HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Japanese rendition of Tenrei bansho meigi's definition in early Japanese lexicography : An essay
Author(s)	Li, Yuan; Shin, Woongchul; Okada, Kazuhiro
Citation	Journal of the Graduate School of Letters, 11, 83-96
Issue Date	2016-03
DOI	https://doi.org/10.14943/jgsl.11.83
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/61097
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	11_07_li.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

Journal of the Graduate School of Letters, Hokkaido University
Vol. 11; pp. 83–96, March 2016

Japanese rendition of *Tenrei banshō meigi*'s definition in early Japanese lexicography: An essay

LI Yuan, SHIN Woongchul, Kazuhiro OKADA

Abstract: This essay will address differences in orientation in early Japanese lexicography with regard to the Japanese rendering of definitions in a Chinese language dictionary. Most, if not all, premodern Japanese dictionaries took the form of rendering the headword in Chinese characters and Chinese words, while also offering a Japanese reading. This does not, however, entail that early Japanese lexicography was entirely oriented to the Chinese language: in fact, a representative portion of Japanese oriented language dictionaries were produced. Japanese readings in Japanese language dictionaries explain the Japanese use of the headword. Alternatively, Chinese-Japanese dictionaries, including Chinese character dictionaries, explain the Chinese use in the Japanese language. By virtue of this fact, they are not distinctive in their form. This essay attempts to distinguish which orientation a dictionary inclines to by focusing on its rendering of definitions of earlier Chinese dictionaries. Here, we will examine the nature of Japanese renditions in a Japanese dictionary, *Ruiju myōgi shō* 類聚名義抄, cited from the Chinese character dictionary *Tenrei banshō meigi* 篆隸万象名義. Our findings suggest that Japanese renditions illustrate Chinese use rather than Japanese use, which accounts for differences in the Japanese readings and compiling strategies of the dictionaries.

(Received on October 30, 2015)

1 Introduction

The history of Japanese writing emerged when the Japanese people learned to write their language in Chinese characters.[1] This seems to have begun in the sixth century when they learned to write

1 The Japanese writing system is unique in using different character types. One type is Chinese characters called *kanji*, while another is *kana* moraics consisted of *hiragana* and *katakana*. It is believed that *kanji* represent the ideal part and *kana* the inflectional part in writing. However, despite arguments made against this assumption

©2016 by the Graduate School of Letters, Hokkaido University
LI Yuan: Graduate Student, Hokkaido University 〈liyuansapporo@yahoo.co.jp〉
SHIN Woongchul: International Research Fellow, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science 〈shin.wngchl@gmail.com〉
Kazuhiro OKADA: Research Associate, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies 〈k-okada@tufs.ac.jp〉
All authors contributed equally to this work. Our sincere thanks are due to the HDIC (Integrated Database of *Hanzi* Dictionaries in Early Japan) Database Project (Chair: Shoju Ikeda, Hokkaido University. URI: http://hdic.let.hokudai.ac.jp/), who helped us collect data from earlier dictionaries.
10.14943/jgsl.11.83

in exchanges with other people using characters. Naturally, their own monolingual dictionary was initially merely an abridgement of earlier Chinese language dictionaries, and bilingual Chinese to Japanese dictionaries, i.e. early Japanese language dictionaries developed from those bilingual dictionaries.[2]

Consequently, the oldest dictionary in Japan was a Chinese dictionary, called *Niina* 新字. While this dictionary has long been lost, the oldest extant dictionary is *Tenrei banshō meigi* 篆隸万象名義,[3] which was compiled in approximately 830 (hereafter, *TBM*). This dictionary is a thorough abridgement of a Chinese dictionary named *Yupian* 玉篇, which is a radical-based character dictionary. For each character, it provides *fanqie* 反切 'pronunciations'[4] and definitions with citations. *TBM*, on the other hand, omits citations entirely and simply provides *fanqie* 'pronunciations' and definitions.

Tenrei banshō meigi was influential on later dictionaries. Ikeda (2011) demonstrates that early Japanese practical dictionaries were produced by Buddhist monks, who relied on this dictionary. One of the clearest examples is the original version of *Ruiju myōgi shō* 類聚名義抄 (hereafter, *RMS*), which cites *TBM* as much as possible. The original *RMS* is a Chinese character dictionary in which every explanation is provided through cited authentic sources. It also cites Japanese renditions of headwords from authentic reading materials. It was later compiled into a more usable style, called the restructured versions of *RMS*. Through its compilation process, citation details were completely removed. Moreover, what is interesting in the enlargement is that a certain proportion of citations from *TBM* in the original version seem to have been incorporated by means of Japanese rendering of the original Chinese definition. Here, we will examine the relationship between the headwords and Japanese renditions in terms of the use that renditions are designated to explain.

Our findings suggest that Japanese renditions illustrate the Chinese rather than Japanese use. This distinction accounts for differences in lexical items and the compiling strategy used for the dictionaries.

The present essay is organised as follows: Here, in this introduction, we will review the relevant issues and establish the research question. In the first half of the second section, we will

---

in articles such as Erbaugh (2002), this belief remains strong seeing as *kanji* usage falls into Sino-Japanese and native Japanese strata. Whilst the Sino-Japanese reading is a Japanese imitation of Chinese, a native Japanese reading represents a Japanese approximation of those semantics. Naturally, it is impossible to distinguish thoroughly between a native Japanese reading and a Japanese rendition of a Chinese character: a reading can be both simultaneously.

2 Early Japanese lexicography spans from the early seventh century to the end of the Muromachi period, specifically, the end of the Keichō era (1615).

3 The oldest dictionary that includes the Japanese language is *Shinsen jikyō* 新撰字鏡, compiled by Shōjū 昌住 during the Shōtai era (898–901). The early history of Japanese lexicography is outlined in Bailey (1960) and Ikeda (2011). Ikeda (2011) views history as a process of Japanisation in that Chinese dictionaries are gradually abridged and rearranged in accordance with Japanese demands.

