

# The Japanese Script since 1900

---

Chris Seeley

University of Canterbury, New Zealand

The postwar *Tōyō kanji* reforms were successful in helping very substantially to simplify the writing of ordinary, non-specialist Japanese texts by restricting the number of kanji in use, their readings, and their form (*jitai*). In 1981 the *Tōyō kanji* List of 1946 was replaced by the more extensive *Jōyō kanji* List. The compilation of the new list over a period of eight years, and its formal adoption, were the subject of much debate. This article gives an account of the new list in terms of its development through two draft stages to the final version, examines its contents and nature, and provides a comparison with the *Tōyō kanji* List. By way of introduction, a summary is given of changes in the Japanese script from 1900 onwards.

## 1 Script Reform: Incipient Attempts

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century the written language was the topic of much controversy and debate in Japan. Various proposals for script reform were put forward prior to 1900, most of which fall into one or the other of three categories: (1) use of kana only, (2) use of romanisation only, (3) continuation of the existing writing system, but with restrictions on the number of kanji employed.<sup>1</sup> For the last of these measures in particular there appears to have been substantial support; not only did it have the support of those who saw restrictions on use of kanji as the ultimate goal,<sup>2</sup> but also it was favoured by certain other scholars who, though they wanted to see the conventional orthography replaced by a phonogram script in due course, considered that a direct transition to such a script would be too abrupt and drastic to have much chance of success.<sup>3</sup>

In response to the mood of the times, in 1900 the Monbushō (Education Ministry) issued new regulations aimed at simplifying the teaching of written Japanese at the primary level. The regulations involved the following: the setting-up of a limited number of kana signs as standard,<sup>4</sup> restricting the number of different *kanji* taught in primary schools to about 1200,<sup>5</sup> and finally, changing the complicated and cumbersome system of kana usage for Sino-Japanese (SJ) items from a historical system to one based on pronunciation.<sup>6</sup>

The first two of the above measures seem to have been generally welcomed, but the third was not. The main features of the rules for SJ kana usage were as follows: (1) use of the length mark in representing the long vowels *ō* and *ū* (e.g., うんとうー, べんきょー); (2) adoption of small-sized や・ゆ・よ in writing syllables such as *kyu* and *ryo* (きゅ and りょ respectively), and small-sized つ in writing a cluster of two like consonants (e.g., がっこー *gakkō*); (3) abolition of the following orthographic distinctions— か:くわ、じ:ぢ、す:づ (thereafter written as かじす" respectively).<sup>7</sup>

These modifications to SJ kana usage meant that the writing of SJ items in kana was greatly simplified at the primary level—the very level where historical kana usage presented the greatest obstacle, being prominent there because of necessity only a limited number of kanji could be used. The new kana usage meant, for example, that SJ *ō*, which was traditionally written in one of six different ways, came to be written in all cases as おー.<sup>8</sup>

Since the Monbushō's new rules for SJ kana usage clearly resulted in considerable simplification, what were the objections to them? One source of difficulty was that the new kana usage related only to the writing of *kango* (SJ items), while native Japanese words and elements (NJ) continued to be written in historical kana usage, e.g., (てふ)ませう (not \*たり)ましょー). This distinction in the way of using kana to write SJ on the one hand and NJ on the other proved to be a problem for primary school children, at least those at the more junior levels, since they were not yet able to appreciate the difference between the two layers. Another problem was that this type of kana usage was employed only in the primary schools, the historical variety being used for the SJ layer in junior high schools and beyond. There was, in other words, a lack of consistency between the forms of SJ kana usage employed by different groups within society. In addition, the new kana usage was criticised by some for use of the length mark (traditionally used only in conjunction with katakana) in combination with hiragana, and for the writing of *ē* as えい and not えー

Aware of such difficulties as these, the Monbushō requested the Kokugo chōsa iinkai (Japanese Language Investigative Committee)<sup>9</sup> to look into the whole question of kana usage for both SJ and NJ. Meanwhile, the movement opposing the new kana usage gained momentum, with men such as Mori Ōgai arguing that the historical kana usage represented the essential form of the Japanese language and so should be preserved in perpetuity. As a result of the controversy which arose concerning the precise form which kana usage should take, in September 1908 the

Monbushō rescinded the regulations of 1900 relating to kana signs, kana usage, and kanji.

In this way, a temporary victory was won in retaining the script unchanged. There were, though, several factors at work within society which actively favoured simplification of the script. One such factor was a desire to shorten the length of time needed to complete an education: compared with the West, the Japanese education system entailed 2-3 years' extra study to complete a university degree, and this was seen as a desirable area for reform.<sup>10</sup> After considering how to ameliorate the situation without bringing about a decline in academic standards, Hoshina Kōichi, a language scholar who had studied under Ueda Kazutoshi (1867-1937: one of the first Japanese to study modern Western linguistic science), came to the conclusion that one possible answer lay in simplification of the script. The first aspect of the script to be taken up by Hoshina was the form (*jiti* 字体) of individual kanji.<sup>11</sup> A number of scholars brought together by Hoshina worked on the problem of *jitai*, and as a result of this a list of kanji entitled *Kanji seirian* (Proposed modifications to kanji) was published in 1919. This list, which contained about 2600 kanji, gave one recommended form of each kanji for use in both printed and handwritten texts. Though not officially adopted, the *Kanji seirian* is nevertheless of significance as an early attempt by the Monbushō to produce some sort of standard list of kanji.

During the first decades of the twentieth century, moves in the direction of simplifying the script were also being made by the newspaper companies. From early in the Meiji period, newspapers had been written in a difficult style which employed a very large number of kanji—a feature which meant that they were intelligible to only a relatively small readership. The first step towards simplification was taken in 1888, when the *Ōsaka Asahi shinbun* began adding small-sized kana to the side of kanji (so as to indicate the pronunciation of the latter) in all articles.<sup>12</sup> In 1900 Hara Takashi, chief editor (and later company president) of the *Ōsaka Mainichi shinbun*, wrote a series of articles in that newspaper in which he argued in favour of reducing the number of kanji used.<sup>13</sup>

The trend towards adoption of a less complicated orthography and more colloquial written style received further impetus after Hara Takashi rose to the position of Prime Minister in 1918.<sup>14</sup> In addition to this, with the principles of democracy taking root in Japan round about that time, there were calls from various quarters for the “democratization” of newspapers so as to make them accessible to everyone rather than to just a privileged few. This proposal was one which was attractive to the newspaper companies, for one thing because processes such as printing and proof reading were easier using a small set of kanji than a large one. On March

21, 1921, a number of Tokyo and Osaka newspapers carried a joint statement entitled *Kanji seigen o teishō su* (Advocation of restriction on the number of kanji), which announced the proposed dropping of particularly difficult kanji from newspapers and use of katakana in their place.<sup>15</sup>

In the same year that the above joint statement appeared, a new body, called the Rinji kokugo chōsakai (Interim Committee on The National Language), was established.<sup>16</sup> Three topics were decided on for early investigation by the committee, viz. a kanji survey (with a view to reducing the number of kanji in use), revision of kana usage, and modification of the colloquial written style.<sup>17</sup> As a result of deliberations, in May 1923 the Interim Committee produced the *Jōyō kanjihyō* (List of kanji for general use), a list containing the kanji which were considered necessary for writing ordinary Japanese texts.<sup>18</sup> The *Jōyō kanjihyō* was welcomed by the major newspaper companies, which on August 5, 1923, announced their intention to base kanji use in newspapers on the list as of September 1 of that year.<sup>19</sup> Unfortunately, September 1, 1923, turned out to be the day of the Great Kanto Earthquake, and so as a result of the ensuing chaos and disruption the proposed kanji restrictions had to be postponed. Two years later a number of Tokyo newspaper companies held discussions and then put out another joint statement,<sup>20</sup> reaffirming their intention to restrict the number of kanji used in newspapers, and proposing to follow the same principle as far as possible in newspaper advertisements also.<sup>21</sup> It was decided to employ a modern version of the 1923 *Jōyō kanjihyō* consisting of 2108 kanji, and not to use kanji outside the list other than in proper nouns, the texts of Imperial rescripts and of laws, and unavoidable quotations. The amended list of 1925 did not, however, have any greatly beneficial effect. The reason for this was that particularly difficult kanji were simply replaced by kana which were identified as substitute signs by the addition of a dot or dots, e. g. 疑 *しんじ* for 狐疑 *しんじ* *kogi shunjun* "hesitancy, vacillation", or 苛 *かれんちりきり* for 苛 *かれんちりきり* *karen chūkyū* "extortion". Rewriting certain *kango* in this way had the advantage of reducing the overall number of kanji used, but in some cases only at the cost of semantic clarity. To help overcome this difficulty, therefore, between 1926 and 1928 the Interim Committee compiled its *Kango seirian* (Proposed modifications to *kango*) in which a number of complicated kanji were replaced by simpler ones. The Interim Committee also set itself the task at about that time of making modifications to the *Jōyō kanjihyō* of 1923, and in 1931 made public proposed revisions resulting in a kanji list of 1856 signs.<sup>22</sup> However, in September 1931 there was the outbreak of the Manchuria Incident and this made it difficult to keep within the limits of the new kanji

list for several reasons: firstly, there was the need to write a large number of Chinese personal and place names, many of which involved uncommon kanji; secondly, the military, who reported on the Manchuria Incident, favoured a written style which was characterized by heavy use of *kango* and difficult kanji.

