

Sound, Scripts, and Styles

Kanbun kundokutai and the National Language Reforms of 1880s Japan

This chapter explores the popularity of *kanbun kundokutai* (*kanbun*-style language in “Japanese” syntactical order with “Japanese” suffixes), which proliferated as a “common language” (*futsūbun*) in the second decade of the Meiji period, as well as the anti-*kanji* reforms and discourses that co-existed with this popularity. As I mentioned in the introduction, the issue of *kanbun kundokutai* is compelling, given that *kan*, too often uncritically equated with “China,” is treated as a negative reference point against which to posit *kokugo*, a “national” form of prose.¹ The focus on de-Asianization (*datsua*) in the Meiji period, which has become especially strong given the postcolonial trends in recent literary studies, reinforces the desire to retain *kan* as the other to the “modern.” As if to supplement such a narrative, much work has been done on the link between the new national literature (*kokubungaku*) scholars and the Edo nativists (*kokugaku*), focusing on what Meiji *kokubungaku* scholars rejected *and* inherited in their efforts to produce *kokugo*. However, without exploring the relationship between *kokugo* and *kanbun kundokutai*, existing scholarship presents *kokugo* as if it emerged from a vacuum (or from a *kokugaku* lineage that had somehow remained dormant until the 1890s). Perhaps to offset such a narrative, critics tend to posit nationalism as that which preceded and hence prompted the emergence of *kokugo*. This is part and parcel of the teleological narrative, because it once again posits nationalism as the primary motivation. This chapter inquires into the manner in which *kokugo* negotiated with the proliferation of *kanbun kundokutai* before the Ueda-led *kokugo* reform era, and shows how the emergence of *kokugo* in fact appropriated the realm of *kanbun kundokutai*.

I will first briefly define *kanbun kundokutai* and then discuss the fertile space it occupied in the early Meiji period. I will then turn to the many arguments for

reform that shaped the second decade of Meiji and inquire into the forces that governed those arguments in an effort to highlight how Meiji literati situated *kanji* characters and compounds, and ultimately *kanbun kundokutai*, in their arguments for new language. Not only will this discussion provide a general background to the historical period in question, but it will also serve as an important context for one of the primary texts I take up in the subsequent section, Yano Ryūkei's 1886 *Nihon buntai moji shinron* (*A New Theory of Style and Orthography in Japan*, hereafter *New Theory*), one of the few texts that advocated a style of *kanbun kundokutai* as the most appropriate language to "foster learning among the Japanese people" amidst the many movements against it.²

Situating *New Theory* as the backdrop to the linguistic reform movements, I will show how it engages not only with varying arguments for orthographic reform, but also with a shift that occurred in *kanbun kundokutai* as it began to claim autonomy from *kanbun*.³ As we shall see in more detail later, the domain of *kanbun*, too, shifted in the first two decades of the Meiji period, providing a fertile ground upon which linguistic reforms were discussed and made possible. *New Theory*, I contend, steps into the possibilities opened up by *kanbun kundokutai* and, at the same time, helps to create the possibilities themselves.

All this prepares for the final section of this chapter, which explores the works of national literature scholars of the late 1880s and early 1890s, with a specific focus on their silent negotiation with *kanbun kundokutai*. I will show that national literature scholars appropriated the realm of *kanbun kundokutai* that laid the groundwork for the purportedly nationalist choice they made, a process that is effaced by scholarship that essentializes the nation as a preexisting telos.

THE POPULARITY OF KANBUN KUNDOKUTAI AND ANTI-KANJI REFORMS AND DISCOURSES

Kanbun kundoku was initially devised to read *kanbun*, or classical "Chinese" writing; hence it was a style of language that was initially a translation of the *kanbun* text. "*Kanbun*," to use Benedict Anderson's language, constituted the "sacred language" which was "imbued with impulses largely foreign to nationalism."⁴ *Kanbun kundoku* was thus a method that was devised to access this "sacred language" in "local" translation. This then developed as a separate style, although the rhythm, rhetorical effects, and, to a large extent, grammar were bound to the *kanbun* text. Strictly speaking, therefore, *kanbun kundokubun* (*kundoku* writing, with *kundoku* referring to "local" syntactical order) and *kanbun kundokutai* (*kundoku* style) ought to be differentiated, given that the former is a "translation" of the original *kanbun* text while the latter is a style of language that developed from the translated prose.⁵

As we saw in chapter 1, different masters or schools devised different rules for reading *kanbun*, which determined how characters were read, how words were

conjugated, and where to place the *te ni o ha* particles. The types of reading that derived from such practice were many. For example, the most popular among late Edo and early Meiji literati was called *issaiten*, devised by the Confucian scholar Satō Issai (1772–1859). In comparison to other forms of reading, its defining characteristics were 1) fewer supplemented words/phrases (*hodokugo*); 2) more readings in *ondoku* of *kanji* characters, with *ondoku* referring to the phonetic approximation of the original pronunciation; and 3) reading as many *kanji* characters as possible, hence fewer “dropped characters” (*ochiji*).⁶ This is probably the style that linked up to what was later known as the “plain gloss” style (*bōdokutai*) of *kanbun kundokutai*, which used a bare minimum of suffixes and used primarily *ondoku*. This “plain gloss” style was predominant, especially in the 1880s.

In addition to the “plain gloss” style, however, there was another form of *kanbun kundokutai* popular in the early Meiji period; this was known as the “translated” or “elaborated” style (*yakudokutai*). This style sought to adjust even the honorific language and use *kanbun*-oriented renderings of polite language that did not exist in *kanbun* itself.⁷ It was used by literate peasants and townsmen, who, as a result, had the ability to read and compose *kanbun*, even if they were less familiar with the full corpus of *kangaku* classics.⁸

These two types of *kanbun kundokutai* existed side-by-side in the early Meiji period. But the “plain gloss” style began to predominate among Meiji literati, especially as new *kanji* compounds and phrases began to increase through the translation of foreign words. This had two somewhat contradictory effects. On the one hand, *kanbun kundokutai* proved to be extremely functional and versatile in absorbing new knowledge, but, on the other hand, this very versatility alienated less-literate townspeople and peasants, because it introduced many new terms and phrases that were beyond the scope of their literacy.⁹ It produced an ironic situation in which the very literati who were concerned about disseminating new knowledge increased the difficulty of the language, leading them to further lament the fact that too many people in Japan were uneducated.¹⁰

In effect, *kanbun kundokutai* enjoyed the status of “current language” (*kintaibun*) and “common language” (*futsūbun*) among Meiji literati, as the style proved versatile in adopting new forms of knowledge and translating newly imported materials. The contemporary literary critic Saitō Mareshi states that one way to look at *kanbun kundokutai* is to see the style as a schema that offers a system of grammar by which to link and make sense of *kanji* compounds.¹¹ The “plain gloss” style allowed for the bare skeleton of grammar. As long as such a system was in place, adding new *kanji* compounds—necessary in translating new concepts and ideas imported to Japan—was not a problem. The practicality of *kanbun kundokutai* in the Meiji period is often attributed to the *kanbun* background literati had acquired in the Edo period, but, as Saitō claims repeatedly, it is in the *kanbun kundokutai* that such practicality was taken to its fullest potential.