4 *Fanqie* is a practice used to indicate how a Chinese character should be read. Two Chinese characters are employed where the first character indicates the onset of the character in question, whereas the latter indicates the remainder, i.e. glide, nucleus, and tone. For instance, the MC pronunciation of 東 'east' [tuŋ] (*dong* in ModC) is represented by '德[tək]紅[ɣuŋ]反', since the onset of *tək* and the nucleus of *ɣuŋ* are identical with those of *tuŋ*. The MC reconstruction is that of Pulleyblank (1984).

investigate how definitions of the *Tenrei banshō meigi* are incorporated into both the original and restructured versions of *Ruiju myōgi shō*, considering, in particular, the case of Japanese rendering. In the latter half of the second section, we will discuss the relationship between headwords and those renditions in comparison with a Japanese language (oriented) dictionary, *Iroha jirui shō* 色葉字類抄 (hereafter, *IJS*). Lastly, we will provide a conclusion to the question and identify further questions.

1.1 Dictionaries investigated

1.1.1 Tenrei banshō meigi *(Kūkai, c. 830)*

Tenrei banshō meigi is a Chinese character dictionary compiled by Kūkai 空海 (775–834) in Japan in approximately 830. *TBM* is the only thorough abridgement of the original *Yupian*, compiled in 543 by Gu Yewang 顧野王 of the Liang 梁 dynasty of China. *Yupian* is a radical-based dictionary that only survives in the form of fragmentary volumes. Composed of six fascicles, *TBM* arranges approximately 16,000 entries. Fascicles 1, 2, 3, and 4 were compiled by Kūkai, and the rest by someone else. The Kōzanji manuscript was copied in 1114 and is the only manuscript of the old kind.

The entries are arranged into two columns with six lines per page. For each entry, the headword is provided in seal script and regular script, and followed by explanations. Each explanation includes *fanqie* 'pronunciation', definitions, and allograph notations. Whilst definitions in *Yupian* are explained with cited authentic sources and comments by the author,[5] *TBM* removes all the context that existed in the original, and simply leaves the 'definition'. Therefore, the entry for *she* 設 in *Yupian*, which illustrates the character in question with citations from various classic texts, including Confucian classics and authoritative lexicons, as well as the compiler's opinion prefaced with the words '野王案' ('In the compiler's humble opinion') is as follows:[6]

尸熱反。《周礼》：設官分職。野王案：設猶置也。《毛詩》：肆筵設席。《傳》曰：設席重席也。《韓詩》：鍾鼓既設。ミ陳也。《公羊傳》：權之所設。何休曰：設施也。《國語》：必設以此。賈逵曰：設許也。《廣雅》：設合也。

(Vol. 9. Hereafter, every decoration and punctuation is ours unless noted.)

This was simply abridged into

尸熱反。置也、施也、合也。 (Fasc. 3, f. 11v)

in *TBM* (Underlined words indicate correspondences.).

1.1.2 *Original* Ruiju myōgi shō *(c. 1100)*

The original version of *Ruiju myōgi shō* is a Chinese-Japanese dictionary compiled by a monk of the Hossō (Dharma characteristics) school 法相宗 of Japan in approximately 1100. The only existing manuscript of the original *RMS* is the Zushoryō manuscript, of which the third of

5 This is a manner adopted widely in the Sinosphere. Ikeda (1967) termed this manner *honmon shugi* 本文主義, which values the attribution of any kind of expression to classical literature, or, in other words, authentic sources. This manner can be understood as a kind of authenticism.

6 The version cited here is from a fragmental volume kept in Waseda University (ホ 04 02555).

the six fascicles survives.

The original *RMS* contains Chinese characters or words (principally Buddhist terms) as headwords, as well as explanations in Classical Chinese concerning the pronunciation, definition, and orthography of the character cited from dictionaries and Buddhist commentaries from China and Japan. It also cites Japanese readings in the form of either *man'yogana* or *katakana*, from authentic vocabularies, including *Wamyō ruiju shō* 和名類聚抄 or glossed Classical Chinese texts, respectively. Whilst the Japanese reading is provided as an appendage to Classical Chinese explanations, it sometimes confers ideas that are not defined in Classical Chinese (Shin, 2015). Both the Chinese and Japanese pronunciations sometimes feature tonal and nasal marks in vermilion.[7] The original *RMS* cites *TBM* extensively: it distinguishes the original part of *TBM* (i.e. the part compiled by Kūkai) from the additional part by means of different citation indicators, e.g. '弘云' (Master Kōbō 弘法大師, or Kūkai 空海: 'as Kūkai states') and '玉云' (*Yupian* 玉篇: 'as *Yupian* states'), respectively, of which the former accounts for 521 examples[8] while the latter accounts for 600 examples[9] (Miyazawa, 1973). Citation generally focuses on *TBM*'s pronunciation and definition. Citations are given for as long as possible, principally for common Chinese characters: however, when both *TBM* and the original *RMS* entry have the same character, *TBM* is cited in 98% of cases for pronunciation and 89% for definition (Miyazawa, 1987).