The Manchuria Incident, with the ensuing mood of conservatism and nationalism which it evoked, also created an obstacle to the revision of kana usage. In 1931, at the same time as the kanji revision proposals, the Interim Committee put forward a proposal to modify an earlier projected pronunciation-based kana usage (proposed in 1924).<sup>23</sup> Subsequently—in June of that year—the Monbushō determined to adopt the modified kana usage in primary school textbooks from the following year. However, public opinion on the issue was so divided that, in the end, the Monbushō abandoned its proposed course of action.<sup>24</sup>

The Interim Committee on The National Language, had, as its name suggests, originally been set up only as a temporary body, and so in 1934 a new organisation called the Kokugo shingikai (Deliberative Council on The National Language) was formed. The following year, the Education Minister (Masuda Genji) requested the Deliberative Council to inquire into the following four topics: “control of the national language” (*kokugo no tōsei*, a kanji survey, revision of kana usage, and improvement of written style. The first of these topics to be taken up by the Council was the kanji survey, but a new and major obstacle was presented at about this time by the emergence of a view of kanji which was linked to the preservation of the *kokutai* “national policy”.<sup>25</sup> The new intellectual climate that prevailed can be illustrated by the case of the Education Minister Hirao Hachisaburō. Originally in favour of abolishing kanji, Hirao was subsequently forced to draw back from this view in both the Upper and Lower House after his critics maintained that to abolish kanji would mean changing the form of Imperial rescripts, an act which, they argued, would be disrespectful towards the Emperor and would have a negative effect on the Japanese spirit because writing and thought were, in their view, inseparable.<sup>26</sup>

In this intellectual environment the Deliberative Council clearly had to exercise great circumspection in its deliberations on kanji reform. In consequence its *Kanji jitai seirian* (Proposed modifications to the form of kanji) of 1938 contained two categories of kanji — one category for use in school textbooks and for general use, the other for special texts such as Imperial rescripts. Thus, the kanji 關 辭 變 繼, for example, were to be replaced in special texts by their unsimplified, more formal equivalents 關 辭 變 繼 respectively.<sup>27</sup> Opposition to the list from conservative elements meant that the *Kanji jitai seirian* was not put into effect at

that time. It is, though, considered to have had substantial influence on the form of kanji appearing in the *Tōyō kanji jitaihyō* (List of forms for the kanji for current use) adopted in 1949.<sup>28</sup>

The *Kanji jitai seirian* addressed itself primarily to the question of the recommended forms of kanji. Shortly before this list was completed, the Deliberative Council set about the task of compiling another list which was to contain the kanji needed for writing ordinary texts. Completed in June 1942, the new list was given the title *Hyōjun kanjihyō* (List of standard kanji). The purpose of this list as explained in the Introductory Remarks (*Hanrei*) was as follows: "In recent times kanji have been used in Japan without limit, at considerable inconvenience to life in society, and so by modifying and controlling kanji usage this List shews the standard for kanji to be used in Government offices and society in general."<sup>29</sup>

With regard to kanji not appearing in the list, the introductory remarks state: "Kanji which are not in this list should, with the exception of those used for writing proper nouns, in principle be written in kana."<sup>30</sup>

The *Hyōjun kanjihyō* consisted of a total of 2528 kanji—considerably more than other lists of its type. Kanji were divided into three categories, viz. those of high frequency (*jōyō kanji*; 1134) those of lower frequency (*jun jōyō kanji*; 1320), and special kanji occurring in the text of the Imperial Constitution, Imperial rescripts, and the like (*tokubetsu kanji*; 74). In his report of June 17, 1942, to the Education Minister (Hashida Kunihiko), Deliberative Council Chairman Minami Hiroshi explained *inter alia* how it was envisaged that kanji of the three categories would be assimilated into the education system.<sup>31</sup> It was expected firstly that school pupils would be taught to read and write accurately all 1134 of the high frequency kanji; with regard to kanji in the other two categories, the ability to read these was to be regarded as sufficient.

The *Hyōjun kanjihyō* as compiled by the Deliberative Council was circulated by the Monbushō to other Government departments for them to comment upon. As a result of this, a number of requests were received for further kanji to be added, and in December 1942 the Monbushō published an amended *Hyōjun kanjihyō* containing 2669 kanji—141 more than in the list as first compiled. In addition to increasing the number of kanji, the *Monbushō* also abolished the division of kanji into three categories. Both these moves diminished the value of the *Hyōjun kanjihyō* as a list to help reduce the number of kanji in daily use.<sup>32</sup>

In June 1942 the Deliberative Council also presented its *Shin jion kanazukaihyō* (New kana usage list for Sino-Japanese). The kana usage proposed in this list was based on pronunciation of SJ elements in the standard language, and was in essence similar to that outlined in earlier proposals of 1924 and 1931.<sup>33</sup> Like its predecessors, however, the New

Kana Usage List failed to be adopted because of the controversy which developed between the 'traditionalists' on the one hand and the 'phoneticians' on the other.<sup>34</sup>

In this way, a thorough-going reform of the Japanese writing system was not carried out in the first part of the 20th century, despite calls and proposals from various quarters. As a result of this failure to reform, Japan was left heir to an intricate and complex writing system which, though it shewed respect for historical principles, often did so only at the expense of clarity of meaning, and sometimes this had disastrous consequences. This point is best illustrated by the case of the Japanese Army. In the late 1930's the shortage of suitable recruits meant that the Army was obliged to take on recruits of an educational standard that became lower and lower, to the point where eventually some of them were unable to read certain of the kanji used to write the names of weapons and related terms. This, it is reported, was the cause of a number of accidents involving weapons.<sup>35</sup> Faced with this situation, the Army Ministry decided to simplify the use of kanji and kana for weapon nomenclature and related texts. To this end, in February 1940 it issued a directive entitled *Heiki meisshō oyobi yōgo no kan'ika ni kansuru kitei* (Regulations relating to the simplification of weapon nomenclature and terms), restricting the number of kanji for weapon names and terms to 1235. This was followed in March 1941 by a directive to the effect that a pronunciation-based kana usage be adopted for weapon names and related texts; this latter directive, *Heiki ni kansuru kanazukai yōryō* (Summary of kana usage relating to weapons), followed the kana usage set out in the Interim Committee's proposals of 1931.

## 2. The Tōyō Kanji Era

Although in the earlier part of the twentieth century there were already various scholars and other prominent figures who were in favour of simplification of the script, until the end of the Pacific War such reform was frustrated by more conservative elements. After the war defeat of 1945, however, the situation changed dramatically, and there sprang up overwhelming support for major orthographic revision.<sup>36</sup> The first postwar meeting of the Deliberative Council was held in November 1945, and at this meeting the then Education Minister emphasized that the solution of problems relating to the Japanese language and script lay at the basis of all the other reforms which were necessary for the rebuilding of Japan. The Monbushō was requested by the Allied Forces High Command to limit the number of kanji used in textbooks to about 1500,<sup>37</sup> and so from December 1945 deliberations went ahead on the basis of making additions and deletions to the 1134 kanji designated as *jōyō kanji* in the *Hyōjun kanjihyō* (List of standard kanji) of 1942.

In March 1946 an American educational delegation visited Japan with the purpose of studying the Japanese educational system and then advising the Allied High Command and the Monbushō. With regard to language reform, the delegation recommended in its report the eventual adoption of romanization.<sup>38</sup>

In April and May 1946 the Deliberative Council discussed in plenary sessions a proposed kanji list of 1295 signs, *Jōyō kanjihō* (List of kanji for general use), that had been compiled by a committee of Council members under the chairmanship of Yanada Kyūjirō.<sup>39</sup> The list was, however, considered too expensive for use in elementary education, yet too restrictive for general use. In consequence, a new kanji committee was set up under the chairmanship of Yamamoto Yūzō, a writer who had shewn considerable enthusiasm for simplification of the script. At the same time, a kana usage committee was set up in order to put forward proposals for reform in that area also.<sup>40</sup> The new kanji list compiled at this time, which profited by experience and included all the kanji found in the text of the new Constitution, was the *Tōyō kanjihyō* (List of kanji for current use), consisting of 1850 signs. The new list was based on the list of 1295 kanji proposed earlier in 1946, but supplemented with additional kanji which were selected after soliciting the opinion of Government offices, newspaper companies, and the like.<sup>41</sup> After being approved by the Deliberative Council at a plenary session on November 5, the List of Kanji for Current Use (hereafter normally referred to as 'the TK List') was announced and promulgated by the Cabinet just eleven days later, on November 16, 1946. That date also saw the promulgation by Cabinet of the *Gendai kanazukai* (Modern kana usage), the rules for which are based on pronunciation in the modern standard language.<sup>42</sup>

The TK List and modern kana usage together represent a major simplification to the Japanese script compared with before the War, but it is interesting to note that both are in fact based on earlier proposals — the former on the *jōyō kanji* in the List of Standard Kanji of 1942, the latter on the New Kana Usage List for Sino-Japanese (also of 1942).<sup>43</sup> Thus, although various of the earlier attempts at script reform had been rejected at the time, they did provide a basis for the reforms of 1946.

The new orthography of 1946 was adopted in newspapers, magazines, and official texts of all kinds almost immediately and was put into effect in school textbooks from April of the following year. Although the number of kanji in the TK List represented a substantial reduction compared with, for example, the List of Standard Kanji of 1942, it was found that it was still not possible to teach school pupils to satisfactorily read and write all of them within the nine years of compulsory education. The situation was remedied by compiling the *Tōyō kanji beppyō* (Separate list of kanji for

current use; referred to below as the “Separate TK List”). Submitted to the Education Minister in September 1947 by the Deliberative Council, the Separate TK List, which set out 881 TK List kanji, was approved and promulgated by the Cabinet in February 1948.<sup>44</sup>

From the very outset the TK List had the desired effect of reducing very substantially the number of different kanji in general use. There remained, though, several areas in which further regulation was required. Firstly, while the TK List contained all the different kanji for general use, it did not give any guidance concerning *on* and *kun* readings; in other words, even obscure readings were permitted, provided that the kanji themselves were in the TK List. Clearly this ran counter to the underlying aim of the TK List, and so in order to rectify this state of affairs an official list of *on* and *kun* readings was announced by Cabinet in January 1948, *Tōyō kanji onkunhyō* (List of *on* and *kun* readings for the kanji in current use; referred to below as the “TK *Onkun* List”). After this list came into effect, many older and literary *kun* readings ceased to have the official seal of approval (e.g., *tagui* for 類, *nottoru* for 貝), as did most irregular *kun* readings for kanji combinations (e.g., *momiji* for 紅葉, *tabako* for 煙草). *On* readings were also reduced in number; in the case of 請, for example, the 1948 TK *Onkun* List contains the *on* readings *sei* and *shin* (the latter being noted as a relatively uncommon reading), but not the reading *shō*; similarly, the reading *jin* is given for 仁, but not *nin*.

