Long story of short forms

SIMPLIFIED CHINESE CHARACTERS
FROM A TO Z

ROAR BÖKSET

ROAR BÖKSET

Long Story
of Short Forms

SIMPLIFIED CHINESE CHARACTERS

FROM A TO Z

Abstract

Chinese characters were simplified in 1956, ten years after their Japanese counterparts. This book traces the origins of simplified form and compares it with rejected alternatives. It concludes that 90 to 91 percent of the new official Chinese forms were in use before the reforms, compared with nearly 100 percent of the Japanese ones.

About 80 characters were simplified differently in China and Japan. Our survey shows that these differences existed already before the reforms, and that the differing outcomes were thus predestined.

One declared aim of the Chinese reform was to unify short forms by eradicating existing variants, leaving just one short form of each character. It turns out that this aim was accomplished. However, the years following the reform saw a wave of newly created short forms of other characters. As a result, the total number of short forms increased rather than decreased. In 1977 many of these "spontaneous" new short forms were proposed for official use, but that proposal was abandoned after six months. From 1986 campaigns against irregular writing were carried through, effectively ousting irregular short forms form the public space. A quiz among different generations shows that the campaign has eradicated irregular short forms not only from public space, but also from human memory, as hardly anyone of the younger generation can identify these forms today.

CONTENTS

TABLES

PREFACE

My interest in character variants was aroused in 1980 by a huge 旅游圤趣 sign in Hangzhou. 旅游 *lǚyóu* meant 'travel' and 趣 *qù* 'interest', but 圤 was not in the dictionary. Non-dictionary characters were not unusual, but could often be guessed from their shape and context, like 亍 which was the right side of 街 (*jiē* street) and 尻 whose phonetic component 元 *yuán* hinted that it represented 原 (*yuán* original).

圤 with 土 (*tǔ* earth) and 人 (*rén* man) was less obvious. Even our teachers, who accompanied us on this school trip from Nanjing University, were at a loss and insisted that the sign painter was illiterate. They nevertheless passed the question on to our Hangzhou hosts, who unanimously identified the character as 增 (*zēng* increase). So the sign read "Let us increase interest in travel" and advertised a travel agent.

This was puzzling: a character known by everybody in Hangzhou was known by nobody from Nanjing. This knowledge gap turned out to be consistent. People from all over Zhejiang recognised 圤 as 增, outsiders did not. 圤 was a local phenomenon.

Were there other characters used and known only locally? Checking whether a character is used in a certain place is time-consuming, but checking whether it is familiar is not, as we have just seen. Between 1981 to 1986 informants in one hundred and forty-one places in China were asked to identify short forms out of context, by me and by mobilised colleagues and teachers, in choronological order: Per Leimar, Anne Gunn, Vikram Seth, Giusi Tamburello, Laura Newby, Helena Håkansson, Philip Wickeri, Magnus Fiskesjö, Bhavatośa, Torbjörn Lodén, Inge Hoem, Rune Svarverud, Bertil Lundahl, Joakim Enwall, Tomas Nilsson and Bào Míngwěi (character forms of Chinese and Japanese names and concepts appear in the Index). About ninety short forms turned out to be local, as specified in Chapter 4:4.

Nevertheless, the survey revealed that most irregular short forms were known nationwide. The collected irregularities, about fifteen hundred in all, were listed in the *A Dictionary of Nonstandard Simplified Chinese Characters* (1986).

By then one had begun to wonder what had made some short forms regular and others irregular. On what grounds had the Script Reform Committee of China accepted some forms and rejected others? Somewhat surprisingly, it turned out that a review of the discussions preceding the 1956 script reform was lacking. This author then collected case histories of short forms from *a-* to *f-* in the 2006 *Long Story of Short Forms: The Evolution of Simplified Chinese Characters*. The present work adds characters from *g* to *z*, as well as new data on pre-reform Chinese and Japanese writing habits obtained by browsing handwritten documents in archives in Beijing, Nanjing, Wuhan, Hangzhou, Tokyo and Yamaguchi. Access to Chinese archives was provided through the good offices of The Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. The former also funded the publishing of this book.

Many more have contributed. Ōbayashi Yōgo and Luciana Bressan provided newspaper articles. Tollef Ås and Halvor Eifring reported irregular characters. Bert Edström gave valuable advice. Wáng Jiālín, Xuē Lín, Marja Kaikkonen, Yoon Kwan Song and Kuramasu Tokiko quizzed informants about present irregular forms.

The book would not have materialised without my friend Bend Bendixen who suggested commencing it and my wife Kuramasu Nobuko who suggested finishing it.

CHAPTER I
PROBLEMS

The 1955 *Hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn cǎo'àn* (Draft of the Character Simplification Scheme) asserts that "the overwhelming number of these simplified characters are already in common use", implying that others were not. At an ensuing script reform conference, the Script Reform Committee member Yè Gōngchuò provided examples:

> When necessary, we have applied the above rules to create a small number of new short forms, like 竞 (競 [*jìng* compete], shortened shape), 买 (買 [*mǎi* buy], from the [contracted handwritten] cursive form), 尘 (塵 [*chén* dust], an ancient form), 桩 (樁 [*zhuāng* stake]), a new picto-phonetic character [consisting of the semantic component 木 (wood) and the phonetic component 庄 *zhuāng*], and 吁 (籲 [*yù* plead], a character with the same reading). Since these characters are not established by custom one might prefer to leave them out, but without them the problem of simplifying some characters will not get a satisfactory solution.

How large was Yè's "a small number"? Writing in *Zhōngguó yǔwén* (Chinese Language) the committee associate Chén Guāngyáo suggested:

> The number of new short forms should not be too large; compared with the number of original forms it should not exceed one per cent. In other words, among three thousand common characters the number of new ones should not exceed thirty.

Zhào Tàimóu made another estimate in *Shāndōng dàxué xuébào* (Shandong University Journal):

> The 230 characters in the first table [of characters to be adopted immediately] are overwhelmingly part old and recent short forms in common use […]. The second part of the scheme is different. Of these 285 characters, 35% are relatively common old or recent short forms, 34% cursive forms or characters of the same reading and the remaining 31% characters not seen before or newly created forms. These new forms look unfamiliar and have been created by various means, most by changing the phonetic component, like 辽 [遼 *liáo* distant], 胶 [膠

jiāo glue], 舰 [艦 *jiàn* warship] and 审 [審 *shěn* examine], […] others by picking a part of the character, like 乡 [鄉 *xiāng* countryside], 习 [習 *xí* practise], 灭 [蔑 *miè* extinguish], 业 [業 *yè* trade], […] others by replacing one part with an arbitrary sign, like 汉 [漢 *Hàn* Chinese] and 币 [幣 *bì* currency].

31% of 285 characters corresponds to 88 "newly created forms", or 17% of the total 515. This number differs from Chén's 30, which corresponds to 6% of the total.

Who came closer? In Chapter 3 we aim to determine which simplified forms were in common use before the reform and which were introduced by the committee. To this end we will examine pre-reform manuscripts (described in Appendix C) and contemporary press comments on the reform. The results are shown in Chapter 4:1.

Just as common as a lack of short forms in use was an overabundance of them. In 1955 the proofreader Zhào Xī complained in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*:

> Many characters which were originally one have now developed into many different short forms, because people have simplified at will. Some write 飛 [*fēi* fly] as 飞, others as 秅. 歸 [*guī* return] is written by some as 归, by others as 逼. 層 [*céng* layer] is already written 尺, 尼 or 层. 礦 [*kuàng* ore] is also written 圵, 矿 or 砿. 廠 [*chǎng* factory] is written 厂, 广, 厈 or 厈. All this puts one at a loss about which example to follow. With a unified norm for short forms this confusion can be avoided.

The committee selected 飞, 归, 层, 矿 and 厂. What factors were decisive? Did the committee opt for the shorter, the more common, the older or the easier forms to learn? We will try to answer that in Chapter 4:2.

One of the stated aims of the reformers was to reduce the above-mentioned confusion. Committee chairman Wú Yùzhāng explained to the People's Political Consultative Conference:

> There is another view which says that the adoption of short forms can create confusion. It is true that, for historical reasons, there is much confusion round our present characters, and that this increases the difficulty of learning and using them. However, when we adopt short forms, we select one simple and easy form among many different ones and do away with all the others. This way we can, both in print and in handwriting, reduce the confusion and diversity as to the form of many characters, and reach our aim of gradual standardisation.

Was the number of variants in popular use reduced by the reform? We will look at that in Chapter 4:5.

The committee intended not only to exterminate existing variants. The Draft of the Character Simplification Scheme further vowed to

> create a norm for the short forms, and if everybody writes according to this norm, we can prevent people from making up short forms at will and creating confusion.

Others thought that recognition of some short forms would instead encourage writers to make up new short forms. In 1957 the writer Wáng Báixiáng complained in a debate:

> Some create and shorten characters indiscriminately and this has created a virtual 'erroneous character craze', or shall we call it a 'character creation craze', all over the country.

Western scholars tend to date the craze later. *The Languages of China* says:

> These limits [of correctness] again became obscure, however, with the beginning of the Cultural Revolution in 1966. Character simplification had been represented all along as a kind of Marxist, proletarian process; as a consequence, coining and using new characters became a popular way to show that one's writing was done in the right spirit. Wall slogans, signs, and mimeographed literature of all kinds began to be embellished with abbreviations never seen before.

Did coining slow down after the 1956 reform, as the Draft predicted, or accelerate, as was Wáng's impression; or did it accelerate later in the Cultural Revolution, as stated in *The Languages of China*? We will look at that in Chapter 4:6.

We saw in the above that characters could be coined locally, like 圦 for 增 in Zhejiang. Were there many such cases? We will sum up our China-wide survey in Chapter 4:4.

Some Chinese forms differ from their Japanese counterparts. Chinese 归 corresponds to Japanese 帰, 矿 to 鉱, 龙 (*lóng* dragon) to 竜, 从 (*cóng* from) to 従, 齐 (*qí* together) to 斉 and so on. Many have lamented this split. Was it avoidable, or was it predestined by pre-reform differences in writing habits? We will look into that in Chapter 4:7.

Conclusions in Chapter 4 are based on Chapter 3, which describes deviant forms through the ages. Before that we will see in Chapter 2 what forms have been regarded as standard forms throughout the ages.

CHAPTER 2
WRITING STANDARDS

Chinese writing standards

We are used to seeing the Chinese script described as five stages, as in *Table 1*.

Table 1. Traditional script forms.

Yin bone script (c.1200–c.1050 BCE)	Zhou bronze script (c.1050–221)	Qin small seal (c. 220)	Han *lìshū* (clerk script)	Late Han *kǎishū* (model script) or *zhèngshū* (square script)	Modern reading and sense
𠂇	𨴐	貝	貝	貝	*bèi* cowrie
☽	☽	⟋	月	月	*yuè* moon
⦆◎	⦆◐	𥇡	明	明	*míng* bright
彳	德	德	德	德	*dé* virtue
𑀋	𑀋	𑀋	其	其	*qí* this

These examples are from two handbooks which happen to stand on my shelf, *Hànzì lìhuà* (Talking of Characters) and *Xuéshēng chángyòng hànzì qiǎnshì* (Concise Explanations of Common Characters for Pupils). They describe the stages in words:

> The Yin bone form 𠂇 [貝] looked like the two halves of a shell. In bronze script it looked basically like in bone script, except that the halves had become connected. But in the small seal there was a distortion which made the shell shape unrecognisable.

> The bronze form ☽ [月] looked like the bone form, except for the addition of a vertical stroke in the middle, with which the ancients represented the cinnamon tree in the moon.

> The Yin bone form ⦆◎ [明] was made up of a moon on the left and a sun on the right. This makes it a compound ideograph. But a distortion occurred in the Zhou bronze form ⦆◐: the sun turned into a window.

The left side of the Yin bone form 彳 [徝] was 彳 chì, which in ancient script indicated movement. The right side was an eye with a vertical line over it, expressing straight sight. The general sense of this character was therefore: virtue is acting straightforwardly without looking askance. In the Zhou bronze form 德 the sense was even more complete: under the eye a heart was added, which meant that only when eye and heart are straight can there be virtue.

In bone script 其 was written 𝕎, as a basket. In bronze script it was 𝕎. In the small seal it was written 𝕎 with an added phonetic component 丌 jī.

How clear-cut were these stages? Let us look at a bigger sample.

Table 2. Yin and Zhou variants in Gāo 1980, Xǔ 1988 and Mǎ 1990.

Yin (c.1200–1046)	Zhou			Modern print
	Western Zhou (1046–771)	Spring and Autumn (770–476)	Warring States (475–221)	
貝貝貝貝	貝貝貝貝		貝貝	貝
月月月月	月	月	月月月	月
明明明明	明明	明明	明明明明	明
德德德	德德德	德德	德德德	德
其其	其其其	其其其丌	其丌元	其

貝 did not have one Yin form with separate cowrie halves and one Zhou form with connected halves; even some Yin scribes connected the halves. The character did not become unrecognisable as a shell in the Qin, but gradually in the Zhou.

The point or cinnamon tree in 月 was added not in the Zhou but, at least by some, in the Yin. Forms without points were seen even in the Zhou.

The sun in 明 did not change to a window (if that is what 囧 is) at the beginning of the Zhou. Both suns and windows appeared in the Yin and remained in use throughout the Zhou.

The heart in 德 was added in the Zhou, yes, but not by all writers. Some but not all Zhou writers found 彳 unnecessary.

The closing line in 其 is present not only in Zhou inscriptions, but also in some Yin ones, and absent in some Zhou ones. The phonetic component 丌 was not a Qin innovation, but a late Zhou one.

Thus neither Yin nor Zhou writing had a fixed norm. There had been at least one attempt to create one. The preface to the 100 CE *Shuōwén jiězì* (Describing Graphs and Analyzing Characters) says: "In the time of King Xuān [827–782], State Chronicler Zhòu wrote fifteen chapters describing the big seal script." Further down it is made clear that this was to be regarded as a standard: "They [the Qin script reformers] took Chronicler Zhòu's big seal, made some changes and created what is called the small seal."

Was this standard followed? Chronicler Zhòu's fifteen chapters are lost, but we may compare writing habits before and after him. The most frequent inscribed characters are X乍鼎其壽萬年無疆子子孫孫永寶用 (X made this cauldron. May it last ten thousand years without end. May sons and grandsons forever treasure and use it). The most volatile of these were 鼎, 其, 疆 and 寶, shown in *Table 3*.

Table 3. Variants before and after Xuān (from Mǎ 1988–1990).

Before Xuan (893–828, reigns of Yiwang, Liwang and Gonghe)	After Xuan (781–670, reign of You and Early Spring and Autumn)	Modern
鼎 (7 inscriptions) 鼎	鼎 (4) 鼎 (3) 鼎 鼎 鼎 鼎	鼎 *dǐng* kettle
其 (26) 其 (9) 其	其 (21) 其 (19) 其	其 *qí* this
疆 (6) 疆 (2) 疆 (2) 疆 疆	疆 (2) 疆 (2) 疆 疆 疆 疆	疆 *jiāng* border
寶 (28) 寶 (3)	寶 (22) 寶 (12) 寶 寶 寶	寶 *bǎo* precious

We see no unifying effect of Chronicler Zhòu's fifteen chapters.

Shuōwén continues that the Warring States (475–221) each had "a speech with a different accent and a script with a different shape." This leaves the impression that each state had a script of its own which it stuck to. *Table 4* shows, however, that the script varied just as much within states, 德 being written with or without the 彳 component, and 其 with the top, the bottom or both. 臣 (chén servant), originally the tilted eye of a bowing subject, was written either with an intact eyeball or with pierced eyeball both in Zhongshan and in Chu.

Shuōwén goes on: "When the First Emperor united all lands under heaven, his minister Lǐ Sī united the script, discarding forms diverging from those of [his own state of] Qin." Lǐ Sī and his colleagues' instructions on writing are lost, but some of his model texts have been preserved. In *Table 4* we

select some characters from his Taishan inscription, to see how subsequent writers complied with his model.[1]

Table 4. Variants before and after Lǐ Sī.

Warring States				Li Si small seal	Early Han Mawang dui texts	Han metal and seal inscrip-tions	Western Han wood slips	100 CE Shuō-wén	Mod-ern print
Qin (Shaan xi)	Zhong shan (Western Hebei)	Qi (Shan dong)	Chu (Hu-bei and environs)						
	明 明		明 明	明	明	明 明	明 明	明	明
德	德 德	德 德	德 德	德	德	德	德德德德	德	德
其 其 兀	其 元 兀	其 元	其 其 其 元 兀	其	其 其 與 元	其 其 其	其 其 其 其 其 其		其
	臣 臣	臣 臣		臣	臣 臣	臣 臣	臣 臣	臣	臣
金	金 金 垂	金 金 金 金 金 金	金	金 金 金	金 金 金 金 金 金	金 金 金 垂 金 金 金 垂 金 金 垂	金	金

We notice two successes for Lǐ the standardiser. Following Qin custom, he wrote 德 with both 彳 and 心 and 其 with both 甘 and 兀. Han scribes complied.

Other directives were less effective.

Lǐ wrote 'bright' with 囧 on the left. Forms with 日 nevertheless persisted. Worse still, 囧 writers shortened 囧 to 目, creating yet another variant.

Some Warring States scribes pierced the eyeball in 臣 (臣), others did not. Lǐ Sī promoted an intact eyeball. Some scribes complied, but the majority did not.

Lǐ Sī promoted 金 with four 丶 (lumps of ore) for 'metal'. Han scribes put in either two or four lumps, or contracted the lumps to 一. So variation remained.

---

1   Qin Curse on the State of Chu and Zhongshan tomb inscriptions in Gao 1980. Qi vessels in items 856, 861, 863 and 866 in Ma 1990. Chu wood slips from Xinyang, Wangshan, Yangtianhu and Guodian in Teng 2007, tallies of ruler of E in Yu 1963. Li Si in *Chūgoku hōsho sen*, vol. 2. Mawangdui texts in *Mawangdui jianbo*. Han metal inscriptions in Rong 1931. Han seals from *Hanyin wenzi zheng*. Han wood slips in Sano 1981.

As we mentioned, Lǐ's description of the small seal is lost. The seal forms we see in dictionaries and handbooks come from the above-mentioned *Shuōwén jiězì*, which was completed in 100 CE by Xǔ Shèn who, said the Tang *Shūduàn* (On Writing), "was particularly proficient in writing seal script, imitated the style of Lǐ Sī and acquired a high degree of his finesse."

Nevertheless we see in *Table 4* that Xǔ Shèn could deviate from Lǐ Sī, and from contemporary practice, writing 德 (德) with 一 over 心 and 金 with a 仐 top. Xǔ's motives were etymological. His dictionary explained that 直 "means to look straight and is [therefore] written with ∟ [straight], 十 and 目." In consequence ∟ or 一 was required even in 德, since it had a 直 phonetic. The 仐 top in Xǔ's 金 defies Lǐ's norm, but fits Xǔ's etymology that 金 "consists of 土 [earth], points to the left and right resembling ore inside the earth, and the phonetic 今 [jīn]."

What *Shuōwén* standardised was the seal script. The immediate effect of this standardisation is hard to measure, since dated seal inscriptions from the time are scarce. *Table 5* shows examples of just one character in Róng Gēng's *Qín-Hàn jīnwén lù* (Collection of Qin and Han Seal Inscriptions).

Table 5. *Seal style variants before and after* Shuōwén.

Seal forms dated 12 CE–109 CE	*Shuōwén*	Seal forms 132–156	Modern
金 (3 inscriptions) 金金金金	金	金金金	金

At least in this case *Shuōwén's* norm was not followed.

By Xǔ Shèn's time, however, most affairs were conducted not in seal style, but in the handier brush-written *lìshū* (clerk style) shown in *Tables 4* and *6*. An attempt to set a norm for this script is related in *Hòuhànshū* (Book of the Later Han):

> In the fourth year of Xīpíng [175 CE] Cài Yōng asked for permission to correct and standardise the script of the Six Classics, and this permission was given by Emperor Líng. Cài Yōng then wrote the characters in red on stone tablets, let craftsmen carve them out and raised the tablets in front of the Imperial College. […] Once the tablets were raised, readers and copiers arriving in a thousand carriages a day packed the streets and filled the alleys.

These *Xīpíng shíjīng* (Xīpíng Stone Classics) were shattered at the end of the Han. In 241 another writing model was erected in front of the Imperial College, called the *Zhèngshǐ shíjīng* (Zhèngshǐ Stone Classics) after the reign name at the time. During the 311 sacking of Luoyang even these tablets were

destroyed. Only fragments have been recovered from the late nineteenth century onwards.

Did these models succeed in regulating the clerk script? Let us count forms in Fushimi Chūkei's *Reisho daijiten* (Comprehensive Dictionary of Clerk Style).

Table 6. Clerk style variants before and after the Stone Classics.

150–174 steles	175 Xi-ping Stone Classics	176–239 steles	241 Zheng-shi Stone Classics	248–323 steles	1716 *Kangxi zidian*
明 (9 inscr.) 眀 (4) 明	明	明 (8) 眀 (2) 明	明	明 (6)	明
德 (17) 德 (2) 悳 悳	德	德 (15) 悳 悳 德 (2)	德	德 (6)	德
其 (8) 其 (5) 其 (3) 其	其	其 (5) 其 (3) 其 (3) 其	其	其 (6) (3)	其
臣 (4) 臣 (4)	臣	臣 (2) 臣 (4)	臣	臣 (4)	臣
曹 (8) 曺 (2) 曹 曺 曺 曺	曺	曹 (3) 曹 (3) 曺 (2)	曺	曺 (4) 曹	曹

No, writers remained uncertain, says *Table 6*. And how could they not be, when the models themselves disagreed whether to write 德 or 德 , 臣 or 臣 and 曺 or 曺?

By this time a new style had developed, called *kǎishū* (楷 書 model style), *zhēnshū* (真 書 regular style) or *zhèngshū* (正 書 square style). The Tang *Shàng-shū gùshí* (A Magistrate's Tales) describes a model set up for this style:

> When Emperor Wǔ of Liang [r. 502–549] wanted to teach his princes to write, he ordered Yīn Tiěshí to make rubbings of one thousand different characters written by the great master Wáng Xīzhī [303–361]. The emperor called for Zhōu Xīngsì [470–521] and said: 'You have great talent. Could you rhyme these characters for me?' Zhōu composed his text in one night, and when he presented it to the emperor his temples had turned white. Seeing this, the emperor rewarded him richly. The Zen monk Zhìyǒng [540–609], a descendant of Wáng Xīzhī, wrote eight hundred copies of this text, which he spread among the people and sent copies of to every temple.

Zhìyǒng's *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* (Text of a Thousand Characters in Regular

and Cursive Style) followed the forms used by his great great great great great grandfather and was copied by learners for generations.

Yet consensus did not follow. Yán Yuánsūn (d. 714) recorded hundreds of variants in his *Gānlù zìshū* (A Dictionary for Position Seekers), labelling them 正 (correct), 通 (*tōng* common) or 俗 (*sú* informal). 從, for example, was called "correct", 従 "common" and 徔 "informal".

Gānlù zìshū is said to have recorded the norm of its time. More exactly it promoted a new norm. *Table 7* shows forms labelled "correct" by *Gānlù zìshū* which deviated from those ordained by *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén*. They also deviated from the forms prevalent in contemporary stone inscriptions, which we count in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* (A Database of Rubbings):

Table 7. Use of variants before and after Gānlù zìshū.

	Correct according to *Zhen-cao qianziwen*	620–680 steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*	Correct according to *Ganlu zishu*	720–770 steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*	500–550 steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*	800–900 steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*	1000–1200 steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*	1716 *Kangxi zidian*
明	明	136		77	100	35	26	明
明		33		26	59	62	81	明
冏		12	冏	19	3	12	13	
従従	従	79		62	62	52	0	
従従		1		1	10	1	20	
従		20		20	2	33	25	
從		6		9	2	6	30	
從		0	從	0	0	0	0	從
龍	龍	77		66	76	16	33	
龍龍		18		29	8	5	24	
龍		15		15	15	2	37	
		0	龍	0	0	0	0	龍
光	光	30		16	17	18	16	光
炗		0	炗	1	0	0	1	
京	京	82		44	70	21	16	京
京		3	京	12	0	6	42	京

What made Yán Yuánsūn reject preceding authorities and preceding practice? Explanations in the 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* (Script of the Five Classics) give a clue: "明 冏 明: the former is the ancient form, the second the *Shuōwén* form and the latter the Stone Classics form [...]. 炗 光: the former is the *Shuōwén*

Table 8. Standard forms modified to fit Shuōwén (modified forms underlined).

100 CE Shuowen	175 Xiping Stone Cl.	241 Zhengshi Stone Cl.	c.350 Wang Xizhi	Sui Qianziwen	Tang Yupian	Tang Ganlu zishu	997 Longkan shoujing	1008 Guangyun	1013 Yupian	1039 Jiyun	Yuan Zijian	1615 Zihui	1716 Kangxi zidian	1965 Xinhua zidian	
德	德	<u>德</u>	德	德	德	<u>德</u>	<u>德</u>	<u>德</u>	<u>德</u>	<u>德</u>	<u>德</u>	<u>德</u>	<u>德</u>	<u>德</u>	*dé* virtue
從	徑		徙	徙	徙	<u>從</u>	<u>從</u>	<u>從</u>	<u>從</u>	<u>從</u>	<u>從</u>	<u>從</u>	<u>從</u>	从	*cóng* from
龍	龍		龍	龍	龍	<u>龍</u>	<u>龍</u>	<u>龍</u>	<u>龍</u>	<u>龍</u>	龍	<u>龍</u>	<u>龍</u>	龙	*lóng* dragon
革	革	草	卓	革	卓	<u>革</u>	<u>革</u>	<u>革</u>	<u>革</u>	<u>革</u>	<u>革</u>	<u>革</u>	<u>革</u>	革	*gé* hide
追	退	退	退	退	退	<u>追</u>	<u>追</u>	<u>追</u>	<u>追</u>	<u>追</u>	<u>追</u>	<u>追</u>	<u>追</u>	追	*zhuī* pursue
嘆	嘆	嘆	嘆	嘆	嘆	<u>嘆</u>	嘆	嘆	嘆	嘆	嘆	嘆	嘆	叹	*tàn* sigh
黃	黃	黃	黃	黃	黃	<u>黃</u>	黃	黃	黃	黃	黃	黃	黃	黄	*huáng* yellow
番	番	番	番	番	番	<u>番</u>	<u>番</u>	番	番	番	番	番	番	番	*fān* time
高		<u>高</u>	高	高	高	高	高	高	高	高	<u>高</u>	<u>高</u>	<u>高</u>	<u>高</u>	*gāo* high
奧				奧	奧	奧	奧	奧	奧	<u>奧</u>	<u>奧</u>	<u>奧</u>	<u>奧</u>	奥	*áo* profound
奇			奇	奇	奇	奇	奇	奇	奇	<u>奇</u>	<u>奇</u>	<u>奇</u>	<u>奇</u>	<u>奇</u>	*qí* ride
皆	皆		皆	皆	皆	皆	皆	皆	皆	<u>皆</u>	<u>皆</u>	<u>皆</u>	<u>皆</u>	皆	*jiē* all
習			習	習	習	習	習	習	習	習	<u>習</u>	<u>習</u>	<u>習</u>	习	*xí* practice
鬼			鬼	鬼	鬼	鬼	鬼	鬼	鬼	鬼	鬼	<u>鬼</u>	<u>鬼</u>	鬼	*guǐ* devil
卑			卑	卑	卑	卑	卑	卑	卑	卑	卑	卑	卑	卑	*bēi* humble
光	光		光	光	光	<u>灮</u>	<u>灮</u>	光	光	<u>灮</u>	光	光	<u>灮</u>	光	*guāng* light
明	明	明	明	明	明	明	明	明	明	明	明	明	明	明	*míng* bright

form, the latter the clerk style form used in [transcripts of] the classics."
Thus Yán was leaning on an authority higher than the Stone Classics and
Wáng Xīzhī, namely *Shuōwén*.