The following example illustrates the structure of entries of the original *RMS*. It is an entry for *anxiang* 安詳, which virtually explains only the latter character, *xiang* 詳:

> 宋云本音祥(L)・慈云安者徐也、一[詳]者審也。或以章反一[詳]狂也。今従初・中云探玄記云一[安]一[詳](は)審諦之状。捷作庠。養也。庠之言詳也亦通・弘云審也論也議也諟也詐也。・又音与羊同　アキラカ(LLHL)詩　イツハル(LLHL)記　ツハヒラカニ(LL゛LHL@)選　眞云シヤウ(LN)[10] (p. 89, l. 7, original punctuation)

The entry begins with an explanation of the pronunciation,[11] followed by definitions, and sources are cited for each description. Each citation indicates the source (underlined in citation): '...云' ('... states') for pronunciation and definition, as in '宋云' (The Song version of *Guangyun* 宋本廣韵: 'as *Guangyun* states'), '慈云' (Master Cien 慈恩大師, or Kuiji 窺基: 'as Kuiji states'), '中云' (中 is an abbreviation of Chūzan 仲算: 'as Chūzan states'), '弘云', on the other hand, the abbreviation in smaller script in Japanese readings is '詩' (*Shijing* 詩經, *The classic of poetry*), '記' (*Shiji* 史記, *The records of the Grand Historian*), and '選' (*Wenxuan* 文選, *Selections of refined literature*), whose glossed text provides authority in native Japanese reading. The final citation, which is from a work of Shingyō 真興, illustrates a traditional Sino-Japanese reading in *katakana*.[12] These Japanese readings bear tone marks to indicate accent and prenasality; here,

7 Note that *seidaku*, or prenasality distinction in phonology was generally ignored in orthography in EMJ. The underlying distinction of consonant voice surfaced as prenasality. See Frellesvig (2010: 162–65).

8 The number of examples excluded the case that cites Kūkai's other works.

9 The number includes the case that cites *Yupian* directly but not the latter part of *TBM*.

10 An enclosure with parentheses transcribes marks and glosses added. See Appendix for transcription conventions.

11 This explanation does not present *fanqie* 'pronunciation' but rather homophonous association.

12 This is a century old Sino-Japanese stratum now called *go on* 呉音, *vis-à-vis kan on* 漢音 which were introduced later, and is usually indicated in *fanqie* 'pronunciation'. *Go on* continued to be used in Buddhist circles when

we also observe a nasalisation mark added to the Sino-Japanese reading.[13]

She in *TBM* resulted as (underlined):

弘云尸熱反置也施也合也・眞云陳也計也列也飼也。マウク(LLH)記 (p. 76, l. 2)

1.1.3 Restructured Ruiju myōgi shō *(The Kanchiin manuscript, 12–13c)*

The restructured versions of *Ruiju myōgi shō* are a group of manuscripts that came from the restructuring of the original *RMS*. The restructured *RMS* bleaches the specialised contents of the original *RMS* including the Buddhist tone, as well as considerably enlarging the Japanese reading. During restructuring, entries of compounds in the original *RMS* are decomposed into entries for each component of a compound, that is to say, a character.[14] Several versions have survived, of which the Kanchiin manuscript is the only surviving complete copy and version, and is the representative witness when the restructured *RMS* is referenced. Of other versions that have survived fragmentally, here we investigate the Renjōin manuscript as supporting evidence to ascertain if the Kanchiin manuscript contains errors.

It contains readings featuring marks indicating accentuation and prenasalisation and the postscript states that marks indicate that a reading is derived from either previous sources or authenticity, whereas unmarked words remain uncertain as renditions of the headword. Komatsu (1971) argued that the marks are utilised to convey authentic pronunciation as they can show vividly and simultaneously both the detail and authenticity of the reading.

Thus, *she* in the original *RMS* was rearranged into:

尸熱 和セチ マウク(LL@) タトヒ(LL@) ヲサム モシ シク マヌカル(LL@@) 置也合也陳也計也列也飼也[15] (Fasc. 法上, p. 61, l. 2)

Underline indicates direct inheritance of *TBM* from the original *RMS*. Whilst the number of Japanese readings undoubtedly increased compared with the original version, as indicated by the underlines, some portion of the Chinese explanation remained unchanged.

1.1.4 Iroha jirui shō *(The three volume version, the Jishō era (1177–81))*

Iroha jirui shō 色葉字類抄 is the earliest dictionary for 'writing Japanese' as well as arranged entries that took phonology into consideration. It was compiled in the Ten'yō to Chōkan eras (1144–65) in two volumes, and was enlarged in the Jishō era (1177–81) into three volumes, both by an official of lower rank, Tachibana no Tadakane 橘忠兼 (Birth and death dates unknown). It is known that the two volume version was edited based on earlier dictionaries (Eguchi, 1995:

---

it was ordered that Sino-Japanese reading should employ the *kan on* stratum. Shingyō's work cited here is a commentary for *Mahāprajñāpāramitā sūtra* 大般若波羅蜜多經, in which the Buddhist traditional reading of the Classical Chinese translation appears to be noted in *katakana*.

13 This indicates that the syllable in question is nasalised whatever the articulation manner may be. This answers to ModJ moraic nasal, and should not be confused with prenasality, which answers to ModJ *seidaku*. Whilst we adopt Frellesvig's (2010) phonological reconstruction of EMJ throughout the essay, which reconstruct it as *syaũ*, Japanese literature has long regarded *ũ* as *ŋ* that associates more with the original Chinese pronunciation.

14 This was possible thanks to the fact that the original *RMS* generally explains not the compound itself, but each character. See Ikeda (1993).

15 '伺也' was corrected after the Renjōin manuscript.

133–34). The three volume version contains approximately 13,000 entries. The order is known as the *Iroha* order, as the title implies, arranged in the order of the letters of *Iroha uta*, a kana pangram.[16]

Each section entry devoted to language expressions lists Chinese characters as headwords with the same reading, particularly when an entry is in monogram form.[17] Explanations follow, including pronunciation either in Sino-Japanese or Japanese readings using *katakana*. The first character of a list or the characters marked in vermilion are those that are widely used in practice to represent the written Japanese word. In this sense, *IJS* is called a Japanese language oriented dictionary (Yamada, 1943: 153–54; Minegishi, 1986–87).