Newspapers were one of the primary media that did much to foster the popularity of *kanbun kundokutai*, not only as the dominant style used in newspaper reports and columns, but also as a means to disseminate many translations of scholarly works, not to mention the newly established laws and declarations.¹² In addition, many fictional works popularized *kanbun kundokutai*, such as *Karyū shunwa* (*Romantic Stories of Blossoms*, 1879) (Oda Jun'ichirō's abridged translations of Bulwer-Lytton's *Ernest Maltravers* [1837] and *Alice* [1838]), Yano Ryūkei's *Keikoku bidan* (*Illustrious Tales of Statesmanship*, 1883), and Tōkai Sanshi's *Kajin no kigū* (*Chance Meetings with Beautiful Women*, 1885–97), to name a few examples. These texts were widely read by Meiji literati, which undoubtedly contributed to the proliferation of *kanbun kundokutai*.

Furthermore, we begin to see a great number of composition (*sakubun*) textbooks produced in the 1870s and 80s that centered on *kanbun kundokutai*, designed for different levels of literacy. In addition to those that focused on letter writing and other forms of “practical” composition, *kanbun kundokutai* textbooks were produced in response to the growing need for *kanbun kundokutai* in Meiji, which in turn further increased its popularity.¹³ Journals and periodicals that specialized in compositions such as *Eisai shinshi* (*A New Journal for the Talented*) appeared, soliciting compositions from their young readership.¹⁴ The main styles of composition published in these journals were *kanbun kundokutai* and *sōrōbun* (epistolary style). To be published in *Eisai shinshi* was considered a great honor among the youths of the time, as seen from records of reminiscences by Meiji literati like Uchida Roan (1868–1929).¹⁵ In short, *kanbun kundokutai* was everywhere apparent, rightfully named the “current language,” and hence offered a legitimate choice as the means for standardization.¹⁶

Perhaps ironically, the more popular *kanbun kundokutai* became, the more anti-*kanji* sentiment grew. The popularity of *kanbun kundokutai* posed a threat to the advocates of language reforms, whose primary goal was to produce a language that would provide not only a basic education to the heretofore uneducated, but also offer easy access to newly imported knowledge. The “impracticality” of learning *kanji* was one of the primary criticisms that motivated the movement for reform. As we saw last chapter, Maejima Hisoka wrote as early as 1866, in “*Kanji onhaishi no gi*” (“On the Abolition of *Kanji*”), that “by abolishing *kanji* from the education of the public, we will reduce the amount of time spent on reading and writing, that is to say, on memorizing the pronunciation and figures of ideographs.”¹⁷ Such criticism of spending too much time on the *means*, and not the *content*, of knowledge, was reiterated again and again throughout the Meiji period.

The desire for language reform was, moreover, motivated by not only practical but also emotional resistance to *kanji*, which increased in intensity as foreign relations between China and Japan (via Korea) produced great anxiety about Japan's position in East Asia.¹⁸ Toyama Masakazu (1848–1900) wrote the most essays

promoting the abolition of *kanji* in the 1880s and stated the following in his 1884 “*Kanjiha*” (“Destruction of *Kanji*”):

I am in support of any group that seeks to abolish *kanji*, whatever conjugation system said group advocates in promoting *kana*. I will support any group with the most people. Actually, I will support any group—whether the *Tsuki* or the *Yuki* factions,¹⁹ whether advocates of *kana* or the Roman alphabet—as long as they seek to abolish *kanji*. I will not hesitate to give my support. There is nothing I hate more than *kanji* these days.²⁰

The rest of the speech, as well as the series of essays he wrote for *Tōyō gakkai zasshi* (*Academic Journals of Japan*) clearly indicate that anti-Chinese sentiments were behind such an emotional reaction against *kanji*. For someone like Toyama, the popularity of *kanbun kundokutai* must have been unbearable. However, interestingly, the very language in which he wrote his argument against *kanji* was *kanbun kundokutai*; this was true even when he wrote in the Roman alphabet.²¹ This was a common contradiction harbored by many advocates of language reform who, perhaps ironically, contributed to the dissemination of *kanbun kundokutai*.

Taguchi Ukichi (1855–1905), a well-known historian and economist of the Meiji period, took a different approach in arguing against *kanji* in his 1884 essay “*Nihon kaika no seishitsu shibaraku aratamezaru bekarazu*” (“On the Path to Enlightenment in Japan”), criticizing the inevitably “aristocratic” nature of *kanji* and *kanji* compounds (*kango*). Claiming that it is a luxury to be able to immerse oneself in learning letters, he writes:

There are many *kanji* compounds that are hard to understand through sound [alone]. If they are simply spoken as such, they will not be comprehensible to many. The language will only be comprehensible to those above middle class and hence those with luxury, necessarily becoming aristocratic in character.²²

This is one of the first class-based criticisms of *kanji* and *kanji* compounds we see in the Meiji period. It of course presents what is by now a clichéd understanding of the length of time that is necessary to study *kanji*, but it further caters to the discourse of the Freedom and People’s Rights Movement prevalent at the time, forces of which were quite strong in mid-1880s Japan.²³ The elitist nature of the ruling class was equated with the language they employed, and such an argument had a significant impact upon the promotion of the vernacular language to raise the overall literacy rate in Japan.