Did writers listen to Yán's recommendations? Not at the time, says the
720–770 column in Table 7. And why should they, if following Yán Yuánsūn
meant abandoning luminaries like Wáng Xīzhī, Zhìyǒng, Chǔ Suìliáng and
Ōuyáng Tōng? Perhaps we would not have known about Yán's *Gānlù zìshū*
at all had not his famous nephew Yán Zhēnqīng (708–784) inscribed it on
stone tablets in 774. Was it after that that *Shuōwén*-based forms like 從 and
京 came into common use? Not even then, shows the 780–900 column. The
breakthrough for the *Shuōwén*-based forms came only in the Song, according
to the last column.

What had changed by then? Perhaps the status of *Shuōwén*, which had
been revised and printed in 986 at the orders of the emperor himself. In the
following years *Shuōwén*-based forms were adopted by the 1008 *Guǎngyùn*
(Comprehensive Rhymes) and 1013 *Yùpiān* (properly *Dàguǎng yìhuì yùpiān*
Comprehensive and Enlarged Jade Chapters, not to be confused with the
extinct 543 *Yùpiān* and the partly extinct Tang *Yùpiān*, two different diction-
aries going by the same name). Furthermore, the status of Yán Zhēnqīng, and
of his *Gānlù zìshū*, rose in the Song due to his martyr's death at the hands
of the rebel Lǐ Xīliè, as shown by Amy McNair.

With time, more characters originally prescribed by the Han and Wei stone
classics, Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén*, Tang *Yùpiān* and Liao *Lóngkān shǒujìng*
(Mirror on the Dragon Shelf) were modified by later dictionaries to match
Shuōwén. In addition to those shown in *Table 8*, 寳 was changed to 寶 (*bǎo*
precious), 䢈 (*bào* report) to 報, 俻 (*bèi* prepare) to 備, 變 (*biàn* change) to
變, 辨 (*biàn* distinguish) to 辨, 寅 (*bīn* guest) to 賓, 叅 (*cān* join) to 參, 挿
(*chā* insert) to 插, 産 (*chǎn* produce) to 產, 甞 (*cháng* taste) to 嘗, 乗 (*chéng*
ride) to 乘, 遟 (*chí* be late) to 遲, 芻 (*chú* hay) to 芻, 處 (*chù* place) to 處, 窻
(*chuāng* window) to 窗, 牀 (*chuáng* bed) to 牀, 辝 (*cí* word) to 辭, 聦 (*cōng*
hearing) to 聰, 荅 (*dá* reply) to 答, 逹 (*dá* attain) to 達, 帶 (*dài* carry) to 帶,
逓 (*dì* deliver) to 遞, 苐 (*dì* number) to 第, 鬪 (*dòu* struggle) to 鬪, 讀 (*dú* read)
to 讀, 對 to 對, 發 (*fā* send out) to 發, 豊 (*fēng* rich) to 豐, 顧 (*gù* look back) to
顧, 歸 to 歸, 漢 to 漢, 黒 (*hēi* black) to 黑, 還 (*huán* return) to 還, 黄 (*huáng*
yellow) to 黄, 會 (*huì* meet) to 會, 昬 (*hūn* dusk) to 昏, 兾 (*Jì* Hebei) to 冀,
殱 (*jiān* destroy) to 殲, 觧 (*jiě* divide) to 解, 京 to 京, 経 (*jīng* pass through)
to 經, 競 (*jìng* compete) to 競, 舉 (*jǔ* lift) to 擧 and then back to 舉, 来 (*lái*
come) to 來, 隸 (*lì* underling) to 隸, 練 (*liàn* practise) to 練, 兩 (*liǎng* two) to
兩, 獦 and 獵 (*liè* hunt) to 獵, 畱 (*liú* remain) to 留 or 畱, 樓 (*lóu* building)
to 樓, 録 (*lù* record) to 錄, 麦 (*mài* wheat) to 麥, 脉 (*mài* vein) to 脈, 毎 (*měi*
each) to 每, 畒 (*mǔ* acre) to 畝, 難 (*nán* difficult) 難, 惱 (*nǎo* annoyed) to 惱,

䏻 (*néng* can) to 能, 噐 (*qì* implement) to 器, 牽 (*qiān* pull) to 牽, 潜 (*qián* hidden) to 潛, 强 (*qiáng* strong) to 強, 髙 (*qiáo* tall) to 喬, 繩 (*shéng* rope) to 繩, 師 (*shī* teacher) to 師, 釋 (*shì* explain) to 釋, 壽 (*shòu* longevity) to 壽, 属 (*shǔ* count) to 屬, 随 (*suí* follow) to 隨, 崴 (*suì* year) to 歲, 聽 (*tīng* listen) to 聽, 穏 (*wěn* steady) to 穩, 習 (*xí* habit) to 習, 戯 (*xì* drama) to 戲, 楢 (*xiāng* box) to 箱, 續 (*xù* continue) to 續, 陽 (*yáng* sunny) to 陽, 陰 (*yīn* shade) to 陰, 隐 (*yǐn* hidden) to 隱, 枌 (*yú* at) to 於, 顚 (*yuàn* wish) to 願, 蔵 (*zàng* store) to 藏, 曽 (*Zēng*) to 曾, 徴 (*zhēng* levy) to 徵, 旹 (*zhǐ* decree) to 旨, 眾 (*zhòng* crowd) to 眾, 専 (*zhuān* special) to 專 and 總 (*zǒng* assemble) to 總.

With the exception of 兊, 冊 and 擧, *Shuōwén*-based forms have prevailed. Once authorities had settled for those, publishers began to readjust old texts. The 竒 in Song editions of *Yùpiān* became 奇 in Qing editions, 習 and 皆 with 日 in the Song *Jíyùn* became 習 and 皆 with 白 in Qing editions, and so on. Writers were slower to adjust. Table 9 shows *Shuōwén*-based forms prescribed by the 1615 *Zìhuì* and 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* overtaking traditional counterparts only in the twentieth century, if at all.

Table 9. *Use of traditional forms (above) compared with* Shuōwén-*based ones (below) prescribed by* Zìhuì *and* Kāngxī zìdiǎn.

	1400–1614 inscriptions in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*	1620–1715 inscriptions in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*	1720–1900 inscriptions in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*	1900–1954 manuscripts in Appendix B
習	13	1	4	0
習	1	0	3	6
竒	45	6	21	0
奇	0	1	7	11
鬼塊魏	30	4	13	5
鬼塊魏	0	0	6	9
畁碑	67	11	34	4
畁碑	4	5	19	5
奥	3	2	4	8
奧	0	0	1	1

By then bigger changes had come on the table. In 1920 Professor Qián Xuántóng och Yanjing University complained in *Xīn qīngnián* (New Youth) that Chinese students were slower at taking notes than their Japanese counterparts. To increase writing speed, he proposed adopting:

a) ancient forms like 囗 for 圍 [*wéi* enclose], 匈 for 胸 [*xiōng* chest] and 亼 for 集 [*jí* assemble]

b) informal forms like 声 for 聲 [*shēng* sound], 体 for 體 [*tǐ* body] and 刘 for 劉 [*Liú*]

c) cursive forms like 东 for 東 [*dōng* east], 为 for 爲 [*wéi* be] [...]

d) phonetic loan characters seen in ancient books, like 辟 [*pì* refute] for 譬 [*pì* example], 道 [*dào* road] for 導 [*dǎo* lead] [...]

e) phonetic loan characters in popular use, like 姜 [*Jiāng*] for 薑 [*jiāng* ginger], 京 [*jīng* capital] for 驚 [*jīng* startle] and 付 [*fù* pay] for 腐 [*fǔ* rot] [...]

f) newly coined phonetic loan characters, like 范 for 範 [*fàn* model], 余 for 餘 [*yú* surplus] and 予 for 預 [*yù* in advance], that is, newly created forms of the e) type.

Adherents of the idea published lists of short forms in the 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn* (The Common People's Dictionary), the 1928 *Jiǎnyìzì shuō* (On Short Forms), the 1932 *Guóyīn chángyòng zìhuì* (Common Vocabulary of the National Speech) and so on.[2] The status of short forms was greatly boosted in 1930 when Liú Fù, a linguist and contributor to *Xīn qīngnián*, published his *Sòng-Yuán yǐlái súzì pǔ* (Index of Informal Characters from the Song and Yuan onwards), showing that common short forms like 变 (*biàn* change), 处 (*chù* place), 従, 刘, 斉, 齐, 声, 体 and 众 had appeared already in vernacular blockprints from the Song, Yuan and Qing.

In February 1935 the bimonthly *Tàibái* (Morning Star) and fourteen other Shanghai journals declared their intention to use 200 short forms dubbed *shǒutóu zì* (handy characters) in their columns. The declaration was signed by Bā Jīn, Cài Yuánpéi, Guō Mòruò, Lǎo Shě, Yè Shèngtáo and three hundred and six more writers and scholars. After *Tàibái* had adopted these forms in April, the bimonthly *Lúnyǔ* (Analects) edited by Lín Yǔtáng followed suit, adopting a list of 105 *jiǎnbǐ zì* (plain stroke characters) which it urged contributors to use in their manuscripts.[3] Some of *Lúnyǔ*'s characters differed from *Tàibái*'s, like 变 for *Tàibái*'s 変, 斉 for 齐, 奥 for 奥 (興 *xīng* prosper), 义 for 乂 (*yì* justice) and 众 for 乑.

Now China had three orthographies. Understandably the Education Ministry wanted just one. Declaring that "the results of compulsory and mass education are not outstanding" and that "one important reason for this is the

---

2 Also Hai 1934, Xu 1934, Chen 1936, Ouyang 1935 and Rong 1936.
3 "Tuixing shoutou zi yuanqi", 1935. "*Lunyu* shixing jianbizi qishi", 1935.

complexity and diversity of character forms", it published its own *Jiǎntǐzì biǎo* (List of Short Forms) in August, prescribing 324 characters, including *Tàibái*'s 变, *Lúnyǔ*'s 齐, 奥, 义 and 众 and their own additions 东, 处 and 归. The compilers were instructed to follow the 述而不作 (copy but not create) principle, more specifically "to select and adopt short forms among already existing ones and not create new ones for those characters which have no such forms", and "to select the more common form when there are many such forms". After July 1936 new textbooks would be authorised only if they used these forms. The list met resistance and was abolished in February the following year.

On 25 August 1949 Wú Yùzhāng, veteran of the revolution and president of People's University, wrote to Chairman Máo, proposing to introduce the alphabetic *Latinxua sin wenz* (Latinised New Script) in selected trial areas. Máo passed the letter on to the language authorities Guō Mòruò, Mǎ Xùlún and Máo Dùn, who considered the time not yet ripe for latinised script. Máo forwarded this answer to Wú, who adjusted his position. When a Chinese Script Reform Society was founded on 10 October Wú, as chairman, described its first objective as research on and propaganda for a reform of characters.[4] By 1950 this society had produced a *Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo* (List of Common Short Forms).

Late in 1951 Chairman Máo gave Mǎ Xùlún, by then education minister, the often quoted instruction that the "script must be reformed, like other scripts of the world it must go towards alphabetisation," with the later deliberately omitted addition that "its form should be national, and the alphabet scheme should be worked out on the basis of the existing characters."[5] The call for a Chinese-looking alphabet pushed alphabetisers back to square one. The chairman added, however, that characters were difficult to write by hand and should therefore be simplified.

To deal with both tasks Premier Zhōu Ēnlái ordered in December the creation of a *Zhōngguó wénzì gǎigé yánjiū wěiyuánhuì* (Chinese Committee for Research on Script Reform). On 25 March 1952 Mǎ Xùlún informed this committee that simplification should follow regular patterns, picto-phonetic characters getting new phonetics with the same reading as the original characters. On this point there was dissent. Committee members Wèi Jiàngōng and Lí Jǐnxī agreed with Mǎ, while Yè Gōngchuò argued that since characters were not regular to begin with and would be even less so after simplification, the aim should be to make each character easy to recognise and easy

---

4   *Jianguo yilai*, pp. 5–7. Zhang and Fei 1980, p. 252.
5   Ma 1952.

to read for the masses.[6] This discussion will resurface in the 濱 *bīn* and 倉 *cāng* sections of Chapter 3.

The research committee was to follow the above-mentioned copy-but-not-create principle of adopting short forms already in use. "However," it decided on 16 May, "if a complicated common character has no current short form, nothing prevents us from looking for a new short form."[7] In Chapter 4:1 we will assess how often reformers resorted to making up new forms.

By the end of 1952 new schemes were shown to Chairman Máo. His comment were conveyed to the research committee in March 1953: "The strokes are still too complicated. Some are harder to write than the National Phonetic Alphabet." This spelt doom for a Chinese-style alphabet, as simpler symbols than the National Phonetic Alphabet, the *Bopomofo* ㄅㄆㄇㄈ used in the Republic, were hard to imagine. Character simplifiers received the less hopeless task of designing simpler but regular forms radically reduced in number and when necessary based on cursive forms. The research committee went ahead with this, turning out new lists of simplified characters in February, June, July and October 1954.[8]

On 8 October 1954 the Committee for Research on Script Reform was promoted to *Zhōngguó wénzì gǎigé wěiyuánhuì* (Script Reform Committee of China). In January 1955 this body presented its *Hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn cǎo'àn* (Draft of the Character Simplification Scheme, hereafter the 1955 Draft), which consisted of three parts:

1. A Draft List of Simplifications of 798 Characters including 1935 veterans like 从, 归, 刘, 声, 体, 为 and additions like 币, 层, 厂 尘, 姜, 胶, 习, 龙 and 权 (權 *quán* power).

2. A Draft List of 400 Retained and Abolished Variants retaining "characters with simple strokes which already exist in print and are consistent with common handwriting habits, or characters which are relatively widely used in print" like 高 and 奇, abolishing 髙 and 竒.

3. A Draft List of Simplified Handwritten Character Components stipulating forms like 贝, 发, 风, 义, 卑, 鬼 and 讠 for handwriting but retaining 貝, 發, 風, 義, 卑, 鬼 and 言 in print.

---

6   25 March 1952 meeting. *Jianguo yilai*, p. 29.
7   *Zhongguo wenzi gaige yanjiu weiyuanhui mishuchu* 1952, pp. 38–39.
8   Mao's instructions reported by Ma Xulun to the Committee for Research on Script Reform on 25 March 1953. *Jianguo yilai*, pp. 38, 35, 46, 49–50. The character lists are now lost.

The introduction of separate forms for handwriting needed explaining:

> We have considered adopting cursive script to simplify characters [as Chairman Máo instructed]. Our conclusion is that mixing cursive characters into printed texts is disharmonious. There are also problems with printing technique. However, we find the adoption of cursive style and [the less contracted] running style in handwriting useful.

This ruse avoided a manifest clash with the chairman's instructions.

The Draft included a form on which respondents could write their mind. By 14 February the committee had received one thousand completed forms, by the end of the month two thousand, and by 23 July five thousand one hundred and sixty-seven forms or letters. By October about two hundred thousand persons had participated in discussions arranged by provincial and municipal education bureaus.[9]

On this basis the committee prepared a *Hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn xiūzhèng cǎo'àn* (Revised Draft of the Character Simplification Scheme) including 56 simplified character components like 贝, 发, 风, 义 and 讠 now in printed form, abandoning the separate norm for handwriting. Some amendments were made during and after a five-day script reform conference in October. On 28 January 1956 the State Council endorsed the *Hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn* (Character Simplification Scheme, hereafter the 1956 Scheme).

230 of its 515 characters became official on 1 February. The other 285 plus 54 character components were to be sent for assessment to the Political Consultative Committees of each province and then introduced batch by batch. The second batch, of 95 more characters, was adopted on 1 June.

During the 1957 Hundred Flowers campaign the Script Reform Committee invited prominent personages to discussions. Discussions revealed aversions against the substitution of complex characters like 麵 (*miàn* flour) with shorter homonyms like 面 (*miàn* face).[10] On 4 June the committee decided to revoke substitutions which were not fully homonymous and ones which could cause confusion. In August the committee staff member Cáo Bóhàn admitted that many substitutions could complicate the reading of classics, announcing the imminent withdrawal of 42 substitutions, already implemented ones like 面 for 麵, 出 (*chū* exit) for 齣 (*chū* play) and 云 (*yún* say) for 雲 (*yún* cloud) as well as planned ones like 发 (*fā* send) for 髮 (*fà* hair) and 胡 (*Hú*) for 鬍

---

9   "Ge di renshi", p. 37. "Hanzi jianhua fang'an cao'an gongbu yi ge duo yue lai de qingkuang". *Wenzi gaige cankao ziliao*, p. 4. "Hanzi jianhua fang'an", p. 48. Wei Que 1955.
10   "Wenzi gaige wenti zuotanhui", pp. 6, 15.

(*hú* beard). Cáo even envisaged other changes: "As for the [230] characters of List One, which have already been implemented, we have taken suggestions by people from all walks of life into account and plan to ask the State Council to change characters regarded as unsuitable." On 10 January 1958 Premier Zhōu confirmed the revision plans:

A small number of characters have turned out to be unsuitable in practice. […] If there really are unsuitable characters among the 230 characters in [the already official] List One, one can make the necessary revisions. The Script Reform Committee is now collecting suggestions and is rearranging and revising the simplified characters. Anybody who has suggestions is welcome to send them to the Script Reform Committee to be taken into account. After that the final decision will be taken.

The Hundred Flowers had by then faded. In September the committee's organ *Wénzì gǎigé* (Script Reform) had urged that rightist attacks on script reform should be exposed and criticised. After this the committee, understandably, received no more suggestions for revisions.

The Hundred Flowers were followed by the Great Leap Forward, which came to affect even characters. On 15 May 1958 a third batch of 70 characters like 两 for 兩, 猎 for 獵 and 业 for 業 were approved, and on 15 July 1959 a fourth batch of 92 including 币 for 幣, 层 for 層, 尘 for 塵, 发 for 髮 and 习 for 習, leaving 28 characters of the 1956 Scheme pending.[11]

Some wanted more action. In June 1958 Hán Róngshí declared in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "Even character simplification can make a Great Leap Forward". Jì Dá elaborated:

There are some short forms which are widely used among the masses but are not included in the two lists announced by the State Council. The Script Reform Committee should study and discuss these forms carefully, and if it finds them adoptable it should, after approval of the State Council, let them become legal short forms. Some common ones are listed below. Everybody writes 建 [*jiàn* build] as 迠, 面 as 靣, 原 as 厡, 源 as 洆, 願 [*yuàn* wish] as 愿 (the form announced is 愿), 儒 [*rú* Confucian] as 仒, 蝶 [*dié* butterfly] as 虸 […].

---

11   The remaining forms were 舫 (舼), 坝 (壩), 灿 (燦), 缠 (纏), 忏 (懺), 迭 (疊), 风 (風), 合 (盒), 胡 (鬍), 回 (迴), 硷 (礆), 笼 (籬), 砾 (礫), 疟 (瘧), 仆 (僕), 纤 (縴織), 曲 (麯), 涩 (澀), 属 (屬), 铄 (鑠), 涂 (塗), 楠 (楠), 象 (像), 须 (鬚), 渊 (淵), 愿 (願), 脏 (臟髒) and 嘱 (囑).

Liú Hé proposed

> adopting simplified characters created by the masses […]. One encounters them all over in billboard verses, slogans, written instructions and wall posters, like 建–玸, 璃 [*li* glass]–玏, 耀 [*yào* shine]–妖, 鞋 [*xié* shoe]–鞋, 街–丁, 部 [*bù* part]–卩, 赛 [*sài* competition]–宧, 帽 [*mào* cap]–帆, 源–沅, 影 [*yǐng* shadow]–形, 家 [*jiā* house]–宊, 宣 [*xuān* declare]–宀 […].

Articles in the same vein proliferated. On 22 April 1960 the Central Committee declared:

> In order to accelerate the literacy campaign and alleviate children's learning burden, it is necessary to simplify another batch of characters […]. For this task we must rely on the broad masses, which are very enthusiastic and capable in this field. The party committees in every province, city and area should instruct local authorities to propose a new batch of simplified characters, send it to the Script Reform Committee in order to pass it on to the Central Committee and State Council for approval.[12]

On 4 June education bureaus of each province were urged to ask teachers, publishers, artists and exhibition decorators to inform the Script Reform Committee about short forms used by the people. The committee even received reports from individuals who observed and collected short forms (listed in the Letters section of the bibliography). By 1962 the committee had compiled a *Jiǎnhuà hànzì biǎo* (List of Simplified Characters) consisting of 337 forms including 宧, 丁, 帆, 百, 仏, 妖, 形, 屍, 沅, 歩 (餐 *cān* eat), 口 (器 *qì* implement) and 北 (冀 *Jì* Hebei).[13]

This was optimistic at a time when the 1956 Scheme had not yet been fully implemented, with 28 characters and 54 character components still pending. On 20 May Premier Zhōu instructed the committee instead to renew discussions on the 1956 Scheme, accept suggestions with open minds and "consider revision of the characters already authorised by the State Council if people have objections."[14]

In October the State Council Secretariat rang the committee to tell them that Premier Zhōu expected a revised simplification scheme to be ready for publication by new year. On 9 November the committee sent a *Hànzì jiǎnhuà*

12 Zhonghua renmin gongheguo jiaoyu bu 1960, p. 4.
13 *Jianguo yilai*, p. 128. *1962 nian ni gongbu di yi pi jianhua hanzi biao.*
14 *Jianguo yilai*, p. 136.

fāng'àn xiūgǎi yìjiàn chū gǎo (Opinion on Revision of the Character Simplification Scheme, First Draft) to Zhōu, who gave his approval the following day. On 9 February 1963 the committee sent a *Guānyú Hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn xiūdīng gōngzuò de bàogào* (Report on the Work on Revision of the Character Simplification Scheme) to the premier, who agreed in principle, and asked the committee to discuss it in plenum and send it back to him. The committee settled on a *Jiǎnhuà hànzì xiūdīng fāng'àn cǎogǎo* (Revised Character Simplification Scheme, Draft) with a few conservative revisions, which was sent to Zhōu on 31 April. All looked set for a revision of the Scheme.

This time the committee had to wait. On 28 October it wrote to Zhōu to ask if the Central Committee could authorise the simplified character components, even if it might not have time to discuss characters just now. After waiting three more months, the Script Reform Committee wrote to the State Council:

> Since Premier Zhōu was busy before going abroad, he has not had time to approve the revised draft. Because textbooks and some dictionaries are now waiting to be printed, news and publishing units demand a clear norm for simplified characters in order to avoid confusion. We have therefore notified concerned units that until the publication of the revised draft, simplified characters should be used according to the original 1956 Scheme, including the twenty-eight characters not yet implemented.[15]

The State Council agreed in February 1964, and in March the now so familiar *Jiǎnhuàzì zǒngbiǎo* (General List of Simplified Characters) was published, including all characters and character components in the 1956 Scheme, except the components 幺, 仐, 亘 and 鸟 which became 纟, 钅, 鱼 and 鸟.[16] The changes envisaged in 1956, 1957 and 1963 had evaporated because Premier Zhōu had been too busy to attend to the matter.

During the Cultural Revolution the Script Reform Committee was inactive. Then in 1972 *Hóngqí* (Red Flag) signalled new action by letting Guō Mòruò, president of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, answer a letter to the editor:

> When the masses keep simplifying characters, it shows that the characters must be simplified and the script reformed. This is the trend

---

15   *Jianguo yilai*, p. 156.
16   In addition 迭, 复, 干, 伙, 借, 么, 余, 象, 征 and 摺 which replaced the homonyms 叠, 覆, 乾, 夥, 藉, 麼, 餘, 像, 徵 and 摺 respectively in the 1956 Scheme did so in the 1964 General List only in cases where they could cause no misunderstanding.

of our times and should not, and cannot, be forbidden. According to Chairman Máo's instructions we must respect the creativity of the masses. Those who work with script reform should pay steady attention to the simplified characters used by the people, absorb those which can be adopted and in due time popularise them.

The committee resumed its recording of short forms and encouraged the publication of articles with titles like "The workers need simplified characters", "The masses' tide of simplified characters cannot be stopped" and so on. In 1973 Helmut Martin was shown a dictionary draft from which he copied 133 new short forms, including 亍 for 街, 彡 for 影, 亻 for 儒 and 厃 for 原. In May 1975 the committee sent a *Dì èr cì hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn cǎo'àn* (Second Character Simplification Scheme, Draft) to the State Council for approval. An answer arrived in September from Premier Zhōu, who "raised objections concerning the number of simplified characters" and stressed other priorities: "At present the question of propagating the standard language is not brought up as often as before. How can one write pinyin correctly if one does not learn the standard language?"[17]

In January 1976 Zhōu died. On 20 May 1977 the committee made a new bid, presenting the draft to the now Huà Guófēng-led State Council, stressing that "the selected forms are short forms in use among the masses", although "some new forms have been coined according to the patterns of the characters simplified by the masses." In October the State Council agreed to publish the scheme.[18]

On 20 December 1977 newspapers published the Second Character Simplification Scheme – Draft (hereafter the 1977 Second Scheme), consisting of two parts, List One containing 193 forms "already widely used by the masses", like 歺 for 餐, 卩 for 部, 北 for 冀, 迀 for 建, 亍 for 街, 功 for 璃, 忛 for 帽, 靣 for 面, 亻 for 儒, 宲 for 赛, 䢞 for 鞋, 亽 for 宣, 彡 for 影, 厃 for 原, 汇 for 演 (*yǎn* perform) and 厾 for 展 (*zhǎn* display) which would be used on trial in print in order to collect opinions, and List Two with 269 characters, like 忈 for 德, 亼 for 集, 灾 for 家, 商 for 商 (*shāng* trade) and 妛 for 要 (*yào* want) whose "extent of use is not yet sufficiently wide" and would be discussed further.