In addition to *on* and *kun* readings, another main area in which a degree of standardization was desirable was the form of individual kanji. Several earlier attempts had been made to deal with this problem (see above), but these had not advanced beyond a draft stage, and in any case the question of the form of kanji is a very intricate area, and not something for which a solution could be found overnight. For a substantial number of kanji there was commonly some difference between (a) the printed form and (b) the handwritten form - e.g., (a) 衣, (b) 衣; (a) 玄, (b) 玄. For some kanji there were variant forms which were used more or less interchangeably—e.g., 叙 ~ 叙 ~ 叙, 宝 ~ 寶 ~ 寶, 場 ~ 土場. In addition, simplification of forms was sometimes achieved only at the expense of structural principles of the kanji script; 突 *tsuku* “to thrust, pierce”, for example, is a kanji of the semantic compound type, consisting of the two elements 宀 “hole, cave” and 犬 “dog”, but this etymology is obscured in the slightly abbreviated form 突.

In order to reduce the inconvenience and problems caused in such areas as education and the printing trade by the form of kanji, in July 1947 the Deliberative Council set up a special committee, the members of

which represented the world of education, printing, newspapers and Government offices. As the title of the committee, *Katsuji jitai seiri ni kansuru kyōgikai* (Committee on the printed form of kanji), suggests, it was concerned primarily with the standardization of printed forms, but the draft proposals which it presented to the Deliberative Council in October 1947 did nevertheless attempt to reduce the gap which existed between printed forms and their handwritten equivalents.<sup>45</sup> After due consideration, which included the setting up of a further committee,<sup>46</sup> the Deliberative Council submitted its *Tōyō kanji jitaihyō* (List of forms for the kanji for current use, referred to below as the "TK Forms List") to the Education Minister in June 1948. The list was then announced and promulgated by Cabinet in April of the following year.

As a result of the implementation of the TK List, the reading and writing of Japanese texts was greatly simplified, but in one area of everyday life—the use of kanji to write given names—the new, simplified orthography was generally felt to impose an excessive restriction: in the past, parents had been free to choose virtually any kanji to represent in writing the given names of their offspring, but after December 1947 they were limited to the 1850 kanji in the TK List, the only alternative being to write given names in *hiragana* or *katakana*.<sup>47</sup> So as to give parents a little more flexibility in choosing kanji for given names, in May 1951 the Deliberative Council submitted a written recommendation to the Attorney General and the Education Minister to the effect that 92 specified kanji be permitted for use in given names in addition to kanji in the TK List.<sup>48</sup>

The 92 kanji set out in the Council's recommendation were approved by the Cabinet, and announced and promulgated later the same month in the form of the *Jinmeiyō kanji beppyō* (Separate list of kanji for use in given names; referred to below as the "TK Name Kanji List").<sup>49</sup>

The term *tōyō kanji* has been rendered in this article as "Kanji for current use"; it could equally well be translated as "Kanji for temporary use". Implicit in this term, in other words, there was the suggestion that the TK List was to be modified as necessary at some time in the future. From 1946 onwards, newspaper companies proposed to the Deliberative Council in the light of experience that a number of kanji be added to the TK List. The Kanji Section of the Council, after considering this matter, recommended in March 1954 that 28 new kanji be added to the TK List, and that 28 other kanji already in the list (but of very low frequency) be dropped. In plenary session (March 15, 1954), however, the Deliberative Council was of the general view that the time was not yet ripe for the TK List to be modified in this way. Consequently, instead of proposing to the Education Minister that the TK List be amended, on this occasion the Council simply received the Kanji Section's recommendations, and made

them public.<sup>50</sup> This meant that from that point on there was some divergence, albeit relatively minor, between kanji usage in newspapers and that in school textbooks and a variety of other texts of a general nature.

During the late 1940's, major reforms in the usage of kanji and kana were carried out as described above. One transitional area between the two still awaited reform—or rather standardization—at that time, namely *okurigana* (kana added following kanji in order to shew inflectional or other endings). *Okurigana* usage falls into one of two broad categories: the 'explicit' type, which often employs kana to represent not just the changing inflectional ending of verbs and adjectives, but also part of the stem (e.g., 行<sup>な</sup>は<sup>る</sup>; *okonau*, 異<sup>な</sup>は<sup>る</sup> *kotonaru*) and the 'implicit' type, which tends to use as few *kana* as possible (e.g., 行<sup>ろ</sup>, 異<sup>る</sup> ). *Okurigana* of the former type tended to be favoured in school textbooks, while the latter type was common in other texts.

Faced with this situation, the Deliberative Council's Orthography Section sought to standardize *okurigana* usage. To this end, it drew up 26 rules for usage, which tended towards the 'explicit' type. These rules, presented by the Deliberative Council as a written recommendation to the Education Minister in November 1958, were approved and promulgated by the Cabinet in July 1959.<sup>52</sup>

By this time all the main areas of the modern Japanese writing system had undergone revision, this often being extensive. The work of reform, though, was by no means complete: some problems remained from the pre-War period, while others had arisen as a result of the new orthographic reforms themselves. The need for continuing revision in this area was brought to the attention of the Education Minister (Nadao Kōkichi) in a report submitted by the Deliberative Council in October 1963 entitled *Kokugo no kaizen ni tsuite* (Reform of the national language).<sup>53</sup> Several years later (in June 1966), Education Minister Nakamura Umeyoshi responded to this report by requesting the Deliberative Council to re-examine the areas which had been specified in its report of 1963, namely: the TK List, together with the Separate TK List (policy regarding selection of kanji therein; scrutiny of kanji in the lists; *on* and *kun* readings; the form of kanji); *okurigana*; modern kana usage; and, finally, any other related points.<sup>54</sup>

The first areas to be given further consideration by the Deliberative Council were *on* and *kun* readings, and *okurigana*.<sup>55</sup> The new *Tōyō kanji onkunhyō* of June 1973, which represented the Council's recommendations, was more liberal than the TK *Onkun* List of 1948, containing approximately 800 additional such readings,<sup>56</sup> and also giving official approval for a group of 106 irregular but long-established *kun* readings for

certain kanji combinations such as 今日 *kyō* "today", 梅雨 *tsuyu* "rainy season", and 息子 *musuko* "son". A less restrictive approach was also evident in the *Okurigana no tsukekata* (Method of adding *okurigana*) announced by Cabinet in June 1973, which allowed more flexibility of usage than the equivalent rules of 1959. The more liberal nature of the 1973 TK *Onkun* List, and the new *okurigana* rules announced at the same time, reflects a change in the collective opinion of the Deliberative Council which was due to a re-organisation of that body in the early nineteen-sixties. The less restrictive attitude of the re-organised Council was, as we shall see below, also brought to bear on the TK List and its eventual successor.

### 3. Beginnings of the New Kanji List

The Deliberative Council took up anew the question of the TK List in November 1972. Two years later, a preliminary report on the Council's basic policy with regard to kanji was completed. The basic policy, the purpose of which was to provide guidelines for future deliberations, included the following points: (1) a kanji list was necessary, but it should not be restrictive in nature like the TK List; (2) kanji for the list were to be selected for use in the ordinary life of society, i.e. for use in official texts, newspapers, magazines, broadcasting, and the like; such kanji were not intended to encompass usage in specialist fields such as science and technology of arts, or the form of writing of individual persons; (3) the field of application of the kanji list was *modern Japanese writing*.<sup>57</sup> The question of whether the kanji list should serve only as a guide (*meyasu*)—the status which had been accorded to the 1973 *Oonkun* List—was deferred for later consideration, as also was the question of how many kanji should be included in the list (though with regard to this latter point, it was understood that there should not be any dramatic departure from the number of kanji in the TK List at that time).<sup>58</sup>

In January 1974 a Kanji Committee was set up by the Deliberative Council. The Committee agreed that it would follow the basic policy on kanji that had been formulated, and resolved to refer to as wide a range of relevant material as possible (studies of kanji frequency in present-day newspapers and magazines, selection criteria for kanji in earlier kanji lists, and material which focussed on the question of how certain *kango* originally written with kanji not included in the TK List were dealt with after the TK List came into effect). The Committee also resolved that it would not be excessively influenced by the TK List in compiling a new kanji list, but that it would nevertheless still treat it as an important source material. During the course of its investigations, the Kanji List Committee drew up a series of points to be borne in mind when considering the

selection of kanji for the new list. These points were as follows: (1) frequency of use; (2) function; (3) the question of kanji for proper nouns, and how to deal with these; (4) the need to attempt a typological classification of kanji in terms of semantic areas—topography, natural phenomena, flora and fauna, the body, kinship terms, and so on; (5) the part of speech being represented; (6) usage in terms of vocabulary—single kanji each of which represents a *kango*, e.g., 胃 *i* “stomach”, 塾 *juku* “private coaching school”; kanji for monosyllabic NJ words, e.g., 蚊 *ka* “mosquito”, 藻 *mo* “seaweed”; different kanji which are of identical or similar meaning, and which share the same *on* or *kun* reading, e.g., 回廻 *kai* “go round”, 膚肌 *hada* “skin”; kanji used to represent foreign loanwords; e.g., 缶 *kan* “can, tin”, 頁 *pēji* “page”; (7) kanji structure—degree of complexity (complicated kanji such as 鬱鬱 *utsu* “gloom, depression”), and whether a kanji occurs as a constituent element in other, more complex kanji 皿 *sara* “dish”, 屯 *ton* “station, barracks”).<sup>59</sup> Consideration was also given by a special subcommittee to the form of kanji in the new list, but it was decided that the forms in the existing TK Forms List should be followed in principle.<sup>60</sup>

The progress made by the Deliberative Council in regard to a new kanji list in the two years from November 1972 to November 1974 (the period corresponding to the 11th Session of the Council)<sup>61</sup> was made public in the form of the *Shingi keika hōkoku* (Report on proceedings). The Report was distributed widely, and responses received from a number of interested groups. One such group was the Japan Newspaper Association Editorial Committee, which in March 1976 submitted a reply to the effect that it would like great care to be exercised in the selection of kanji, and that it would like the total number of kanji in the new list to be kept below 2000; the Editorial Committee also submitted a list of 79 kanji in the TK List as candidates for omission from the putative new list, and 16 kanji as candidates to be added.

In the latter part of 1976, it is reported, the Kanji List Committee set about its task with great vigour,<sup>62</sup> and in the following January the *Shin kanjihyō shian* (New kanji list draft) was drawn up, and submitted to the Education Minister (Kaibu Toshiki).