As we saw last chapter, the status of *kanji* and *kanbun* was further threatened by Western linguistics. Theories of Western linguistics found their way to Japan in the early years of the Meiji period as comparative linguistics entered the realm of the natural sciences, empowered by Social Darwinism. This development of Western linguistics owes much to Friedrich von Schlegel, said to be the first to coin the term “comparative linguistics,” who employed methods of anatomy in the study of

language in order to take it closer to the natural sciences. To remind ourselves of the highly ideological view of languages that Schlegel promoted, here are his categorizations: “Inflectional languages,” as many Indo-European languages were categorized, “are eminently capable of expressing complex ideas through a single word: the root contains the main idea, the syllables that serve to form derived words express accessory modifications, and the inflections express variable relations. . . . Only these languages bear in themselves a principle of fecundity, of progressive development, and can guide the way in any improvement of the human spirit.”²⁴ As such, Schlegel argued, inflectional languages present themselves as the most advanced form of languages. In contrast, he likened “isolating languages” like Chinese, which do not show any inflection and are “made up of monosyllables that we cannot even call roots,” to a lifeless organism and hence a reflection of barbarity.²⁵ Strictly speaking, it was the Chinese language and its grammar that was object of attack, but the attack further provoked the anti-Chinese sentiments that *kanji* themselves invoked. Many factors thus contributed to the rejection of *kanji* and *kanbun* in 1880s Japan: practicality, anti-Chinese sentiments, the anti-elitist trend of People’s Rights Movement, and Western linguistic theories.

The renunciation of Chinese as a “lifeless” language was certainly not the only way that Western linguistics affected the language reform movements in Japan. One crucial element was the focus of linguistics on phonetics, as we saw in Mori’s proposal in the last chapter. As the study of Western linguistics tried to establish itself as a part of the growing body of natural sciences in the nineteenth century, scholars sought to focus on “living,” as opposed to “dead,” languages, presumably the object of study of classical philologists from which linguistics sought to differentiate itself. The “living” language referred to the language “currently in use,” and precisely because of this, it privileged sound and the pronunciation of words and phrases. It was, in a post-Saussurean manner of speaking, the production of *langue* via sound. “Living” language did not necessarily refer to spoken language; rather, it featured a way of defining language through sound—how it *would* be pronounced—and not necessarily how it was actually spoken by the people.²⁶

How did such a privileging of sound become translated in the many language reforms in 1880s Japan, and what effect did it have on the status of *kanji* and *kanbun*? Let us look at some arguments for the use of Roman alphabets. In “Rōmaji o mote Nihongo o tsuzuru no setsu” (“On Writing Japanese Language in the Roman Alphabet,” 1882) and *Rōmaji hayamanabi* (*The Learning of the Roman Alphabet*, 1885), Yatabe Ryōkichi (1851–99) argued that sound should be the main criterion by which to define a language.²⁷ His argument for the Roman alphabet was based on its ability to transcribe as accurately as possible the many sounds in the Japanese language that *kana* apparently could not account for. In his paradigm, therefore, the sound of a given word becomes privileged over script, which, as a means to transcribe that sound, is thereby secondary. He posits the following rules: “1) In writing in the Roman alphabet, the words should be transcribed not based

on *kana* but based on pronunciation; 2) We must do our best to use the Tokyoite's pronunciation as the standard.”²⁸ Critics have been quick to note the centrality of the Tokyo dialect and its importance in the standardization of the spoken language in a statement like this, but we should not immediately assume that Yatabe is promoting the transcription of “the spoken.” The example he gives in *The Learning of the Roman Alphabet* is quite revealing: in transcribing “Ari to kirigirisu no hanashi” (“The Ant and the Grasshopper”), the opening passage reads:

Natsu mo sugi aki mo take, yaya fuyugare no koro ni narite, aru atataka naru hi,
ari domo ōku uchiatsumari, natsu no hi ni toriosametaru e wo hi ni hosu tote, ana
yori hikiidashi itari.²⁹

Despite the fact that it is rendered in the Roman alphabet, this passage, with its 5–7 rhythm and grammatical structure, features written prose reminiscent of classical tales (*monogatari*). His text therefore may transcribe the pronounced “sound” (and that may very well be the Tokyo sound) of the chain of words that constitute his prose, but it does not necessarily transcribe the “spoken.” Such a view was quite faithful to the manner in which Western linguistics defined “living” language via sound.

There were, however, many arguments that conflated the “living” language with the spoken. Many Meiji intellectuals thought that the advantages of the Western languages lay in their alleged unification of the spoken and written languages, which was inevitably traced to the phonetic nature of the Roman alphabet. As such, many argued that Japan ought to adopt the Roman alphabet or *kana* in order to move their written language closer to the spoken. Taguchi Ukichi's “Nihon kaika no seishitsu shibaraku aratamezaru bekarazu” is one such example. Rejecting *kanji* and *kanji* compounds as aristocratic, he claims, “I am a supporter of the use of the Roman alphabet. I believe that adopting the Roman alphabet to write our own language will allow the spoken and the written to unify completely.”³⁰ As flawed as this logic is—because phoneticizing the written language does not automatically produce the spoken language—he argues that *kanji* and *kanji* compounds interfere with the unification of spoken and written languages. This notion was quite prevalent among the advocates of language reform. Many anti-*kanji* arguments held that *kanji*, given its “hieroglyphic” nature, was entirely divorced from the spoken, an idea further supported by the view that *kanbun*-style composition was the medium furthest from the spoken language.³¹ Those who advocated such a stance often lost sight of the fact that there is also a phonetic element to *kanji*. In effect, we can identify in this period two binary oppositions that align with each other, namely “spoken/written” and “phonetic scripts/hieroglyphic.” The privileging of sound, inextricably linked to the Roman alphabet and Western linguistic theories, reinforced the idea that *kanji* and *kanbun* constituted “dead” languages.

Yet this privileging of sound was not limited to those advocating the Roman alphabet. In fact, one group of *kana* advocates promoted the phonographic *kana*

system (*hyōonshiki kanazukai*), which attempted to transcribe and hence reproduce the pronunciation of a given word in *kana* spelling. Arguing against the other dominant group of *kana* advocates, who promoted the historical *kana* system (*rekishiteki kanazukai*)—which refers to an older system of spelling that presumably reflected how the words were pronounced in the Heian period and was thus already in discord with the Meiji pronunciation—*hyōonshiki* supporters sought to transcribe the sounds and to relegate writing secondary to sound.³² Just like the supporters of the Roman alphabet, they too had many debates on whether to use the Tokyo or Kyoto dialect as the basis for standardizing spelling.³³ The privileging of sound was thus everywhere apparent, governing the many arguments for reform.