Opinions were easy to collect. 亍 was too close to 于 (*yú* at) and 灾 to 穴 (*xué* hole). 迀 was not much simpler than 建. 一 inconsistently represented 亘 in 亽, 頁 in 汇, 異 in 北 and 衣 in 厾, which in turn looked too much like

17   Liu 1973. Shandong shifan xueyuan 1975. Martin 1982, pp. 239–240. *Jianguo yilai*, p. 188.
18   *Jianguo yilai*, pp. 191–192, p. 194.

尸 (*shī* dead body). On 17 April 1978 the Education Ministry gave in and instructed: "Textbooks for this autumn which have not yet been typeset shall not use the new simplified characters. Textbooks already printed with the new simplified characters need not be altered, but tuition shall be carried out using the former characters."[19] The proposed forms disappeared from books and newspapers.

Nobody was now certain what was valid orthography. In July 1981 the committee produced a *Dì èr cì hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn xiūdìng cǎo'àn* (Revised Draft of the Second Character Simplification Scheme) consisting of 111 characters "both established by custom and simplified in a rational way", without criticised forms like 肀, 亍, �, 㐬, 氿, 北 and 巳. The rationality requirement was a 1981 addition.

In November the committee sent ten thousand copies of the Revised Draft to key units in education, post, telegraph, publishing and defence, receiving 81 888 replies. One hundred and four of the proposed forms were supported by more than 70 000 of these respondents, wrote Fù Yǒnghé who took on the task of counting. Yet no reform was announced. In June 1986 the Second Scheme was finally declared void by the State Council. The single standard was back.

Or was it? The committee complained of a fad for old-style complex characters and set out to fight them alongside the outlawed Second Scheme. In December 1985 the Script Reform Committee became *Guójiā yǔyán wénzì gōngzuò wěiyuánhuì* (State Language Commission) and its mouthpiece *Wénzì gǎigé* became *Yǔwén jiànshè* (Language Planning). In February 1986 the new Language Commission wrote to the State Council to suggest a campaign against "the serious chaos which at present affects the characters used in society". During the ensuing campaign schoolchildren, called "little wood-peckers", were mobilised to detect and paint over irregular characters on shop signs and street slogans. In 1989 the title of Standard Character-using Model Street was introduced.[20]

Encouragement and persuasion did not give the desired results. By 1992 local authorities introduced fines for units using irregular characters in public. Zhengzhou City imposed fines of up to 500 yuan on units which neglected to rectify signs containing unsimplified or oversimplified characters, and up to 1000 yuan for those creating new signs with these outlawed

---

19 "Jiaoyu bu guanyu xuexiao", p. 32.
20 Fu 1984, p. 32. Wang 1985. Chen 1985. Fei 1985. *Xin shiqi de yuyan wenzi gongzuo*, 1987, pp. 331–32. "Gao hao shehui yong zi guifanhua bing bu nan", p. 48. Beijing shi yuyan wenzi gongzuo weiyuanhui 1990, p. 16.

characters. Other cities followed suit. Some municipalities extended the threat to sign-writing individuals, like Beijing which imposed "fines of 100 yuan per day and character until the character is corrected."[21]

These threats have succeeded in eradicating irregular forms from the public space. Have they also succeeded in eradicating them from people's minds? One way to find out is to ask. The result is related in Chapter 4:7.

Japanese writing standards

In the fifth and sixth centuries Japan imported the Chinese script. With time norms split. While the Ming *Zìhuì* and Qing *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* promoted *Shuōwén*-based forms like 黃, 高 and 奧, the sixteenth-century *Setsuyōshū* (Index of Plain Ways) and 1669 *Zōho kagakushū* (Enlarged and Amended Compilation of Humble Learning) more laxly accepted unetymological but common forms like 髙, 黄 and 奧.

Even so, Japanese writing remained difficult and became one of many targets for reformers. Proposals were made to replace characters with the native phonetic script hiragana, with the native katakana or with the Latin alphabet, or to limit the number of characters or the number of their strokes.

The latter two projects came to receive some official backing. In 1873 the Education Ministry prepared a *Shinsen jisho* (Newly-Selected Character Dictionary) which limited the number of characters to the 3167 "most common ones in society". However, this manuscript was removed from the publishing list by the ministry later that year and from the surface of the earth by the 1923 Tokyo earthquake. Our information about it comes from the ministry chief librarian Shidehara Tan, who read it earlier that year and commented in *Kyōiku kenkyū* (Research on Education): "Particularly interesting was this dictionary's adoption of short forms. Although this is something anybody might imagine today, it was at that time a very daring step."

Yes, by 1923 the adoption of short forms had become imaginable. In 1918 Hara Kei, once the author of articles like "Kanji shiyō no hai" (The Harm of Using Characters) and "Kanji genshō no hōhō" (How to Reduce Characters), became prime minister. By December 1919 his Education Ministry had issued a *Kanji seiri an* (Character Regulation Scheme) which alongside traditional forms like 變, 從, 發, 聲, 體, 學 and 圍 listed the "permitted forms" 変, 従, 発, 声, 体 and 囲 "based in the main on habitual use in society".

---

21   *Guojia yuyan wenzi zhengce*, pp. 396–469. Hu 1996, p. 6.

In 1921 the Education Ministry established an Interim Committee on the Japanese Language, proposing to limit the number of official characters to 1962, which it named in a *Jōyō kanji hyō* (List of Characters for Common Use) presented in *Kanpō* (The Official Gazette) on 2 May 1923 with a *Ryakuji hyō* (List of Abbreviated Characters) containing 154 short forms, including the above-mentioned 変, 従, 発, 声, 体 and 囲. Twenty newspapers in Tokyo and Osaka pledged to abide by this list from 1 September 1923. These plans were buried by the Kantō earthquake, which erupted on that day.

The Interim Committee remained convinced that "regulation of character forms is an important goal, since the present practice of using all kinds of character forms alongside each other is extremely inconvenient, and characters, because of their complicated strokes, are very hard to learn and to use" and so produced a *Jitai seiri an* (Proposal for the Regulation of Character Forms) in 1926, enlarging the 1923 list with forms like 竜 for 龍 and 単 for 單.[22]

In 1934 the Interim Committee was replaced by the *Kokugo shingikai* (Japanese Language Council), which by 1938 had produced a *Kanji jitai seiri an* (Proposal for the Regulation of Sino-Japanese Character Forms), prescribing 56 short forms like 変 and 点 for use in school books and common texts (but not in imperial edicts and laws) and permitting 161 more like 従, 單, 発, 竜, 声, 体 and 囲. The proposal was never passed by the Cabinet, which was preoccupied with the war with China which had broken out the preceding year.

The Language Council was less concerned with the war. By June 1942 it had prepared a *Hyōjun kanji hyō* (List of Standard Characters) of 2528 characters, of which 1134 were to be learned actively by pupils. 78 short forms were to become standard forms and 64 others optional. This mattered little when Japan was at war with most of its neighbours and script reform was on the bottom of everybody else's agenda.

Peace changed this. In November 1945 the Education Ministry notified the Language Council that complicated characters were an obstacle to development and script reform was necessary. Support for a reform was anticipated from a delegation arriving from the United States on 5 March to assess Japanese education and advise the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers on the matter. By 31 March the delegation presented a report advocating the adoption of Latin script, which could make "a great contribution to the transmission of knowledge and ideas across the borders".[23]

---

22   Hoshina 1926. Rinji kokugo chōsakai 1926.
23   Inokuchi 1982, pp. 73.

Latin script was not what the Education Ministry had in mind and it chose to circumvent the advice. It had already informed the Language Council that

> Although all forms of administration in this country are carried out under the auspices of the allied powers, the Education Ministry will do its utmost to maintain autonomy in domestic affairs. The occupation authorities have expressed their consent on this point and declared that they will refrain from interference and not issue unnecessary directives.[24]

The council strengthened its case by pointing to the undeniable fact that the American educational delegation had "spoken of language reform in its report", and continued its work on characters.[25] By late October 1946 it had prepared a *Tōyō kanji hyō* (List of Characters for Current Use) containing short forms like 変, 点, 発, 体, 声 and 囲, which was sanctioned by the Cabinet already on 16 November.

Some wanted to go further. At a meeting on 5 November, Education Minister Tanaka Kōtarō said: "As I see it, even printed forms should have few strokes. Character forms should be dealt with as soon as possible."[26] By June 1948 the Language Council had produced a *Tōyō kanji jitai hyō* (List of Forms of Characters for Current Use) which added short forms like 従 for 從, 単 for 單, 価 for 價 (*ka* price) and 芸 for 藝 (*gei* art).

The List of Forms was submitted to the Education Ministry in June 1948. This time the Cabinet was in no hurry, authorising it only in April 1949. In May 1951 the Cabinet authorised a 92-character *Jinmeiyō kanji beppyō* (List of Characters for Use in Personal Names), which included simplified 亀 for 龜 (*Kame*) and 弥 for 彌 (*Iya*).

It would have been surprising if everybody was satisfied. The newspapers' organisation urged the Language Council to replace 28 of the 1850 characters with 28 others of their choice and to shorten 燈 (*tō* light) to 灯. The council published the characters in a *Tōyō kanji hyō shingi hōkoku* (Deliberative Report on the List of Characters for Current Use) in March 1954, but did not get round to asking the Education Ministry to confirm the list. Newspapers nevertheless took the Deliberative Report as an approval and adopted the 28 new characters, including the shortened 竜 for 龍, 壌 for 壤 (*jō* soil) and 渓 for 溪 (*kei* valley) which thus came to be used in print.

---

24   Vice Minister Ōmura at 27 Nov. 1945 meeting. Inokuchi 1982, p. 73.
25   Language Council chairman Abe Yoshinari at 5 Nov. 1946 meeting. Inokuchi 1982, p. 76.
26   Inokuchi 1982, p. 77.

Although the council had let this opportunity slip, it intended to proceed with further reform. Council chairman Abe Yoshinari was "content with the designation 'current use' (which means 'for the time being') in 'Characters for Current Use'", since this opened the possibility "to set up a permanent committee to decrease the number of characters in future, not only for the benefit of women, but also for the benefit of common people."[27] In the event both groups coped, and the List of Characters for Current Use was replaced in 1981 by a longer *Jōyō kanji hyō* (List of Characters for Common Use) of 1945 characters, including the short forms 竜 for 龍, 灯 for 燈 and 缶 for 罐 (*kan* can), and in 2010 by a *Kaitei jōyō kanji hyō* (Revised List of Characters for Common Use) of 2136 characters.

---

27   Language Council meeting 5 Nov. 1946. Inokuchi 1982, p. 77.

CHAPTER 3
SHORT FORMS FROM A TO Z

Yin bone forms without reference are from Xu 1988, Zhou bronze forms from Gao 1980 or Xu 1981, Han wood slip forms from Sano 1991 and contexts from *Jūyán Hànjiǎn shìwén héjiào* (Juyan Han wood slips Explained), Han seal inscriptions from Luo 1978, Han and Jin clerk style inscriptions from Fushimi 1989, Later Wei to Qing inscriptions from *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* (A Database of Characters in Rubbings), Song to Qing blockprints from Liu 1930, Japanese stone inscriptions from Kitagawa 1991 and Japanese calligraphers from Kitagawa 2001. Pre-1900 quotes not listed in the Bibliography are from *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn*. 1900–1954 manuscripts are those described in Appendix C. Entries preceded by * are unofficial forms absent in *Xīnhuà zìdiǎn* and in contemporary Japanese dictionaries.

礙 碍 *ài* obstacle

The 旱 in the simplified 碍 is puzzling. *Shuōwén* called 旱 "an ancient form of 得 [*dé* obtain]." This 旱 must thus have been read *tək* like 得 and so could not serve as a phonetic in 礙 *ŋɐi*. There existed, however, a character similar to 旱 but with a different sense. The 148 CE Stone Gate inscription describes terrain where one 遭旱弗前 (遭碍弗前 *dì ài fú qián* meets obstacles and cannot proceed). The 1008 *Guǎngyùn* added to its 礙 entry that "Buddhist texts say 无旱 [无礙 tolerance]", identifying 旱 with 礙. As late as in 1084 Sīmǎ Guāng wrote 設無旱大會於太極殿 (*shè wú'ài dàhuì yú Tàijí diàn* a meeting promoting tolerance was arranged at Taiji hall).

By then the enlarged form had turned up, according to *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn* first in Qí Jǐ's (863?–937?) tale of a traveller who 舉頭還有碍 (舉頭還有礙 *jǔ tóu hái yǒu ài* raised his head and faced an obstacle). This 碍 came to outcompete the ambiguous 旱, which was forgotten and had to be explained to later readers. In 1167 the commentator Hóng Kuò informed his readers that 旱 in 遭旱弗前 meant 碍, and in 1285 Hú Sānxǐng commented on Sīmǎ Guāng's 1084 text: "旱 is the same as 礙. Monks wrote like this."

碍 became official in China in February 1956 with the First Batch of Simplified Characters. The Japanese Language Council included 碍 in its abortive 1942 List of Standard Characters but excluded 礙/碍 from

its shorter 1946 List of Characters for Current Use, and so took no decision on the shape of 礙. The burdensome 障礙 (*shōgai* obstacle) was dealt with by prescribing 障害 with 害 (*gai* harm), rendering sound fully and sense fairly.

愛 爱 *ài* love

The 1956 Scheme turned 愛 into the heartless 爱, a form first seen on a 519 CE Buddha statue carved by Cuī Qín.

骯 肮 *āng* dirty

The 1955 Draft proposed to leave only 'meat' on the left and write 肮, a form absent in former records. In *Shāndōng dàxué xuébào* (Shandong University Journal) Zhào Tàimóu criticised "hitherto unseen or newly created short forms. These new forms look unfamiliar, […] like 硷 [*jiǎn* alkali] and 肮 […]." Not surprisingly, 肮 became official only in 1964.

襖 袄 *ǎo* jacket

The 1627 *Zhèngzìtōng* (All About Correct Characters) said 襖 "is informally written 袄." From 1958 襖 was even formally written with the 夭 *yāo* phonetic.

懊 *忄夭 *ào* regretful

忄夭, an analogy to the older 袄, was first registered by the 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn* (The Common People's Dictionary). The *Tàibái* editors included 忄夭 in their 1935 "handy characters". In 1955 Guǎn Xièchū of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences repeated that proposal. The Script Reform Committee refrained from this in 1956, but did include 忄夭 in its abortive 1977 Second Scheme.

澳 *沃 *ào* bay

In 1955 Yùn Huī and Jùn Tāo argued in the Script Reform Committee organ *Yǔwén zhīshí* (Language Knowledge): "Since 襖 has become 袄 in the Draft, all characters with the 奥 component can be simplified to 夭. 澳 can for example become 沃 and 墺 can become 圵." One Xú Yīhuī objected: "沃 is used in 肥沃 [*féiwò* fertile]. If one writes 沃門 [for 澳門 Macao] nobody will understand."

In 1960 correspondents from Guangzhou and Chaozhou in Guangdong, the province adjacent to Macao, nevertheless informed the committee that there were those who wrote 沃 for 澳, and presumably were understood. This practice spread. In 1962 Chóng Wén complained in the Beijing *Guāngmíng*

rìbào (Daily Enlightenment): "沃 is read *wò* and means 'fertile'. Some now use it as a short form for 澳 (*ào*) and write 澳洲 [*Àozhōu* Australia] as 沃洲. This way of writing is completely wrong."

The committee included 沃 in List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme but not in its 1981 Revised Draft.

奧 奥 *ào* profound

The middle 釆 became 米 in Japan with the 1949 List of Forms and in China with the 1965 *Yìnshuā tōngyòng hànzì zìxíng biǎo* (Table of Printed Forms of Current Characters). Hasegawa Motoi argued that "there are examples of this already in clerk script."

That was an understatement. Fushimi Chūkei's register of Han and Wei clerk style forms contains three 奥 with 米 but no 奧. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains eighty-two legible Wei to Song 奥 with 米 but no 奧. Even authorities like the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng,* 1013 *Yùpiān* and 1039 *Jíyùn* prescribed 奥 with 米.

This harmony did not last. *Shuōwén* took the component between the roof (宀) and hands (廾) to be a groping claw and prescribed 釆 with a twisted top to distinguish it from 米 (米 *mǐ* rice). Yuan philologists insisted on upholding this distinction even in square style. *Zìjiàn* (Reflections on Characters) stressed that "the middle is written with 釆." *Liùshū zhèng-é* (Right and Wrong about the Six Kinds of Characters) spelled out: "Informally written 奥. This is wrong." The editors of the Ming *Zìhuì* and Qing *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* followed suit, prescribing 奧 with 釆.

The public were less concerned. Our rubbings database contains twelve Qing 奥 with 米 against one 奧 with 釆, our 1900–1954 manuscripts ten 奥 against one 奧. The Chinese 1965 decision did not change practice, just confirmed it.

All this fuss may have been unnecessary. In 1920 Lín Yìguāng pointed out that "釆 looks like rice," implying it was an offering, not the groping claw described by *Shuōwén*.

罷 罢 *bà* stop

罢 looks like an arbitrary simplification but is not. By the Tang, writers had contracted 罷 to 罷. Yuan blockprinters peeled off the bottom left to write 罡 or 罢. The latter survived and appears in Qing prints as 罢 with 去, a component more familiar to writers than the undefinable 卡.

罢 became official in China in February 1956.

壩 坝 *bà* dam

The 1615 *Zìhuì* said: "坝 is read 壩 and [like that character] means 'dike'. It is different from 埧 [*jù* embankment]." That difference was not maintained. When we encounter a handwritten 埧 in 1916, it is in an order by the republican general Cài È to secure 蓝田埧 (Lantianba) in Sichuan against the northern army. Later we read in Beijing Archives about construction projects in 東埧 (Dongba) and 埧河 (Bahe).[28] Of the reading *jù* we hear no more.

The 1955 Draft proposed to use *Zìhuì*'s 坝 for 壩. Yú Xīnbó objected in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "Some of the simplifications [in the Draft] do not agree with those the masses are already accustomed to. One should as far as possible simplify in line with the forms the masses are used to. For example 坝 (壩), the habitual short form is 埧." Professor Zēng Zhāolún asked in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Is it not a mistake to simplify 壩 to 坝? The form in common use is 埧."

Zēng and Yú had a point. Zēng's 埧 (or 塓) appears in twelve of our 1940–1954 manuscripts, Yú's 埧 in three, 坝 in three and the proposed 坝 in none.

The reformer Chén Guāngyáo defended 坝: "This character is also written 埧. This is a mistake for 坝. Besides there is no connection between 具 and 壩, neither in sound nor sense. This is inconvenient for those who learn to read. We should therefore adopt 坝." This was done with the 1964 General List, which turned all 貝 into 贝 and so 坝 into 坝, a form absent in the above-mentioned manuscripts.

霸 覇 *覇 *bà* hegemony

The official Chinese form has 雨 (rain) on top, the Japanese one 襾 (lid). Neither makes much sense in a character meaning 'hegemony', nor do the bottom 革 (*gé* leather) and 月 (*yuè* moon). The original sense of 霸, however, is 'new moon', which explains 月. The phonetic in 霸 is 霈 (*pò* soak), which explains 雨 and 革.

So 雨 tops must have preceded 襾, which can be traced back to a 覇 on the 308 CE Shí Xiǎn stele. 襾 tops thrived and were recommended by the Sui model text *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén,* but were degraded to "common" status by the Tang *Gānlù zìshū*, to "informal" by the Song *Guǎngyùn* and to "wrong" by the Yuan *Zìjiàn* and Ming *Súshū kānwù*. Many nevertheless stuck to 霸, which appears in five of our Chinese 1900–1954 manuscripts compared with 覇 in four.

Sticklers for 襾 were even more numerous in Japan, where this top outnum-

---

28   *Guojia tushuguan cang zhengui geming lishi wenjian*, p. 16. Beijing Archives J2-8-1252, p. 50.

bers 雨 eleven to nil in our 1900–1946 manuscripts. Unsurprisingly, the 1923 List of Characters for Common Use, the 1926 Proposal for the Regulation of Character Forms and the 1938 Proposal for the Regulation of Sino-Japanese Character Forms advocated 覇 with 覀. However, when a reform finally came about in 1946, 霸 did not make it into the List of Characters for Current Use and no ruling was issued on its shape. Only in 1981 did 霸 enter the new List of Characters for Common Use and get its shape set to 覇.

In China, where neither form predominated, the 1955 First List of Regulated Variants discarded 覇 to keep 霸. Why did the reformers not take this chance to shorten 霸 somewhat? Perhaps because they had their eyes on something more radical. In 1935 the Jiangxi teacher Ōuyáng Zhēn recorded use of 㔩 with the phonetic 伯 *bó* for 霸 in his *Jiǎnbǐzì zhī yánjiū* (A Study of Short Forms) and in 1951 the Shanghai *Jiǎnbǐzì* (Short Forms) registered the analogous 㔩. In 1955 Wáng Tónghàn argued in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "If the masses have already created a short form, like 㔩 for 霸 […], we should not retain the original character."

The problem was that the masses created not one, but several short forms. In 1957 Fán Jiāng informed *Guāngmíng rìbào* readers that his Zhejiang pupils wrote 㔩 with a 巴 *bā* phonetic. In 1960 letters to the Script Reform Committee from Luoyang and Yiyang reported 覀 with 八 *bā* and in 1975 one from Yangzhou mentioned use of 坝 for 霸.

The committee's 1962 List of Simplified Characters proposed none of the above, but the innovative 伯, with the argument: "If written 㔩, this character will still have many strokes. If we instead simplify to 伯, the phonetic will be easy to read and the semantic component [亻man] easy to comprehend."[29] This was not put to the test, as this list was not published.

For List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme the committee chose the less revolutionary 㔩. Guangdong Script Reform Committee objected: "Some think we should, as far as possible, adopt characters which the masses are used to, like 妾 for 要 and 坝 for 霸." Zhū Ruìqīng of Yixing Education Bureau wrote: "The masses in our area have long been used to writing 霸 as 坝. A change to 㔩 will make the character hard to remember and hard to write. (The雨top is inconvenient to write and one gets a feeling that 㔩 is something like ice or snow)." The committee caved in and passed 霸 over in its 1981 Revised Draft.

Use of 伯 as a phonetic for 霸 as in 㔩 was not a new idea. In *Zuǒ zhuàn* (Zuo's Chronicles) we find 晉之伯 for 晉之霸 (the ruler of Jin), in *Zhànguó cè* (Strategies of the Warring States) 伯首 for 霸首 (ruler) and in *Hànshū* (Book

---

29   *1962 nian ni gongbu di yi pi jianhua hanzi biao*, p. 3.

of the Han) 文公伯諸侯 (*Wén gōng bà zhūhóu* Duke Wén ruled over the no-bles). Behind the latter quote the Tang commentator Yán Shīgǔ (581–645) inserted a clarifying "伯 is read as 霸". Why were Han readers trusted to identify 伯 as 霸 but not their Tang descendants? Because Han readers read 霸 and 伯 similarly as something like *pak*, while 霸 by the Tang had lost its *-k* ending and so its similarity to 伯. Later even 伯 lost the ending and could again serve as a phonetic for 霸.

拜 拜 *bài* pay a visit

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council shortened the 手 (hand) in 拜 to 扌, the usual form for 'hand' in that position. 拜 had been in use at least since 1868, when we find a document titled 聖護院宮ヲ議定ニ拜ス (*Shōgoin no miya o gitei ni hai su* decision on pilgrimage to Shōgoin Shrine) in the National Archives of Japan.

闆 板 *bǎn* boss

The 1956 Scheme replaced 闆 with the homonym 板 (plank). Chén Guāngyáo argued: "People in the Changjiang area call a shop manager 老闆, which they usually write 老板. These two characters have long been used inter-changeably."

辦 办 *bàn* do

Liú Fù found 办 for 辦 in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. Yuan writers may have picked up the idea of replacing 辡 with 八 from rubbings of the 108 CE Yáng Dòudào stele, which has 劜明 for 辦明 (*biànmíng* explain).
办 became official for 辦 in February 1956.

幫 幇 帮 *邦 *bāng* help, gang

幫 turns up in the 1008 *Guǎngyùn* in the sense of 'shoe covered with cloth', which explains the 帛 (silk) below. It was then borrowed for the more com-mon sense of 'help', which made it liable to simplification, first to 幇 without 白 as recorded by Dài Tóng (1200–1285), then to 帮 with the shorter 邦 *bāng* phonetic as on an 1800 stele and then to just 邦 as in a 1943 pamphlet from the Administrative Office of Southern Jiangsu, a revolutionary base

area, urging not to 邦助敌人作事 (*bāngzhù dírén zuò shì* help the enemy by working for him).[30]

In 1955 Yǐn Bīnyōng, a Sichuan middle school teacher who later became editor of *Yǔwén zhīshí,* proposed to replace 幫 with 邦 (state), which "has the same reading and tone and so cannot cause mixing up." The Script Reform Committee member Zhèng Línxī added a note that this practice was "relatively common". The 1956 Scheme nevertheless adopted the more distinctive 帮. Use of 邦 for 幫 continued and was criticised in 1957 by Fán Jiāng in *Guāngmíng rìbào* and by Zhū Qìngxià in *Yǔwén zhīshí.* Use peaked in 1976 with posters attacking 四人邦 (The Gang of Four).

The committee's 1977 Second Scheme proposed to make 邦 official for 帮. Wú Jiǎfēng of the Chinese Academy of Arts pointed out in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "The original sense of 邦 is 'country', for which it is still widely used. Words like 邦交 [*bāngjiāo* diplomatic relations], 邻邦 [*línbāng* neighbouring country], 友邦 [*yǒubāng* friendly nation], 联邦 [*liánbāng* federation] and 乌托邦 [*Wūtuōbāng* Utopia] should not be merged with the pejorative 帮 in 帮派 [*bāngpài* clique]." 邦 was duly withdrawn from the 1981 Revised Draft.

Unlike Chinese dictionaries, Japanese ones early recognised 幫 for 'help'. The 1907 *Jirin* (Forest of Words), for one, wrote *hōjo* (help) as 幫助, as do its modern successors.

丰 is actually a regression to an older form. 㞷 in 封 and 幫 descends from the phonetic ¥/ꞷ/Ψ *p'iung,* a picture of a plant, which appears as 丰 in 峰, 蚌 and 邦.

寶 寳 宝 *bǎo* precious

寶 consists of 玉 (gems) and 貝 (valuables) in a 缶 (jar) in a 宀 (house). 缶 *fǒu* may also have a phonetic function. The jar was written 𠙶 or 𠙵 in the Zhou and 尒, 仌, 击 or 尔 on Han steles. The latter came to dominate and was the form advocated by the Sui model text *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén.* However, 尔 deviated from *Shuōwén,* which specified that the phonetic was 缶. We first find a 寶 with a *Shuōwén*-inspired 缶 in the 519 Wáng Qiān epitaph, and then in the Tang writing guides *Zìyàng, Gānlù zìshū* and *Wǔjīng wénzì.* The latter was adamant: "寶 is written with 缶. Writing with 尔 is wrong." Later dictionaries followed suit, while writers wavered.

