>満</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Notes:

Chart 2 comprises some common variants, some less-common variants, some variant forms of standard kana, and a few cases of mistaken identity, as in the grapheme pronounced /te/ (third line from the right, second kana from the top), which is a variant form of the kana <て>, whose jibo is <天>. The jibo identified in Chart 2, <弖>, is an unusual case of a kokuji 国字 which was created for a phonetic rather than a semantic purpose. As noted above, Chart 1 also identifies alternative jibo, but it is unclear whether these are to be interpreted as jibo for the same grapheme, or jibo for alternative graphemes that the creator nonetheless considered “true.”

In general, Chart 2 is inexpertly done, with repetitions and inconsistencies. For example, the kaisho character beneath each kana at first is the jibo of the kana above it, but later begins to be mixed up. The kana <な> appears above the kanji <南>, but the jibo of <な> is in fact <奈>. Similarly, two kanji, <気> and <花> appear below the kana <> (third column from the right, third kana from the bottom), but neither of those is its jibo, which is <介>. The compiler begins Chart 2 in IROHA order, leaving out the phonemes he does not have variant kana.
for. However, after the *kana* fourth from the top of the third column from the right, he appears to be adding extra variants as he thinks of them.
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