The following example is an entry for *yurusu* ユルス, listing all the Chinese characters associated with the Japanese word:

• ✓許〈ユルス/虚呂反〉✓免〈亡辨反〉✓赦(シヤ)　✓聽〈一[聽]昇殿/他定反〉祚✓原〈恕也〉[...]税〈已上同〉 (Maeda Manuscript, Vol. 下, f. 68r, l. 6)

The first character, *xu* 許, deserves, in the compiler's consideration, the foremost association with *yurusu*. Generally speaking, the first character accompanies the native Japanese reading, but in some cases, it accompanies the Sino-Japanese reading, with *fanqie* 'pronunciation' in double line comments. It follows several characters that have a common reading, some receiving vermilion marks, and others with pronunciation and definitions noted in double line comments. Including omissions, *yurusu* counts 33 Chinese characters. The order of characters is believed to be associated with degree of ordinariness: earlier appearances imply greater ordinariness in the association between the character and the reading. Characters are checked in particular when the character-reading association is based on a concrete authority.

1.2 Japanese rendering of definitions in earlier Chinese dictionaries as a strategy in lexicography

It has been pointed out that some portion of the Japanese reading that was enlarged in the restructured *RMS* was rendered from definitions in earlier Chinese dictionaries. Yoshida (1958) mentions supposed cases in the restructured *RMS*. Yoshida (1958: 134–35) explores materials that were consulted in the restructured *RMS* and concluded that:

> It is apparently recognisable that replacement from explanation in a Classical Chinese to a rendered Japanese reading has been largely carried out, despite the remaining incompleteness, throughout all fascicles of the Kanchiin manuscript. In this sense, I suggest looking at Chinese-Japanese dictionary, like *RMS*, as a type of glossed materials of Classical Chinese. [...] In other words, most, if not all, Japanese readings appear to come from explanations to Classical texts or Buddhist canons, and exceptions are rare, such that the Japanese reading is

16 Strictly speaking, this was not a practice used in early Japanese lexicography to order entries strictly in terms of neither phonology nor orthography. The same is true for *IJS*, in which the *Iroha* order is only employed in the first level of the section. Each section is subdivided primarily semantically, whilst in some headings the orthographic length of the headword is also considered.

17 Minegishi (1986–87) demonstrates the association between Chinese characters and Japanese readings focusing on the sections of *Zinzi* 人事 'Human affairs' and *Zizi* 辭字 'Words and characters'. There are some other sections related to verbal expressions.

explicitly distant from the Chinese textual scholarship shown in *Yupian* or *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切経音義.

Whereas he does not provide particular examples for the discussion, this conclusion deserves special attention in that it is the earliest argument of its kind.

Mochizuki (1992) makes an independent investigation together with Yoshida (1958). Assuming that the Japanese rendering from explanation in Classical Chinese was conducted by the editor of the restructuring, Mochizuki (1992) appropriates Tsukishima's (1988) idea that Japanese readings in the Kanchiin manuscript of *RMS*, which is one of the restructured versions thereof, are replacements for explanations in Classical Chinese from *TBM*,[18] for example, while Chinese explanations in the restructured *RMS* are those for which it is difficult to find appropriate replacements. However, Mochizuki (1992) does not commit herself to Tsukishima (1988) as the executor of rendering, and assumes that the editor consulted Japanese readings in replacing authentic materials.

As occurs elsewhere, Japanese dictionaries have enriched their lexicographic repertoire by means of 'copying' earlier dictionaries.[19] Whether this is called 'plagiarism' or not, borrowing earlier literature was apparently common practice in early Japanese lexicography. Thus, similar facts have been observed in other dictionaries. For example, in observation into the Keichō version of *Wa gokuhen* 和玉篇, Kita (1969: 23–24, 30–31) pointed out that some Japanese readings are Japanese renditions of the definition of *Daguang yihui yupian* 大廣益會玉篇 (1013 by Chen Pengnian 陳彭年).[20] Whilst Kita (1969) does not enter into the nature of borrowing, the motivation behind the borrowing appears to be the same in our case.

1.3 Japanese rendering and the types of dictionary

The type of dictionary concerns the inclusion of Japanese rendering of definitions in earlier Chinese dictionaries. Ueda and Hashimoto (1916: 303–305), in their survey of earlier Japanese lexicography,[21] made a distinction between 'dictionaries for reading' and 'dictionaries for writing'. They classified each dictionary according to type of achievement as follows:

1. Dictionaries for reading are to be consulted either:
    a. to learn the readings and meanings of a character by its shape
    b. to learn the meaning of a character by its reading
2. Dictionaries for writing are to be consulted either:
    a. to learn the appropriate character or words from their idea
    b. to learn the appropriate character either by word or reading

In this respect, earlier Japanese dictionaries are classified according to what they achieve and not according to their target language. As long as public Japanese writing at that time was

18 We carefully investigated Tsukishima (1988) to find that statement, but failed.

19 For the problem of 'copying' in lexicographic traditions, see Osselton (1986) *inter alia*. A recent instance, where the growing demand for bilingual dictionaries has arisen worldwide, is detailed in Marello (1998).

20 This phenomenon is not exclusive to the Keichō version: see also Yamada (1967). *Daguang yihui yupian* is one of the later enlargements of the original *Yupian*.

21 In fact, Ueda simply lent his name to the title page.

dominantly conducted in Classical Chinese or Japanised Classical Chinese (or so-called *hentai kanbun* 変体漢文), it is a sound conclusion that the development of dictionaries would not move apart from the Chinese language. However, as Yamada (1943: 153–54) claims and Minegishi (1986–87) partly confirms, there exist dictionaries that targeted writing of the Japanese language, rather than Chinese, although their headwords are provided in Chinese characters. These include *IJS*, in that this dictionary allows an appropriate character to be found from a Japanese word. Taking target language into consideration, we may recognise the types of Japanese dictionary as follows: Chinese language dictionaries, Chinese character dictionaries, Chinese-Japanese dictionaries, and Japanese language dictionaries.