The New Kanji List (Draft) contained 1900 kanji, and so in terms of number of signs did not constitute any major departure from the TK List. However, the very fact that any difference at all was proposed in this respect was of considerable significance, marking a new and more liberal attitude towards use of kanji. This same liberality was also reflected in the fact that it was also proposed that the new List should serve as a guide

(*meyasu*) for kanji use rather than as a rigidly prescriptive list. The nature of the New Kanji List (Draft) is made clear in the following excerpt from the Preamble to the List: "The New Kanji List contains kanji which are efficient and which also share a high degree of common usage, for use in the general life of society—laws and ordinances, official texts, newspapers, magazines, broadcasting, etc. The list aims to provide a guide in the general life of society for writing in an easily-intelligible and clear manner."<sup>63</sup>

The 1900 kanji in the New Kanji List (Draft) consist of all the TK List kanji except for the following 33, which are of low or very low frequency:

芋謁歐効堪蕪嗣遊嫡遙痘陪畔濫且但虞脹勺畝匆侯爵帥朕錘銑薪奴翁隸婆嚇  
together with the following 83 additional kanji:

猿凹渦靴稼涯垣殼瀉褐岳頑挾襟隅溪蚩嫌洪溝昆崎皿傘肢遮蛇酌汁塾尚宵  
繩唇基搢杉齊逝仙栓挿槽藻馱濯挑眺釣塚漬亨泥棟洞凸把霸漠肌鉢披扉猫頻  
瓶霧塀泡倭褒朴僕堀磨岬妄厄癩悠羅竜戾。

The above list of additional kanji includes 24 of the 28 recommended in 1954 by the Deliberative Council's Kanji Section for adoption at a future date. Similarly, 15 of the 33 kanji omitted from the New Kanji List (Draft) were among those recommended for deletion earlier in 1954.

The TK List of 1946 had consisted of a bare list of kanji, which were set out according to the order of the 214 radicals; this List was then supplemented by the TK *Onkun* List (January 1948) and the TK Forms List (April 1949). The New Kanji List (Draft) is more convenient in this respect in that individual kanji are set out in the approved form, together with the recommended *on* and *kun* readings, in the one list.

At the stage of the New Kanji List (Draft), the following points were noted as needing to be dealt with at a later date: (1) the question of kanji for use in proper nouns, especially the 120 kanji designated for the writing of given names only; (2) the question of how to accommodate kanji in the new List into the education curriculum; (3) various specific problems relating to the form of kanji.<sup>64</sup>

Once the New Kanji List (Draft) had been made public, the Cultural Agency (*Bunkachō*) set about the task of assessing public opinion on that topic. In June and July 1977 special conferences were held at five centres (Sendai, Tokyo, Osaka, Hiroshima, Fukuoka) to explain and discuss the List; opinions were sought from all government departments, from public bodies, and those engaged in publishing and printing, education, the arts, and language; in addition, a public opinion survey was conducted by the Information Bureau of the Prime Minister's Secretariat. From such enquiry, the following points emerged: there was majority support for the proposed

status of a new kanji list as a guide (though at the same time there was also a feeling of concern among many lest the guide status of the list be ignored, and kanji outside the list be used indiscriminately); regarding the number of kanji in the List, there was general agreement over the total of 1900 (some felt that the total should not be increased beyond the 1850 of the TK List, but certain others considered that an increase would be in order provided that it did not go beyond the 2000 level); as for individual kanji, there was substantial support (over 20%) for nine kanji (芋 畔 奴 但 婆 侯 薪 且 翁) which had been dropped from the New Kanji List (Draft) to be retained, and more than 10% support for the three kanji (瘻 癩 霸) to be deleted. There was, in other words, overall consensus of agreement concerning the new list, with differences of opinion essentially over points of detail.

In due course, after considering reaction to the New Kanji List (Draft), the Deliberative Council resolved the following policy in regard to the proposed final form of the list: (1) particular attention would be paid to opinions which related to laws and ordinances, official texts, and newspapers; close attention would also be given to opinions obtained from public opinion surveys; (2) kanji which had been omitted from the New Kanji List (Draft) would be retained if they had hitherto been widely used in laws and ordinances, official texts, or newspapers, and if there had also been a strong request for retention; (3) further kanji would not be added to the list without substantial cause; (4) no kanji in the New Kanji List (Draft) would be deleted without substantial cause.<sup>65</sup>

With regard to the form of kanji, a special subcommittee of the Deliberative Council's Kanji List Committee determined that: (1) the matter of the modification of the form of kanji *not* in the proposed list be handled with the greatest care;<sup>66</sup> (2) kanji in the new list should be shown using a variety of Ming type;<sup>67</sup> (3) there was a need to shew by means of examples and explanation that small differences in movable type design did not come within the scope of the list; (4) there was a need to shew that there were, in some cases, small differences between kanji in Ming type and their handwritten equivalents.<sup>68</sup>

On the basis of the above guidelines, a new list called the *Jōyō kanjihyōan* (Proposed list of kanji for general use) was compiled, being completed in March 1979. This list was very similar in nature to the New Kanji List (Draft), but there were certain overall differences. The most immediately noticeable difference was in the number of kanji: The New Kanji List (Draft) contained 1900 signs, whereas this latest list contained all these together with a further 26 signs—14 TK List signs re-adopted after being dropped from the New Kanji (Draft) 芋 謁 歐 勃 堪 蕪 嗣 遊 嫡 通 痘 陪 畔 濫

and the following 12 kanji: 拐喝矯棧褒曹棚偵搭屯抹粹 .<sup>69</sup> Another feature of the March 1979 list was the addition of a section entitled *Jitai ni tsuite no kaisetsu* (Explanation concerning the form of kanji) which set out examples of very minor variation in the form of one and the same kanji in Ming type which represented nothing more than a difference in type design. This section also gives examples of minor differences to be found in some cases between Ming type kanji and their handwritten equivalents (see below for examples from the JK List of both these types of minor variation).

In the case of the TK List, those kanji which all schoolchildren were to be taught to read and write during the six years of primary education were specified in the Separate TK List; with regard to the new kanji list, however, it was resolved that when this came into effect the Separate TK List should cease to be used, and that the question of how to accommodate the new list into the education system should be the subject of separate enquiry. Also to be given separate consideration were kanji for special use in writing given names.<sup>70</sup>

It had originally been expected that the new kanji list as described above (i.e. the Proposed List of Kanji for General Use) would constitute the Deliberative Council's final recommendations on this topic, but Council Chairman Fukushima Shintarō was in favour of testing public opinion on the new list somewhat further, and so the Proposed List of Kanji for General Use was only presented to Education Minister Naitō Yosaburō as an interim report.<sup>71</sup>

#### 4 List of Kanji for General Use (Jōyō kanji)

After the Proposed List had been made public in March 1979, public opinion on the subject was tested. As in the case of the New Kanji List (Draft), explanatory conferences were held (this time in Sendai, Tokyo, Fukuoka, Gifu, and Okayama), and copies of the Proposed List sent to interested bodies and organisations. As before, there was a measure of concern among some that the concept of the new list as a guide (*meyasu*) was too vague and needed clarification so as not to be interpreted as being tantamount to a complete absence of control on kanji use. With regard to the number of kanji in the Proposed List, there was substantial support for the figure of 1926, but at the same time there were those who chose to differ: the Japan Literati Association, for example, was of the view that the number of kanji in the List was far too small,<sup>72</sup> while the *Kanamoji kai* (lit. "Kana Society")<sup>73</sup> considered that the number should be decreased. Concerning the question of individual kanji to be included in or omitted from the List, there were various views. There was, though, a considerable body of opinion to the effect that those kanji in the TK List which had

been dropped in the New Kanji List (Draft) and not re-adopted in the Proposed List of March 1979 should be reinstated.<sup>74</sup> There was substantial support also for a more detailed section in the Preamble to the proposed kanji list in its final form dealing with the form of kanji. Educational groups, understandably, requested that suitable steps be taken to ensure that an increase in the total number of kanji in the list would not impose any further burden on young pupils.

After ascertaining reaction to the Proposed List, certain modifications were made. Further consideration was given to the term *meyasu* (guide), and it was decided that it would be necessary to emphasize that the use of this word in indicating the status of the new list was not a signal for the dropping of all control on kanji use; accordingly, it was resolved that a note clarifying *meyasu* be added to the Preamble to the kanji list in its final form. With regard to the 19 TK List kanji not included in the Proposed List, it was decided to re-instate all 19, on the grounds that they were familiar through over 30 years of use.

The duly modified new kanji list, the *Jōyō kanjihyō* (List of kanji for general use), was approved at a plenary session of the Deliberative Council held on March 23, 1981, and submitted to Education Minister Tanaka Tatsuo. The List was then approved and promulgated by Cabinet on October 1, 1981.

The List of Kanji for General Use (hereafter normally referred to as “the JK List”), consists of a Preamble, an explanation of the List, the kanji list itself (1945 kanji), and an appendix containing kanji combinations which involved irregular *kun* readings.

The Preamble is comprised of six sections. Section one, *Hajime ni* (Introduction), describes how the Deliberative Council took up the task of revising the TK List. Section two, *Jōyō kanjihyō sakusei no kei* (Circumstances of compilation of the JK List), goes on to explain that while the TK List and related lists had had the beneficial effect of simplifying the writing system, there were certain negative aspects to the reforms also: the restrictive nature of the TK list (and related lists) meant that words involving kanji not included in the List, or *on* and *kun* readings not contained in the TK List of *On* and *Kun* Readings, had either to be written in kana, or a different word used, thus restricting range of expression and leading to unnaturalness of expression: in addition, the TK List kanji included some which were very seldom employed,<sup>75</sup> while on the other hand there were other kanji of high frequency (or potentially high frequency) which were not included. It was to meet the changing needs of the times, therefore, that in 1966 the Education Minister asked the Deliberative Council to consider ways of improving the national language policy (with particular reference to the script). The Deliberative Council had

approached its task by firstly examining all kanji lists which had appeared from the Meiji period onwards, and had then decided to compile a new kanji list which, while it did not involve any abrupt changes compared with the TK List, would facilitate communication and understanding in the general life of society. Section two concludes by re-affirming the effectiveness of using kanji and kana together for writing Japanese, point out the advantages of kanji from the point of view of representing SJ items and expressing the hope that Japanese orthography will become even more clear and attractive in the future.

Sections one and two of the Preamble provide the historical background to the JK List. Section three makes clear the intended application and status of the List. This part of the Preamble, of which a translation follows, is particularly important because of the differences which exist in this respect between the JK List and the TK List.