Song blockprinters and their successors dodged the quandary by dropping both 缶 and 貝 to write 宝, a form which become official in Japan in 1946 and in China ten years later.

---

30 1800 Lei zu shenghui stele. *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 110.

爆 *炸 *bào* burst out, quick-fried

爆 was liable to be shortened by cooks and waiters. The 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì* said 炸 with the phonetic 卜 *bǔ* was "already in use in society" for 爆. In 1960 use of 炸 was reported in letters from Baotou and Wuhua to the Script Reform Committee, which proposed this form in its abortive 1962, 1977 and 1981 schemes.

報 报 *bào* avenge, report

Han scribes could not make up their minds how to write the left side, which comes out as 辛 or 𢆶 on steles and 𢆶, 丰 or 扌 on wood slips. The latter lives on, appearing in eleven of the twelve Song to Qing blockprints surveyed by Liú Fù. In 1956 报 with 扌 became the official form in China.

Many prefer to write the right side as 𠂆, like the calligrapher who provided the caption for 人民日报 (*Rénmín rìbào* People's Daily). This habit can be traced back to Han wood slips and was promoted by the 175 CE Xīpíng Stone Classics and by model writers like Wáng Xīzhī (303–361), Ōuyáng Xún (596–658) and Yán Zhēnqīng (708–784). However, 𠂆 defies *Shuōwén*, which has a distinct 彐 (又 hand) holding a 卩 (man). The 1008 *Guǎngyùn* and later dictionaries followed the latter authority, prescribing 報 with 又.

貝 贝 *bèi* cowrie
頁 页 *yè* page
貞 贞 *zhēn* loyal
見 见 *jiàn* see

Usage of 貝 without 三 appears already in the oldest clerk style inscriptions. Cáo Wǎnrú noticed place names like 夗里 (貞里 Zhenli) and 九员 (九員 Jiuyuan) on a 239 BCE wood plate map excavated in Tianshui in Gansu. Song, Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprinters shortened 貝 to 贝 or 贝. The latter became the more common. Our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain thirty-one 员 (*yuán* personnel) against one 員 and twelve 见 against two 見.

The 1955 Draft proposed to write 贝, 见 and 页 but print 貝, 見 and 頁. The 1956 Scheme abandoned the dual norm and stipulated an overall change of 貝, 見 and 頁 components to 贝, 见 and 页, a plan which was implemented in 1964.

Japanese habits were similar. Our Japanese 1900–1946 manuscripts contain six 员 but no 員, two 见 and one 見. Nevertheless simplified 貝, 見 and 頁 never appeared in the Language Council's reform schemes.

<h1 style="text-align: center">備 备 *bèi* prepare</h1>

The now official 备 differs from the former 備 by having 夂 for 芦, 田 for 用 and nothing for 亻. The changes came one by one. 夂 is in fact not a successor but a predecessor to 芦. 俻, 偹 and 偹 precede 備 which appears in the 522 Lady Yuán epitaph, presumably influenced by *Shuōwén* which instructed that the phonetic was 蒲. 田 appears for 用 from the 522 Zhāng Měnglóng stele onwards. We first notice a missing 亻in an 1853 note by Jiǎng Chāobó that he was about to 备诗 (*bèi shī* prepare a poem). Intellectuals like Jiǎng knew of course that *Shuōwén* said the right side of 備 meant "prepare" and so felt free to drop 亻.

In the early twentieth century forms with 芦 or 用 remained in use alongside those with 夂 or 田 , and those with 亻 alongside those without. The Education Ministry chose 俻 for its 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee 备 for its 1956 Scheme. The turn-about was not caused by a surge in 亻 dropping. Our 1900–1934 manuscripts contain nine 亻-less forms against eighteen 俻, 備 or 偹, a proportion which dropped to four to forty-two in 1950–1954.

Japanese writers were more obedient to the dictionary. We encounter our last irregular 備 in a 1917 plan for cuts in the 設備 (*setsubi* facilities) of a railway station near Wakayama.[31] We find no Japanese proposal to shorten 備.

<h1 style="text-align: center">鼻 *自 *bí* nose</h1>

The 1977 Second Scheme prposed 自. Records of 自 were scanty: a proposal by the paleographer Róng Gēng in his 1936 *Jiǎntǐ zìdiǎn* (Dictionary of Short Forms) and one by the Chinese Script Reform Society in its 1950 List of Common Short Forms. In 1964 Zēng Xiàndá of Yiyang District Health Office wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that "there are even people who go so far as to write 鼻 as 自 […]." No claims were made that 自 was common.

By the 1980s medics had found other ways. In 1980 this author received a diagnosis of 毕窣炎 (鼻窦炎 sinusitis) by a Nanjing doctor.

---

31   National Archives 1917.8.6, p. 1.

筆 笔 *芼 *bǐ* pen
答 *荅 *dá* answer
等 *荨 *děng* wait
简 *苘 *jiǎn* simple
篇 *萹 *piān* sheet
箱 *葙 *xiāng* box

筆 is a hand (⼹) holding a writing implement (⺁) made of bamboo (⺮). On the 560 Juàn Xiūluó stele we find a 笔 with hair (毛), the material in the by then common writing brush. This 笔 remained in use and became official in China in June 1956.

For some this was not short enough. In 1965 Xiāo Tiānzhù pointed out in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "笔 is not written 芼. 芼 is read *mào* [and means 'to weed']."

Merger of 'grass' and 'bamboo' stems from the Han, when Zhou 屮屮 (grass) became ⁺⁺ and Zhou 𥫗 (bamboo) became ⺮ and then ⺮ or, more often, ⁺⁺. Of fifty-three clear 等 in Sano Kōichi's register of Western Han wood slips, fifty have ⁺⁺, ⼗⼗ or ⺍ tops, compared with three 𥫗. Overuse of 'grass' tops continued and even gained some recognition. The 175 CE Xīpíng Stone Classics recommended 荅, 荨 and 葙 and the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* 筆, 荅, 荨, 茅, 葙 and 卽 (節 *jié* section). The Tang version of *Yùpiān* numbered its sections 第一百三 and so on.

This tolerance of ⼗⼗ did not last. The Tang *Gānlù zìshū* accepted only 筆, 第, 等 and 節 as correct. Its 776 successor *Wǔjīng wénzì* specified that "writing 篇 as 萹 is wrong" and "writing 符 [*fú* symbol] with 'grass' is wrong." The 1610 *Súshū kānwù* spelled out: "筆 is informally written 笔. This is wrong. 葦 is also wrong. 葦 is the name of a plant."

The 1955 Draft mooted a rehabilitation of ⼗⼗ in 荅, 荨, 茅, 葘 and 萹. Some even advocated abolishing ⺮ tops altogether in favour of ⼗⼗, but the 1955 Scheme left all ⺮ tops unchanged.[32] The abortive 1977 Second Scheme confined itself to proposing 荅 for 答 and 苘 for 简.

幣 币 *bì* currency

Wartime currencies multiplied and had to be specified, if possible with something shorter than 幣, as in a 1944 proclamation by Huaibei Jiangsu-Anhui Border Area People's Anti-Japanese Self-Defence Force promising a reward of 边币 70 元 (70 yuan in Border Currency) for each pistol captured from

---

32   "Ge di renshi" 1955, p. 37.

the enemy.[33] Zhào Tàimóu regarded the 丿 in 帀 as a contraction of 敝, Lǐ Lèyì as the first stroke of 幣.

The 1955 Draft proposed to make this 帀 official. It turned out to be new to many. Shí Hòu, a manuscript copyist, wrote in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "Most of the 798 simplified characters are familiar to us, and also common, like 拥 [擁 *yōng* support], 护 [護 *hù* protect], 扰 [擾 *rǎo* disturb], 乱 [亂 *luàn* disorder], 戏 [戲 *xì* drama] and 据 [據 *jù* seize], but there are some unfamiliar ones, like 帀 and 並 [鑿 *záo* chisel]. However, those are easy to memorise." At the October script reform conference the committee member Yè Gōngchuò argued that "the 帀 meaning 'currency' is already popular in financial circles and the 艺 [藝 *yì*] meaning 'art' is now common in the realm of literature and art, although perhaps unfamiliar to the general public. We will make these characters known and popularise them." Three years later 帀 was deemed popular enough to become official.

畢 毕 *bì* finish

The 1955 Draft proposed to replace the top of 畢 with the phonetic 比 *bǐ* and write 毕. This form is absent in our pre-1955 manuscripts, which include quite a few 1954 畢業 (*bìyè* graduation) reports in Beijing Archives. Zhāng Zhōu wrote in his 1956 *Jiǎnhuàzì de hǎochù* (The Advantages of Simplified Characters): "All the simplified characters were selected according to the established-by-custom principle, except a few newly created ones like 亿 [億 *yì* a hundred million] and 毕." Unfamiliarity explains why recognition of 毕 was delayed until 1959.

斃 毙 *bì* die

毙 is absent in our pre-reform records and was called a "new picto-phonetic character" by the reformer Chén Guāngyáo. This may explain why 毙 was authorised only in 1959.

蔽 *芘 *bì* cover
蓖 *芘 *bì* castor-oil plant
弊 *毕 *bì* fraud
壁 *坒 *bì* wall

The Script Reform Committee's creative use of 比 in 毕 and 毙 inspired copycats. In 1960 use of 芘 for 蔽 and 毕 for 弊 was mentioned in a letter to

---

33   *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 132.

the committee from Guangdong Education Bureau, and 芘 for 蔥 appears in one from Hanzhong in Shaanxi. Qī Chángshùn of Shenyang Forestry and Pedology Institute wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that 垒 had "long been in use by the masses." In 1973 one Yáng Bóqīng wrote in the same paper: "Like every profession in the country, the officers and men of the People's Liberation Army create and use new simplified characters. Below I list some words with simplified characters which we often use: 卩队 [部队 army unit] [...] 隐 芘 [*yǐnbì* take cover] [...]."

In its unpublished 1962 List of Simplified Characters the committee proposed all the above changes, specifying that "one is already used to using 芘 [for 蔽] in the armed forces." Its 1977 Second Scheme repeated the proposal. The agronomist Qián Xī asserted in *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* (Script Reform Newsletter) that "characters like 芘 (蔥), 㧒 (播 [*bō* sow]), 尐 (餐) [...] have been in use here for years". 芘 and the other forms were nevertheless purged from the 1981 Revised Draft.

邊 边 辺 *biān* side

China's official form 边 with 力 differs from Japan's 辺 with 刀. Records of 邊 without 自, 穴 and 宀 begin in China, where Liú Fù found 边 in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. The Sino-Japanese split can be traced back to a sixteenth-century transcript of *Wa-Kan rōeishū shichū* (Japanese and Chinese Poems to Sing) in which Yamada Tadao found both forms. 辺 came to outcompete 边 in Japan, where our 1900–1946 manuscripts contain fourteen 辺 and two 辺 against one 边. The Language Council followed custom and settled for 辺 in 1946.

辺 is absent in our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts, which instead contain thirty-six 边 and three 辺. Unsurprisingly the 1956 Scheme adopted 边 with 力.

Chinese writers found another use for 辺, as we shall see in the 道 *dào* section.

變 变 变 *biàn* change

The change from 𢎥 to 亦 looks arbitrary but is not. Han, Tang and Song scribes wrote 變, 變 or 變 with a long 一. This left little space for 絲, which turned into 八, and for 言 which became 刂. We find our first 变 on the 1110 Liáo Tower pillar.

The official Japanese form has a 夂 bottom, the Chinese one 又. Bottoms varied between 乂, 又 and 反 already in Han and Jin inscriptions. However, neither was consistent with the 攴 (支 beat) prescribed in *Shuōwén*. This seems to have bothered Tang calligraphers like Ōuyáng Tōng and Yán Zhēnqīng,

who adjusted their bottoms to 攵, a variant of *Shuōwén*'s 𠂤/攴, giving us the later dictionary form 變.

All variants were exported to Japan, where our 1900–1946 manuscripts contain twenty-two 変 with 反, seven 変 with 攵 and eight 変 with 又. The Language Council rejected the more common 変 with 反 for the shorter 変 with 攵.

In China the majority wrote 変 with 又, which appears in twenty-eight of our 1900–1946 manuscripts against 変 with 攵 in sixteen and 変 with 反 in three. The choice of 变 was nevertheless not unanimous. In 1935 the editors of the Shanghai journal *Lúnyǔ* chose 変 with 攵 for their "plain stroke characters" and their colleagues at *Tàibái* 変 with 又 for their "handy characters", like the Education Ministry for its List of Short Forms. In 1952 变 with the etymologically correct 攵 was mooted again by Dīng Xīlín in *Zhōngguó yǔwén* and in 1954 by Xú Huàwén. In the end the 1956 Scheme opted for the shorter 变.

<div align="center">

辨 弁 *biàn* distinguish
辯 弁 辩 *biàn* argue, explain
瓣 弁 *bàn* valve

</div>

Shuōwén took 辡 to be quarrelling criminals, later etymologists thought they were seals brandished by arguing officials or sharp implements used to cut things straight or to punish the above-mentioned criminals. Even scribes were uncertain what to make out of this 辛, rendering it 𡊅, 丯, 𡴂, 𡴃, 羊 or 辛 on Han wood slips and stone steles. Also standardisers wavered. The Han Xīpíng Stone Classics prescribed 辨 with 𡊅, the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* 辯 with 丯 and 羊, the early Tang *Zhèngmíng yàolù* (Index of Correct Terms) 辨 with 羊 and the 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* 辨 with 辛. The latter was the most compatible with *Shuōwén* and came to be followed by later dictionaries.

In Japan 辨 and 辯 were officially replaced by the shorter 弁 (*ben* cap) in 1946. Such a step has been mooted also in China. In 1954 the Script Reform Committee associate Chén Guāngyáo described 弁 as a "character in common use" for 辨. The committee's abortive 1962 List of Simplified Characters proposed to adopt 弁 for 辨 and "achieve unity with the short form used in Japan." The proposal was repeated in List Two of the the 1977 Second Scheme but abandoned in the 1981 Revised Draft.

The practice was of course older. In 1997 Zhāng Yōngquán wrote in an article for *Zokugogen kenkyū* (Research on Plain Language) that "in Dunhuang scrolls 辯 and 辨 are often written 弁". The Japanese editors were skeptical, used to regarding 弁 as a genuine Japanese short form, aware that the Japanese scholar Matsumoto Guzan had written in 1803 that "here [in

Japan] 辨 is informally written 弁." Professor Zhāng took them to task with Tang examples like 弁認 (*biànrèn* distinguish), 弁別 (*biànbié* distinguish) and 弁色 (*biàn sè* distinguish the colour). Our admittedly incomplete Japanese records begin later with a 1057 land contract from Echigo Province, now in Tōdai temple, urging tenants to 弁済 (辨濟 *bensai* clear up debts).[34]

In China 弁 met some competition from the still shorter homonym 卞 (*biàn* impetuous). As late as in 1981 this author noticed both 卞证法 (辯证法 dialectics) and 弁证法 in the notes of Nanjing students.

標 标 *biāo* sign

The 覀-less 标 is on record from 1934, when Xú Zémǐn saw it used by his Nanjing students. The form became official in China in February 1956.

表 錶 *biǎo* watch

錶 is a novelty, according to *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn* first seen in the 1907 novel *Lǎocán yóujì* (Travels of an Old Decrepit). When 錶 became 表 in 1956, Professor Chén Wénbīn stated that "there are still many people in our society who write 表, not 錶, for 'clock'."

彆 别 *biè* awkward

别 is read *bié* and means 'different'. The 1956 Scheme let this character replace 彆. Chén Wénbīn wrote that use of 别 for 彆 "is very widespread", Chén Guāngyáo that this "has been common for a long time, for example when writing 彆扭 [*bièniu* awkward] as 别扭."

賓 宾 *賓 *bīn* guest

The structure of 賓 is unclear. 宀 is the house the guest comes to, obviously, and 貝 the gift he brings, but 𠂉? *Shuōwén* took its early shape 丂 for the phonetic 丏 *miàn*, later authorities for a man bowing to his host. Han stele writers rendered the centre as 卩 or 夕, their successors as 尸, 尹 or, beginning with the 528 Yuán Tì epitaph, as 𠂉, imitating *Shuōwén*'s 丏.

Even standardisers wavered. The 175 Xīpíng Stone Classics recommended 賓 with 卩, the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* 賓 with 尸, the 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* 賓 with 尹, the 837 *Jiǔjīng zìyàng* (Character Models of the Nine Classics)

---

34   Dunhuang scrolls S. 4571, S. 2682, P. 2292 and P. 2133. Zhang 2003, p. 356. *Enshū komonjo sen: Shōen hen*, item 5.

賓 with 尹, the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng*, 1008 *Guǎngyùn* and 1013 *Yùpiān* 寊 with 尸. The latter added that "賓 is the *Shuōwén* form for 寊", prompting the 1615 *Zìhuì* and 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* to prescribe 賓 with 尹. This directive converted some but far from all; *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* registers four Qing steles with 寊 and three with 寊 against two with the prescribed 賓.

Some found all these too elaborate. Qing blockprinters replaced the bulky bottom with the phonetic 兵 *bīng* and wrote 宾, a form which became official in China in 1956.

<div align="center">

濱 浜 滨 *bīn* shore
鑌 镔 *bīn* wrought iron
鬢 鬓 *bìn* hair on the temples
殯 殡 *bìn* carry to a funeral
檳 梹 槟 *bīng* betel nut

</div>

Japanese 浜 differs from Chinese 滨, but is nevertheless obviously a Chinese import, as Japanese 兵 *hei* or *hyō* makes no phonetic sense in 浜 *hin*. Nor is 浜 a shortened 滨. Counter-intuitively, the shorter forms with 兵 *bīng* are older than those with 宾 *bīn*. Liú Fù found 鬓 with 兵 in blockprints from the Yuan onwards but 殡 and 镔 with 宾 only from the Qing. The late appearance of forms with 宾 is no accident, as we know from the preceding section that 宾 did not exist before the Qing.

In 1935 *Tàibái* selected 浜 for its "handy characters" and the Education Ministry 滨 and 殡 for its List of Short Forms. The Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft followed the latter, adding 槟.

The calligrapher Liú Nǎizhōng pleaded in *Guāngmíng rìbào* for the simpler 梹, "the short form one is more accustomed to". Cáo Bóhán replied on behalf of the committee: "As 賓 becomes 宾, even other characters written with 賓 will be changed to 宾. The simpler 梹 and 浜 which are in use in society will not be adopted, since we must distinguish the 浜 in 洋涇浜 [*Yángjīng-bāng* Yangjing Creek] from the 滨 in 哈尔滨 [*Hā'ěrbīn* Harbin]." One Zhèng Yīnghàn praised 滨 and 槟 for being easier to learn, even if they "deviate from the 浜 and 梹 current in society".

This leaves the impression that the proposed 滨 and 槟 were unfamiliar to the public. Hardly so. 滨 appears in six of our 1940–1954 manuscripts compared with 浜 in two. The committee stuck to its 滨, 鬓, 殡 and 槟, even though it authorised them only in 1964.

These Qing inventions never made the crossing to Japan, where our 1900–1946 manuscripts contain twelve 浜 but no 滨. Unchallenged, 浜 became a Character for Current Use in 1946.

病 *疒 *bìng* sick

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed 疒 for 病. Records of 疒 for 病 were scanty: a 1960 report to the Script Reform Committee from Guangdong Education Bureau and a 1976 letter from a teacher in Gejiu in Yunnan. Fujian Education Bureau criticised 疒 for its "loose structure" and Tibet Script Reform Office for its "ugliness", helping to oust the form from the 1981 Revised Draft.

播 *㨂 *㧋 *bō* sow

The 'hand' on the left is a late addition, absent in the 番于下土 (sow on the ground) in the early Han Lǎo zǐ B manuscript but present in the 播 on Eastern Han steles.

The top 丿 appeared later, first in a 播 in the 626 Bólíng epitaph, but did not immediately become standard. The 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* said: "番 and 番 are read 煩 [*fán*]. The former is the *Shuōwén* form, the latter the shortened clerk style form used when copying the classics. Characters like 潘 [*Pān*] and 蕃 [*fán* multiply] are written with 番 釆 (采 claw) and 米 (米 rice), beginning with the 1008 *Guǎngùn* which prescribed 番 and 播 with 采. Writers were slow to convert; our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain eighteen forms with 采 but also eight with 米.

Then some adopted the shorter phonetic 布 *bù*. In Hubei Archives we find a 1956 plan by Xīngshān State Farm to 㧋后派专人芟理 (播后派專人管理 *bō hòu pài zhuānrén guǎnlǐ* sow and then assign persons in charge) and a note from Báidìgūyuè Farm in Tianmen County dealing with 早㧋问题 (the question of early sowing).[35] On 14 July 1958 the Hubei *Máchéng bào* carried the headline 趙金良同志作廣㧋講話 (Radio Speech by Comrade Zhào Jīnliáng). A 1960 letter from a teacher in Taishun in Zhejiang informed the Script Reform Committee that 㧋 had "a history of five to ten years". A likely birthplace for 㧋 is Shanghai, where 播 is read *pu* 52 and 布 *pu* 334 (numbers indicate tones on a scale from 1 to 5).

The committee included this 㧋 in its 1977 Second Scheme. Fujian Education Bureau, Zhejiang Education Bureau and Beijing Education Section pointed out that the 布 phonetic might lure pupils to misread 㧋 as *bù* and so impede tuition of the standard language. The committee took note and excluded 㧋 from its 1981 Revised Draft.

---

35   Hubei Archives SZ18-2-139.

薄 *莐 *bó* meagre *báo* thin *bò* peppermint

One may wonder why a character meaning 'thin' is burdened with components meaning 'grass' (艹), 'water' (氵), 'hand' (寸) and 'just now' (甫). Originally 薄 meant not 'thin' but 'interlaced branches', hence 艹. Its phonetic 溥 *pǔ* was the name of a river, hence 氵. The phonetic 尃 *fū* in that character meant 'spread out', hence 寸. 尃 was read *fū*, hence the phonetic 甫 *fǔ*.

Writers shunned the overloaded 薄. The early Han Lǎo zǐ B manuscript says a good man does not 居亓泊 (居其薄 rely on flimsiness) with the homonym 泊 (*bó* calm) for 薄, but also mentions 德溥而功厚者 (people with frail morals but great achievements) with the topless 溥 for 薄.

Others avoided 薄 by using the cursive form 𦬇, then 𦰩, then 𦳝. After 尃 became 专 based on cursive 㔄 in 1964, writers analogously began to write 莐 for 𦳝/薄.

Liú Fù found 薄 written 菏 with a 泊 *bó* phonetic in a 1796–1820 blockprint of *Jīn Píng Méi* (The Story of Jīnlián, Píng'ér and Chūnméi) and in an 1862–1820 print of *Lǐngnán yìshǐ* (A Tale from South of the Ridges). In 1960 two letters from Guangzhou informed the Script Reform Committee that locals wrote 菏 for 薄. In 1981 this author saw 咸菏荷 (*xián bòhe* salty peppermints) for sale in Shantou and in 1986 菏膜 (*báomó* film) in Jiangmen. Our modern records of 菏 are thus all from Guangdong. Interviews conducted in 1981–1986 showed that 菏 had lived on only in the extreme south.[36]

The Northeast boasted a form of its own. In 1982 signs outside workshops in Shenyang and Dalian advertised 苀板 (薄板 sheet metal) and 苀铁 (iron plates). Interviews confirmed that this 苀 was known only in the Northeast.[37] This was no accident. 苀 is an analogy to the 筄 often used for 簿 in Japan (see *bù*) and presumably in pre-1945 Manchuria.

The committee proposed in 1962 to simplify 薄 to the traditional but retreating 菏, in 1977 to 莐, the common 莐 with an additional 丶 on the right, obviously in an attempt to distinguish the 尃 component from 專 which was now 专. 莐 without 丶 nevertheless remained the common form.

---

36 菏 identified as 薄 in Huizhou, Shaoguan and Shantou but not Jiangmen in Guangdong, in Nanning, Wuzhou and Yulin but not Beihai and Guilin in Guangxi and in Xiamen but not Fuzhou, Longyan and Yong'an in Fujian. Not identified in neighbouring Guizhou, Hunan, Jiangxi and Zhejiang.

37 苀 identified as 薄 in Qiqihar and Daolu but not Yichun in Heilongjiang, in Changchun and Tonghua in Jilin and in Shenyang and Anshan but not Dalian in Liaoning. Not identified in neighbouring Shanhaiguan, Beijing, Tianjin and Baotou or further south.

萏 卜 *bo* radish

卜 (*bǔ* to divine) officially replaced 萏 in February 1956. We can trace this practice to a 1920 Changchun police report about a girl who had been abducted on her way to buy 醬萝卜 (*jiàngluóbo* pickled radish).[38]

補 补 *bǔ* mend

In 1934 Xú Zémǐn found that his students wrote 补 for 補 when hurried. The practice became official in February 1956.

簿 *箁 *筝 *bù* register

We saw in the 笔 *bǐ* section that 'bamboo' tops tend to become 'grass'. This affected even 簿, which thus came to merge with 薄 *bó*. Juyan wood slip 198.19 from 55 BCE says 平柀兵薄 (*zú bèi bīngbù* the soldiers were enrolled in the military register). Such fusion of 簿 and 薄 was long routine. Umehara Seizan's register of Later Wei inscriptions contains eight 薄 with 卄 or 丷 for 'register' but only one 簿 with ⺮. The Tang *Gānlù zìshū* reminded writers: "簿薄; the former is the 簿 in 簿籍 [*bùjí* records], the latter the 薄 in 厚薄 [*hòubó* thickness]." Such warnings restrained but did not eradicate fusion. As late as in 1994 visitors to the National Library of China were invited to write their mind in a 读者意见薄 (*dúzhě yìjiànbù* readers' opinion book).

In 1962 Xiāo Tiānzhù criticised self-made characters, but described 箁 with a 布 *bù* phonetic as a "relatively sensible" form of 簿. The Script Reform Committee agreed and included 箁 in its 1962 List of Simplified Characters and List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme, but excluded it from its 1981 Revised Draft.

Japan had a short form of its own. In 1963 Language Council chairman Abe Shinnosuke reported to the education minister: "As for the List of Forms, we need to consider the adoption of suitable short forms used to some extent in society today but not included in the List of Forms […] like […] 峀 (留), 才 (第), 筝 (簿) […]." This 筝 is a near-analogy to Japanese 伝 for 傳 and 転 for 轉. Unlike 箁, 筝 is known to have been used, first on a receipt of a 原筝 (*genbo* ledger) dated 1944.3.3 now in the National Archives. In 2014–2017 筝 was identified by six of our twenty-four Japanese informants.