Apart from the Chinese language dictionaries, since they solely include the Chinese language, it is not an obvious procedure to draw a border between Chinese-Japanese dictionaries and Japanese language dictionaries. In the current essay, we will examine criteria from each direction to which a given dictionary is oriented, Chinese-Japanese or Japanese language.

2 Relationship between rendition and lexicographic orientation: Concerning the distinction between ordinary reading and literal reading

We will endeavour to show that there are two types of Japanese reading in earlier Japanese dictionaries, one of which developed from the other. The development in the use of Chinese characters in the Japanese writing system branched unwillingly from the original current. This resulted in the separation of Japanese dictionaries into two branches in a similar form: One explains the Chinese use, the other the Japanese use. Here, we will inspect how the restructured *Ruiju myōgi shō* adopted the definitions of *Tenrei banshō meigi* through a distinction, for Japanese reading, between ordinary reading and literal reading.

2.1 Ordinary reading and literal reading

We term the two types of Japanese reading ordinary reading and literal reading.[22] Whilst a literal reading is a type of Japanese reading that renders the idea of a Chinese character in the Japanese tongue, an ordinary reading evolves from the literal reading and entails some strong ties between a Chinese character and certain Japanese readings. An ordinary reading of a Chinese character can be the same as a literal reading by its very nature; however, changes in the meaning of Japanese readings may differentiate an ordinary reading from a literal reading. The development of literal readings of Chinese characters in the Japanese writing system enabled Japanese texts to be written consistently in Chinese characters, even in a phonetically undetermined way (Kamei, 1957).

A literal reading, in other words, is a Japanese equivalent of a Chinese character. Kamei (1957) outlines the development of literal reading which began when Japanese rendering of a Chinese character was understood to be the meaning of the character, and its difference with the

22 The terms are our coinage after *teikun* 定訓 and *seikun* 正訓, respectively, both of which have been used in historical studies of the Japanese language. As Kamei (1957) clarifies, *seikun* was coined in the philological studies of *Man'yoshū*. On the other hand, *teikun* has been discussed by scholars since Yamada (1971).

Chinese language was put aside. Wide acceptance of literal reading, then, led to the establishment of the ordinary r eading.[23]

2.2 Criteria concerning Japanese rendition of *Tenrei banshō meigi*'s definition in the restructured versions of *Ruiju myōgi shō*

It is widely known that *IJS* collected ordinary readings in its volumes. This arrangement was to ensure that the appropriate orthography could be easily found. In contrast, which type of dictionary would provide literal readings while omitting ordinary readings? We assume that such a dictionary would orient to explaining the Chinese usage in the Japanese tongue, i.e. a Chinese-Japanese dictionary. It is not an easy task, however, to verify that a Japanese reading in a dictionary is in fact a literal reading as we assume. Difficulties lie in the fact that there is little evidence to illustrate the tie between a Japanese reading and a Chinese word.

As mentioned above, the restructured versions of *RMS* include *TBM*'s definition through Japanese rendering. If a given Japanese reading can be viewed as a Japanese rendering of *TBM*'s definition, by definition it is of a literal reading. Mochizuki (1992) does not establish any criteria to recognise the Japanese rendering of *TBM*'s definition. Considering that modern practice may largely differ from earlier practices, it is necessary to confirm that the recognition is conducted in a manner that imitates the ancient intuition. In consideration of such a requirement, we employ the following criteria:

1. We regard a Japanese reading in the restructured *RMS* as a Japanese rendering of *TBM*'s definition of a character,
   a. when that reading and that character agree in the first place of entry or are marked in *IJS*, or,
   b. when that reading is attested as a gloss to that character in *Kunten goi shūsei*.[24]

In this essay, we assume that the Japanese reading in question is a literal reading when it meets at least one of the above criteria. Each criterion ensures that the Japanese reading in the restructured *RMS* and *TBM*'s definition character were linked. *Kunten goi shūsei* (hereafter, *KGS*), which was consulted for the second criterion, is a collection of glossed characters and renditions from the year 1000 and following compiled by Tsukishima Hiroshi (Tsukishima, 2007–9).[25]

23 The *IJS* compiler nicely captures the phenomenon in his introduction: 'whereas the Chinese can understand a Chinese character by means of sound [i.e. Sino-Japanese stratum], we Japanese appreciate it with the aid of reading [i.e. native Japanese stratum]' ('漢家は音を以て義を悟り，本朝は訓に就いて言を詳かにす').

24 We include the entire attestation; however, we indicate with asterisks (*) glosses that are unique to certain materials or those that are found in Buddhist commentaries, which present different characteristics from other materials.

25 *Kunten shiryō* 訓点資料 or the glossed material is a group of materials that were produced in the practice of vernacular reading of the Classical Chinese texts and Buddhist canons. See Whitman et al. (2010) to overview the materials.

2.3 Examples of Japanese rendering of *Tenrei banshō meigi*'s definition in the restructured *Ruiju myōgi shō*

We investigate the *yan* 言 radical of the restructured *Ruiju myōgi shō* to ascertain whether or not the criteria are valid to consider the Japanese rendering of *Tenrei banshō meigi*'s definition. Since the restructured *RMS* adopts *TBM*'s definition through the original *RMS*, we limit ourselves to investigating entries that cite *TBM* in the original *RMS*. As a result, we have found several illustrative examples. Consider, as an example, the case of *ye* 謁, which is defined in *TBM* as follows:

於歇反。告也、白也、請也。 (Fasc. 3, f. 8r)

The definitions are adopted in the original *RMS* as:

弘云於歇(ケチT)反告也白也請也。マウス(LLH)記[26] (p. 99, l. 4)

In the restructured *RMS*, finally:

音闕(S) アフ マウス(LLH) シロシ ネカフ イフ(HL↘) ツカフ カタラフ トヽノフ ウク ツク(HF↘) マミユ コフ ムカフ エラフ[27] (Fasc. 法上, p. 52, l. 1)

Here, 'ツク(HF↘)' reads *tugu* ツグ 'to tell'.