In 1880s Japan, therefore, we had, on the one hand, the popularity of *kanbun kundokutai* in newspapers, textbooks, fictional works, and compositions. Yet, on the other hand, the arguments for language reforms—be they for the Roman alphabet, *kana* scripts, or *genbun'itchi*—almost always targeted *kanji*, *kanji* compounds, and *kanbun* for criticism. As a result, it appears that the forces supporting *kanbun kundokutai* and language reforms were not only separate, but worked against each other. The privileging of sound in Western linguistic theories, moreover, further reinforced the binary oppositions (“spoken/written,” “phonetic scripts/‘hieroglyphic’”) that supported such seemingly opposing forces. This is the contradictory background that nation-centered stories of *kanbun kundokutai* perhaps inadvertently reinforce. However, as I will show in the next section, they in fact worked together to create a new space for reform. This will be evident as we look at Ryūkei’s *New Theory*, which bridged the two realms by mobilizing the discourse of Western linguistics and arguing for the superiority of *kanji*, *kanji* compounds, and ultimately *kanbun kundokutai*. By seeing how he responded to the many criticisms against *kanji* and *kanbun*, we can gauge the commonality that these two apparently opposing forces actually shared.

YANO RYŪKEI’S *NEW THEORY* AND THE SHIFT IN *KANBUN KUNDOKUTAI*

Published in 1886, *New Theory* was conceptualized and written (or, more accurately, dictated to his brother Yano Takeo) during Ryūkei’s trip to England between 1884 and 1886. *New Theory* is composed of six chapters, titled “Gotai gosei no koto” (“Enunciated Style and Force”), “Bungo oyobi buntai no koto” (“Written Words and Style”), “Nihon ni mochiu beki moji oyobi buntai no koto” (“On the Orthography and Style that Ought to Be Adopted in Japan”), “Kana to kanji no yūretsu” (“Advantages and Disadvantages of *Kanji* and *Kana*”), “Nihon no kana to rōmaji to no yūretsu” (“Advantages and Disadvantages of *Kana* and the Roman Alphabet in Japan”), and “Zenpen no yōryō oyobi hoi” (“Summary and Supplemental Points”), respectively. As these chapter titles show, Ryūkei’s focus revolves primarily around

orthography rather than grammar or style. Chapter 3 is often taken up as the most important chapter, since Ryūkei here discusses the five different styles available in Japan.³⁴ Among them, he chooses what he refers to as *ryōbuntai* (a twofold style)—a *kanbun kundokutai* with *kana* glosses on all *kanji*—as the most appropriate style “to promote people’s learning.” However, Ryūkei’s engagement with contemporary reforms is more apparent in other chapters. Given the limited space available here, it is not my intention to provide a comprehensive analysis of the text, but rather to highlight the manner in which the text engaged with the contemporary reforms to show how Ryūkei evaluated *kanbun kundokutai* and argued for its superiority.

The first two chapters show Ryūkei’s awareness that the spoken and written languages were fundamentally different and hence had different needs and functions. As we have seen, the unification of the spoken and written languages had been heralded as one of the key ways to bring about language reform, which constituted one of the main arguments for the Roman alphabet and *kana* scripts. Thus, Ryūkei’s stance that the spoken and written languages ought to be treated differently sets him apart from his contemporaries.³⁵

Chapter 1 begins with the following: “In order to identify the most beneficial orthography and style that we need to adopt in order to best develop the people’s level of learning, we must look at enunciated style (*gotai*) and enunciated force (*gosei*),” referring to the forms of spoken words and their brevity.³⁶ In effect, he agrees with his contemporaries that speech forms are important for language reform. What is decisively different, however, is his focus on the phonetics of *kanji*. His discussion compares the number of syllables between what he refers to as *dogo* (“native” language) and *shinago* (language originally from China), which roughly align with *kun-yomi* (the “*kun*”-reading or “indigenous” pronunciation) and *on-yomi* (the “*on*”-reading or phonetic approximation of original characters) of *kanji*, respectively.³⁷ In discussing the advantages and disadvantages of the respective languages, Ryūkei provides several examples, including these two:

神罰思ヒ知タルカ kami no togame omoi shittaruka

(Do you now see the power of divine punishment?)

神罰思ヒ知タルカ shinbatsu omoi shittaruka

(Do you now see the power of divine punishment?)

如是我聞 wa re ka ku ki ku (Thus I have heard) 6 syllables

如是我聞 nyo ze ga mon (Thus I have heard) 4 syllables

In both cases, he claims that the latter examples are superior, because they are “convenient for the movement of the mouth” given the smaller number of syllables. To substantiate his claim, he argues: “That which relates the most meaning

in the smallest amount of oral movement is considered the best language, and that which tells the least meaning with the most oral movement is considered lowly.”³⁸ Accordingly, he argues that *shinago*, which has fewer syllables, is superior to its *dogo* counterparts.

Whether or not we agree with him is not the issue here. What he is trying to do is to argue for the superiority of *on-yomi* and ultimately *kanji* compounds based on their economy and conciseness, which clearly draws on theories of linguistics dominant in nineteenth-century Europe. Ryūkei’s argument, for example, engages with the theory of natural selection applied to articulatory phonetics, which argued that change in speech sound develops based on simplicity of pronunciation relative to easy movement of the muscles.³⁹ August Schleicher (1821–68), who insisted on the importance of articulatory phonetics, claimed that words requiring less muscle movement survived linguistic evolution; such, he claimed, was the natural order of things. Ryūkei mobilizes Western linguistic theories that were in most cases used to promote the superiority of the Roman alphabet to argue for the superiority of *kanji* and its compounds.⁴⁰ In light of contemporaneous anti-*kanji* arguments, this is an important move on Ryūkei’s part, because he is giving a *phonetic* reason for the existence and durability of *kanji* compounds. Unlike advocates of the Roman alphabet and *kana* scripts who rejected *kanji* as “written” ideographs that were furthest from the “spoken” and hence “living” languages, Ryūkei refuses to relegate *kanji* to such a status. He reminds his readers that, although *kanji* may be ideographic, it still retains its phonetic value, which is precisely where its strength lies.

Ryūkei reorients his argument as he begins to show the advantages of *kanji* and its compounds as written scripts. In chapter 4, arguing for the superiority of *kanji* over *kana*, he says the following:

In the world of vision, the language that relates the most meaning in the smallest amount of time is considered superior, while the language that tells only little in the most amount of time is considered inferior. In other words, the language that evokes the most meaning in the quickest possible glance is the superior language.⁴¹

What is foregrounded here is no longer the phonetic value of *kanji*, but its ideographic nature. This logic also appropriates elements from the linguistic and rhetorical theories that I referred to earlier, clearly invoking the authority of such theories. Ryūkei’s logic, however, is not necessarily correct. Once we recognize the fact that a word written in the phonetic alphabet is a unit, our vision does not necessarily read the phonetic syllables individually before recognizing it as a word. But this does not take away the advantages of ideographic scripts that embody more meaning efficiently, in fewer characters, as Ryūkei describes. As contemporary critic and literary scholar Komori Yōichi argues, the print media chose the mixture of *kanji* and *kana* as the economic winner from among the many claims for different orthography, because *kanji* compounds could more concisely and economically pass along necessary information than *kana* or the Roman

alphabet.⁴² In arguing for the superiority of *kanji*, Ryūkei pinpointed one of the main reasons for the popularity of *kanbun kundokutai*, the form that he was advocating: its efficacy for print media.