---

38   Beijing Archives J181-19-31013, p. 50. The report says she finally did get home to Beijing.

部 *卩 *bù* part

The late sixth-century Changansông city wall near Pyongyang is inscribed 漢城下後卩 (the back part of Hansông) and a sword from the contemporary Japanese Okadayama grave 各田卩臣 (額田部臣 *Nukata be no omi* the retainer in charge of the Nukata guild).[39] Japanese use of 卩 for 部 continued. In 1750 Kondō Saigai related: "卩 is an erroneous character customarily used in Japan. It should be written 部. It is the 阝 on the right turned into 卩." In 1910 Kuroyanagi Isao of Wakayama Middle School more liberally declared he would not deduct points from pupils who wrote irregularities like 卩 for 部. The question of right and wrong faded away as this came to be our last Japanese record of 卩.

Chinese writers found even more use for the handy 卩, which appears for 爺 (*yé* old man) in Qing blockprints and account books, for 磅 on a late Qing shipping receipt for 乌梅七卩 (*wūméi qī bàng* seven pounds of smoked plums) and for 脚 (*jiǎo* foot) in the phrase 卩夫 (*jiǎofū* porter) in a 1921 description of the Chaozhou dialect.[40] The 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn* said 卩 was used for 部 or 簸 (*bù* basket) in shops and for 磅, 節 or 跟 (*gēn* piece of) elsewhere. In 1934 Hú Xíngzhī registered 卩 for 脚, Xú Zémǐn for 磅 and Hǎi Gē for 爺.

No wonder 1935 reformers wavered. The *Tàibái* editors chose to use 卩 for 磅, while the Education Ministry's List of Short Forms avoided "forms used for different characters, like 广 which stands for 廣 [*guǎng* wide] but also for 慶 [*qìng* celebrate], and 卩 which stands for 爺 but also for 部."

And more was to be added. In 1951 the Hubei cadre Yuán Zhèn complained in *Dàgōng bào* (Impartial Daily) of a 丽光彡卩 (麗光影院 *Lìguāng yǐngyuàn* Brightness Movie Theatre) sign. In 1957 the Zhejiang teacher Fán Jiāng informed *Guāngmíng rìbào* that his pupils wrote 卄卩 for 革命 (*gémìng* revolution).

By 1955 reformers had thus seen 卩 for 部, 磅, 簸, 跟, 脚, 爺 and 院. On top of this the philologist Bào Yòuwén proposed to adopt 卩 for 節 "in accordance with the ancient [1013 *Yùpiān*] form". Understandably, the 1956 Scheme passed 卩 over.

In fact practice had become more uniform than these testimonies suggest; in our 1950–1954 manuscripts we find twenty 卩 for 部 but none for other characters. We might therefore expect the more radical 1962 List of Simplified Characters to contain 卩 for 部. Instead it proposed 阝, a less common variant

---

39 Tanaka 1985, pp. 125, 135–136. *Nihon kofun daijiten.*
40 Liu 1930, p. 93. Beijing Archives J106-1-1. *Shina keizai zensho*, vol. 3. Jiang 1921, p. 173.

first mentioned in 1951 by Bái Jùnrú. The more common 卜 was included in the 1977 Second Scheme but excluded from the 1981 Revised Draft.

纔 才 *cái* only

Abstract words were a problem for early scribes, who for 'only' borrowed the homonym 纔 *cái* which originally meant, says *Shuōwén*, "the colour of the head of a silk-finch." Not surprisingly their successors sought simpler ways. The 158 CE Sūn Shū'áo stele says 各遣一子財八九歲 (each sent one son aged just eight or nine years) with 財 (*cái* fortune) for 纔, the 179 Guō Mín stele has 頌裁足 (only a eulogy will do) with 裁 (*cái* cut cloth) and the 648 *Jìnshū* (Book of the Jin) says 惟正月才生魄 (*wéi zhèngyuè shēng bó* only the first month of the year produces the first new moon) with 才 (*cái* talent). The latter became common and then official in 1956.

菜 *芽 *cài* vegetable

In 1963 Wú Nánxīng described a stroll in Beijing:

> Above me were ten large characters: 拥和宫大亍商店青芽卩. I looked at the sign and sure enough it contained some characters unknown to me. True, some of them could be made out from the context. 拥和宫 was 雍和宫 [*Yōnghégōng* the Lama Temple] of course, 大亍 must be 大街, these were no problem. It was only 青芽卩 which I could not make out at first, what on earth was that? Still pondering, I went inside the shop and looked. It turned out that it sold vegetables. Only then did I realise that 青芽卩 must be short for 青菜部 [*qīngcài bù* vegetables section].

Unfamiliarity with 芽 was excusable. Our first record of this later so common form is a 1959 *Wénzì gǎigé* article where Liú Hé mentioned 芽 among "simplified characters created by the masses". The form then spread fast, however. In 1960 芽 was reported to the Script Reform Committee from Baotou in Inner Mongolia in the north to Yangchun in Guangdong in the south. In 1961 Wén Bīng mentioned 芽 among characters "in common use all over the country".

Some writers saved even more strokes. Wú continued: "In many restaurants one can see all kinds of strange characters on the menu, like 米反, 代亍, 九才 [...]. Even if your education level is high as the sky, can you at a glance make out that this means 米飯 [*mǐfàn* rice], 帶魚 [*daìyú* hairtail], 韭菜 [*jiǔcài* chives] [...]?"

The committee included 芽 in its 1962 and 1977 schemes but not in its 1981 Revised Draft.

蔡 *芋 Cài

List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme proposed to merge 蔡 with 菜 to 芋. Reactions were negative. Zhejiang Education Bureau pointed out that "one does not know whether 邻家的小芋好 means 'our neighbour Cài is a nice person' or 'our neighbour's pickles are tasty'", Shanghai Interim Script Reform Leading Group that "the masses have not responded positively" and Shandong Education Bureau that "comrades named Cài have objections." Only Beijing Education Section registered some support for the proposal: "Some say that if replacing 蔡 with 芋 is disrespectful to people named Cài, then how should one deal with names like Niú [Cow] and Mǎ [Horse]?" Needless to say, the merger was excluded from the 1981 Revised Draft.

A local alternative existed. In 1975 staff of Huzhou Middle School in northern Zhejiang wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Some of the new short forms used in the countryside are based on dialect and do not comply with the need for a standard for character simplification. In the Wu dialect [...] 尺 *chǐ* [inch], 察 *chá* [examine], 插 *chā* [insert] and 蔡 *caì* are all read *cā*, so forms like 宀 (察), 扠 (插) and 艿 (蔡) have emerged."[41] Readings were not quite identical. In the Wu dialects of Zhejiang, Shanghai and southern Jiangsu 尺 ends in a glottal stop, 蔡 does not. However, when Wu speakers switch to standard language, they drop their rustic glottal stop and read 尺 much like 蔡. 艿 did not spread far; in 1981–1986 the form was recognised only by informants in Huzhou and Shaoxing in northern Zhejiang and Suzhou, Wuxi and Yixing in southernmost Jiangsu.

參 参 cān join

參 officially became 参 in Japan in 1946 and in China in 1956. 一 for 厸 begin with a 厽 in the 664 Yuán Hóngyì epitaph, and 厶 for 厺 goes back to Yuan blockprints.

The 小 (heart) in the Yuán Hóngyì epitaph, and elsewhere, is not an older form of 彡, but an attempt to confer some logic on this cryptic character, which had since the early Han mostly been written 參 with 小 below. Neither 小 nor 小 bottoms were compatible with *Shuōwén*, however, which said the phonetic was 彡 (*zhěn* thick hair). Later commentators have doubted this etymology; already the 986 *Shuōwén* editors added: "参 is not phonetic. Its role is obscure." The 837 *Jiǔjīng zìyàng* nevertheless took *Shuōwén* at its word, prescribed 彡 and was followed by later dictionaries. With time even

---

41 Zhejiang sheng Huzhou zhongxue 1975.

writers complied. Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain twenty-seven 參 against two 糸, two 仐 and one 糸.

餐 *飡 *飡 *歺 *cān* eat

The 1955 Draft proposed to simplify 餐 to 飡. Records of 飡 or 飡 begin on Western Han wood slips, preceding those of 餐 which begin with *Shuōwén*, which held 餐 and 飡 for variants. Thereafter the forms competed. Han to Qing inscriptions in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contain eleven 飡, ten 飡 and ten 餐, the latter often with the top left 歺 reduced to 歹, 夕 or 又.

After the publication of the Draft a letter from a group of teachers in Changsha urged the Script Reform Committee to simplify 餐 more thoroughly to 歺, a novelty we first see in an August 1949 list of 歺費 (*cānfèi* meal expenses) of war prisoners in Bengbu in Anhui.[42]

The committee did not adopt 歺 at the time, but the public did. In 1957 the committee member Wèi Jiàngōng wrote: "Now there are some creations in the streets again, like 廷, 宙 and 歺 which are used for 鞋 [*xié* shoes], 賽 and 飡." In 1960 the committee received reports of use of 歺 from Baotou in Inner Mongolia in the north to Pingnan in Guangxi in the south. The committee abandoned 飡, proposing the shorter 歺 in its abortive 1962, 1977 and 1981 schemes.

蠶 蚕 *cán* silkworm

The now official 蚕 is a 蠶 minus 旡, 丿, 日 and 虫. The missing components did not go in one blast. One 虫 is missing on our earliest 蠶 seen on an Eastern Han wood slip, 日 on the 186 Zhāng Qiān stele, the left 丿 in 旡 in the 506–507 Lady Lú epitaph and one 天 on the 563 Ālùjiāo cūn statue. The 1008 *Guǎngyùn* complained: "蠶 is informally written 蚕. This is wrong." To little avail; the wrong form appeared in blockprints from the Song, in typeprint from the Ming, in Japanese dictionaries from 1946 and in Chinese ones from 1956.[43]

---

42   1955 letter from Changsha. *Anhui geming shi huace*, p. 276.
43   Liu 1930, p. 70. *Zhongguo banke tulu*, vol. 7, item 632.

殘 殘 残 *cán* damage
賤 賎 贱 *jiàn* cheap
淺 浅 浅 *qiǎn* shallow
綫 綫 线 *xiàn* thread

Shuōwén says 戔, an image of two halberds, means 'injure', regarding it as the original form of 殘. After adding 歹, scribes took to reducing the original 戔 component, which became 戋 in a 㦖 on the 458 Cuàn Lóngyán stele, 㦮 in a 殘 in the 783 Sòng Yǎn epitaph and 戋 in a 1939 party call urging the New Fourth Army to adhere to the guerrilla 路线 (line).[44]

戔 deposed 㦮 and kept 戋 at bay; our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain seventeen 綫 against two 綫 and no 綫. The Script Reform Committee nevertheless chose the shorter component, recognising 残, 贱, 浅 and 线 in 1964.

The shorter 戋 never spread to Japan, where our 1940–1946 manuscripts hold thirteen 残 or 浅 but no 残 or 浅. Predictably 残, 賎 and 浅 became official in 1946.

Short forms of the analogous 錢 *qián* are described in that section.

燦 灿 *粲 *càn* brilliant

粲 with 'rice' originally meant 'fine grain' but came to be borrowed for 'bright'. Some writers added 'fire' and wrote 燦. Dictionaries entered both, like the 1952 *Rénmín xīn zìdiǎn* (The People's New Dictionary) which defined 粲 a 鲜明 (*xiānmíng* bright) and 燦 as 光彩 (*guāngcǎi* lustre).

The Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft disregarded such subtleties and proposed to retain the shorter 粲 only. One Wú Jìng objected in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that 粲 was not simple enough, pointing out that "the custom of writing [...] 燦 as 奵 [...] is already established in society." The committee took note and chose a shorter form for 燦 for its 1956 Scheme. Not Wú's 奵, however, but 灿 with the phonetic 山 *shān*.

We have no prior record of this 灿. The reformer Chén Guāngyáo asserted that 灿 was "established by custom", whereas Zhào Tàimóu of Shandong University listed 灿 among "hitherto unseen or newly created short forms." Cáo Bóhán defended 灿 in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "Some people believe that the characters in the Draft which they do not know have been created by the editors of the Draft. This is inconsistent with the facts. The reason that they do not know them is that some characters have been used only to a limited extent. For example [...] 灿 (燦) is used in parts of Shandong and Zhejiang [...]."

Cáo did not explain how 灿 could have come into use in such disparate

---

44   *Dajiang nanbei*, p. 59.

areas. On top of its unfamiliarity, 灿 was criticised by Qiū Chángnù of Northeast Normal University for luring learners to read *shān*. Unsurprisingly the legalisation of 灿 was delayed until 1964.

倉 仓 *cāng* storehouse
滄 沧 *cāng* dark blue
蒼 苍 *cāng* dark green
創 创 *chuàng* start
槍 枪 *qiāng* gun
搶 抢 *qiǎng* rob

Liú Fù found 仓, 沧 and 苍 for 倉, 滄 and 蒼 in Qing blockprints. 仓 is not a plausible descendant of 倉. Most likely the first 仓 writer had seen the passage "仝: odd form of 倉" in *Shuōwén* and remoulded 仝 into square style.

In any case 仓 remained in use, appearing in three of our 1900–1954 manuscripts alongside one 创, six 枪 and five 抢. Nevertheless the 1955 Draft proposed the formerly unknown 仓, 创, 沧, 苍, 枪 and 抢. Cáo Bóhán explained in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "In order to distinguish 淪 [*lún* sink] from 滄 we decided to simplify 淪 to 沦 and 滄 to 沧 and treat all characters written with 侖 and 倉 analogously."

All agreed to the latter statement. The Script Reform Committee member Wèi Jiàngōng mentioned 仓 among "newly created forms" and Jīn Míngshèng among "characters simply made up by the Script Reform Committee". At a meeting of the Chinese Association for Promoting Democracy "some comrades thought the introduction of 仓 for 倉 could be postponed, since it might create problems with understanding."[45] The proofreader Zhào Xī advocated 仓, 创, 苍, 沧 and 枪, which were "more in accordance with the masses' longstanding habits." These reservations explain the delayed legalisation of 仓 and 枪 in 1959 and of 创, 沧, 苍 and 抢 in 1964.

Forms with 仓 were still common in the 1990s. As late as in 1998 *Xiàndài Hànyǔ guīfàn zìdiǎn* (Normative Dictionary of Modern Chinese) reminded writers: "沧 is different from 沦. The right side of 沧 is 仓, that of 沦 is 仑."

藏 蔵 *芷 *cáng* conceal

See 藏 *zàng*.

---

45   "Zhongguo minzhu cujinhui".

厠 厕 *� 厕 cè lavatory

The 广 (wall) component has tended to become 厂 (cliff) at least since the Tang. The 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* cautioned: "廚 [*chú* kitchen] is informally written 厨. This is wrong." The Yuan *Zìjiàn* repeated: "*Shuōwén* says 广 means 'building'. It is different from 厂 which is read 罕 [*hǎn*]. 廳 [*tīng* hall], 廂 [*xiāng* room], 廨 [*xiè* mandarin's office], 廈 [*shà* tower], 廛 [*chán* family patch], 厠, 廚 and 廄 [*jiù* stable] are written with 广. To mix up these components and write with 厂 is wrong."

Theoreticians fought a losing battle. The 1916 *Zhōnghuá dà zìdiǎn* said "厕, same as 厠," the 1952 *Rénmín xīn zìdiǎn* "厦, same as 廈" and "厮, same as 廝 [*sī* servant]." In 1954 Xú Huàwén suggested in *Zhōngguó yǔwén* that all 广 be shortened to 厂. The 1955 Draft List of 400 Retained and Abolished Variants suggested replacing 厠, 廚 and 廈 with 厕, 厨 and 厦. The decisive First List of Regulated Variants added 厢 and 厮. In 1964 厕 became 厕 as all 貝 became 贝.

By then an alternative form had turned up. In 1960 a letter from Guangdong Education Bureau informed the Script Reform Committee that there were those who wrote 厕 as � "in parts of Guangdong Province". The following year teachers at Dongguan Normal School, also in Guangdong, mentioned � among "common irregular simplified characters" in a *Nánfāng rìbào* (Southern Daily) article. In 1981 and 1982 this author saw �所 (toilets) and 男� (gents) in Guangzhou, Shaoguan and Zhaoqing in Guangdong and Wuzhou in eastern Guangxi and in 1986 in Yangjiang and Zhongshan in Guangdong and Ruijin in southern Jiangxi. In 1981–1986 � was identified by informants in Guangdong and Guangxi but not elsewhere.[46] Unsurprisingly, as the 次 phonetic is read *tʃi* in Cantonese and so fits 厕 *tʃi* in Cantonese-speaking Guangdong and Guangxi but not elsewhere.

㟃 has since then disappeared from the cityscape. In 2014 Guangzhou informants could not identify the form.

層 層 层 céng layer

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council changed 層 with 曾 to 層 with 曽. Forms with 田 are actually the older, descending from Zhou 曽, 曽 and 曽. If we see these as primary forms of 甑 (*zèng* rice kettle), they make sense as

---

46 次 identified as 厕 in Guangzhou, Jiangmen, Zhaoqing, Shaoguan and Meixian in Guangdong and in Nanning, Guilin and Wuzhou but not Yulin in Guangxi. Not identified in ten places in neighbouring Fujian, Jiangxi, Hunan, Guizhou and Yunnan.

depictions of vapour (八) from a kettle (田) on a stove (曰), which was then borrowed for 'add', 'before', 'layer' and 'and so'. The Han clerk form 曾 kept 田.

Xǔ Shèn saw no kettle in 曾, but formulated an etymology fitting the borrowed sense of 'and so': "曾 extends the statement. It consists of 曰 [speech], 八 [split] and the phonetic 囱, […] the ancient form of 囱 [*cōng* chimney]." This etymology required 囱 in 曾 and 層.

Xǔ's contemporaries ignored his directive. Luó Fúyí listed six 曾 on Han seals, all with ⊕. Fushimi Chūkei recorded twenty 曾, 增 or 贈 on Han to Jin steles, all with 田. 曾 with the prescribed 囱 does not turn up until the Later Wei. Many continued to write with 田, however, also in Japan, where 増, 贈, 僧 [*sō* monk] and 憎 [*zō* detest] became official in 1949.

Such trivial reforms did not interest the Script Reform Committee of China, which had spotted shorter ways out. In 1943 a handwritten declaration by the Administrative Office of Southern Jiangsu called on 各社会阶层 (*gè shèhuì jiēcéng* every social stratum) to join the resistance against Japan.[47] In 1950 Huáng Ruòzhōu, writing in the Shanghai *Wénhuì bào*, reported seing 尺 for 層. 层 is an analogy to the older 会 for 會, while 尺 employs the phonetic 人, read *zən* 24 in Shanghai, like 層.

层 seems to have been the more common form, appearing in two of our 1940–1954 manuscripts compared with 尺 in none. The committee duly chose 层 for its 1955 Draft. Yùn Huī and Jùn Tāo argued in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that 尺 was shorter and better. The committee nevertheless adopted 层 in 1959.

尺 records cease with a 1976 letter to the committee from a correspondent in Huzhou in Zhejiang. No recent informant has identified 尺 as 层.

插 *挿 *chā* insert

插 consists of a pestle (千) pounding a mortar (臼) and a hand (扌) which is probably a late addition. Some contracted 臼 to 曰 to write 挿, a form the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* listed as correct. Later dictionaries prescribed the more etymological 插.

Alternatives turned up late. 扦 without 臼 was reported in 1960 letters to the committee from Hanzhong in the north to Zhongshan in the south. In 1982 this author saw price tags on 扠头 (*chātóu* plugs) or 扠座 (*chāzuò* sockets) with 扠 (*chā* to spear) for 插 in Taiyuan in Shanxi, Luoyang in Henan, Sùzhou in Anhui and Lianyungang in Jiangsu. In the 蔡 *Cài* section we saw that by 1975 "new short forms like like 宀 (察), 扙 (插) and 艻 (蔡) have emerged" in Huzhou in Zhejiang, since "in the Wu dialect […] 尺 *chǐ*, 察 *chá*,

---

47 *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 110.

插 *chā* and 蔡 *cài* are all read *cā*." Indeed 択 was a local form, identified in 1982 as 插 by informants in Huzhou and Hangzhou in northern Zhejiang, in Shanghai and in Nantong in near Shanghai but unknown further north, west and south.

In 1981 the Japanese Language Council included 挿 with 曰 in its List of Characters for Common Use. There had been some promotion of 挿 even in China. In 1952 *Xué wénhuà zìdiǎn* (The Learn to Read Dictionary) called 挿 "the short form of 插" and *Rénmín xīn zìdiǎn* "the same as 插." The 1956 Scheme, however, passed 挿 over. List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme mooted �, a form based on a *Shuōwén* variant, but the idea was abandoned in the 1981 Revised Draft.

扦 has lived on. In 2014 Jiāng Màoyǒu mentioned 扦 among "Characters which people in Yancheng [in Jiangsu] often miswrite". The same year this author saw 移动扦座 (*yídòng chātóu* mobile sockets) on offer in Foshan in Guangdong.

In Japan 択 is used for 擇 *taku,* as we shall see in the *zé* section.

<h2 style="text-align:center">察 *宊 chá examine</h2>

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed to change 察 to 宊 with a 叉 *chā* phonetic, a form mentioned in 1960 letters to the Script Reform Committee from Baoding in the north to Guangzhou in the south.

As we saw in the preceding section, new short forms like 宊 (察), 択 (插) and 芢 (蔡) had by 1975 appeared in Huzhou and the Wu dialect area, where these characters are read *ts'aʔ* like 尺. 宊 was somewhat older, mentioned already in 1960 letters to the committee from Xiamen, Zhangzhou, Pucheng and Songxi in Fujian, Wuhua in Guangdong and Yancheng in Jiangsu. In 1981 this writer read about a 叫宊队 (纠察队 *jiūcháduì* order maintenance patrol) on a billboard in Shanghai, a 市宊院 (*shì cháyuàn* city procuratorate) on one in Xiamen and 观宊 (*guānchá* observations) on one in Quanzhou in Fujian.

We would not expect to find 宊 in Fujian and Guangdong, where 尺 ends in *-k* and 察 in *-t.* Could these observations be accidental? No, informants in Fuzhou, Xiamen, Longyan, Dehua and Zhangzhou in Fujian identified 宊 as 察 (as did, more expectedly, informants in Zhejiang, Jiangsu and Shanghai). Presumably 宊 spread south from the Wu area, filling a need in Fujian and Guangdong where 叉, which had no consonant ending, was even less fit as a phonetic in 察.

攙 搀 *chān* to help by the hand
讒 谗 *chán* slander
饞 馋 *chán* greed
巉 *屶 *Chán*

Shuōwén says the phonetic 毚 means "a dexterous and swift hare" and consists of 毚, "an animal similar to a hare, dark and big […] with a head like a hare and legs like a deer" on top of a 兔 (hare). Writers found the former hard to envisage and depict. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* registers forms with double 兔 on ten Jin to Tang steles compared with 毚 and 兔 on four.

Writing with two 兔 opened the possibility of replacing one with the repetition mark 〻. 讒 appears in blockprints from the Song and 搀 and 饞 from the Yuan onwards. The reduced 搀, 谗 and 馋 became official in 1959. The delay may have been due to doubts how to deal with the components 訁 and 飠 in the latter two.

The unusual 巉 was left as it was. The inhabitants of Chanshan near Qingdao then took the matter in their own hands. In 1982 this author saw Qingdao buses bound for 屶山, which passengers confidently rode. This near-analogy to 才 for 毚 is on record since 1974, when one Jì Gébào campaigned for 屶 in *Guāngmíng rìbào*.

纏 *纒 缠 *chán* entangle

Shuōwén says the phonetic 廛 (*chán* farm) depicts a village (里) house (广) on allotted (八) land (土). Few writers squeezed all this in. Luó Fúyí registered a 纒 (纒) without 八 on a Han seal. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* of Han to Qing steles contains one hundred and twenty-five 纏, ten 纒 and two 纒. 纒 with its top- and bottomless right side was recommended by the Tang *Zhèngmíng yàolù* and accepted as a variant by the Song *Jíyùn* and Qing *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*.

Not surprisingly, the 1955 Draft advocated this somewhat shortened 纒. More surprisingly the 1956 Scheme advised 缠 with a 丶 top, a form absent in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* as well as in Liú Fù's *Sòng-Yuán yǐlai súzì pǔ*. Lǐ Lèyí of the State Language Commission later explained: "This was because use of 厘 for 釐 *lí* was already established by custom, so an extra point could avert mixing up." Thus obviously controversial, 缠 was not awarded official status until 1964. As late as in 1998 *Xiàndài Hànyǔ guīfàn zìdiǎn* reminded writers: "The right side of 缠 is 廛 (*chán*), not 厘."

產 产 *chǎn* produce

产 appears in a 1943 call by the Administrative Office of Southern Jiangsu to 发展农業生产 (develop agricultural production).[48]

At the October 1955 script reform conference the Script Reform Committee member Yè Gōngchuò quoted criticism that the proposed "厂, 产 and 严 [嚴 *yán* severe] do not stand straight and look like falling over," countering that "there will be no problem as one gets used to them." Doubts nevertheless delayed the official status of 产 and 严 until June 1956.

Apart from lacking 生, the new dictionary form differed by having a 立, not 文 top. Perhaps surprisingly, this 立 top had been universal in Han clerk style and early square style. Umehara Seizan registers seven Tang 産 with 立 but none with 文. The snag with the 立 top was that it was inconsistent with Zhou seal forms and, crucially, with *Shuōwén*, which had a distinct 夊 (文) top. Following that authority, the Yuan *Zìjiàn* and Ming *Súshū kānwù* pronounced 立 wrong, and was followed by *Zìhuì* and *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*. established the 産 norm which held sway until 1946 in Japan and 1956 in China.

懺 懴 忏 *chàn* repent

See 纖 *xiān*.

長 长 *キ *长 *cháng* long *zhǎng* grow
張 张 *zhāng* display

On Han wood slips 長 is rendered 長, 镸, 镸, 长 or 仈, in Yuan and Qing blockprints 镸, 镸, 击, キ or 歩, and in our 1900–1954 manuscripts 长 (thirty-five times), 长 (thirty-two times), 歩 (thirteen times) or 长 (five times).

For its 1935 List of Short Forms the Education Ministry chose neither of the latter but the キ which reformers knew from Liú Fù's 1930 register of blockprinted forms. The Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft changed this to 击. Duàn Dàpéng objected in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "击 is hard to write. The masses of the countryside write 歩." Liú Kuímín argued in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "击 is easily mixed up with 去. I think it is better to write 長 as 长." Zhāng Décún and Xú Chuánxíng made the same point in *Yǔwén zhīshí*. The committee took note, letting Yè Gōngchuò announce a change to 长 at the October script reform conference. The 1956 Scheme, however, introduced 长, a further tilted 击, which became official in 1959.