In the example, *tugu* is one of the examples that has a tie with *TBM*'s definition. Of the three possible definitions, first consider the case of *gao* 告 as an example. *Gao* is linked with the following readings in each criterion:

- a. *Gao* is placed in the first part of the entry for *tugu* in *IJS*,
- b. *Gao* is linked with the following readings in *KGS*: ウシナフ, シメス, ツグ, ツグラク, ツゲ, ツゲタマハク, ツゲマク, ナス, ノタマハク, ノタマフ, マウス, マヲサク, ミツゲ, ヨコス (the underlined reading appears in the restructured *RMS*)

Thus, we conclude that *tugu* is linked with *gao*. In this manner, we have also found the following readings linked with *TBM*'s definition:

- *sirosi* シロシ (with *bai* 白), *uku* ウク, *kou* コフ, *mukau* ムカフ* (with *qing* 請)[28]

all of which are unmarked. These readings are considered to be Japanese renditions of definitions in *TBM*.

In the following, we will examine the cases of *xu* 許 and *feng* 諷. In *TBM*, they appear as follows:

虛語反。進也、聽也、從也、舉、然也、諾也、所也、與也。 (許, Fasc. 3, f. 8r)

不鳳反。教也、誦也。 (諷, Fasc. 3, f. 8v)

They enter the original *RMS*:

弘云虛語反進也聽也從也然也諾也所也與也中云聽也一[許]可也スヽム(HHL)

(許, p. 74, l. 7)

---

26 歇 is *xɨat* in MC, *ket* in the EMJ, and *xie* in ModC.

27 闕 is *ʔat* in MC, *a(t)* in EMJ, and *e* in ModC. Here, *mausu* directly answers the original *RMS*. Since it is hardly classifiable whether it is inherited or rendered, for the sake of simplicity, we ignore inherited readings.

28 In this case, 'イフ(HF↘)' has some problems. Whilst the marks indicate that the second mora is prenasalised (i.e. *ibu*; cf. fn. 7), it would be suspicious if such a word existed. Moreover, this reading is not marked in the Renjōin manuscript. Therefore, we assume that this mark is an error. In case this is not prenasalised, i.e. it is *iu* (<*ipu*), it can be regarded as a rendition of the definition *bai*, which also means 'to say'. However, the rendition *iu* is not attested well in *KGS*, where the reading is attested only once.

慈曰方鳳(R)反一[諷]謂詠讀也誦背文也弘云教也誦也。眞云不由長行(一)忽爾孤起之頌。

(諷, p. 70, l. 7)

Then, the restructured *RMS*:

虛語反 ユルス(LL@)コツ(LHヘ) ㄱハル アラハス スヽム(HHL)モト トコロ アタフ(HH@) ユツル オホキナリ(LL@@@)ハカル(LHH)ハカリ(LHF)アハク ソシル ハカラフ 従也 然也 諾也 呵也 擬也 アハク(LL@) 禾コ (許, Fasc. 法上, p. 61, l. 2)

ヨム(LH)イマシム カソフ ナスラフ ヒトシ ヲシフ ツク イサム ウカフ ソシル タトヒ ワツカ ウヤマフ イフ ウタフ 禾フウ(FN) (諷, Fasc. 法上, p. 71, l. 8)

The Japanese readings that are tied with *TBM*'s definition are as follows:

- ●許
  - ○Marked: *yurusu* ユルス (聽 and 然), *atau* アタフ (與)[29]
  - ○Unmarked: *kotowaru* コトハル (聽), *moto* モト, *tokoro* トコロ (所)
- ●諷
  - ○Marked: *yomu* ヨム (誦)
  - ○Unmarked: *osiu* ヲシフ (教), *tuku* ツク (興), *ukabu* ウカブ, *utau* ウタフ (誦)

2.4 The characteristics of the Japanese rendering in the restructured *Ruiju myōgi shō* and strategy of compilation

Provided that tone marks also demonstrate the authenticity of the reading (Komatsu, 1971), what are the characteristics of marked renditions? Observe that *tugu* in *ye* 謁 features tone marks, when attested reading in *KGS* is limited to the following readings (the underlined word is a Japanese rendition, while doubled underline indicates that the word in question is marked):

- ●ツカヘマツル, マウス, モノマウス

Furthermore, no ordinary reading of *ye* is provided in *IJS*. Unlike *ye*, attested readings of both *xu* 許 and *feng* 諷 in *KGS* almost cover the renditions in the restructured *RMS*:

- ●アタル, コトワル, トコロ, バカリ, バカリニス, ハカル, モト, ユヅル, ユルシ, ユルス (許)
- ●イソフ, イフ, イマシム, ウカブ, ウタフ, スフ, ソシル, ソナフ, ソフ, ソラニス, ツク, ヨム, ヲシフ (諷)

However, ordinary readings in *IJS* are limited to ハカリ, ユルス, モト, and ソフ, respectively.

This causes us to question what authenticity is related to the reading in question. If the renditions are not related to ordinary readings but to renditions in the glossed materials, it is likely to be related to demonstrating the meaning of the headword. In other words, these readings are enlarged for use in Chinese-Japanese dictionaries, as proposed by Yoshida (1958). This enlargement was apparently in line with the original *RMS*, an evident Chinese-Japanese dictionary. Contrary to the fact that the restructured *RMS* enlarges itself through a literal reading, *IJS* adopts ordinary readings to enhance its use as a Japanese oriented dictionary. Differences in compiling, or more precisely, enlarging strategy can be observed in the difference between the Japanese readings in these two dictionaries.