Seeing his logic in both phonetic and ideographic selection helps explain Ryūkei's preferred style of language in chapter 3, the most-often cited chapter of the book. Here Ryūkei sets out to describe the five styles of language that are in use in Japan. The first is *kanbun*, referring to “the pure *kanbun*” used from the time when *kanbun* first entered Japan: in other words, a form of writing in *kanji* that strictly follows the original classics. The second is *kanbun hentai* (a variation of *kanbun*), which is a “Japanized” *kanbun* that employs words and phrases that are not in the original *kanbun* texts. The third is *zatsubuntai* (an assorted style), which, according to Ryūkei, is a style of *kanbun kundokutai* that began toward the end of the Tokugawa period. Accordingly, *zatsubuntai* is based on translated word order, and hence, unlike the first two styles, avoids the inconvenience of moving back and forth to read the sentences. He valorizes this style by saying, “[T]he emergence of this style signified a great advance in the world of letters in Japan, which multiplied the convenience of spreading knowledge among the people.”⁴³ According to Ryūkei, this style can be traced back to the thirteenth-century *Heike monogatari* (*The Tale of the Heike*) and the c. 1370 *Taiheiki* (*Chronicle of Medieval Japan*), but it was further developed by Edo literati like Arai Hakuseki and Kaibara Ekken. This, Ryūkei adds, is also the medium used for translating Western writings. The fourth style he discusses is *ryōbuntai* (the twofold style), which is a *zatsubuntai* with *kana* glosses added to the *kanji* characters.) Finally, the fifth is *kanatai* (the *kana* style), which is a style that uses only *kana*; he includes the *Genji monogatari* (*The Tale of Genji*, eleventh century) and *Ise monogatari* (*The Tales of Ise*, mid-tenth century) as prime examples. What he ultimately advocates is *ryōbuntai*, which is basically *kanbun kundokutai* with complete *kana* glosses. The rest of the chapter elaborates the superiority of *ryōbuntai* by employing the logic used in the other chapters, namely the superiority of *kanji* compounds and *kanji* as concise orthography, and ultimately proposes to reduce the number of *kanji* characters to around 3000.⁴⁴

It is easy to question Ryūkei's categories. For example, the primary difference between *zatsubuntai* and *ryōbuntai* is whether or not there are *kana* glosses; surely, that cannot be considered a stylistic difference.⁴⁵ These categories are also far from exhaustive, since the tradition of *kanbun kundokutai* prior to the end of Tokugawa period is not accounted for. *Kanatai* is also rather vague; it appears to be a purely orthographic categorization, but the difference between the *kana* style of the *Genji monogatari* and *kanbun kundokutai* is much more than a simple matter of orthography. However, it is futile to criticize Ryūkei for being wrong or selective in his categorization. Rather, it is best to question what he gains through such categorizations.

The categorizations in *New Theory* are inextricably linked to orthographic styles. The focus on orthography is consistent throughout *New Theory*, as his

discussion of any given language is quite narrowly limited to orthography—that is, *kanji*—and not that of thematics or its rhetorical effects. Perhaps a better way to say this is that Ryūkei deliberately severs the language he wants to promote from its rhetorical or content-oriented effects. Even as he discusses the styles of language in chapter 3, and mentions some classical works with them, his defining characteristics of a given style are either the order in which a given sentence is written (that is, whether it follows *kanbun* or *kundoku* grammar), or the existence of *kana* glosses. Throughout the text, he does not discuss the rhetorical effects of language, whether those effects be the number of syllables or the conciseness of *kanji* compounds for reading.

Perhaps his decision to classify the available styles in this manner is more compelling when we think about the categories he used in his earlier attempt at theorizing styles in “Buntairon” (“On Styles”), which he wrote in the second volume of his famous work of fiction, *Keikoku bidan*, serialized in the newspaper *Yūbin hōchi* between 1883 and 1884. He categorized the four available styles in Japan as the following: *kanbun* style, which is appropriate for “tragic elegance”; *wabun* (indigenous “Japanese” writing) style for “weakness and calmness”; *ōbun chokuyakutai* (“direct-translation style” of Western language) for “precision and accuracy”; and *zokugo rigentai* (local vulgar style) for “comic twists and turns.”⁴⁶ They are, in effect, styles that define the content of narration, with clear attention paid to the rhetorical effects of a given style. Such categories, in other words, allow the writer to mobilize the prior literary tradition that is inscribed in a given style as these styles maintain a dialogic relationship with past literary discourse. With *New Theory*, Ryūkei is, in effect, making a break with his own past categories, which were primarily rhetorical. The discussion in *New Theory* thus signifies an attempt to institute a clear severance between what he calls *ryōbuntai* and its predecessors.⁴⁷

This gives us a new perspective from which to see Ryūkei’s discussion of *kanji* and *kanji* compounds. His discussion not only implicitly criticizes his contemporaries, who uncritically argued for the superiority of the Roman alphabet and *kana* scripts for their phonetic nature, but also aims to give a new life to what he refers to as *ryōbuntai*. His use of Western linguistic theories contributes to this aim in several ways, by introducing an entirely new way to theorize language and style. Furthermore, his argument to reduce *kanji* to 3000 characters ultimately shows his focus on the *current* use of *kanji*. He claims that among the 80,000 or so *kanji* characters available, many are from classical literature and had become obsolete in later periods. He therefore proposes to reduce the number of characters to those in current use.⁴⁸ We should not think of this as a reduction in mere number, as Ryūkei might like us to believe. There is another rhetorical manipulation at work, which is evident in his constant use of the word “*futsū*” (glossed with the English word “popular” in *katakana* to refer to characters currently in use). “Popular” writing—which includes official pronouncements, school textbooks, and

newspapers—is differentiated from *bungakusho* (the English phrase “literary work” is provided in *katakana*), which includes fiction, specialized writings, history, and biography.⁴⁹ The division between the “popular” writings and *bungakusho* is certainly neither clear-cut nor even valid; for example, newspapers featured many fictional works, as well as other “specialized writings.” Hence, this is better situated as a prescriptive division. Popular writings, in other words, are genre-specific; they are anti-literary and anti-rhetorical. The characters that ought to be used in those popular writings, therefore, should be limited to those that do not invoke literary or rhetorical effects.