This 长 was close to the classic cursive 长, but not to the common square

48 *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 110.

forms 镸, 长, 長 and ぢ. So grumbles continued. Zhāng Ruìlín cared about his surname: "张 is impractical to write. In fact many still write the 伥 which people often used before." Qī Chángshùn worried about his middle name: "长 is hard to write correctly. […] If we change 長 to 长 it will be easier to get right. Without ⼃ the character is ugly and difficult to write, as one tends to add ⼃ by habit." Zhāng Ruìlín related in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "All our pupils write 长 for 长. Would it be possible to recognise that form?"

It was not, but a 1982 article by the *Wénzì gǎigé* editors did admit that 长 "is a newly created component, moreover one easily splits the vertical stroke into one upper and one lower stroke [writing 长]." The 1998 *Xiàndài Hànyǔ guīfàn zìdiǎn* reminded writers: "The stroke order is ⼃一㇙长, in four strokes." Many stuck to other stroke orders, however, as we shall see in Chapter 4:5.

嘗 尝 *嚐 *cháng* taste

In 1923 and 1926 the Interim Committee on the Japanese Language proposed to simplify 嘗 to 甞. The idea was abandoned in later schemes.

Shuōwén said: "𣅃 [嘗]: taste. Consists of 旨 [beautiful] and the phonetic 尚 [*shàng*]." Han scribes ignored it, writing 甞, 甞, 甞 or 嘗. The 甘-bottomed 甞 became the common form and was the one recommended by the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* and Tang *Yùpiān*. The first 嘗 with 旨 in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* turns up on the 780 CE Yán Family Temple stele. The 837 *Jiǔjīng zìyàng* explained: "嘗甞: the former is the *Shuōwén* form, the latter the shortened clerk style form." The *Shuōwén*-like 嘗 became official only with the 1615 *Zìhuì*.

The new standard form was congested. Yuan blockprinters came up with 尝, a square version of the cursive 嘗. This 尝 became official with the 1956 Scheme.

償 偿 *cháng* repay

Initially 'repay' was written without the 'man' on the left, identically with the cognate 賞 (*shǎng* to reward), as on the tenth-century BCE Hū tripod whose author was compelled to 賞馬 (賞馬 repay a horse). 亻 was added by the Western Han, when we find the enlarged 償 on wood slip contracts from Juyan.

The 1956 Scheme shortened 償 to 偿. This 偿 was mentioned in Róng Gēng's 1936 *Jiǎntǐ zìdiǎn* but seems to have been little known. In 1956 the reformer Chén Guāngyáo described 偿 not as 'a character established by custom' but less assertively as "a new picto-phonetic character, written with 亻(人) and the phonetic 尝. […] In order to make the character easy to read, the phonetic of 償 has been changed to 尝."

腸 肠 *膓 *肠 *膓 *肠 *肠 *肠 *坊 *坊 *坊 *膓 *膓 腸 肠 *膓 *肠 *肠 *肠 *肠 *膓 *坊 *坊 *坊 *膓 *膓 腸 肠 *膓 *肠 *肠 *肠 *肠 *膓 *坊 *坊 *坊 *膓 *膓

<div align="center">

腸 肠 *膓 *肠 *chǎng* intestines

場 场 *塲 *场 *坊 *chǎng* place

</div>

Thorough dictionaries enter parallel complex forms, 腸/膓 and 場/塲 . The shorter variants with the original phonetic 昜 *yáng* appear on Western Han wood slips, preceding 塲 which appears on Eastern Han stone steles. The addition of 宀 may have been influenced by the 宀 in 傷 (*shāng* wound).

坊, the beginning and end of 塲, appeared in the 1930s, first in Róng Gēng's 1936 *Jiǎntǐ zìdiǎn*, together with the analogous 伤 for 傷. 坊 quickly became the common short form, appearing in twenty-nine of our 1935–1954 manuscripts compared with 场 in one and 场 in one.

The 1935 List of Short Forms proposed the cursive-based 肠 and 场, the 1955 Draft 坊 and 膓 and the 1956 Scheme 肠 and 场, retaining the analogy to 扬 for 揚 (*yáng* raise) and 杨 for 楊 (*yáng* poplar) rather than that to 伤 for 傷. 坊 turned out to be one of the most resilient of all rejected variants, appearing for example in five of our 1970–1979 manuscripts compared with the official 场 in one, as shown in Chapter 4:5.

An arguably simpler form has existed of 肠. In 1981 this writer saw a price notice for 廣肮 (*guǎngcháng* intestines) in Nanjing and one for 猪大肮 (*zhū dàcháng* pork intestines) in Jinhua in Zhejiang. This 肮 was identified as 场 by informants in Shanghai, northern Zhejiang and southern Jiangsu but not further north, west and south.[49] The initial of the 丈 *zhàng* phonetic fits 肠 *cháng* badly in the standard language but better in Wu dialects, in which both 肠 and 丈 have voiced initials. The two still differ in tone, except in Shanghai where even and departing tones merge and 肠 and 丈 merge to *zaŋ* 113. Presumably 肮 originated in Shanghai and then spread. Today it is unknown to all informants.

<div align="center">

廠 厂 *厰 *chǎng* factory

</div>

Before the reform the above-mentioned proofreader Zhào Xī had seen 廠 written 厎, 广, 厂, 仄 (misprint for 仄?) and 厓. 厎 is first seen in the early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì* (The Story of Mùlián), 广 in a 1948 Beijing survey of 广内 (inside-factory) staff, 厂 in a 1949 report on a Beijing 车厂 (vehicle plant), 仄 in a 1954 list of union delegates from a Hangzhou 纺织仄 (textile mill) and 厓 in Zhào's 1955 article.[50]

厂 was the more common form, appearing for 廠 in thirty-seven of our

---

49   肮 identified as 场 in Shanghai and in Hangzhou, Huzhou, Jiaxing, Shaoxing, Ningbo, Jinhua and Linhai but not Wenzhou and Lishui in Zhejiang. Unknown in other provinces.
50   Liu 1930, p. 23. Beijing Archives 87-7-2, p. 6; 101-1-244, p. 29. Hangzhou Archives 230-1-68, p. 64.

1950–1954 manuscripts against 广 in five, 仄 in one, 仄 in one and 厊 and 厊 in none. For its 1955 Draft the Script Reform Committee duly chose 厂.

One Zhào Yǒngshǎng urged in *Yǔwén zhīshí* to instead "change 厂 to 广 and 歷 [*lì* history] to 厂, because everybody writes the 厂 in 厂史 [歷史 *lìshǐ*] like this." Not quite everybody; our 1940–1954 manuscripts contain three 厂史 among eight 历史. The committee followed the majority, sanctioning 厂 for 廠 in February 1956 and 历 for 歷 four months later.

仄 lived on. In 1962 Zhāng Yǒngmián reported in *Wénzì gǎigé* that Zhejiang students wrote 仄 for 廠 at university entrance exams and Wáng Yún that his Ningbo students did so in compositions. In 1988 this writer saw a 纸仄 (*zhǐchǎng* paper factory) in Hangzhou, a 日用仄 (daily products factory) in Wenzhou and a 汽车仄 (car plant) and a 白肉仄 (pork processing unit) outside that city.

仄 records are concentrated in Zhejiang Province. This is no accident. In 1981–1986 仄 was recognised as 厂 by informants in Zhejiang, but not elsewhere.[51] Nor was it recognised by *Zhōngguó yǔwén*'s Beijing typographers who, as we saw above, rendered it as 仄. In dictionaries 仄 is read *zè* and means 'non-even tone'. In southernmost Zhejiang *-ng* endings are lost and 廠 becomes *ts'e*, not too unlike 仄 *zè*. This explains the appearance of 仄 for 廠 in this area.

厊 is 厊 minus ｜｜. This form survived for some time after 1956. In 1964 the Guangxi teacher Liú Wànxīn criticised use of 厊 for 厂, while the Beijing postman Wáng Hóngjìn complained of people who "write 道 as 辺, 宣 as 宀, 厂 as 厊 […]. Since these characters are hard to decipher, we have appointed special people in the sorting process to deal with these nonsensical letters." In 1985 Tollef Ås noticed a 氿厊 (酒厂 distillery) in Guangzhou and in 1988 this writer passed a 釉面厊 (*yòumiànchǎng* enamel factory) in Hui'an in Fujian and a 纸箱厊 (cardboard box factory) in Shantou in Guangdong.

All 厊 reports are from the south, except that of our Beijing postman who, tellingly, called 厊 "nonsensical". 1981–1986 interviews confirmed that 厊 was known only in the south.[52]

---

51 仄 identified as 厂 by informants in Hangzhou, Huzhou, Jiaxing, Jinhua, Shaoxing, Ningbo, Lishui, Linhai and Wenzhou but not Quzhou in Zhejiang and in Shanghai. Not identified in surrounding provinces.

52 厊 identified as 厂 in Guangzhou, Meixian, Shaoguan and Zhaoqing in Guangdong, in Nanning, Guilin and Wuzhou but not Yulin in Guangxi, in Fuzhou, Xiamen and Zhang-zhou in Fujian, in Changsha, Zhuzhou and Lianyuan but not Xiangtan and Yueyang in Hunan, in Nanchang and Jiujiang in Jiangxi. Unknown in thirty-two places in provinces further west and north.

<div align="center">車 车 *chē* carriage</div>

The 1955 Draft proposed to write the 車 component as 丰 but keep printing 車. Liú Kuímín objected in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "As far as possible, characters should be simplified according to the forms people are used to. [...] Everybody writes the character and character component 車 as 车, as in 较 [*jiào* compare] and 范 [*fàn* model]."

Not everybody, but quite a few. Our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain sixteen 转 (轉 *zhuǎn* turn) with 车, but also nineteen 挢 with 丰. However, Zhāng Décún pointed out in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that "people can misunderstand and take 丰 for 豐 [*fēng* abundant]." If one intended to simplify not only the component but also the character 車, 丰 would not do. So 车 was recommended in the 1956 Scheme and confirmed by the 1964 General List.

<div align="center">徹 彻 *澈 *chè* penetrating
澈 *chè* clear</div>

澈 has long been used for 徹. *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn* records of the practice begin with the phrase 日光下澈 (the sunshine broke through) by the Tang novelist Liǔ Zōngyuán. More recently this 澈 was shortened further, as in a 1948 pledge by North China Office to 貫澈 (貫徹 *guànchè* implement) party decisions on prices and rationing.[53]

When the 1955 Draft presented no remedy for 徹 and 澈, Huáng Fújiā proposed in *Guāngmíng rìbào* to simplify 澈 to 沏, since "some people write 澈 as 沏". Yùn Huī and Jùn Tāo argued in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that 沏 was "now used by broad layers of the people," Wáng Tónghàn that the use of 沏 for 澈 and 徹 had "a broad basis of use among the masses".

Chén Guāngyáo pointed to a hitch: "If we simplify 澈 to 沏 it will become identical with the colloquial Beijing word 沏 (read *qi*) as in 沏茶 [*qī chá* make tea]." To avoid this clash, the 1956 Scheme recommended simplifying 徹 and 澈 not to 沏 but to 彻 with 彳, a form absent in our pre-1956 records. The recommendation was only partly implemented, as 彻 became official in 1959 for 徹 but not for 澈. The proposal to replace 澈 with 彻 was renewed in the 1977 Second Scheme and the 1981 Revised Draft.

To speakers of the standard language the phonetic 切 *qiè* gives little clue to a character read *chè*. In Yangzhou in Jiangsu, however, both 徹 and 切 are read *tɕ'ieʔ*14 and in Guangzhou both are *tʃ'it*33. Was the 切 phonetic introduced in the south?

Some keep using 沏 for 彻. The 1998 *Xiàndài Hànyǔ guīfàn zìdiǎn* warned:

---

53 Beijing Archives 1-8-1, p. 22.

"徹 is simplified to 彻, but 澈 has not been simplified. One cannot by analogy write 沏." A 2017 web search nevertheless yielded one hundred and seventy three 贯沏.

塵 尘 *chén* dust

Lǐ Lèyì found 坣 and 尘 for 塵 on Tang scrolls from Dunhuang, with 'micro-dirt' for 'deer-dirt'. The 1039 *Jíyùn* rejected the form: "塵 is informally written 尘. This is not correct." The informal form nevertheless made its way to Japan, where Yamauchi Yōichirō registered the phrase 皆砕テ尘トナリヌ (*mina kudakete chiri to narinu* all things crumble and go to dust) in a Buddhist tale copied in 1140. Thereafter 尘 faded away in both countries. The 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* described 尘 as "an ancient form of 塵."

Chinese reformers saw 尘 in the latter, appreciated its shortness and included it in their 1955 Draft. Not surprisingly, the foundling turned out to be unfamiliar to the public. Yáo Jiāzhēn from Jiangsu Industry Bureau wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Some comrades disapprove of 尘 and 灭 [*miè* extinguish] and find them difficult to understand." At the October script reform conference Professor Chén Zhōngfán conceded that 尘 was "a little unfamiliar". As we have seen, the Script Reform Committee member Yè Gōngchuò explained:

> When necessary, we have applied the above rules to create a small number of new short forms, like 竞 (競, shortened shape), 买 (買, from the cursive form), 尘 (塵, an ancient form) […]. Since these characters are not established by custom one might prefer to leave them out, but without them the problem of simplifying some characters will not get a satisfactory solution.

As late as in 1958 尘 was still widely unknown. One Liáng Xià wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé*:

> I wrote the character 塵. When the pupils saw this heap of a character, they anxiously asked: 'Teacher Liáng, is there a simplified form of this?' I stopped to think, what simplified form could there possibly exist? So I answered: 'No, this character cannot be simplified.' Then a young peasant in the back row stood up and and said reproachingly: 'No? 小 above and 土 below, isn't that 尘?' I wrote this character on the blackboard, but no matter which way I looked at it I could not recognise it.

He soon would, of course, as 尘 became official the following year.

襯 衬 *chèn* shirt

In 1950 Huáng Ruòzhōu wrote in the Shanghai *Wénhuì bào* that 衬 was "now common" for 襯. The following year the Shanghai *Jiǎnbǐzì* said even the shorter 寸 (*cùn* inch) was commonly used. In 1956 the reformer Chén Guāngyáo wrote that the form 衬 was "established by custom" and that "in some department stores 襯衣 [*chènyī* shirt] is even written 寸衣, because some people from the Wu dialect area [round Shanghai] pronounce both 寸 and 襯 as *cen* […]." And not only they: 襯 and 寸 readings are identical along the Changjiang up to Sichuan.

衬 entered the 1955 Draft, puzzling many. Yì Xīwú of Guangxi University mentioned 衬 among "newly created characters" and Zhào Tàimóu of Shandong University among "hitherto unseen or newly created short forms". Tellingly, both deniers were based outside the area where 襯 reads like 寸. So was even the Script Reform Committee, which hesitated until 1959 before granting 衬 official status.

Official status for 衬 did not rein in 寸 writers. In 1982 this author saw 寸衣 or 寸衫 (衬衫 *chènshān* shirts) for sale in Hangzhou in Zhejiang, Wuhan in Henan, Zhuzhou in Hunan, Wanxian in Sichuan and Xingyi in Guizhou and in 1986 in Yongxin in Jiangxi, all in the Changjiang basin.

稱 称 秤 *chēng* weigh, name *chèn* fit
稱 秤 称 *chèng* scales

Dictionaries distinguish 称/稱 (*chēng* to weigh) from 秤 (*chèng* scales). They have not always done so. The departing tone section of the Tang *Gānlù zìshū* said 秤 was "informal" for 稱, and the Song *Yùpiān* gave 稱 the reading 齒 證切 (as the first part of 齒 *chǐ* and last part of 證 *zhèng*, i.e. *chèng*) as well as 齒陵切 (*líng*). Even in texts we find 秤 not only for 'scales' but also for 'weigh', as in the assertion that 天將秤其德 (heaven will weigh his virtue) on the 833 Wēnjí shéndào stele.

So 秤, a combination of 'grain' and 'balance', was conceived not to designate a new concept, but to serve as a short form for 稱. This happened some time before 609, when 秤 appears in the Lǚ Hú epitaph.

称 is a square version of the cursive 秂, found by Liú Fù in blockprints from the Song onwards.

The Japanese Language Council shortened 稱 to 称 with a straight 一, while the Script Reform Committee of China simplified to 称 with a bent 乛. Both followed custom. In our pre-reform Japanese manuscripts we find eight 称 with 一 against three 称 with 乛, in our Chinese ones the proportion is fifteen to thirty-five.

程 *权 *chéng* course

In 1981 a 课权 (课程 *kèchéng* course schedule) was displayed at the campus of Beijing University. This 权 was unusual but not new. In 1960 a teacher from Lu'an in western Anhui reported the character to the Script Reform Committee as did one from Duchang in northern Jiangxi the following year. In 1982 权 was identified as 程 by a traveller from Shangrao in northeastern Jiangxi and in 1988 by a Nanjing University freshman from Huangshan in southern Anhui and by another from Huangshi in eastern Hubei, areas overlapping that of our 1960 correspondents. In surrounding areas 权 was identified as 稻 (*dào* rice), as we shall see in that section.

权 was also unknown to informants in faraway Beijing, where our 课权 notice had been observed. A teacher at the Chinese Department of Beijing University commented the above-mentioned course schedule: "We were all in Jiangxi." Sent there during the Cultural Revolution, where some of them seem to have picked up local writing habits.

懲 惩 *chéng* punish

Qiú Chéngyuán found 惩, an analogy to 征 for 徵 (*zhēng* levy), in documents from the Taiping Rebellion. The form becme official in February 1956.

乘 乗 *椉 *chéng* ride *shèng* chariot

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council simplified 乘 to 乗. The Script Reform Committee of China did not bother to shorten the character by one stroke and left it as 乘 , even though the shorter form was as common in China as in Japan, appearing in three of our Chinese 1900–1954 manuscripts against 乘 in five, compared with two 乗 against six 乘 in Japanese 1900–1946 manuscripts.

乗 is not a shortened 乘, but an older form known from Han steles. This puzzling character stems from Yin 夲, a picture of a man climbing a tree, which became Zhou 椉, Qin 椉, Western Han 乘 and Eastern Han 乗.

椉 with 舛 is first seen in the 675 Zhāng Chōng epitaph. The 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* explained: "椉乗: the former is the *Shuōwén* form, the latter the shortened clerk style form." Yes, 椉 followed *Shuōwén*'s instruction that 椉 consisted of 入, 舛 and 木. The 1013 *Yùpiān* recognised 椉 as the standard form, with the caveat that "乗 is the modern form." This promotion of 椉 failed. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* lists thirty-one 乗 but no 椉 on steles from 1013 to the end of the Song.

乗 with 北 was a square version of *Shuōwén*'s 椉 appearing in the 741 Lady Zhèng epitaph and on the 1339 Great Teacher Hóngjiào stele. The 1615

Zìhuì and ensuing dictionaries prescribed 乘, with some success; *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains twelve Qing 乘 among twenty-three 乘.

喫 吃 *chī* eat, drink

The shorter 吃 (*chī* stammer) has been borrowed for 喫 (*chī* drink) at least since 1623, when visitors to the Xiǎoxītiān Tea Pavilion were invited to 吃 茶鮮渴 (*chī chá jiěkě* drink tea to quench their thirst). The 1955 First List of Regulated Variants made 吃 compulsory.

癡 痴 *chī* silly

痴 with the shorter phonetic 知 *zhī* was first mentioned in the 1013 *Yùpiān* and became official for 癡 with the 1955 First List of Regulated Variants.

遲 遟 迟 *遅 *chí* be late

In 1946 the Japanese Language Council shortened 遲 to 遅. Records of the latter are older than of the former, beginning on second century BCE wood slips from Yinqueshan, preceding the 遲 on the 220 CE Shàng zūn hào stele. We will now see how the split came about.

㣠 consists of 彳 (move) and a 尸 (man) sitting on a 几 (object). On Yin bones the object appears as 八, 冂 or 乎, on Zhou bronzes as 乎, on Chu wood slips as 亲 or 二, in an early Han manuscript from Mawangdui as 丰, on Western Han wood slips from Yinqueshan and Dunhuang as 羊, on slips from Juyan as 夫 or 才, on Han seals as 辛 and on Han steles as 辛, 羊 or 匕. Xǔ Shèn was aware of this variation, mentioning forms with 㞑 and 犀 in his *Shuōwén*, but chose to recommend 遲 with the phonetic 犀 (*xī* rhinoceros). Some but far from all followed this advice; Umehara Seizan's list of Later Wei inscriptions contains six 遲 with 羊 but no 遲 with 犀. The 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* accepted both forms: "遲遟: the former is the *Shuōwén* form, the latter the [pre-Qin] big seal form. […] Today [the form based on] the big seal is used." It was the 1013 *Yùpiān* which first insisted on the *Shuōwén*-based 遲, followed by later dictionaries. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* nevertheless registers only two Ming and Qing 遲 among three 遲 with 半, three 遲 with 羊 and one 遲 with 辛.

So 遟 was in use even in China, where it had adherents like the *Tàibái* editors, who included it in their 1935 list of "handy characters". Later that year fellow reformers in the Education Ministry promoted the less hopeful 迲 with 丰 in their List of Short Forms.

Both came to be outcompeted. In 1934 Xú Zémǐn noted that when hur-

ried, his Nanjing students wrote 遲 as 迟 with the phonetic 尺 *chǐ*. The Script Reform Committee embraced this new form and made 迟 official with its 1956 Scheme. Chén Yuè pointed out that 迟 violated the laws of calligraphy by containing two 乀 (*nà*) strokes. The committee took note, changing the 迟 to 迟 in its 1959 *Sì pī tuīxíng de jiǎnhuà hànzì biǎo* (Table of the Four Implemented Batches of Simplified Characters).

<div align="center">

齒 歯 齿 *chǐ* teeth

齡 齢 龄 *líng* age

</div>

齒 was originally written with the bottom 㐭 (teeth) only; the 止 *zhǐ* phonetic is a Zhou addition. In the early Han silk mansucripts from Mawangdui this came out as 齒. Already on Western Han wood slips, however, we find 齒 with a missing 一, 齒 with a missing 人 and 齒 with 井 for the teeth.

The now official Japanese 歯 with 米 descends from none of these shortened forms but from an extended one. On a 498 statue for the Lord of Shǐpíng we find a 齡 with an added | inside 齒. In a 齡 in the 512 Lady Qín epitaph the four 人 have been reduced to points. The resulting 齒 became common enough to annoy friends of orderliness, like the author of the 1617 *Zìkǎo*: "齒 is written with 㸚. 齒 is wrong." The Japanese Language Council nevertheless legalised 歯 and 齢 in 1946.

Even Chinese reformers leaned toward 歯, including this form in the "handy characters" to be used in the columns of *Tàibái* in 1935. Then in 1950 Huáng Ruòzhōu reported seeing 齒 with ス, a 齒 minus 从人. The 1955 Draft shortened this further to 齿. This form turned out to be unfamiliar to many. The reformer Jīn Míngshèng mentioned 齿 among "characters simply made up by the Script Reform Committee," his colleague Chén Guāngyáo among "newly coined picto-phonetic characters" and Zhào Tàimóu among "hitherto unseen or newly created short forms." Such reservations explain why 齿 and 龄 were given official status only in June 1956.

<div align="center">

衝 沖 冲 *chōng* crossroads, rush at *chòng* forcefully

</div>

Shuōwén said 衝 means 'crossroads' and 沖 'to surge upwards'. Readings seem to have differed as late as in the Song, when *Guǎngyùn* placed 衝 in the 東 *tuŋ* rhyme and 沖 in the 鍾 *tɕiuŋ* rhyme. Thereafter readings converged to the present *chōng,* and the characters began to merge. Lǐ Lèyì records a Ming example: *chōngzhuàng* (offend) was written 沖撞 in *Bái tù jì* (The White Rabbit) but 衝撞 in *Shuǐhǔ zhuàn* (Water Margin).

The 1956 Scheme merged 沖 and 衝 to 冲, a variant of 沖 known since the

531 Mù Shào epitaph. By the twentieth century it had come to dominate, appearing in eleven of our 1900–1954 manuscripts against 沖 in none.

In Japan a merger of 衝 *shō* and 沖 *chū* has never been on the agenda. Nor has a change of 沖 to 冲, a rarity outnumbered one to fourteen by 沖 in our Japanese 1900–1946 manuscripts.

Other changes of 氵 to 冫 are described in the 決 *jué* section.

虫 蟲 *chóng* insect

蟲 officially became 虫 in Japan in 1946 and in China in 1956. The idea was old; already the Yuan *Yùnhuì* complained: "蟲 is informally written 虫. This is wrong."

Wrong because 虫 defied *Shuōwén*, which distinguished creatures "with legs which are called 蟲" from 虫, which "is also called 蝮 [*fù* Siberian pit viper]." The 986 *Shuōwén* revisers gave 蟲 the reading 直弓切 (*zhōng*) and 虫 許偉切 (*huǐ*), identifying 虫 with 虺 (*huǐ* a snake).

The Song philologist Dài Tóng pointed out: "There are no cases of 虫 for 虺 in ancient books. 虫 is phonetic in 融 [*róng* melt], therefore we know that 虫 […] is short for 蟲. They are not different characters." Cases of 虫 for 'insect' abound. In the early Han Lǎo zǐ B manuscript from Mawangdui 蟄 蟲 (*zhéchóng* hibernating insect) is written 執虫. An Eastern Han wood slip from Wuwei recommends a cure for 喉中如百虫鳴状 (a throat feeling like a hundred squealing insects).[54] 虫 looks more like the primary form of 蟲 than a shortened 蟲.

醜 丑 *chǒu* repulsive

Traditionally 醜 means 'repulsive' and the homonym 丑 'the second of the twelve Earthly Branches' or an opera character. Liú Fù found the latter used for the former in the early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì*.

The 1955 Draft proposed to replace all 醜 with 丑. Objections by the public were summarised in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "This can easily cause misunderstanding. 小丑 and 小醜, for example, mean different things. The former is the name of an opera character and the latter 'a repulsive wretch'."[55] The change was nevertheless approved in February 1956.

---

54 "Lao zi yi ben", line 88. "Donghan jian 'Wuwei Han dai yijian'".
55 "Ge di renshi", p. 38.

齣 出 *chū* performance

The classifier for theatre plays was not only complex, but also misleading. Hé Yǎngmíng recalled in *Guāngmíng rìbào*:

One comrade was reading out documents at a meeting. When the phrase 这真是一齣怪戏 [this is really a weird spectacle] appeared, he read 齣 as *jù*. Afterwards I wanted to tell him that 齣 is not read *jù*. He spoke first, however, sighing: 'Why must some characters be changed into ancient style when they appear in a document?' I said: 'What is in ancient style?' He said: 'When watching plays we all say *yì chū xì*. Why on earth must this be changed to *yí jù xì* in books and newspapers?' The others laughed and told him that this was the character *chū* not *jù*. He was very surprised to hear this.