It should be noted that *TBM*'s definitions are cited without rendition in *xu* in the restructur-

29 *Susumu* ススム can be a Japanese rendition of either *jin* 進 or *ju* 擧, although it is simultaneously an inheritance of the original *RMS*.

ed *RMS*. This is fairly observed among the restructured *RMS*. These unrendered definitions are of common use respectively, so that the editor(s) seemed not to pay attention to rendering them in Japanese. Examples are as follows (excerpted relevant part):

弘云誠也明也驗也用也敬也宿也重也處也 (Original *RMS*, 信, p. 73, l. 3)

明也 驗也 用也 敬也 宿也 オモヒテ(FL@L〳) 重也 處也

(Restructured *RMS*, 信, Fasc. 法上, p. 43, l. 2)

弘云問天道也謀也求也 (Original *RMS*, 訪, p. 98, l. 1)

求、謀也 (Restructured *RMS*, 訪, Fasc. 法上, p. 56, l. 6)

Formal treatment of the problem left unsolved in the present essay.

3 Conclusion

We have hitherto explored the nature of Japanese rendering in a Japanese dictionary from a Classical Chinese definition in an earlier Chinese language dictionary. The findings imply that renderings are conducted to enlarge explanations of the Chinese use. This accounts for the difference between the Chinese-Japanese dictionary and the Japanese language oriented dictionary in terms of Japanese readings.

The present essay merely touches the surface of early Japanese lexicography and we expect that more in depth analysis could demonstrate drastically different results. Further studies are thus required, particularly regarding the distribution of such rendering phenomena, both within a given material and between materials, in verifying the effectiveness of our criteria. Furthermore, the form of inclusion deserves attention in addition to rendering. Here, we simply mentioned direct and unrendered inclusion but there are also cases of double inclusion and decision not to include.

Materials and Literature

Source materials

Tenrei banshō meigi (*TBM*): Kōzanji tenseki monjo sōgō chōsadan, eds. 1977. *Kōzanji kojisho shiryō dai ichi*. Kōzanji shiryō sōsho 6. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Original *Ruiju myōgi shō* (original *RMS*): Kunaichō Shoryōbu, eds. 1969. *Kunaichō Shryōbu zō: Zushoryō bon Ruiju myōgi shō*. Tokyo: Benseisha.

Restructured *Ruiju myōgi shō* (restructured *RMS*),

The Kanchiin manuscript: Masamune, Atsuo, ed. 1938–40. *Ruiju myōgi shō*. Tokyo: Nihon Koten Zenshu Kankokai. Reprinted in 1954–55. Tokyo: Kazama Shobo.

The Renjōin manuscript: Ozaki, Satoakira, ed. 1986. *Sanbō ruiju myōgi shō: Chinkoku shukoku jinja zōhon*. Tokyo: Benseisha.

Iroha jirui shō, the three volume version (*IJS*): Nakada, Norio, and Minegishi Akira, eds. 1964. *Iroha jirui shō: Kenkyū narabi ni sakuin*. Tokyo: Kazama Shobo.

Kunten goi shūsei (*KGS*): Tsukishima (2007–09).

Literature

Bailey, Don Clifford. 1960. Early Japanese lexicography. *Monumenta Nipponica* 16: 1–52.

Eguchi, Yasuo [江口泰生]. 1995. Kamakura jidai no jisho [Dictionaries of the Kamakura period]. Nishizaki Toru,

ed. *Nihon kojisho o manabu hito no tame ni* [*A learner's handbook for Japanese earlier dictionaries*]. Kyoto: Sekai Shisosha.

Erbaugh, Mary S. ed. 2002. *Difficult characters: Interdisciplinary studies of Chinese and Japanese writing*. Colombus: National East Asian Language Resource Center, Ohio State University.

Frellesvig, Bjarke. 2010. *A history of the Japanese language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ikeda, Genta [池田源太]. 1967. Heian chō ni okeru 'honmon' o ken'i to suru gakumon keitai to yūsoku kojitsu [The relationship between scholastic organisation appealing from text authority and Court Practice in the Heian period of Japan]. In Kodaigaku kyōkai, eds. *Engi, Tenryaku jidai no kenkyū* [*Studies in the Engi to the Tenryaku periods*]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan. pp. 387–412.

Ikeda, Shoju [池田証壽]. 1993. Zushoryō bon *Ruiju myōgi shō* no tanji jisho teki seikaku [The Zushoryō manuscript of *Ruiju myōgi shō* as a Chinese character dictionary]. *Kokugo kokubun kenkyū* 94: 1–14.

Ikeda, Shoju. 2011. Japanization in the field of Classical Chinese dictionaries. *Journal of the Graduate School of Letters* 6: 15–25.

Kamei, Takashi [亀井孝]. 1957. *Kojiki* wa yomeru ka? Sanbun no bubun ni okeru jikun oyobi iwayuru kundoku no mondai [Can we utter *Kojiki*? Problems in Japanese reading and so-called 'kundoku' in the prose part]. In Takeda Yukichi, ed. *Kojiki taisei*, Vol. 3 'Gengo, moji hen' [*The Kojiki collection* Vol. 3, 'Volume for the language and writing systems']. Tokyo: Heibonsha. Reprinted in *Kamei Takashi ronbunshū*, Vol. 4 'Nihongo no sugata to kokoro (2) Kunko to goi' [*Papers of Kamei Takashi* Vol. 4, 'The figure and heart of the Japanese language (2): Philology and word histories']. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1985. pp. 1–67.

Kita, Yasuaki [北恭昭]. 1969. Kanwa jisho no keifu ni okeru keichō seihan *Wa gokuhen*: *Jikyō*, *Onkun hendate*, *Taikōekikai gyokuhen* to no taihi ni oite [The Keichō version of *Wa gokuhen* in the development of Chinese-Japanese dictionaries: In comparison with *Jikyō*, *Onkun hendate* and *Daguang yihui yupian*]. *Kokugogaku* 77: 22–41.