### **Nature of the JK List**

The JK List contains kanji which are efficient and share a high degree of common usage, for use in the general life of society—laws and ordinances, official texts, newspapers, magazines, broadcasting, etc. The List aims to provide a guide for kanji use for writing in an easily-intelligible and clear manner.

The JK List is to be used in the general life of modern society. It does not attempt to encroach upon kanji use in the various specialist fields in science, technology, and the arts, nor upon the kanji use of individuals; nor does it attempt to negate kanji use in earlier documents. The List does not concern itself either with kanji used in place names, personal names, etc.

Furthermore, “kanji use in the general life of society” refers to usage by persons who have to some extent experienced life in actual society or educational institutions after finishing study in the period of compulsory education.

Since the JK List aims to provide, as mentioned above, a guide to kanji use in the general life of society, it is not a restrictive list which demands that texts be written using only kanji which are given in the List. [Rather], there is scope for suitable reflection in its application, according to circumstances at the time. In cases where kanji seem difficult to read, one method might be to consider using furigana where necessary.

However, in order to facilitate mutual communication and understanding in the general life of society, it is expected that kanji use will conform to this List as far as possible. [Note] The nature of the JK List is not restrictive; rather, it has been made into a guide to kanji use in general life of society. The sense of the word ‘guide’ (*meyasu*) may be supplemented as follows: (1) It is expected that in the general life of society—laws and ordinances, official documents, newspapers, magazines broadcasting etc.—there is no objection to deviation in certain areas from the way kanji are treated in this List, as, for example, in taking decisions on special kanji use on the basis of the List [but] in accordance with actual conditions.

The first paragraph of the above states that the JK List “aims to provide a guide to kanji use” (*kanji shiyō no meyasu to naru koto o mezashita*). For the general public, who had in the postwar period become used to a kanji list the purpose of which was to shew the limits of the different kanji to be used,<sup>76</sup> this was a very pertinent point.

Some degree of difference is also to be seen between the two lists in relation to their range of application. The TK List Preamble states that that list shews the limits of kanji to use “in laws and ordinances, official documents, newspapers, magazines and society in general”. The stated range of the JK List as described in the first paragraph of section three (“the general life of society—laws and ordinances, official documents, newspapers, magazines, broadcasting, etc.”) would appear to be very similar to that of the TK List, but some reduction in the intended range of the new List is clearly indicated in the subsequent paragraph (paragraph two of the above translation).

A further point to be noted here is the suggestion that furigana may be used where necessary, essentially to indicate the readings of kanji not in the JK List. Until shortly after the Pacific War, furigana were used quite extensively, but the orthographic simplification brought about by the TL List reforms meant that from then on this device was far less necessary.<sup>77</sup>

Section three of the Preamble concludes with two notes which attempt to clarify the meaning of *meyasu* (guide), the term used to describe the intended role of the JK List. The notes were added as a result of criticism of the two earlier drafts of the new kanji list to the effect that the word *meyasu* was excessively vague.<sup>78</sup>

Section four, *Jishu to onkun* (The different kanji; *on* and *kun* readings), sets out the main guidelines which were employed in determining the kanji to be included in the List, and their *on* and *kun* readings. The following is the translation.

#### The Different Kanji; *On* and *Kun* Readings.

As mentioned above, the different kanji are shewn in the JK List together with their *on* and *kun* readings also. With regard to *on* and *kun* readings the List of *On* and *Kun* Readings for the Kanji in Current Use (June 1973) has been followed in principle; readings for kanji which have been added [to the JK List] for the first time have been selected in accordance with [the principles for selection of] readings in the June 1973 List.

Selection of kanji and *on* and *kun* readings was determined in a collective manner from the viewpoint of representing words and sentences in writing, on the basis of the actual state of kanji and *on* and *kun* readings used in modern Japanese. The main way of thinking was as follows:

- 1 Kanji of a high degree of frequency or function (especially as elements in compounds) are included. Furthermore, consideration is given also to extent of field of use.

- 2 Kanji which from the viewpoint of expression of concept are hard to understand when written in kana and seem particularly necessary are included, even if they do not possess a very high degree of frequency or function.
- 3 Kanji which are used mainly for proper nouns—place names, personal names, etc.—are not included.
- 4 Kanji for interjections, auxiliary verbs, and particles are not included.
- 5 Kanji for pronouns, adverbs, and conjunctions which are widely-used are included.
- 6 Different kanji which have the same *kun* reading are avoided as far as possible, but kanji [of this type] which can be distinguished in use, or for which there is a strong custom of use, are included.
- 7 In the case of kanji chosen arbitrarily for their sound value (*ateji*) or kanji combinations involving irregular *kun* readings, those which have been used widely and for a long time are included.

Furthermore, taking into account the effect on various areas, all the kanji in the TK List were included.<sup>79</sup>

The above guidelines regarding selection of kanji in the JK List are set out in a somewhat different manner to the corresponding guidelines for the TK List (for instance, frequency of use is specified as a selectional criterion in the case of the JK List, but not in the case of the TK List, even though it was clearly a guiding principle for this latter list also; similarly, kanji used mainly for proper nouns are specified amongst the numbered guidelines above as not being included in the JK List, while in the case of the TK List criteria the same general principle operates, but is given in unnumbered form),<sup>80</sup> and so it is difficult to compare the guidelines for the two lists directly simply by noting differences between the two sets of numbered criteria. One general difference which may be noted is that the selectional criteria for the JK List tend to be couched in more general terms than those for the TK List. This has the advantage that very few—if any—exceptions need to be recognized in relation to the JK List criteria, whereas with the TK List as many as five out of the eight numbered criteria involve exceptions—e.g., “(3) Kanji of a difficult shape are omitted

難形 難形 難形 are omitted; exceptions: 穢, 廳”.

Allowing for differences of format and arrangement, there are nevertheless certain points of clear divergence between the selectional criteria for kanji in the two Lists. Guidelines (4) of the TK List is as follows: “Kanji possessing a small range of use are omitted— 挨拶 曖昧 (exceptions: 矛盾, 膨脹)”. The JK List makes allowance for certain low-frequency kanji such as those used in writing 矛盾 *mujun* “contradiction” and 膨脹 *bōchō* “expansion” in the form of its second guideline on kanji selection (see above). The eighth guideline for the TK

List states that: “Kanji used mainly only in Government offices are omitted—俸牒傭 (exceptions: 叙轄)”. This principle was set aside in compiling the JK List, which includes kanji with a pronounced bureaucratic flavour such as 屯 *ton* “station, barracks” (as in 駐屯 *chūton* “stationing of troops”) and 拐 *kai* “falsify, kidnap” (as in 誘拐 *yūkai* “kidnapping, abduction”). The JK List guidelines make clear provision for kanji representing widely-used pronouns (e.g., 私 *watakushi* “I” and adverbs (e.g., 殊 *shū* = *koto ni* “particularly”), whereas the TK List guidelines note that words of these two categories should “as far as possible be written in kana”(see above). The treatment of kanji combinations having irregular *kun* readings (e.g., 今日 *kyō* “today”) is a further difference between the two lists (though readings of this type were officially approved prior to 1981 when the revised TK *Onkun* List came into effect in 1973).

The New Kanji List (Draft) of 1977 contained 1900 kanji—a figure which increased to 1926 in the Proposed List of Kanji for General Use. In the JK List itself, the total number of kanji increased further to 1945 due to calls from various groups (especially the Monbushō) for re-instatement of the 19 TK List kanji which had been omitted from the New Kanji List (Draft) and not re-adopted in the interim list of March 1979.

The JK List, which replaced the TK List in October 1981, consists of the 1850 TK List kanji together with the following 95 kanji:

猿凹渦靴稼涯垣袂馮褐缶頑挾襟隅溪蚩嫌洪溝昆崎皿傘肢遮蛇酌汁塾尚宵  
 繩唇甚据杉齊逝仙栓插槽藻馱濯挑眺釣塚漬亨泥棟洞凸把霸漠肌鉢披犀猫頻  
 瓶霧塀泡俸褒朴僕堀磨岬妄厄癒悠羅竟戾 芋謁欣幼堪繭嗣遊嬌遙痘陪畔濫  
 拐喝矯棧壤曹棚偵搭屯抹粹 且但廣脹勺畝匆侯爵帥朕錘銃疥奴翁隸婆嚇

The JK List was compiled to provide a kanji list<sup>81</sup> suited to the needs of writing modern Japanese in the nineteen-eighties and beyond. Just as the TK List had been selective in its choice of kanji from earlier lists in accordance with general changes in society, so too the JK List reflects changes in everyday life which took place in 35 years between compilation of the TK List and JK List. The following are examples of kanji added to the JK List on the basis of such changes: 缶 *kan* “can, tin” (as in 缶詰 *kanzume* “tinned goods”; reflects the rise in popularity of such items since the War); 搭 *tō* “load (a vehicle), ride” (as in 搭乗受付 *tōjō*

uketsuke "(airport) check-in"; reflects the rise of air travel); 凹 *ō* (as in 凹凸レンズ *ōtotsu renzu* "concavo-convex lens"; reflects the greater importance of optical equipment).

Among the new kanji added to the JK List, there are a number which represent everyday words, e.g., 垣 *kaki* "fence, hedge", 塀 *hei* "(outside) wall", 堀 *hori* "ditch, moat", 皿 *sara* "dish". Probably kanji of this type were omitted from the TK List out of the need just after the War to compile a list of well under 2000 kanji.

In considering additions to the new kanji list, the Deliberative Council is reported to have taken into consideration the question of whether a particular kanji was necessary in order to avoid writing certain SJ nouns partly in kanji and partly in kana. An example of this is *sentaku* "washing, laundry": in the TK List era the approved way of writing this word was 洗汰く (the second element *taku* being written in kana because the kanji for *taku* "wash, rinse" is not in the TK List): when the JK List came into effect, 濯 *taku* was included and so *sentaku* "washing, laundry" could legitimately be written as 洗濯 in newspapers, magazines, and the like, thus avoiding the aesthetically displeasing visual effect created by kanji/kana SJ hybrid writings (known in Japanese as *mazegaki*, "mixed writing"). The following are other examples of kanji added to the JK List to avoid such hybrid writings (examples of words involving the kanji concerned are added in parentheses): 猿 *en* "monkey" (猿人 *enjin* "pithecanthrope, ape-man"); 拐 *kai* "falsify, kidnap" (誘拐 *yūkai* "kidnapping, abduction"); 喝 *katsu* "scold, become hoarse" (恐喝 *kyōkatsu* "threat, blackmail"); 昆 *kon* "descendants, elder brother" (昆布 *konbu* "kelp"; 昆 is used here for its sound-value only); 涯 *gai* "shore" (生涯 *shōgai* "career"); 霧 *fun* "fog" (霧圍氣 *fun'iki* "atmosphere"); 把 *ha* "bundle, grasp" (把握 *haaku* "grasp").