The 1955 Draft proposed to simplify 齣 to 龂 analogously to 齿 for 齒. Guǎn Xièchū of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences found even 龂 too complex, suggesting instead the homonym 出, which became official in February 1956.

出 actually preceded 齣. In the 1004 *Jǐngdé chuán dēng lù* (Spreading the Light) the Zen master Shèng told Yàoshān that he could do a lion act. Yàoshān asked: 弄得幾出 (*nòng de jǐ chū* How many acts can you perform?). Shèng answered: 弄得六出 (I can perform six). *Zhōnghuá dà zìdiǎn* first registers 齣 in the 1666 *Zìhuìbǔ* (Zìhuì Enlarged) and the 1750 *Rúlín wàishǐ* (The Scholars).

<div align="center">
芻 刍 <i>chú</i> hay
雛 雏 <i>chú</i> chicken
趨 趋 <i>qū</i> hurry
皺 皱 <i>zhòu</i> wrinkle
騶 驺 <i>zōu</i> trot
鄒 邹 <i>Zōu</i>
</div>

It is hard to see how 刍 could develop from 芻. More likely this shortened component derived from the 刍 and 刍 found on Han wood slips, which became 刍 in cursive script and then � as in a 邹 in the 515 Wáng Shào epitaph and 刍 as in a 驺 in the 661 Dài Yuēguān inscription. The latter prevailed. In his Qing blockprints Liú Fù registered 雏, 趋, 皱 and 邹 with 刍 but no corresponding forms with � or 刍. The 1956 selection of 刍, 趋 and so on raised no stir.

The dictionary form 芻 springs from a misunderstanding. Yin 㣺, a hand reaping straws, became Warring States 芻 and Han 刍, 刍 or 茻 with no discernible hand or straw. Xǔ Shèn, who had seen no Yin forms, conjectured

that the character had "the shape of bundles of straw." Some took him on his word and wrote 芻 with 勹 (bundle) and 中 (grass), first to our knowledge in a 趨 on the 174 Magistrate Yáng stele. 芻 writers remained a dwindling minority, however. On Later Wei steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* the 芻 component is written 㥮 six times, 彐 five times, 彐 twice, 多 three times, 彐 once and 匐 once but never 芻. It was the Tang *Gānlù zìshū* which began to promote 芻, followed by later dictionaries and, with time, by writers.

礎 础 *chǔ* foundation stone

The 1955 Draft proposed to shorten 礎 to 础, a form we know from a 1949 call by Beijing Finance Committee to increase the 基础 (basis) for export of handicraft items.[56] The reformer Chén Guāngyáo called 础 "established by custom".

The custom was not universal. Professor Yì Xīwú of Guangxi University described 础 as "newly created". Zhāng Zhōu wrote in Guangzhou that 础 was "common in the north". Jīn Míngshèng pointed out in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that the phonetic 出 *chū* was alien to southerners, who read it with a *-t* ending absent in 礎. This may explain why 础 was authorised only in June 1956.

Southern resistance lingered. In 1962 Zhāng Yǒngmián informed *Wénzì gǎigé* that students in Zhejiang had invented their own short form 砰 by dropping the bottom 疋. We hear no more of this form, however.

儲 储 *仛 *chǔ* store up

The 1955 Draft offered no remedy for 儲. Wú Jìng argued in *Yǔwén zhīshí*:

> Among the two thousand common characters listed by the Education Ministry there are quite a few characters which have not been simplified, like 疑 [*yí* doubt], 聚 [*jù* assemble], 靜 [*jìng* quiet], 隸 [*lì* subordinate], 鼻, 傲 [*ào* proud], 儲 […], while uncommon characters like 噸 [*dūn* ton], 燉 [*dùn* stew] […] have been. I wish the Script Reform Committee could simplify those of the two thousand common characters which contain more than ten or twelve strokes and make them easy to use for common people.

The Script Reform Committee was at a loss, offering only 储 with 讠 for 言. Bankers, however, needed to write 儲蓄 (*chǔxù* deposit) and found a way. In 1960, letters from Changchun in the north to Meixian in the south informed

---

56   Beijing Archives 4-2-24, p. 15.

the committee that one could see 儲 written 仦 with the phonetic 出 *chū*. The committee selected this form for its 1977 Second Scheme but abandoned it in its 1981 Revised Draft.

處 処 处 *chǔ* stay *chù* place

The 1956 Scheme replaced 處 with 处, "the ancient original character" according to the reformer Chén Guāngyáo. The originality claim is based on *Shuōwén*: "𣪠 [処]: to rest. One rests when one finds a stool, hence the components 几 [stool] and夊 [walk up to]. 𧆚 [處]: 処 is also written with the phonetic 虍 [*hǔ* tiger]." The claim was strengthened in 1974, when the early Han Lǎo zǐ B manuscript from Mawangdui turned up phrases like 入 興処出興反 (entering one wants to stay, leaving one wants to return).

However, the 'tiger' is present in the slightly older Lǎo zǐ A manuscript and on much older Zhou bronzes, so the primacy of 処 is a hard sell. 処 was not even the common form at Xǔ Shèn's time; Han wood slips, personal seals and stone steles all include the tiger in some form.

Why did Xǔ Shèn go against the tide and advocate the topless 処 as the genuine and correct form? Perhaps because he found it easier to explain than the bewildering tiger-topped 處, deeming his theory that 虍 *hǔ* is phonetic in 處 *chǔ* so dubious that he preferred to hide it at the end of the paragraph. Later analysts have turned out other explanations, Gāo Jǐngchéng holding 虍 for a tiger guarding its living place and Shirakawa Shizuka for a tiger skin worn by a shaman at a performing place.

The topless 処 remained rare until the Song, when it came to be used in vernacular blockprints, appearing in all prints investigated by Liú Fù, except the 1962–1874 *Lǐngnán yìshǐ* where the form was 处 with a contracted last stroke. This 处 continued in use but did not outcompete 処, which outnumbers 处 eight to two in our 1900–1934 manuscripts.

Reformers wavered. In 1935 *Tàibái* chose 処 for its "handy characters" and *Lúnyǔ* for its "plain stroke characters", while the Education Ministry opted for 処 in its short-lived List of Short Forms. Twenty years later 処 remained the more common form, outnumbering 处 sixty to twenty-two in our 1950–1954 manuscripts. The reformers nevertheless settled on the handier 处.

处 with 卜 never reached Japan, where 処 was legalised in 1946.

觸 触 *chù*

See 獨 *dú*.

傳 伝 传 *chuán*

See 轉 *zhuǎn*.

窓 窻 窗 *窻 *chuāng* window

The Japanese Language Council chose to write 窓 for 'window' and the Script Reform Comittee of China 窗. Both followed practice. Our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts contain fifteen 窗 against one 窓, one 窻 and one 窗, while our 1900–1946 Japanese texts have ten 窓 but no 窗 or 窗.

Variation goes back to *Shuōwén*, which entered three forms for 'window': 囱 (囱/匇), an image of an opening; 窗 (窗), an opening plus a hole; and 窗 (窻/窻), a hole plus the phonetic 悤/怱 *cōng*. Writers preferred the fuller forms. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains sixteen Han to Ming inscriptions with 窓, six with 窻, five with 窻, one with 窻, three with 牕, one with 牕 and one with 牕 but none with the heartless 窗.

窗 did turn up in the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng*, but only with the label "an ancient form […] read 窓." Not before 1716 did *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* set the 窗 standard which came to be followed by later dictionaries. As we have seen, this converted Chinese but not Japanese writers. Hence the present Sino-Japanese discrepancy.

Variation in the 囱/囱/匇/凸/公 component is dealt with in the 總 *zǒng* section.

牀 床 *chuáng* bed

床 with 广 (wall) for the older 爿 (plank) is on record since the Jin, when we find it in the calligraphy of Wáng Xīzhī. By the twentieth century 床 had become the more common form by far, outnumbering 牀 sixteen to one in our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts and eight to nil in 1900–1946 Japanese ones. Unsurprisingly, Japan's 1946 List Characters for Current Use and China's 1955 First List of Regulated Variants prescribed 床.

創 创 *chuàng* start

See 倉 *cāng*.

辭 辞 *辤 *辝 *cí* words

辭 consists of hands (⺈又) disentangling threads (⺈厶) on a frame or loom (冂) using some sharp implement (辛). Few put up with the burdensome left

side. Alongside three 辭, Umehara Seizan's catalogue of Tang inscriptions contains three 辤, five 辝, two 辞 and two 辞.

The threadless 辤 is known from the Han, as pointed out in the 1718 *Lì biàn*: "*Shuōwén* says 辤 means 'decline', is written with 辛 and 受 and differs from 辭, but on steles they are used interchangeably", citing 其辤曰 (its words say) on the 161 CE Huáshān Temple stele and 其辝曰 (without マ and ム) on the 158 Zhèng Gù stele.

Even 辝 was registered by *Shuōwén*, which said "in the big seal 辝 was written with 台." 台 *yí/tái* may be phonetic. 辝 was popularised by the calligrapher Wáng Xiànzhī (344–386).

辞 is 辝 with a straight 丨 for 丶. This form came to outlive its competitors. Liú Fù found 辝 and 辤 in Song and Yuan blockprints but only 辞 in Ming and Qing ones. Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain ten 辞 but no 辝 or 辤 (alongside just three 辭). Practice was similar in Japan, where 辞 became official in 1946, as it became ten years later in China.

賜 赐 *赐 *cì* grant

See 易 *yì*.

聪 聰 聪 *cōng* intelligent

See 總 *zǒng*.

*怱 *悤 匆 *cōng* hurried, quick-witted

The 1955 First List of Regulated Variants abolished 悤 and 怱 to retain 匆. The 匆 component is a variant of 囪 which in turn is an elaborated 丿, a picture of a hole or opening. If the original sense was 'quick-witted' or 'open to ideas', 丿/匆 should be older than 怱 and 悤.

In the 總 *zǒng* section we shall see that forms with 匆 have been in use longer than those with 囪.

从 *従 従 從 *cóng* follow

On Yin bones 'follow' was mostly written 从 (从 two men), sometimes enlarged with 彳 (step) or 止 (foot) or, from the Zhou, often with both. Since 从 was present in all forms, this is regarded as the original form. By the Warring States 从 had nevertheless become a rarity. In 219 BCE Lǐ Sī carved 從 (從) on the Taishan stone, and presumably elsewhere, confirming the enlarged form as standard. In Han to Qing inscriptions in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* 从 is absent.

Clerk style writers soon began to compress the enlarged form. Alongside a few complete 從 we find 从 and 㣊 with a contracted 止 in the early Han manuscripts from Mawangdui and 従 with a contracted 从 on 32–6 BCE wood slips from Wuwei. The contracted 従 was recommended by the 175 CE Xīpíng Stone Classics, the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* and the early Tang *Zìyàng*, but not by the ensuing *Gānlù zìshū*, which prescribed the *Shuōwén*-compatible 從 and was followed by later dictionaries. By the Song the once rare 従 had become the more common variant, as we saw in Table 7.

Twentieth-century writers sought relief from 從 by reviving 从, as we see in a 1910 letter from Lǔ Xùn.[57] 从 did not immediately outcompete other short forms; our 1920–1939 manuscripts contain three 从 among six 従, two 㣊 and one 従.

For their 1935 simplification schemes the editors of *Tàibái* and *Lúnyǔ* and the Education Ministry selected the shorter, *Shuōwén*-backed 从 rather than the apparently more common 従. Habits were changing, however. Our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain fifteen 从 against six 従, one 㣊 and two 従. The choice had thus become simple and 从 was legalised in February 1956.

Japanese writers never revived 从. Our 1900–1946 manuscripts contain twenty 従, one 㣊, three 従, one 従 and three 従 but no 从. Dominance did not guarantee 従 a smooth path to official status, however. In 1923 and 1926 the Interim Committee on the Japanese Language proposed 従, less frequent than 従 but shorter by two strokes. Ensuing schemes dodged 従 until the 1949 List of Forms settled for 従.

叢 从 *叢 *cóng* assemble

In 1956 the reformer Chén Guāngyáo wrote that "叢書 is usually written 从 書 in second-hand book shops". Presumably it was already in 1935, when *Tàibái*'s list of "handy characters" comprised a change of 叢 to 从. The Education Ministry's ensuing List of Short Forms more cautiously proposed 叢 with 'trees' for the 'grass' on top, a form which had been in use at least since the 181 CE Xiáo Kēng stele.

The 1955 Draft renewed the 从 proposal. Some warned of mixing up. The epigrapher Róng Gēng, himself a reform fan, said at a meeting: "If 叢 is replaced with 从, will then 从林中出来 mean 'come out of the thick forest' or 'come out of the forest'?" Guǎn Xièchū of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences wrote in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "If 从 replaces 叢, a phrase like 這頁是 从書裏掉出來的 [*zhè yè shì cóng shū lǐ diào chu lai de*] becomes ambiguous

---

57 *Lu Xun shougao quanji*: *Shuxin di yi ce*, p. 14.

[meaning either 'this page has fallen out of a book' or 'this page has fallen out of a book series'].'' Similar objections were raised by Xú Shìsōng and Wáng Zhìpéi.

Reformers took note and opted for 丛 with a distinguishing 一 below. Chén Guāngyáo called 丛 "newly coined"; Zhào Tàimóu, "hitherto unseen or newly created" and "unfamiliar"; and Zhōu Yǒuguāng, "recently created" with "no basis in usage". Official status for this novelty was delayed until 1958.

鼠 𪃍 *cuàn* flee

𪃍 with the phonetic 串 *chuàn* replacing the rat (鼠) heading for its hole (穴) was recorded by Chén Guāngyáo in 1931. 𪃍 was thus old enough to catch the boat to Taiwan. Luó Jiālún, president of the Kuomintang Control Yuan and an advocate of short forms, wrote in 1954 that 𪃍 was used in the armed forces of Taiwan, out of necessity: "Assume that the bandit enemy 鼠進 [makes a rushing advance] and the situation is urgent. If we have to write all the strokes in 鼠, the enemy may rush in before we finish the character!"

As we know, Taiwanese servicemen were not relieved from their burden, unlike mainland colleagues who were authorised to write 𪃍 from June 1956.

答 荅 *dá* answer

See 筆 *bǐ*.

達 逹 达 *dá* attain

The 1617 *Zìkǎo* insisted: "達 is written with 幸. 逹 is wrong." Wrong because *Shuōwén* said the 㚇 *dá* phonetic consists of 大 *dà* and 羊 (sheep). Few followed *Shuōwén* at first. The 175 CE Xīpíng Stone Classics promoted 逹, and Umehara Seizan's collection of Later Wei inscriptions contains nineteen 逹 with 幸 against three 達 with 幸. The early Tang *Zhèngmíng yàolù*, however, said 達 was written "with three strokes [in 羊]". It was followed by later dictionaries and, with time, by writers.

Radically shorter forms had appeared by 1934, when Hǎi Gē saw the cursive-based 达 in Jiangsu and Xú Zémǐn 达 with the phonetic 大 *dà* in his students' notes. Xú's well-read students may have been aware that they had support in *Shuōwén* which said "達 is also written with 大", but hardly that they were also replicating a 达 (达) seen on a Yin bone. Later records are lacking, however, and forms without 羊 must have been rarities in Xǔ Shèn's time.

达 seems to have become the more common form, appearing in four of our 1930–1954 manuscripts against 达 in one. The *Lúnyǔ* editors chose the

common 迕 for their 1935 "plain stroke characters", while the Script Reform Committee opted for the shorter and more transparent 达 for its 1956 Scheme.

戴 *代 *六 *dài* wear

In 1953 Zhèng Línxī proposed to replace 戴 with 代 (*dài* act as), a practice he dubbed "rather common". In 1960 the proposal was repeated by Dīng Xīlín in *Guāngmíng rìbào*. Dīng Chén of Hangzhou University objected: "To change 戴草帽 [*dài cǎomào* wear a straw hat] to 代草帽 [replace a straw hat], what a joke! This is very unscientific. People have long written 戴 as 六. Now that is a good form!"

We have known this 六, the left top and bottom of 戴, since 1922 when Professor Qián Xuántóng mentioned it in *Guóyǔ yuèkān* (The National Language Monthly) among "simplified characters now in use among the people". The form was mentioned again by Hú Huáichēn in 1928, by Hú Xíngzhī and Ōuyáng Zhēn in 1935 and by *Xué wénhuà zìdiǎn* in 1952.

The Script Reform Committee's tentative 1962 List of Simplified Characters nevertheless proposed 代, which "has been in use in society for a long time, and the senses [of 戴 and 代] are related. There is another simplified form, 六, but that form is difficult to read, understand and write so we have not adopted it."[58] These words were forgotten by 1973, when Helmut Martin visited the committee and saw 六 in a draft of a new dictionary. 代 reappeared in the 1977 Second Scheme. A Shanghai meeting declared:

> On some of the characters in List Two the masses react strongly and hold firm views. For example, a change of 戴 to 代 will make it hard to distinguish 代局长 [*dài júzhǎng* an acting office director] from an office director named 戴. 戴表 [wear a watch] will be hard to distinguish from 代表 [represent]. Among the masses 戴 is now commonly written 六, a form easy to read and easy to learn.[59]

Similar objections were voiced by the education bureaus of Jiangsu and Fujian. Zhejiang Education Bureau wrote: "In Southern China 戴 is written 六. Why not adopt that character?"

In Southern China? Was this a quarrel between regions? Let us re-read our records. Hú Huáichēn reported 六 from Shanghai, Hú Xíngzhī from Baimahu in Jiangsu, Ōuyáng Zhēn from Yihuang in Jiangxi and Zhōu Qǐfèng from

---

58 *1962 ni gongbu di yi pi jianhua hanzi biao*, p. 4.
59 "Shanghai shi jiji kaizhan 'Di er ci hanzi jianhua fang'an (cao'an)' de pinglun gongzuo", p. 30.

Wan'an in Anhui. In 1960 the committee received letters reporting 六 from Shanghai, Jinan in Shandong, Rugao in Jiangsu, Hangzhou and Pinyang in Zhejiang and Zhangzhou in Fujian, in 1976 from Wenling in Zhejiang and in 1977 from Mengcheng in Anhui. Letters mentioning 代 were in turn sent in 1960 from Changchun in Jilin, Ürümqi in Xinjiang and Changsha in Hunan. In 1982 this author saw a road sign pointing to 北代河 (北戴河) in Hebei. Records of 六 come from the east, 代 from the north and west. 1981–1986 interviews confirmed that 六 was known in Shanghai, Jiangsu, Anhui, Zhejiang and northern Jiangxi and in parts of Fujian and Guangdong but was unknown further west and north.[60] Today the form is unknown even in these areas.

Why did just easterners opt for 六? Perhaps because they shunned 代, which in the Wu dialects of Zhejiang, Shanghai and Southern Jiangsu differs from 戴 by having a voiced initial.

帶 带 帯 dài girdle, carry

The Japanese Language Council reduced 帶 to 帯 with a 卅 top and the Script Reform Committee of China to 带 with 卌. Both forms occur in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. The former fell out of use in China but not in Japan. Our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts contain seven 带 but no 帯, 1900–1954 Japanese ones four 带, three 帯 and one 带. The 卅 top was therefore never contemplated by Chinese reformers. Perhaps surprisingly, the shorter and reasonably common 带 was never considered by their Japanese colleagues, whose 1919, 1923, 1926 and 1938 schemes all promoted 帯 with 卅.

带 had not always been the norm. In Han silk manuscripts, wood slips and stone steles this character is written 帶, 帯, 帶, 帶, 带 or 带. The latter came to dominate and was prescribed by the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* and the Tang version of *Yùpiān*.[61] The boat was rocked in the Tang by Yán Yuánsūn, whose *Gānlù zìshū* prescribed 带 with a 卌 top, denigrating as "informal" the 带 used by Wáng Xīzhī, king of calligraphy, and Lǐ Shìmín, emperor of China. Yán leaned on the still higher authority of Xǔ Shèn, whose *Shuōwén* prescribed a 卌 top. Standardisers began to waver. The 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* recommended 带 with 卌, the 1013 *Yùpiān* 带 with 卌 and the 1039 *Jíyùn* 带 with 卌. The *Yùpiān* form came to prevail.

---

60 六 identified as 戴 by informants in Shanghai, in Nanjing, Huaiyin, Lianyungang, Suzhou, Wuxi, Yancheng, Yangzhou, Yixing and Xuzhou in Jiangsu, in Hangzhou, Huzhou, Jinhua, Lishui, Quzhou, Shaoxing and Wenzhou in Zhejiang, in Hefei, Bengbu and Huaibei but not Fuyang and Sùzhou in Anhui and in Guangzhou in Guangdong. Unknown in thirty-one localities in other provinces.

61 The Tang fragments of *Yupian* contain not 带, but the derived form 嵑.

Liú Fù registered that 帶 was shortened 代 in the early Qing *Mùliánjì*. Why did writers not think of this before? Because the two words had not always been identical. In the Song *Guǎngyùn* and *Jíyùn* 帶 did not rhyme with 代, which had a closer vowel.

The authors of the 1935 List of Short Forms specified that they had refrained from adopting loan characters "used in one area only, like 代 which is used for 帶 in Beiping". And not, we take it, in Shanghai where 代, but not 帶, is read with a voiced initial. Even the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft passed 帶 over. The Language Section of People's University in Beijing then proposed 代, a form "already in habitual use" (in Beijing, that is).[62] In the end the 1956 Scheme plumped for 带, which then became official in 1958.

Shortening 帶 by one stroke did not eradicate use of the shorter 代. In 1984 *Rénmín rìbào* complained of Beijing shop signs like 海代 (海带 *hǎidài* kelp), 代鱼 (带鱼 *dàiyú* hairtail) and 代料加工 (*dài liào jiāgōng* processing of cloth brought [by customer]). In 2005 the Sichuan Language and Script Network warned against writing 代子 for 带子 (belt).[63]

Some writer became aware that the top of 帶 was unique and exploited that fact. Use of 卅 for 帶 was reported in 1950 by the Shanghai *Wénhuì bào* and later from Jiangsu, Zhejiang and Shanxi.[64] In 1985 Chén Qìngwǔ complained in *Wénzì gǎigé* about use of the still shorter 卅 for 带 in the streets of Fuzhou.

By then yet another alternative had turned up further south. In 1960 and 1961 letters from Wuhua and Gaozhou informed the committee that some shortened 带 to 帗 with a 大 *dài* phonetic, and teachers at Dongguan Normal School complained of students writing 帗 for 带. In a stencilled *Bǎo lián dēng* (Lotus Lantern) libretto bought in Guangzhou in 1982 we find a 宝帗 (precious belt). These records are all from Guangdong. 1981–1986 informants in this province and neighbouring Fujian identified 帗 as 带, others as 帗 as 幕 (*mù* curtain), as they had learned from the 1977 Second Scheme.[65] Residents in margin areas wavered. A theatre in the Guangdong border town of Zhaoqing advertised a 四帗喜剧 expecting all to read this as 四幕喜剧 (*sì mù xǐjù* comedy in four acts). Our local informant, however, read 帗 without context as *dài*.

Today informants recognise neither 卅 nor 帗.

---

62   Zhongguo renmin daxue 1955.
63   Wang 1984. "Wenzi – rongyi wuyong" 2005.
64   Huang 1951 (1950). 1960 letter from Yancheng. Zhang 1962, p. 17. Ni 1963, p. 15.
65   帗 identified as 带 in Xiamen and Fuzhou in Fujian, in Guangzhou, Huizhou, Jiangmen, Maoming, Meixian, Shaoguan, Zhanjiang, Zhaoqing and Zhuhai in Guangdong and in Nanning and Wuzhou in Guangxi, elsewhere as 幕 or taken for the similar 帗.

單 单 单 *dān* single

𤕦, a drawing of a cicada (according to Lín Yìguāng), or a bird net (Zhū Fāng-pǔ), or a shield (Dīng Shān), or a flagpole (Chén Bāngfú), or a two-pointed weapon (Luó Zhènyù) or a carriage (Mǎ Xùlún), or a duster (Tōdō Akiyasu) was early loaned for 'single'. In clerk style it beame 單, a form reduced to 単 or 单 already on Western Han wood slips.

In China 单 became the more common short form, appearing in one hundred and ten of our 1900–1934 manuscripts against 単 in thirty-seven, 𤕦 in one and 單 in one. 单 was duly chosen for the Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Scheme.

单 was not an option in Japan, where our 1900-1946 manuscripts contain thirteen 單 and four 単 but no 单. The abortive 1919, 1926 and 1938 schemes opted for the common 單 and the decisive 1949 List of Forms for the shorter 単.

擔 担 *dān* carry *dàn* 50 kg
膽 胆 *dǎn* gallbladder

担 and 胆 appear in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. Later users found even 担 too laborious. A 1906 Japanese manual for China traders reproduced an invoice for 叁拾扠川三刄 (*sānshí dān sānshí sān liǎng* thirty dan and 33 liang) of cowhides and a receipt of 念圭扠六十七斤 (*niàn yī dān liùshí qī jīn* twenty-one dan and sixty-seven pounds) of prepared hides.[66] Later heavy weights came to be measured in *dūn* (tons), however, so 扠 records cease with the 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì*.

The Script Reform Committee then simplified 擔 and 膽 analogously to 担 and 胆, as the Japanese Language Council had done before it.

蛋 *旦 *dàn* egg

In 2005 students complained that "鸡蛋 [*jīdàn* eggs] becomes 鸡旦. […] if one takes a walk in the streets of Lishui [in Zhejiang], one easily discovers incorrect handwritten characters of this kind."[67] Lishui peddlers were not the first to use 旦 (*dàn* dawn) for 蛋. Hú Huáichēn wrote in 1928: "On restaurant menus 蛋炒飯 [*dàn chǎofàn* fried rice with eggs] is written 旦炒飯." The 1977 Second Scheme legalised 鸡旦 menus for some months.

The now official 蛋 is itself a shortened form, appearing in the 1666

---

66 *Shina keizai zensho*, vol. 9, pp. 244, 237. 刄 is short for 兩.
67 "Chengshi bu guifan yong zi heshi xiu?" 2005.

Zìhuìbǔ but absent in the preceding *Zìhuì* and *Zhèngzìtōng,* which prescribed 蜑 with the phonetic 延 *yán.* This explains the puzzling 疋 top in 蛋 as the first three and last two strokes of 延.

當 当 *dāng* serve as *dàng* take as

當 consists of the phonetic 尚 *shàng* and 田 (field). Han scribes tended to reduce its centre, turning out the 當, 当 and 峃 we find on Juyan wood slips. The latter is the basis for cursive �встроб, which Yuan blockprinters formalised to the 当 which became official in Japan in 1946 and in China in 1956.