Komatsu, Hideo [小松英雄]. 1971. *Nihon seichōshi ronkō* [*Studies on the history of Japanese accent*]. Tokyo: Kazama Shobo.

Marello, Carla. 1998. Hornby's bilingualized dictionaries. *International Journal of Lexicography* 11: 292–314.

Minegishi, Akira [峰岸明]. 1986-87. Sankanbon *Iroha jirui shō* 'Jinji', 'Jiji' ryōbu shoshū kanji no seikaku ni tsuite (jō), (chū), (ge) [The sections of 'Human affairs' and 'Words and characters' in *Iroha jirui shō* 1–3]. *The Humanities: Journal of the Yokohama National University, Section II Language and literature* 33 (1986): 199–204, 34 (1987): 167–82, 183–98.

Miyazawa, Toshimasa [宮沢俊雅]. 1973. Zushoryō bon *Ruiju myōgi shō* ni mieru *Tenrei banshō meigi* ni tsuite [*Tenrei banshō meigi* cited in the Zushoryō manuscript of *Ruiju myōgi shō*]. *Kuntengo to kunten shiryō* 52: 1–30.

Miyazawa, Toshimasa. 1987. Zushoryō bon *Ruiju myōgi shō* to *Tenrei banshō meigi* [The Zushoryō version of *Ruiju myōgi shō* and *Tenrei banshō meigi*]. *Kuntengo to kunten shiryō* 77: 51–69.

Mochizuki, Ikuko [望月郁子]. 1992. Ruiju myōgi shō *no bunkengaku teki kenkyū* [*Philological research on* Ruiju myōgi shō]. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin.

Osselton, Noel E. 1986. The first English dictionary? A sixteenth-century compiler at work. In Hartmann, R. R. K., ed. 1986. *The history of lexicography: Papers from the Dictionary Research Centre Seminar at Exeter, March 1986*. pp. 175–84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1984. *Middle Chinese: A study in historical phonology*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Shin, Woongchul [申雄哲]. 2015. Zushoryō bon *Ruiju myōgi shō* no kiso teki kenkyū [A basic research on the Zushoryō manuscript of *Ruiju myōgi shō*]. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Hokkaido University.

Tsukishima, Hiroshi [築島裕]. 1988. Kanbun kundoku to kojisho no kokunten [Vernacular readings of Chinese texts and early glosses on earlier Japanese dictionaries]. *Chuo daigaku kokubun* 31: 4–13.

Tsukishima, Hiroshi. 2007–9. *Kunten goi shūsei* [*Vocabulary in the early glossed materials, 1000–*]. 8 Volumes. Tokyo: Kyuko Shoin.

Ueda, Kazutoshi [上田万年], and Hashimoto Shinkichi [橋本進吉]. 1916. *Kohon* setsuyōshū *no kenkyū* [*A study of earlier* Setsuyōshū]. A special issue of *Journal of the College of Literature, Imperial University of Tokyo* 2.

Whitman, John, Miyoung Oh, Jinho Park, Valerio Luigi Alberizzi, et al. 2010. Toward an international vocabulary

for research on vernacular readings of Chinese texts (漢文訓讀 *hanwen xundu*). *Scripta* 2: 1–36.

Yamada, Tadao [山田忠雄]. 1967. Entoku bon *Wa gokuhen* to *Onkun hendate*, *Jikyō* [The Entoku version of *Wa gokuhen*, *Onkun hendate*, and *Jikyō*]. In Tadao Yamada, ed. *Honpō jisho shi ronsō: Yamada Yoshio tsuioku* [*Studies in the history of Japanese dictionaries in memoriam Yamada Yoshio*]. Tokyo: Sanseido. pp. 304–20.

Yamada, Toshio [山田俊雄]. 1971. Kanji no teikun ni tsuite no shiron: kirishitan ban *Rakuyōshū* 'shōgokuhen' o shiryō ni shite [Remarks on ordinary reading of Chinese characters: With an insight into 'Shōgokuhen' of *Rakuyōshu*, a Japanese Jesuit edition]. *Seijō kokubungaku ronshū* 4: 1–256.

Yamada, Yoshio [山田孝雄]. 1943. *Kokugogaku shi* [*The history of Japanese language studies*]. Tokyo: Hobunkan.

Yoshida, Kanehiko [吉田金彦]. 1958. Kanchiin bon *Ruiju myōgi shō* no sanshō bunken [Materials consulted in the Kanchiin manuscript of *Ruiju myōgi shō*]. *Geirin* 9 (3). Reprinted in Kanehiko Yoshida, *Ko jisho to kokugo* [*The Japanese language and its earlier dictionaries*]. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 2013. pp. 130–41.

Appendix: Abbreviations and transcription conventions

Languages: EMJ: Early Middle Japanese; ModJ: Modern Japanese; MC: Middle Chinese; ModC: Modern Chinese

Primary literature: *TBM*: *Tenrei banshō meigi* 篆隸万象名義; *RMS*: *Ruiju myōgi shō* 類聚名義抄; *IJS*: *Iroha jirui shō* 色葉字類抄

Secondary literature: *KGS*: *Kunten goi shūsei* 訓点語彙集成

Classical Chinese tone or Sino-Japanese approximation: H: High; L: Low; R: Rising; S: Stop; F: Falling; T: Stop (high tone)

Japanese accentuation and pronunciation: H: High; L: Low; F: Falling; N: Nasalised; ◟: Prenasality (an ancestor of contemporary *dakuten*); @: Unspecified (unmarked)

Other transcription conventions: *Katakana* glosses: Sino-Japanese reading; *Hiragana* glosses: *Wokoto-ten* glosses; ¯: Inversion (Decode the character suspended earlier); ✓: Checked in vermilion; —[...]: Supplementation to elliptic mark ('—'); 《...》: Title of the work cited; 〈...〉: Written in double lines; /: Line break