This brings us to another commonality between *New Theory* and the orthographic reforms. What is particularly noteworthy in the desire for new orthography is not only the anti-Chinese sentiments and pro-Western perceptions of language—which are, of course, very obviously there—but the strong desire to sever the present from its past. There were many “practical” arguments for the use of the Roman alphabet and *kana*, but they cannot entirely account for the strong desire to completely alter the linguistic landscape. While some sought to bracket the issue of orthography and first reform the style of languages (which seems much more prudent and “practical”),⁵⁰ the arguments to adopt new orthography remained firmly present, integrated into varying attempts at language reform. Even the arguments for *kana*, the foundational ideology of which is often traced to the Edo nativist movement, included calls for an entirely different transcription of words, one that was based on pronunciation (*hyōonshiki kanazukai*) rather than the more conventional historical *kana* system (*rekishiteki kanazukai*) that followed classical orthography, which would have significantly altered the visual representation of language. The urge to erase the linguistic traditions of the past existed in almost all of the language reform movements, and the adoption of a new orthography simply offered the most dramatic break with the past. Ultimately, what better way to erase the linguistic traditions of the past and start anew than to adopt a new orthography, which brings change not only in content or in style, but in the very representation of its own language?

Just like the other arguments for new orthography, then, *New Theory* embodies the urge to sever itself from the past. The question we must address is: What “past” did Ryūkei want to sever *ryōbuntai* from? Since *ryōbuntai* is *kanbun kundokutai*, its natural ancestor was *kanbun*.⁵¹ In effect, not only was Ryūkei seeking a new way to promote *kanbun kundokutai*, but a way to sever the connection between *kanbun* and *kanbun kundokutai* and to take *kanbun kundokutai* out of the genre of *kanbun*. Let us explore this severance a little further, especially in the context of *kanbun kundokutai* and its development. In so doing, we will see that Ryūkei’s advocacy of *ryōbuntai*, and ultimately the severance of *kanbun* and *kanbun kundokutai*, was not unique to him or unbefitting of the discursive conditions of the time. In fact, it was on a par with a movement in *kanbun kundokutai* that was occurring in the general media.

Given that *kanbun kundokutai* grew out of a method of reading that was initially devised to interpret *kanbun*, *kanbun kundokutai* was secondary to the original *kanbun*. However, when it was appropriated to meet the needs of the new world, *kanbun kundokutai* began to take on a life of its own.⁵² There were, of course, many reasons for this. As I discussed above, one was *kanbun kundokutai*'s ability to accommodate many new *kanji* compounds; there were also the many changes made to *kanbun kundokutai* as it accommodated new grammar in translating Western languages, such as the introduction of relative clauses and other formulaic expressions. There were also various efforts on the part of individuals to depart from the rules and literary conventions of *kanbun*. One well-known example is Fukuzawa Yukichi; when he first wrote a draft of *Seiyō jijō* (*Conditions of the West*, 1866), he was told that he ought to have it checked by a Confucian scholar because it lacked "authentic elegance" (*seiga*). Responding that his main aim was "communication" (*tatsui*), he left his prose as it was.⁵³ To "communicate" his ideas, he felt it necessary to break the mold of "authentic elegance," which was undoubtedly based on the literary conventions of *kanbun*.

In addition, in the realm of *sakubun*, or composition, a parallel discursive movement in the 1880s further facilitated *kanbun kundokutai*'s shift away from *kanbun*. This shift in composition is perhaps most telling, because most intellectuals equated composition with *kanbun* writing, and hence it constituted a domain often considered to be the most conservative. As such, a dichotomy is repeatedly posited between the realms of composition and linguistic reforms in recent scholarship: while "old-fashioned" composition continued to teach *kanbun*, linguistic reforms sought to jettison *kanbun*. Despite such characterizations, the realm of composition too, however indirectly, contributed to the shift in *kanbun kundokutai* and hence in the relationship between *kanbun* and *kanbun kundokutai*.

The complexity and the sheer variety of composition textbooks that were available in the early Meiji period is certainly not a topic to which I could do justice in this chapter. Yet a quick review of publishing changes supports the argument that the relationship between *kanbun* and *kanbun kundokutai* changed in this period. Consider, for example, the form of model sentences (*bunpan*) composed by distinguished or well-versed men, many of which were published by scholars presumably upset by the increase in students who lacked the knowledge of *kangaku* classics. Such model sentences were pure *kanbun* and hence not rearranged according to familiar syntax, and these textbooks included a list of model phrases, grammar (sentence structures), vocabulary, rhetorical devices such as *shōō* or *fukusen* (both denoting different forms of foreshadowing), and so on. Many had the original *kanbun* in big letters, followed by the *kundoku* reading in small letters. On the surface, therefore, such *bunpan* replicated the hierarchy between an original *kanbun* and a derivative *kanbun kundokutai*. However, in the 1880s, we see such composition textbooks being published without the original *kanbun*. *Kiji ronsetsu: shūbun kihan* (*Practice Book of Model Sentences*, 1884) is one such

example. This textbook was published not only in fully conjugated form with the word order following the *kundoku* reading, but with glosses on how to read the characters, as well as the clear placement of *te ni o ha* particles. (Predictably, Confucian scholars were extremely critical of such a style and rejected the textbooks as vulgar renderings of *kanbun*).⁵⁴

Such a practice was further supported by the publication of *kanji* compound dictionaries in the Meiji period. Saitō Mareshi notes that dictionaries of *kanji* compounds began to be published in great number in the Meiji period, while the dictionaries of the previous era catered more to the writing of *kanshi* or Sinified verse. In effect, Saitō concludes, these dictionaries were specifically composed to read *kanbun kundokutai* and not *kanbun*.⁵⁵ The dissemination of such textbooks and dictionaries clearly reinforced the “original” status of *kanbun kundokutai*, thereby robbing *kanbun* of its primary status.⁵⁶