Suggestions for new kanji for the JK List which were put forward by government departments tended to be regarded favourably by the Deliberative Council. Thus, at the request of the Self Defence Agency, the kanji 屯 *ton* "station, barracks", 曹 *sō* "an official" (as in 陸曹 *rikusō* "sergeant"), and 偵 *tei* "spy" (as in 偵察 *teisatsu* "scouting, reconnaissance") were approved, as were two kanji put forward by the Justice Ministry, viz. 拐 *kai* and 喝 *katsu* (see above for meanings and examples). However, by no means all kanji requested for inclusion by Government departments were approved. The Self Defence Agency had also wanted 哨 *shō* "scout, sentinel" (as in 哨艦 *shōkan* "patrol

ship”) and 曳 *ei* “pull” (as in 曳航 *eikō* “towing”) approved, but neither in fact was;<sup>82</sup> the same fate was also shared by three kanji requested for inclusion by the Construction Ministry: 堰 *seki* “dam, embankment”, 峻 *shun* “high, steep” (as in 峻路 *shunro* “steep road”), 汎 *han* “spread out, wide” (as in 汎濫 *hanran* “flooding”).<sup>83</sup>

The influence of government departments on the new kanji list was not restricted to kanji being added for the first time. 遵 *jun* “follow, obey” (as in 遵守 *junshu* “obey, observe”) and 濫 *ran* “overflow, spread over” (as in 濫用 *ran’yō* “misuse, misappropriation”) were omitted from the New Kanji List (Draft), but subsequently re-instated at the request of the Justice Ministry.<sup>84</sup> Similarly, 逡 *tei* “in turn” (as in 逡信 *teishin* “communications”) was re-adopted at the wish of the Ministry of Postal Services. Finally, all 19 of the TK List kanji omitted from the proposed List of Kanji for General Use were re-adopted—a move which was due largely to a request to that effect from the Monbusho.<sup>85</sup>

The fact that all TK List kanji were in the end retained in the JK List is somewhat surprising when one bears in mind the following statements in the two earlier stages of the JK List:

In the TK List there are some signs which are at present hardly used at all, while on the other hand there are some signs which are frequently used in society but not included in the List.—New Kanji List (Draft), Preamble. <sup>86</sup>

Kanji such as 朕 *chin* “(Imperial) we” and 虞 *osore* “fear, anxiety”—very rarely used in everyday texts (but included in the TK List because they are used in the text of the postwar Constitution)—are among the 19 TK List kanji re-adopted in the JK List. In view of their very low frequency of occurrence, one might expect the passage corresponding to the above (translated) passages in the kanji lists of 1977 and 1979 to be omitted from the JK List itself, reflecting the more accommodating stance of the Deliberative Council in relation to TK List kanji of very low frequency at the time of compiling the JK List. Such is not the case, however: the above passage in the 1979 Proposed List (“It has, moreover, also been pointed out....”) is included verbatim in the JK List Preamble.<sup>88</sup> The final incorporation of all 1850 TK List kanji into the JK List is referred to in a vague manner at the end of section four (The different kanji: *on* and *kun* readings) of the JK List Preamble, where it is stated: “Furthermore, taking into account the effect on various areas, all the kanji in the TK List were included.”<sup>89</sup>

As described above, from 1954 onwards there was minor divergence between kanji usage in official documents, school textbooks and so on on the one hand, and that in newspapers on the other, due to the adoption in

newspapers of 28 kanji not in the TK List to replace 28 other kanji already in the List. When the JK List report was submitted to the Education Minister in March 1981, the press agreed that it would follow the JK List when it came into effect, but with minor modifications. These modifications consisted of not using the 11 following uncommon kanji 謁 *etsu* “audience (with a ruler)” (as in 謁見 *ekken* “audience”), 虞 *osore* “fear”, 箇 *ka* (counter), 且 *katsu* “furthermore”, 遵 *jun* “follow, obey”, 但 *tadashi* “however”, 脹 *chō* “swell, expand” (as in 膨脹 *bōchō* “swelling, growth”), 朕 *chin* “(Imperial) we”, 附 *fu* “attach, append” (as in 附錄 *furoku* “supplement”; this and other compounds such as 附着 *fuchaku* “adhesion” are now commonly written with the simpler kanji 付), 又 *mata* “again, furthermore”, 盪 *ran* “overflow, spread over”, and using six kanji not in the JK List, viz.: 龜 *ki* “turtle, tortoise” (as in 龜裂 *kiretsu* “cleft, fissure”), 舷 *gen* “gunwale” (as in 右舷 *ugen* “starboard”), 痕 *kon* “mark, footprint” (as in 血痕 *kekkon* “bloodstain”), 挫 *za* “break, sprain” (as in 挫折 *zasetsu* “setback, frustration”), 哨 *shō* “scout, sentinel”, 狙 *so/nerau* “to aim”. It was also resolved that the press would adopt the additional *on* reading of *ka* for 個 (counter), a kanji for which only the reading *ko* is listed in the JK List and the earlier TK List equivalent. These points of deviation from the JK List in kanji use in newspapers represent a reduction the the degree of divergence from the norm compared with the period when the TK List was in effect.

Section five of the JK List Preamble—entitled *Jitai* (The form of kanji)—explains that kanji in the List are given in a variety of the widely-used Ming type; that the forms are based on the TK Forms List (promulgated in 1949), with the form of new kanji being determined as appropriate in accordance with those in the 1949 List (e.g., 螢 *kei* “firefly—as in 螢光灯 *keikōtō* “fluorescent light”—in the form 螢, on the basis of the upper element in kanji such as 勞 *rō* “labour, toil” and 榮 *ei* “prosperity, glory”); it is also mentioned that the JK List is not concerned with the minor variations in type design that are to be found in different varieties of Ming type, nor with the minor differences which are sometimes to be found between kanji in Ming type and their handwritten equivalents.<sup>90</sup> These last two points are dealt with in an additional section in the Preamble entitled *Jitai ni tsuite no kaisetsu* (Explanation concerning the form of kanji).<sup>91</sup> The Proposed List of 1979 did already include a small amount of guidance on these two points, but this was elaborated on further here in the JK List in response to requests to this effect.<sup>92</sup>

Section six of the Preamble deals with three miscellaneous topics. The first topic is that of how many and which kanji should be taught at school. During the TK List era there was a set list of kanji which were to be taught during the six years of primary education (at first, the 881 kanji of the Separate TK List, but in 1968 a further 115 kanji were added to these), but in the JK List the question of precisely which kanji should be taught at primary school, and during the period of compulsory education as a whole, is left for later deliberation, as the following passage shews:

The JK List, as explained in [the section on] its nature, was compiled as a guide for kanji use in the general life of society, but in school education it is desirable that the teaching of kanji in an appropriate manner, taking into consideration the gist and contents of the JK List.

Furthermore, with regard to guidance in kanji during the period of compulsory education, it is not necessary to teach all the kanji in the JK List at that time; treatment of the List is left for separate appropriate measures in education which take into account circumstances in the teaching of kanji in the past, and which also pay due regard to such matters as the stage of development of child pupils.

The question of how to relate the JK List to the school curriculum was a difficult problem for the Deliberative Council, especially as those involved in the education process tended to be of the view that teaching the 1850 kanji in the TK List was already a very demanding task, given the limited time allocated to that topic in the school timetable.<sup>93</sup> In view of this situation, it is in a sense not surprising that the Deliberative Council should have decided to leave this matter for later consideration by another body.

The next topic to be treated in Section six is the question of special kanji for use exclusively in writing given names. 92 kanji of this type had been approved in 1951 to be used in conjunction with the TK List, and in 1976 a further 28 kanji were approved for this purpose. The first group of 92 kanji was drawn up by the Deliberative Council, and a recommendation made to both the Education Minister and the Attorney General. The second group of 28 kanji, however, was selected by the Civil Affairs Administrative Council (CAAC) (a consultative body which reports to the Justice Minister); this change in procedure was due to the ramifications which changes in name kanji had in relation to the Family Registration Law.

From 1976, then, there was a total of 120 kanji which could be used together with the 1850 kanji in the TK List for choosing how to write the given names of children. Since these 120 name kanji had been selected in relation to the TK List, however, it became necessary to reconsider the question of kanji of this type when it was clear that the familiar TK List would before long be replaced by a new list. Accordingly, early in 1979

the CAAC again began investigations into this topic; its report was submitted to Justice Minister Okuno Masaaki in May 1981. The main recommendations of the CAAC report may be summarised as follows: (1) restrictions on the use of kanji for given names should continue to operate; (2) all 1945 kanji in the JK List should be permitted for use in given names; (3) the number of kanji for use exclusively in writing given names should be increased from 120 to 166;<sup>94</sup> (4) variant forms (of both JK List kanji and name kanji) to be permitted in writing given names should be clearly specified.<sup>95</sup>

The CAAC's recommendations in relation to name kanji were approved by the Justice Ministry, and put into effect from October 1, 1981—the date from which the JK List itself came into effect—by amending the operational regulations for the Family Registration Law. The final topic in Section six of the Preamble relates to the use of the JK List by such bodies as the Cabinet's Bureau of Legislation, the Monbushō, the Justice Ministry, newspaper companies, and the Japan Broadcasting Corporation. Entitled *Kakushu no kijun nado* (Standards, etc.), this final passage expresses the hope that the JK List will be followed by the Bureau of Legislation, the Monbushō, and so on in place of the TK List, making modifications to the kanji in the new List as appropriate to each area.<sup>96</sup>

Following on from the Preamble, there is an explanation of the JK List (*Jōyō kanjihyō no mikata*) which deals with the format of the List, but this need not concern us here, except to note two points. Firstly, the form of certain individual kanji as they appear in the famous *K'ang hsi tzu tien* 康熙字典 dictionary (completed 1710) is noted in parentheses where this differs substantially from the main form in which a particular kanji appears in the JK List, e.g., 国(國) 桜(櫻). Secondly, certain irregular readings for kanji are given (and hence approved) in the "Remarks" (*Bikō*) column beside kanji in the List; e.g., 衣 *i/koromo* "garment, clothes", which combines with 浴 *yoku* "bathe" to make up 浴衣 *yukata* "unlined cotton kimono".<sup>97</sup>

The final part of the JK List consists of an appendix (*Fuhyō*) which sets out the way of writing in kanji 110 miscellaneous words which involve irregular readings, e.g. *kotoshi* "this year" (alternatively, depending on the point of view, this appendix may be regarded as a list of irregular readings for such kanji combinations as 今年 ).