The effect of such a shift can easily be imagined. *Kanbun kundokutai* divested itself of the *kanbun* rhythm, a decisive element of the “authentic elegance” associated with *kanbun*. The rhetorical effects associated with such rhythm also disappeared. Ryūkei’s *New Theory*, with its focus on orthographic efficacy rather than rhetoric, is thus very much a product of its time, as it clearly engaged with the shift in *kanbun kundokutai* by focusing on the current use of *kanji* and their compounds. His arguments for the superiority of *kanji* and *kanji* compounds, just like in the realm of composition, also severed their positions from the literary conventions, rules, and “authentic elegance” to which *kanbun* was subject. *New Theory* therefore not only constitutes a criticism of the contemporary arguments for orthographic reform, but also embodies the many discursive movements that shaped the very reforms Ryūkei criticized.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF KOKUBUN

As *kanbun kundokutai* became “liberated” from its secondary status, a space opened up for another system of language to claim authority and “primary” status. This was “national letters” (*kokubun*). It is not a coincidence that criticisms of *kanbun kundokutai* as a style that “destroy[ed] the Japanese grammar” emerged in great number around this time. As long as *kanbun kundokutai* was relegated secondary to *kanbun*, whether or not it adhered to “Japanese” grammar was not an issue. But toward the end of the 1880s, as scholars of “national literature” began to take center stage, such criticism emerged, suggesting that *kanbun kundokutai* had begun to achieve primary status by that time.

In characterizing the *kokubun* movement that emerged in the late 1880s, typically scholars trace it to the Edo nativist movement; its attempt to produce *wabun*-oriented “common language” (*futsūbun*) by incorporating *kanji* compounds in *wabun* is characterized as an effort to counter the popularity of *kanbun kundokutai* (and ultimately to supplant its status as “common language”), which is likened to the

efforts of the Edo nativists.⁵⁷ It may thus be easy to say that *kokubun* scholars took after Edo nativists as they criticized *kanbun kundokutai* for destroying Japanese grammar. But it is also easy to imagine how the significance of such criticism changed when *kanbun kundokutai* was no longer treated as secondary to *kanbun*.

Let us examine how the *kokubungaku* scholars of the late 1880s and early 1890s position *kokubun*. See, for example, the following passage from Ochiai Naobumi's "Shōrai no kokubun" ("The Future of National Letters," 1890), which criticizes the grammar of the "current language" as "unsystematic" and "unruly":

As long as we call a given style *kokubun*, there must be a standard system of grammar and usage. Looking at today's letters, many err in the conjugation of verbs and use of particles, and violate the relationship between verbs and particles, as well as the relationship between particles. There are too many careless usages of *kana* suffixes, confusion between transitive and intransitive forms, and mistakes in tenses.⁵⁸

Notice what Ochiai focuses on in this passage: particles, conjugation, tense, and suffixes. These are the grammatical elements that are needed to convert *kanbun* to *kanbun kundokutai*.⁵⁹ Ultimately, he seeks to systematize the very rules used to adopt *kanji* compounds in the *kundoku* form and situate them as the defining characteristics of *kokubun*. Rather than a critique that follows in the footsteps of Edo nativists, this effort is better situated as an attempt to redefine and reorient the "current language" as *kokubun* by focalizing these structures of "Japanese" language as defining characteristics of *kokubun*. Simply put, Ochiai used *kanbun kundokutai*'s status as the "current language" and designated it as the imperfect *kokubun*. I do not mean to imply that these scholars did not incorporate any *wabun*—they clearly did, especially in the early 1890s as the *kokubun* movement ripened. The point is that their definition of *kokubun* relied heavily on *kanbun kundokutai*, the form by which *kanji* compounds were processed in the *kanbun kundokutai* tradition. In defining *kokubun*, they thus appropriated the fertile space opened up by the shift in *kanbun kundokutai* in the early Meiji period. That is, such a definition of *kokubun* became possible as "current language" claimed autonomy from its ancestor.

The focus on "current language" as an object of critique does not stop here. Here is a passage from Sekine Masanao's "Kokugo no hontai narabi ni sono kachi" ("The Basis of *Kokugo* and Its Value," 1888). After he focuses on *te ni o ha* particles and verb conjugation to define the "Japanese-ness" of *kokugo* (national language) and criticizes the current style of language as "unsystematic" just as Ochiai did, he continues:

An erudite man has sought to adopt *wabun*—the old language used about a thousand years ago—as the language of the present. Accordingly, he designated the study of classical writings (*kobun*) and vocabulary (*kogo*) as the main aim of our "national language" study (*kokugogaku*). . . . In my humble opinion, I believe that the basis of *kokugo* lies in the language that is in use today. And the main goal of *kokugo*

scholarship is the study of the structure and rules of today's language based on rules specific to our country, so as to correct the unruliness of the spoken and written languages, and write a systematic language so that it can be easily understood without confusion.⁶⁰

Sekine, too, redefines the "language of the present" as *kokugo* by promoting "rules specific to our country." His argument, however, goes a step further than Ochiai's by implicitly associating the *kokugo* lineage with *wabun*, citing works like *Ise monogatari* and *Genji monogatari* later in his essay. This has two important effects. First, it legitimates *kokugo*'s "current practicality," because it is posited in opposition to impractical "old words that are unfamiliar to our ears" (*kikinarenu kogen*).⁶¹ Second, the dichotomy of *kokugo* versus *kobun/kogen* (as *wabun*) replaces the most obvious dichotomy—*kanbun kundokutai* versus *kanbun*—which is deliberately effaced in this discussion. In effect, Sekine effaces *kanbun*'s original status and situates *wabun* as the rightful ancestor to the "current language" (which is renamed as *kokugo*).⁶² Such a rhetorical operation is not unique to Sekine. We see similar arguments by other national literature scholars of the late 1880s, such as in Hagino Yoshiyuki's "Wabun o ronzu" ("On Wabun," 1887).

This erasure of *kanbun* as origin extends to other national literature scholars, who compiled many textbooks of model compositions to disseminate their *kokugo*. As the models for *kokugo*, these textbooks selected not only works considered *wabun* or even those written by the Edo nativists like Motoori Norinaga, but also pieces by Edo writers such as Arai Hakuseki and Kaibara Ekken, men that Ryūkei chose as the models for his *zatsubuntai*. Haga Yaichi, in his 1890 *Kokubungaku tokuhon* (*Anthology of Japanese Letters*), praises Arai's narrative and says he prefers this mixed *wa-kan* style (*wakan konkōbun*) to the neoclassical prose (*gikobun*) developed by the Edo nativists.⁶³ In other words, *kokugo* clearly absorbed texts that had *kanbun* ancestry, while erasing *kanbun*'s originary status. This further reinforces the severance of "current language" from its *kanbun* "ancestor." Or rather, such a rewriting of the "origin" was made possible by the shift in *kanbun kundokutai* and its severance from *kanbun*.