The JK List was the subject of much debate after the JK List report was made public in March 1981. Although there was relatively widespread support for the List, there was opposition expressed in some quarters. The Japan Teachers' Union, for example, was against the new List replacing the TK List, largely because of what was perceived as a potential increased

burden on school-pupils, but also because it would mean the abolition of the Separate TK List, which provided a firm framework specifying the kanji to be taught at different stages of the period of compulsory education.<sup>98</sup> The Japan Teachers' Union was also opposed to the concept of the JK List as a guide (*meyasu*), a point concerning which the major newspapers also expressed reservations.<sup>99</sup> On the other hand, the status of the JK List was welcome by many as being less restrictive than the TK List. For the Japan Literati Association, however, the List was still too restrictive, and the increase in number of kanji compared with the TK List was too small.<sup>100</sup>

## 5. In Conclusion

In the early decades of the 20th century various attempts were made at script reform, but these tended to be frustrated either by traditionalism or by events of the time. After the Second World War the time was ripe for change, and orthographic reforms in the direction of simplification of the script were seen as providing the basis for all other reforms. The major orthographic reforms of 1946, though partly resulting from external pressure, would hardly have been possible without the insight and experience gained from the protracted exchanges of views and deliberations over proposals for orthographic change during the period 1900-1945. The TK List itself was, though, compiled and put into effect in a very short space of time after the War. In the case of the JK List, circumstances permitted a less hurried approach, and deliberations over the new list extended over a period of some eight years, taking into account the experience gained through operation and use of the TK List.

The JK List represents a move towards kanji usage which is slightly more complicated than that based on the TK List, and in this sense may be said to go against the uneven but nevertheless overall trend during the period 1900-80 towards simplification of the writing system. In terms of its status and the total number of kanji, the JK List may be said to be the product of compromise—compromise both between the views of the Japanese people in general in relation to kanji list, and between different groups within the Deliberative Council which compiled the List. The guideline status of the JK List has both its good and bad points, but it could be that this will be the answer to the need to provide some guidance on kanji use in writing ordinary modern Japanese texts on the one hand, yet without imposing excessive restraints on the other. Whether this device proves to in fact be a workable solution, however, is something which only time will tell.

1. For an account of reform (both proposed and actual) of Japanese script and written styles in the latter part of the 19th century, see Twine 1983.
2. Yano Fumio, author of *Nihon buntai moji shinron* (New Discourse on Japanese script and style, 1886), for instance, was of this view.
3. The Kokugo chōsa iinkai (Japanese Language Investigative Committee; formed 1902), for example, was in favour of a phonogram script (referred to in the Committee's investigative policy as *on'in moji* [phonemic script], with the term *fonoguramu* added in parentheses; see Maruya 1983:54), but saw reduction in the number of kanji in use as a necessary interim measure.
4. That is to say, the *hiragana* and *katakana* syllabaries each consisting of 48 signs, as to be found in Nelson 1966, Appendix 7. The principal effect of this particular measure was to standardize *hiragana* signs, of which many variant forms (*hentaigana*) were still widely used. For the actual text of this regulation, see Yoshida & Inokuchi 1962:951-952.
5. For the list of kanji, see Yoshida and Inokuchi 1962:110-112, or Inokuchi 1982:393-395.
6. The traditional system of SJ kana usage was determined largely by Motoori Norinaga (1730-1801) in his *Jion kanazukai* (Sino-Japanese kana usage; 1776), which was based on the Chinese work entitled *Yün ching*—a set of sound tables printed in 1161. Concerning the SJ kana usage reform of 1900, see Shinkōsha 1973:150-153; for the actual text of the Monbushō regulation, see Yoshida and Inokuchi 1962:479-483.
7. It was, however, still permissible to follow the traditional SJ kana usage in relation to these three groups of kana; see Shinkōsha 1973: 153.
8. Viz. あう (e.g., in the case of 嬰鳥, etc.); あふ (凹, etc.); あう (應, etc.); あふ (押, etc.); わう (王, etc.); をう (翁, etc.).
9. This body was set up as a national body to investigate and report on problems and aspects of the Japanese language. For a table of the various Japanese language committees and their reports as mentioned in the main text of this article see Appendix 1.
10. Maruya 1983:56-57.
11. The major task of bringing a degree of standardization to the form of kanji had been begun about ten years earlier by the Investigative Committee. Part of the work of the Committee can be seen in its *Kanji yōran* (Outline of kanji, 1908).
12. Kana used in this way are called *furigana* in Japanese. As the system of compulsory education began to take effect, the consequent rise in the general level of reading led to the blanket use of *furigana* changing to a selective use (Shinkōsha 1974:9). Selective use of this kind continued widely until the orthographic reforms of 1946 (to be described below).
13. Maruya 1983:44.
14. Upon the formation of the Hara Takashi Cabinet, a colloquial written style was adopted in Monbushō directives issued by the then Education Minister, and also in public notices issued by the railways and post offices; see Ōno & Shibata 1977:279.
15. For the text of the statement, see Shinkōsha 1974:11-12.
16. There had been some criticism of, and dissatisfaction towards, the Investigative Committee on account of its having sometimes conducted research into arcane topics rather than into more immediate problems; see Ōno & Shibata 1977:280.

17 Ōno & Shibata 1977:280.

18. That this was the field of application of the 1923 *Jōyō kanjihyō* is clear from the explanation of this list by Hoshina Kōichi which appeared in the Official Gazette (*Kanpō*) of May 12, 1923 (see Inokuchi 1982:39-40).

19. The joint announcement which appeared in newspapers on August 5, 1923 was entitled simply *Sengen* (Declaration); for the text, see Shinkōsha 1974:13.

20. This statement—*Kanji seigen ni kansuru sengen* (Declaration regarding restrictions on kanji)—appeared in newspapers of June 1, 1925; see Shinkōsha 1974:14-15 for the text.

21. In the event, restrictions on kanji use in advertisements were never put into effect (Shinkōsha 1974:15).

22. The revisions of 1931 involved the deletion of 147 kanji originally in the list, and the addition of 45 others which were necessary for writing Imperial rescripts. For the text of these revisions (including lists of the kanji which were deleted and added at that time), see Inokuchi 1982:41-42.

23. For the main points of the 1924 proposals, see Shinkōsha 1973:173-174. For the proposed changes of 1931, see *ibid.*, 177-178.

24. For a list of articles dealing with this issue in newspapers and journals of the time, see Shinkōsha 1973:179-180.

25. Concerning the various connotations of this term, see Miller 1982:92-94.

26. Ōno & Shibata 1977:286-287.

27. 關辭變繼 are forms of 關辭變繼 to be found in the *K'ang hsi tzu tien*, a dictionary which became a standard reference work on kanji in Japan as well as China from soon after it was compiled in 1710.

28. Inokuchi 1982:46.

29. *Ibid.*, 54.

30. *Ibid.*

31. For the text of Minami's report, see Inokuchi 1982:63-65.

32. This list did not in any case come to be widely used (Inokuchi 1982:120).

33. For the main points of the New Kana Usage List of 1942, see Shinkōsha 1973:188-189.

34. For a list of the main articles which appeared concerning the New Kana Usage List, see Shinkōsha 1973:190-191.

35. Maruya 1983:61.

36. In November 1945 the *Yomiuri shinbun* went so far as to carry an editorial headed *Kanji o haishi seyo* (Abolish kanji).

37. Ōno & Shibata 1977:288.

38. Maruya 1983:115.

39. The proposed list consisted of 1046 of the 1134 *jōyō kanji* in the List of Standard Kanji, together with 249 of the lower frequency *jun jōyō kanji* in that List; kanji in the latter category were selected on the basis that they would be widely used in the future (Inokuchi 1982:73).

40. The kana usage committee was headed by the language scholar Andō Masatsugu (1875-1952).

41. Inokuchi 1982:75. Nine of the original 1295 kanji were deleted (也 —used for the literary copula *nari*, 俸 *hō* "salary", 慾 *yoku* "desire", 棉 *men* "cotton", 硯 *suzuri* "inkstone", 聯 *ren* "join", 覺 *kō* "expire", 輯 *shū* "gather", collect, 輿 *kago* "palanquin"), and a further 564 kanji added.

42. The modern kana usage rules had also been approved by the Deliberative Council earlier in the same year (September 21.). For the text of these rules, see Yoshida & Inokuchi 1962:667-684.

43. The scope of the TK List and the modern kana usage rules were somewhat different from that of the material on which they were based. The 1134 *jōyō kanji* had been selected as high-frequency kanji in the context of a list containing a total of approximately 2500 signs, while the New Kana Usage List for Sino-Japanese was intended, as its title suggests, to have application to SJ only.

44. The kanji in the Separate TK List are (or were) popularly known as the *kyōiku kanji* (kanji for [use in compulsory] education). To many, *Tōyō kanji beppyō* (Separate TK List, might seem to be an odd title, given the role of the List. Some light is shed on this point by Miyake Takerō, who, in writing on this topic, reports that at the time that the TK List itself was being compiled, it was envisaged that the number of kanji in general use would gradually be further restricted to about 1000 signs. The Separate TK List was, in other words, apparently compiled partly with the aim of providing for the future a list of "core" kanji for general use. The Separate TK List in its final form consisted of 881 signs (a further 115 kanji being added in 1968, also to be taught in the six years of primary education), but an early draft of this list contained 1060 kanji. See Kokugo gakkai 1955, *Kyōiku kanji* entry.

45. Inokuchi 1982:95.

46. *Ibid.*, 95-96.

47. On December 29, 1947, it was specified in the Rules for Operation of the Family Registration Law that only kanji in the TK List, or *katakana* or *hiragana*, be permitted for writing the given names of children born after January 1, 1948. See Inokuchi 1982:223.

48. *Ibid.*, 224-226.

49. For the list of 92 name kanji, see *ibid.*, 227. At the same time that these name kanji were introduced (May 25, 1951), the Rules for Operation of the Family Registration Law were amended so as to permit the use of these additional kanji in writing the given names of newborn children.

50. The recommendations of the Deliberative Council's Kanji Section were known as the *Tōyō kanjihyō shingi shiryō* (Material for deliberation concerning the list of kanji for current use) or *Tōyō kanji hōsei shiryō* (Supplementary material on the kanji for current use). The recommendations made by the Kanji Section also proposed that the reading *ka* be recognized for 個 in addition to *ko*, and the reading *hi* for 火丁 besides *tō*; it was also proposed that the simplified form 火丁 be adopted in place of 火登. See Inokuchi 1982:112-113.

51. Nihongo kyōiku gakkai 1982:502.

52. For the text of the *okurigana* rules, see Yoshida & Inokuchi 1962:903-922.

53. For the text of this report, see Inokuchi 1982:120-127.

54. *Ibid.*, 129-130.

55. As Yasunaga Minoru (1981:24-25) notes, it would in a sense have been preferable to have begun by establishing the different kanji to be included in the list, and then proceeding to the question of *on* and *kun* readings and *okurigana*, but apparently at that time there was insufficient material on which to base such a list.

56. Many of the additional readings in the new *Onkun* List result from a different format which is more explicit than the 1948 List. According to Kokugo gakkai 1981 (*Tōyō kanji* entry) if the 1973 List were to be rewritten according to the

format of the 1948 *Onkun* List, then the total number of the two types of readings in that case would be 3485 instead of 3938.

57. Yasunaga 1981:26.

58. *Ibid.*

59. *Ibid.*, 27.

60. Inokuchi 1982:145.

61. Each Session of the Council was of two years' duration, at the end of which there was a change of membership.

62. Yasunaga 1981:28.

63. Inokuchi 1982:148.

64. *Ibid.*, 151-152.

65. Yasunaga 1981:29.

66. For example, in the case of 煉 *ren* "refine (metal)" (a kanji outside of the list), should this be "standardized" in form to 煉 through analogy with kanji in the list such as 練, or left in the form 煉?

67. The type most commonly used in Japan.

68. Yasunaga 1981:29.

69. The general rationale underlying inclusion of these kanji is explained below with reference to the JK List (1981).

70. It was decided by the Deliberative Council that the Justice Ministry should report on this topic, in view of the ramifications any changes to name kanji had on the Rules for Operation of the Family Registration Law (Inokuchi 1982:162).

71. Yasunaga 1981:30.

72. Opposition to the Proposed List by the Literati Association was expressed in its *Jōyō kanjihyōan ni tsuite no ikensho* (An opinion concerning the proposed list of kanji for general use).

73. An organisation dedicated to popularising the use of *katakana* for writing Japanese (*Kokuritsu kokugo kenkyūjo* 1983:264).

74. There were 19 such kanji, viz. 且但虞脹勺畝匆侯爵帥朕錘銃薪奴翁隸婆嚇

75. 朕 *chin* "(imperial) we", 虞 *osore* "fear", and 又 *mata*—included in

the TK List because of their use in the text of the postwar Constitution - are examples of this type of kanji.

76. The TK List Preamble begins with the following statement: "This list shows the limits of the kanji to be used in the laws and ordinances, official documents, newspapers, magazines, and society in general." For the full text, see Inokuchi 1982:78.

77. The TK List Preamble states that *furigana* "are as a rule not to be used" (*furigana wa gensoku to shite tsukawanaï*).

78. Much of the two years' work by the Deliberative Council between March 1979 and March 1981 centred upon further discussion of the term *meyasu*. See *Asahi shinbun*, March 24th 1981: *Jōyō kanjihyō - umi no kurushimi hachinen* (The JK List — eight years of struggle).

79. Inokuchi 1982:173.

80. The selectional criteria for kanji in the TK List were as follows:

1 As far as possible, pronouns, adverbs, conjunctions, interjections, auxiliary verbs, and particles are to be written in kana.

2 Names of flora and fauna are also to be written in kana. By analogy with this, the names of utensils are also to be written in kana.

- 3 Complicated kanji are to be omitted.
- 4 Kanji with a small range of use are to be omitted.
- 5 Kanji having *kun* readings only, or mainly *kun* readings, are to be omitted.
- 6 In the case of different kanji having the same *on* reading and a similar meaning, one of the two is omitted.
- 7 Low-frequency kanji used for writing SJ words are to be omitted where there is an alternative word which involves TK List kanji.
- 8 Kanji used mainly in government offices are to be omitted.

For the original text of the above, which includes examples in each case, see Inokuchi 1982:79-80.

81. For the *on* and *kun* readings of these kanji, and examples of usage as set out in the JK List, see Kokuritsu kokugo kenjyūjo 1981, *Shiryō: Jōyō kanjihyō*. For the English equivalents, etc., for the JK List kanji, see W. Hadamitzky and M. Spahn, *Kanji and Kana* (Charles E. Tuttle Co., Rutland & Tokyo, 1981).

82. See *Yomiuri shinbun*, March 24, 1981: *Shinkanji jijō 1* (Circumstances relating to the new kanji: 1).

83. Inokuchi 1981:155.

84. *Ibid.*

85. See *Yomiuri shinbun*, March 31, 1981: *Shinkanji jijō 8* (Circumstances relating to the new kanji: 8).

86. Inokuchi 1982:147.

87. *Ibid.*, 157.

88. *Ibid.*, 168.

89. *Ibid.*, 173.

90. The following are examples of minor variations in different varieties of Ming type for the one kanji: 印 印, 奔 奔, 空 空. The following are instances of minor variation between (a) kanji in Ming type and (b) their handwritten equivalent: (a) 北 (b) 北, (a) 史 (b) 史.

91 *Nihongō kyōiku gakkai* 1982:512-513 for the full text of this additional section.

92. Minor differences between kanji in Ming type (the form in which they appear in the TK Forms List) and their handwritten equivalents were the cause of some uncertainty and confusion in schools. See *Asahi shinbun*, March 24, 1981: *Tegaki moji sawagi heru?* (Less commotion over handwritten kanji?).

93. See *Asahi shinbun*, March 24, 1981: *Shinkanjihyō—kyōiku genba no taio wa* (The new kanji list and how to deal with it in the teaching situation).

94. See *Asahi shinbun*, March 24, 1981: *Shinkanjihyō—kyōiku genba no taio wa* (The new kanji list and how to deal with it in the JK List.)

95. At the time that the CAAC made its report, this aspect of name kanji was unclear, some variant forms being permitted for use in entering given names of newborn children in the official family registers, while others were not; see Inokuchi 1982:236-237. The rules for Operation of the Family Registration Law as amended on October 1, 1981, as a result of the CAAC report clarified this situation, since they set out, in the form of an appended list, those variant forms for JK List kanji and name kanji which are permitted for writing given names in the official registers. 205 variant forms are recognised for this purpose—195 being for JK List kanji, and the remaining 10 for name kanji. See Inokuchi 1982:245 for the complete list.

96. Inokuchi 1982:179-180.

97. Some of these same irregular readings (such as 浴衣 *yukata* itself) are also given in the appendix (*Fuhyō*) which follows the actual list of 1945 kanji.

98. See the long statement that was made by the Japan Teacher's Association on the day that the Deliberative Council's JK List report was made public (Inokuchi 1982:217-220).

99. The *Mainichi shinbun*, for example, commented that "it was impossible not to feel considerable concern regarding the fact that the JK List had slipped out of a framework of control through the vague expression *meyasu*"; for this and other editorials on the JK List by the major newspapers, see Inokuchi 1982:217-220.

100. For the Japan Literati Association's *Jōyō kanjihyō ni tsuite no seimei* (Statement on the JK List), see Inokuchi 1982:199-202.

## References

- Inokuchi Yūichi. 1982. *Meiji igo no kanji seisaku* (Kanji policies since the Meiji Period). Nihon gakujutsu shinkōkai.
- Kokugo gakkai. 1955. *kokugogaku jiten* (Dictionary of Japanese language studies). Tōkyōdō.
- Kokugo gakkai. 1981. *Kokugogaku daijiten* (Comprehensive dictionary of Japanese language studies). Tōkyōdō.
- Kokuritsu kokugo kenkyūjo. 1981. *kokugo nenkan* (Japanese language yearbook).
- Kokuritsu kokugo kenkyūjo. 1983. *Kokugo nenkan* (Japanese language yearbook). Shūei shuppan.
- Maruya Saiichi. 1983. *Nihongo no sekai* (The world of the Japanese language), v.16: *Kokugo kaikaku o hihan suru* (Criticism of national language reforms). Chūōkōronsha.
- Miller R.A. 1982. *Japan's modern myth: the language and beyond*. New York & Tokyo: Weatherhill.
- Nelson A.N. 1966. *The modern reader's Japanese-English character dictionary*, 2nd ed. (revised). Rutland, Vermont, & Tokyo: Weatherhill.
- Nihongo kyōiku gakkai. 1982. *Nihongo kyōiku jiten* (Dictionary of Japanese language education). Takishūkan shoten.
- Ono Susumu & Shibata Takeshi. 1977. *Iwanami kōza Nihongo* (Iwanami lecture series on the Japanese language) v. 3: *Kokugo kokuji mondai* (Problems of the national language and script). Iwanami shoten.
- Shinkōsha (ed.) 1983. *Fukkoku bunkachō kokugo shirizu* (Cultural Agency Japanese language series, reprint), vl: *Kokugo mondai* (Problems of the national language). Kyōiku shuppan.
- Twine, Nanette. 1983. "Toward simplicity: script reform movements in the Meiji Period". *Monumenta Nipponica*, 38:2. 115-132.
- Yasunaga Minoru. 1981. "Jōyō kanjihyō ga umareru made" (Background to the JK list). *Gengo seikatsu*, 355:24-31.
- Yoshida Sumio & Inokuchi Yūichi (ed.) 1962. *Meiji ikō kokuji mondai shōan shūsei* (Collected proposals concerning problems of the Japanese script since the meiji Period). Kazama shōbō.