Though *kokubun* advocates were effacing the primacy of *kanbun*, they, like Ryūkei, embraced the efficacy of *kanji* and sought to incorporate them as "Japanese." Since *kokubun* advocates did not inherit the anti-*kanji* sentiments of the second decade of the Meiji period, they did not promote orthographic changes.⁶⁴ Here is another section of Sekine's "Kokugo no hontai narabi ni sono kachi," wherein he discusses *kungo* (indigenous words) and *ongo* (referring to *kanji* compounds, "Chinese" in origin):

Kungo and *ongo* were initially different in character, but [*ongo*] have since changed and adopted our sound and speech forms (*onchō gosei*) over several hundred years. *Ongo* have thus been assimilated naturally by *kungo* and have since become one with them. As such, it is not easy to rid ourselves of *kanji* compounds. If we forcefully

resist the use of these compounds, *kungo* will become deficient and inadequate not only in writing but also in speech.⁶⁵

This is a logic on a par with Ryūkei's argument in *New Theory*. It evaluates *kanji* compounds in terms of their phonetic value instead of their ideographic character. It further assimilates the *kanji* compounds as "Japanese" based on their very phonetic value. In fact, this is a departure from the Edo nativists' view that constantly designated *kanji* as a "foreign" medium that interfered with the "Japanese-ness" of language. Instead, in Sekine's paradigm, it is assumed that *kanji* is pronounced, and the sound—the manner in which it is read—is privileged over the written script. It is, in other words, a logic that ties in with Western linguistics; it is not a coincidence that *onchō gosei*, a phrase used in Sekine's passage, is also used to translate the term "phonetics" in linguistics. Sekine's view seems to endorse the idea that it is the pronunciation of a word that makes it a word, and this is precisely what the discourse of linguistics promotes.

CONCLUSION

On the surface, the many arguments for reform that proliferated in 1880s Japan and rejected *kanji*, *kanji* compounds, and *kanbun* appear incongruous with the increasing popularity of *kanbun kundokutai*. As we have seen, however, the orthographic reforms of the second decade constituted a parallel discursive movement to the shift in *kanbun kundokutai*, as both sought to sever the past from the present. Their relationship may not be causal, but the focus on the "current" linguistic terrain is predicated on the proliferation of the "current language," a space opened up through a multitude of forces that shaped the discursive site in question: the many translingual practices that shaped the early Meiji period, the development of print media, anti-Chinese sentiments that resulted from growing anxiety vis-à-vis Japan's status in East Asia, the People's Rights Movement and the proliferation of "democratic" discourse, the prevalence of Western linguistic theories, and so forth. Although in appearance they differ in their goals, it is not a coincidence that both *New Theory*, which promoted *kanbun kundokutai*, and national literature scholars, who promoted *kokubun*, sought out this discursive space in which to posit their own means toward standardization. Without seeing the development of *kanbun kundokutai* as an integral part of *kokugo* reform, we lose sight of the fact that it was developments in *kanbun kundokutai* that made such reform possible.

The *kokubungaku* scholars' emphasis on the "current language" is too often attributed to their sense of nation, and hence the idea that a national community ought to have one common language.⁶⁶ However, we must not forget that such an idea needs a linguistic terrain that can accommodate and hence make possible such views. It is much more convincing to say that such a positing of *kokugo* became possible through the space opened up by *kanbun kundokutai*, which allowed

wabun to supplant *kanbun* in its “ancestral” status and hence the retrospective gaze that discovered *wabun* as the rightful lineage of (*kanbun*) *kundokutai*. The scholarly focus on the production of the nation has undoubtedly brought much needed perspective on language reforms by highlighting their political nature. However, there is a kind of inversion at work in how this scholarly work posits the nation, unnecessarily empowering the nation as an entity that motivates the movements that created it. It features, in many ways, an anachronistic projection of a Japanese national identity that necessarily excluded *kanbun*—whether it be *kanbun* or *kanbun kundokutai*—as a means of achieving language reform. This scholarship also obscures the fact that the conception of national language that ultimately prevailed after the Sino-Japanese war should actually be traced back to the reform of *kan*. More attention to the pre-Ueda Kazutoshi era, not simply as an “imperfect” preparatory phase for *kokugo* reform, but as a space in which the varying forces of linguistic encounters struggled with one another, can help expose what recent focus on the nation and nationalism conceals.

APPENDIX

Kanbun: 当是時臣唯独知有韓信不知有陛下也

Two types of *kanbun kundokutai* derivative of the above *kanbun*:

bōdokutai: 是時ニ当リ臣唯独韓信アルヲ知ル陛下アルヲ知ラザル也

yakudokutai: 是時に當りて臣は唯独り韓信あるを知りて陛下のましますを知り奉らざるなり (underlined portion showing the honorific language absent from *kanbun*). [These examples were taken from Kamei Hideo, *Kansei no henkaku* (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1983), 32–34.]

The following are examples Ryūkei raises for *kanbun hentai*, *zatsubuntai*, and *ryōbuntai* in *New Theory*:

Kanbun hentai:

恒例之祭祀不陵夷如在之礼奠令怠慢因茲於関東御分国々並莊園者地頭神主等各各存其趣可致精誠也(437). From *Goseibai shikimoku* (*The Formulary of Adjudications*, 1232).

Zatsubuntai:

宇都宮公綱千余人ヲ以テ来リ援ヒ急ニ攻テ柵ヲ拔キ城趾ヲ鑿ル正成、機ニ応ジテ之ヲ拒グ敵竟ニ抜クコト能ハザリキ (439). From Rai Sanyō, *Nihon gaishi* (*An Unofficial History of Japan*, 1827).

Ryōbuntai:

キセイリョウトウ ヨキ ヨセテ クワワリ イマ キ クツ アラテ
 紀清両党千余騎寄手ニ加テ未ダ氣ヲ屈セザル荒手ナレバ（云々）（440）.
 From *Taiheiki* (*A Chronicle of Medieval Japan*, late fourteenth century).

Kanatai:

ミダノ、ツルギノ、トナミヤマ、クモヂハナカス、ミコシヂノ、クニノ
 ユクスエ、サトトヘバ、イトド、ミヤコハ、トウザカル、サカイガハニ
 モ、ツキニケリ（440）. From *Yōkyoku: Yamanba* (*Noh lyrics: Mountain Hag*, 1840).