黨 党 *dǎng* party

党 consists of the phonetic 尚 *shàng* and 儿 (man). The men indicated were the 党項 (*dǎngxiàng* Tanguts), who created the Western Xia state in 1038 but were wiped out by the Mongols in 1227. This made 党 available for other use. Yuan blockprinters adopted it for the 黨 which means 'party', a practice which became official in Japan in 1946 and in China in 1956.

By then mainland writers had grown weary even of 党. In 1951 the Hubei cadre Yuán Zhèn complained in *Dàgōng bào* that some writers "do not care whether the reader understands or not, writing, for example, 黨員 [*dǎngyuán* party member] as 丁〇 […]. These incomprehensible 'characters' have lost their function as transmitters of language." 丁 is the *t* in *tang,* the traditional transcription of 黨, 〇 a circle, a *yuán.* Bái Jùnrú of Harbin Normal School wrote in *Yǔwén xuéxí*: "If we use or create short forms at random, we can cause trouble for others. May we ask those who write 幹部 [*gànbù* cadre] as 干阝, 歷史 [*lìshǐ* history] as 厊, 共產黨 [*gòngchǎndǎng* the communist party] as 共产丁 and 問題 as 閅: how many can read characters like these?" In Hangzhou Archives we find a 1953 call for 每个丁员 (every party member) of the public health bureau to study.[68] In 1955 Professor Jīn Lúnhǎi of Jiangsu Normal Institute complained that "everybody keeps creating characters at will, seeking easy ways, writing 國民黨 [Kuomintang] as 囗民丁, or still simpler as 田 […]."

丁 became even less comprehensible when the transcription changed from *tang* to *dǎng.* Reports cease in 1962 with a complaint by Wáng Yún of Ningbo Cadre Literacy School that "some students have created characters by themselves, like 囗 (国) 丁 (党) […]".

---

68   Hangzhou Archives 87-1-15, 75.

<h1 style="text-align:center">導 导 *孕 dǎo lead</h1>

In 1920 Professor Qián Xuántóng proposed replacing 導 with 道. This 道 is shorter by three strokes only and its reading *dào* differs from 導. Reformer Qián was obviously hard up for a short form.

Later reformers were not. In 1943 the Administrative Office of Southern Jiangsu called for a stronger 领孕 (*lǐngdǎo* leadership) of the people's militia. The same year Central China Office, also in Jiangsu, issued a directive to organise and 領导 (lead) the militia.[69] 孕 is a 導 with the phonetic 刀 *dāo* for 道 *dào*. 导 is a square version of the cursive 㝶.

The 1955 Draft opted for 孕. Liú Nǎizhōng objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "The new picto-phonetic character 孕 is not as common as 导. It is better to use 导." Also Yú Xīnbó argued that "the habitual simplification is 导." Yáo Jiāzhēn wrote from Jiangsu: "Some comrades point to writing habits and consider that 導 can only be simplified to 导, and definitely not to 孕. But there are also some who approve of 孕, because they are used to writing 孕." 孕 was definitively a minority form, appearing in just one of our 1950–1954 manuscripts compared with 导 in twenty-nine. The 1956 Scheme duly included 导. Lingering doubts delayed official status for 导 until June that year. 孕 records cease in 1974 with a remark by Xiàng Huī in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Arbitrary self-created characters should be reined in, in order to preserve the correct 邓 [*Dèng*] and 导 and do away with the irregular 阝 and 孕".

<h1 style="text-align:center">蹈 蹈 *阴 dǎo tread
蹈 稻 *利 dào rice</h1>

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council turned 稻 into 稲. The analogous 蹈 is on record since the 513 Guì Huágōng epitaph. The 臼 to 旧 shift corresponds to that in 児 for 兒 (*ér* child) first seen in the 256 CE Pìyù sutra. The still shorter 踏 appears from the 516 Wáng Chāng epitaph onwards. The ク top is analogous to the older 争 for 爭 (*zhēng* strive) and 隐 for 隱 (*yǐn* hidden). The shorter top made it into the Tang *Yùpiān*, whose 粢 *cí* entry says 說文稻 餅也 (*Shuōwén* [says] 'rice cake'). Later dictionaries, however, stuck to the etymologically correct 爫 (hand) over 臼 (mortar).

Chinese ones, that is. Sixteenth-century versions of the Japanese writing manuals *Ikyōshū* and *Setsuyōshū* recommended 稻妻 for *inazuma* (lightning). In our Japanese 1900–1946 manuscripts we find nine 稲, one 稻 and three 稲 (with 日 below). The Language Council opted for the more common form.

In our Chinese 1900–1954 manuscripts 稲 is outnumbered nil to five

---

69   *Jiangsu kangzhan*, pp. 110, p. 131.

by 稻 which, however, was not short enough to interest the Script Reform Committee. In his 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ* (Index of Short Forms) Chén Guāngyáo instead suggested 籾 with the phonetic 刀 *dāo*. In 1960 use of this form was reported in letters to the committee.[70] In 1965 Sūn Xiǎohuī of Sichuan Institute of Agriculture proposed to make "habitually used short forms" like 籾 official.

籾 had a competitor. In 1960 and 1961 use of 权 for 稻 was reported from Lu'an in Anhui, Yichang in Hubei, Guidong in Hunan, Jiangyin and Sihong in Jiangsu, Hangzhou and Ningbo in Zhejiang and Ankang in southernmost Shaanxi. In 1981 this writer saw 权罗 (*dàoluó* rice sieves) for sale in Yixing in Jiangsu. These reports are concentrated to Central and East China. In 1981–1986 权 was identified as 稻 by informants in Jiangsu, Anhui, Jiangxi, northern Zhejiang and parts of Hunan but not elsewhere.[71]

The committee ignored the local 权, advocating 籾 and 𥝛 in its 1962 and 1977 simplification schemes. Not too surprisingly, Anhui Education Bureau objected: "One is used to writing 稻 as 权. Simplifying to 籾 is not habitual." The committee responded by advocating the less short 稻 and 蹈 with 日 in its 1981 Revised Draft.

籾 and 权 are now forgotten. Our youngest informant to identify 权 as 稻 was a student in Wuhu born in 1988, who recognised it from his father's handwriting.

In a still smaller area 权 was used for 程 *chéng* (q.v.).

道 *辺 *dào* road

In 1957 Fán Jiāng wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that some of his Zhejiang pupils wrote 辺 for 道 in their compositions. In 1960 the Script Reform Committee received reports of 辺 from Baotou in Inner Mongolia in the north to Rongjiang in Guizhou in the south. This 辺 was obviously a novelty. Only two years earlier Liú Zéxiān wrote in a *Zhōngguó yǔwén* article on Japanese script reform that Chinese readers could "easily recognise" the Japanese 辺 as 邊. Not as 道, as they would later.

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed to make 辺 official. Jilin Education

---

70 Letters from Gaozhou, Heyuan, Linxiang, Rongjiang, Songxi and Wugang.

71 权 identified as 稻 in Nanjing, Huaiyin, Suzhou, Wuxi, Xuzhou, Yancheng, Yixing and Zhenjiang but not Nanjing and Yangzhou in Jiangsu, in Hefei, Bengbu, Fuyang, Huangshan, Jingxian, Ma'anshan and Sùzhou but not Huaibei in Anhui, in Hangzhou, Huzhou and Jiaxing in Zhejiang but not Ningbo and Wenzhou further south, in Ganzhou, Ji'an and Ruijin but as 程 in Jingdezhen and Shangrao in Jiangxi, in Chaling, Chenzhou and Xiangtan but not Changsha, Hengyang, Lianyuan and Zhuzhou in Hunan. Identified as 程 in five other places and unknown in twenty-four places in other provinces.

Bureau and corresponding organs in Hubei, Sichuan and Yunnan found 辺 too similar to 边. Yè Nán asked in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "How can one 讲道理 (talk sense) using a 刀 (knife)?" Needless to say, the threatening 辺 did not make it to the 1981 Revised Draft.

德 德 *㥁 *dé* virtue

The official Japanese form 徳 is shorter than the Chinese 德 by one 一. The split did not spring from different pre-reform habits; in our 1900–1946 Japanese manuscripts 徳 outnumbers 德 twenty-nine to five, while the Chinese proportion is an inverse forty-five to fifty-one.

The stroke under the 罒 (eye) turns up on the Western Zhou Héng guǐ goblet, where the character 直 (*zhí* straight, the phonetic in 德) appears as 𥄂 instead of the 𥄃 established at the time. Forms without 一 remained the more common, however. The Qin standardiser Lǐ Sī wrote 㥁 (德) without 一 in his Taishan inscription, and probably elsewhere, setting a standard which was followed in the silk manuscripts from Mawangdui and on the wood slips from Juyan and Dunhuang.

But not by Xǔ Shèn. His *Shuōwén* said 德 "consists of 彳 and the phonetic 悳", 悳 "consists of 直 and 心" while 直 meant "look straight" and "consists of ∟, 十 and 目." This etymology called for a ∟ or its shortened version 一, which duly turns up on the 165 Kǒng Zhòu stele. Standardisers wavered. The 175 Xīpíng Stone Classics, the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén*, the Tang *Yùpiān* and the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* all prescribed 德 without 一, whereas the 241 Zhèngshǐ Stone Classics, 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì*, 1008 *Guǎngyùn* and later dictionaries promoted 德 with 一.

Chinese reformers did not bother to shorten the character by one stroke. In 1959 Liú Hé instead advocated use of "ancient shortened forms (including original forms)" like 悳 for 德. In 1960 a teacher from Linxiang in Hunan wrote to the Script Reform Committee that 㣍, the bottom right of 德, was "used by the people" for 德. In 1976 similar reports arrived from Wenling in Zhejiang and Gejiu in Yunnan.

㣍 was included in List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme, the list intended for further debate. The debate revealed that 㣍 was little known. The Education Bureau of the Revolutionary Committee of Jiangsu Province wrote: "Seeing forms like 屵 (微 [*wēi* tiny]), 虲 (韩 [*Hán*]), 㣍 (德) […] there is no way of making out which characters they have been simplified from." Guangxi Script Reform Leading Group warned: "One should not create new characters, like 𡗗 for 寡 [*guǎ* alone], 㣍 for 德 […]." Unsurprisingly, 㣍 was purged from the 1981 Revised Draft.

<center>*鐙 燈 灯 *dēng* lamp</center>

'Lamp' was written with 金 but appears in shorter form as 燈 in the calligraphy of Wáng Xīzhī (303–361). Xú Xuàn explained in his 986 edition of *Shuōwén*: "A torch is placed on a [metal] tablet, therefore it is called 鐙 [with 金]. Nowadays 鐙 is informally written 燈. This is not correct." The 1008 *Guǎngyùn* ignored him, prescribed 燈 and was followed by later dictionaries.

Yuan writers shortened the character more radically. In a list of monks on the back side of a 1314 tablet dubbed Chánshī zōngpài tú (Chart of Zen Master Sects) in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*, one 智燈 (Zhìdēng) reappears as 智灯. Liú Fù found this 灯 with the phonetic 丁 *dīng* for 登 *dēng* in each of the ten Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprints he surveyed. In 1956 灯 became official in China.

In Japan the form 灯 was recommended already in the 1496 version of the *Setsuyōshū* dictionary. Legalisation of 灯 was proposed in 1919 by the Education Ministry and in 1938 by the Language Council, which however passed the character over in 1946 and 1949. Ōiwa Masanaka pointed out that 灯 nevertheless appeared in at least one of the Ministry's textbooks. In 1954 the newspapers' organisation proposeded adding 灯 to the List of Characters for Current Use. The Language Council complied in 1981, including 灯 in its new List of Characters for Common Use.

<center>等 *莩 *děng* wait</center>

See 筆 *bǐ*.

<center>鄧 邓 *邒 *Dèng*</center>

邓, the first and last strokes of 鄧, was reported from Jiangsu by Hǎi Gē in 1934. 邒 with the phonetic 丁 *dīng* was referred to by Chén Guāngyáo in 1936. 邓 became the more common form, appearing in four of our 1940–1954 manuscripts against 邒 in none.

So the 1955 Draft proposed 邓. At a meeting of the Guangdong Committee of the People's Political Consultative Conference, Dù Dìngyǒu worried about the extensive use of the component 又 in 对 for 對, 汉 for 漢, 仅 for 僅, 欢 for 歡 and 戏 for 戲, suggesting instead 邒 analogously to the Draft's 灯 for 燈.[72] Zhèng Yīnghàn made the same point in *Guāngmíng rìbào*. The revised October draft nevertheless kept 邓, justifying it as "the more common" form. Chén Guāngyáo hinted in 1956 that the decision was not unanimous: "This

---

72   Renmin zhengxie 1955.

character was changed several times, but in the end 邓 was adopted." The final adoption was delayed until the June 1956 second batch of simplified characters.

The choice is even said to have been influenced by a higher power. In 1994 Chén Yuán, former head of the Institute of Applied Linguistics at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, told Matsuoka Eiji:

> About the 邓 in 邓小平 [Dèng Xiǎopíng] and how it came to be this character there is an inside story. For 鄧 there were different simplification proposals. At the time both 又 and 丁 were used [on the left], plus some other ways. When the proposals were sent to the Central Committee, Chairman Máo asked: 'Dèng Xiǎopíng, what do you think?' (I was not there, this is something I heard.) Dèng answered: 'This one.' [73]

Chén did not specify when Máo and Dèng found time to discuss individual characters, nor do we find records of such a meeting in *Jiànguó yǐlái wénzì gǎigé gōngzuò biānnián jìshì* (Chronicle of Work on Script Reform since the Founding of the People's Republic).

After the reform the uncommon 邔 faded away. In 1964 the teacher Huáng Hé wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that he had seen 邔 in a Wenzhou worker's notebook. In 1974 Xiàng Huī urged in *Guāngmíng rìbào* to "do away with the irregular 邔 and 孕". With this, complaints about 邔 cease. None of our post-2000 informants have recognised 邔.

糴 籴 *糴 dí buy grain

糴 consists of 入 (purchase), 米 (grain) and the phonetic 翟 *dí*, which in turn consists of the 羽 (feathers) of a 隹 (pheasant). On eleven out of twelve Han wood slips in Sano Kōichi's catalogue the character is written 糴 without 入.

Later shorteners were more radical. The Tang writing guide *Gānlù zìshū* warned against the "informal" 籴, a 糴 without 翟. Nevertheless the form remained in use in 1950, when it was observed by Huáng Ruòzhōu in Shanghai. In 1959 籴 became the official form.

敵 敌 dí enemy

In the ruinous 1930s and forties enemies abounded, as did their character, which turned into a burden. Some lessened this burden by writing 敌 with 丶 for 啇, as in a vow to 消滅敌人 (*xiāomiè dírén* annihilate the enemy) in

---

73 "Chugoku no kanji: kako – genzai – mirai (ge)" 1994, p. 10.

the 1934 Oath of the Pioneers of the Red Guards of Fujian. 敌 spread as far as to Taiwan, where Luó Jiālún wrote in 1954: "敵 written as 敌 is something one can see in every military report."[74] On the mainland 敌 became official in February 1956, stirring no debate. The form did not march on to Japan, where 敵 remained the official form.

<div align="center">遞 遁 递 dì deliver</div>

遞 became 遁 in Japan and 递 in China. Both forms had old roots.

遞 with 帀 for 虍 appeared as 遞 in the 513 Chén Xīn epitaph and as 遁 in the 520 Lǐ Bì epitaph. Early scribes could not agree how to render the character 虍, writing 鬲 or 虍 in the early Han silk manuscripts from Mawangdui, 甶, 甶 or 兩 on wood slips from Juyan and Dunhuang, 鬲, 甶 or 鬲 on Eastern Han stone steles and 庸, 庸 or 甶 on Later Wei steles. 帀 in 遁 is a shortened version of these.

遞 with the full 虎 is actually younger, first known from the 641 Chéng Shèróng eptitaph. Even 虎 with 几 is a relative novelty, appearing in the 543 Yuán Zhàn epitaph. 几 is an attempt to follow Shuōwén's instruction that the tiger's legs resemble those of a man (儿).

递 with the phonetic 弟 was called ancient for 遞 by the 997 Lóngkān shǒujìng and the same as 遞 by the 1013 Yùpiān. 递 was revived or reinvented in the twentieth century, as we see in a 1948 instruction from the Communications Section of Beiping City urging post offices to intensify checks for 私递炮毒 (sī dì yāndú opium sent by personal mail).[75]

Our 1940–1954 Chinese manuscripts contain three 遞 and one 递. The reformers preferred the explicable to the common and recognised 递 in 1959. In Japan, where there was no sign of a 递 revival, 遁 became official in 1946.

<div align="center">第 *弔 *才 dì number</div>

第 consists of 'bamboo' over a shortened 弟 dì phonetic. Shuōwén said 弟 means "a sequence of bundles [of bamboo writing slips] tied up with leather strings," holding it for the original form of 第. We find examples like 弟一車 (carriage number one) and 弟廿三部 (detachment number twenty-three) on Western Han wood slips.[76] Later Liú Fù noticed the practice in blockprints from the Song onwards.

---

74   Fujian geming shi huaji, p. 174. Luo 1954, p. 17.
75   Beijing Archives J1-4-467, p. 6.
76   Juyan slips 29.9 and 210.2. Analogous phrases on slips 25.23, 26.6, 35.7, 71.35, 76.8, 227.12 and 231.7.

Most Han 第 had tops, however, although the ‘bamboo’ was mostly short-ened to ‘grass’. Fushimi Chūkei registered four 第 with ‘grass’ on Han steles against one 第 with the original ‘bamboo’. Even standardisers wavered. The 175 Xīpíng Stone Classics advocated 第 with ‘grass’, the 241 Zhèngshǐ Stone Classics 第 with ‘bamboo’, the Tang *Yùpiān* 第 with ‘grass’ and the Tang *Gānlù zìshū* 第 with ‘bamboo’. From the Song onwards the 第 standard was uncontested, if not always followed; on Ming and Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* we still find sixteen 苐 among fifty-seven 第.

The 1955 Draft included 苐 for 第, a nalogously to the proposed 荅, 荨, 苐, 萢 and 萹 for 答, 等, 範 and 篇 (see 筆 *bǐ*). Dǒng Jiànshēn objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào*:

> Quite a few characters have already been simplified rather thoroughly by the people, like 倉 to 仓, 兩 to 刄 and 第 to 㐧. In the Draft, howev-er, they have become 仓, 両 and 苐. […] People who have been using simpler forms will of course not take up forms which are harder to write. This way double forms may emerge.

Yes, 㐧 which we first find in the phrase 㐧一楼 (first floor) in an 1881 manuscript was common, appearing in forty-six of our 1950–1954 manu-scripts compared with 苐 in twenty-three.[77] The 1956 Scheme nevertheless bypassed 第.

The 1977 Second Scheme more radically proposed to change both 第 and 弟 (*dì* younger brother) to 才, an unusual if not unknown form, which was discarded in the 1981 Revised Draft.

才 was not the shortest form on record. In May 1912 Lǔ Xùn wrote 才一 in his diary. In 1960 a teacher in Changchun in Jilin informed the committee that the masses wrote 才 for 第. This writer saw this 才 in Shenyang and Dalian in Liaoning in 1982, in Tainan in Taiwan in 1986 and in Jiamusi in Heilongjiang in 2012.

These records are skewed. Jilin, Liaoning, Heilongjiang and Taiwan were administered by Japan until 1945, and Lǔ Xùn had studied in Japan. Not surprisingly we find earlier records of 才 in Japan, like a 1278 petition from farmers in Tairyō Village in present Fukui calling a contract clause 不便之次才 (*fuben no shidai* an unsuitable precedent).[78] In our 1900–1946 Japanese manuscripts 才 appears sixty-eight times, outnumbering 苐 by nineteen and 㐧 by sixty-two. In 1953 才 found its way onto a postage stamp

---

77 “Yanshan conggao”, p. 08.0437.
78 *Enshū komonjo sen: Shōen hen*, item 50.

commemorating 㐧8回国民体育大会 (*dai hachi kai kokumin taiiku taikai* the 8th National Sports Meet).

Recognition of 㐧 was mooted in 1963, when Language Council chairman Abe Shinnosuke mentioned the "need to consider the adoption of suitable short forms used to some extent in society today but not included in the [1949] List of Forms […] like […] 畄 (留), 㐧 (第), 笵 (簿) […]." As we know, these changes never came about.

點 点 *占 *奌 *diǎn* point

點 consists of 黑 (black) and the phonetic 占 *zhān*. In Yuan and Ming blockprints the character appears without the top left as 点 or 占. 奌, an analogy to the older 奂 for 魚, appears in Japanese manuscripts from 1910 onwards and in Chinese ones from 1935.[79]

In Japan 奌 dominated, appearing in twenty-two of our 1900–1946 manuscripts compared with 点 in four and 占 in two. The 1919, 1923, 1926, 1938 and 1942 reform schemes nevertheless proposed the more etymological 点. Dissent surfaced in August 1946, when a draft from the Textbook Office of the Education Ministry proposed 奌 with 大. In the margin someone had inserted 点. The margin writer got his way; the Language Council's September List of Simplified Forms had a 点 which stayed put in the decisive List of Characters for Current Use.[80]

In China 奌 appeared late. Our 1900–1934 manuscripts contain seven 点 and four 占 but no 奌. Unsurprisingly, *Tàibái*, *Lúnyǔ* and the Education Ministry chose 点 for their 1935 simplification schemes.

By the 1950s habits had changed. Our 1950–1954 manuscripts hold seven 点 and thirteen 占 but no less than fifty 奌. The 1956 Scheme nevertheless endorsed the longer-established 点. This break with practice went unnoticed even by some who ought to notice: Chén Yuè wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào* about a typefoundry delivering 奌 types instead of 点.

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed to shorten all 灬 bottoms to 一, turning 点 into 占. Professor Xú Zhōnghuá pointed out: "In the scheme's List Two 一 replaces five or six components: 䒞 in 𡰱, 亘 in 亡 […], 𡗗 in 汒 [演 *yǎn* perform], 豖 in 苎 [蒙 *méng* cover], 異 in 丠 [冀 *Jì* Hebei]: 一 also replaces all 灬 ." The 1981 Revised Draft duly excluded all.

---

79 Aichi Archives 448-3-42, p. 37. Shen 1935.

80 National Archives 1946.6.4–1946.12.19, pp. 75, 234.

殿 *㐆 diàn hall

Liú Fù found 殿 without 殳 in blockprints from the Yuan and Qing. The 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn* called 㐆 "the informal form for 殿". In 1957 the calligrapher Mǎ Gōngyú wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "In letters and documents I have received recently there are many newly created short forms. Some I have made out, like 宀 (宣), 衻 (街) and 㐆 (殿) […]." The scantily recorded 㐆 was proposed in the 1977 Second Scheme. The public pointed to its similarity to 展, effectively excluding it from the 1981 Revised Draft.[81]

澱 淀 diàn sediment

澱 is a rarity except in the word 澱粉 (*diànfěn* starch). Those in that trade circumvented the sixteen-stroke 澱 by writing 淀, a homonym meaning 'shallow waters' but mainly used in the Beijing place name 海淀. Already the 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* called the two characters identical. The 1956 Scheme prescribed 淀 even for 'sediment' and 'starch'.

電 电 diàn lightning, electricity

At the 1955 script reform conference Professor Chén Zhōngfán defended "the adoption of ancient original characters, like […] 云 and 电 for 雲 and 電 […]. Some think that this is to restore ancient ways. However, […] 云 and 电 have been in use in society all the time and constitute no problem."

Yes, the bottom of 電 is a variant of 申 *shēn* which comes from 㬳 which comes from 昌 which comes from ⚡ which does look like a lightning. But no, 电 had not "been in use in society all the time", not even if we include its closest kin 申 which has been used for 'stretch', 'express' and the ninth earthly branch, but not for 'lightning' or 'electricity'.

We first find a topless 電 in the latter senses in the 1935 "plain stroke characters" launched by the editors of *Lúnyǔ*. This promotion had little immediate effect. The first topless form in our manuscripts is a 电 in a 1947 transcript of a telegram to the Bank of Communications.[82] This 电 became the more common short form, appearing in twenty of our 1947–1954 manuscripts compared with 电 in two and 电 in none.

So the 1956 Scheme opted for 电. Chén Wénbīn explained:

> For 電, the short forms 电, 电 and 电 are in use in society. Since all three are common, we had to select one of them. If one omits the 雨

---

81   *Qunzhong dui 'Cao'an'* [1978], p. 6.
82   Beijing Archives J32-1-2398, p. 38.

top from the regular form, the remainder is 电. But if one looks at the ancient forms 申 and 䨣, it becomes natural to write 电 or 电. Bearing the stroke number of the printed form and the convenience of learners in mind, we finally selected 电.

This sheds light on the origin of the short variants. 电 is a square version of the 申 bottom of *Shuōwén*'s seal form. 电 is not, as Chén pointed out, what one would get from spontaneously shortening 電. These forms were obviously made up not by the broad masses but by someone well versed in *Shuōwén*.

*疊 *疊 叠 畺 *dié* pile up, repeat

On Han steles we find both 疊 with 畾 and 疊 with 晶. *Shuōwén* took the shorter form to be original and correct: "Yáng Xióng [53 BCE–18 CE] said: 'When a judge passed a sentence in ancient times, sacrifices were made for three days before it was carried out.' The character is therefore written with 晶 [three days] and 宜 [sacrificial urn]. In the bygone [9–23 CE] Xin dynasty the three 日 in 疊 were deemed too plain and changed to three 田."

This etymology convinced few. On Later Wei steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* we find eighteen 疊 with 畾 but no 疊 with 晶. The 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* entered both 疊 and 疊, but added: "Today the form is correctly written 疊." Later dictionaries followed suit, and writers. From the Song to the Qing the database registers thirty-three 疊 but no 疊. Lín Yìguāng claimed in 1920 that the top represents not three days but objects piled up on an altar, justifying 畾. Others like Shirakawa Shizuka hold the objects for jewels or jade lumps, justifying 晶.

Many found both 疊 and 疊 too crammed. Some dropped two of the objects and wrote 畺, as on the 508 Gāo Qìng stele. Others shortened each one to 又, as in cursive style, and wrote 叠, a form called "informal" by the Yuan *Zìjiàn*. Later writers applied both methods and wrote 壹, as Hǎi Gē noticed in 1934.

Takuhon moji dētabēsu contains seven Qing 叠 against one 畺. Reformers began by following custom, selecting 叠 for *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters". Their 1955 Draft, however, more radically replaced 疊 with 迭 (*dié* to alternate). The change was implemented only in 1964, with a restriction: in cases when 迭 and 疊 might be confused, 叠 was to be used. This was not the last word on the matter. In 1973 Helmut Martin saw the proposal 壹 in a dictionary draft prepared by the Script Reform Publishing House. In 1986 the State Language Commission simplified matters by prescribing 叠 for all former 疊.

Japanese writers have contrived yet another form. Shibata Masao found

畳 in the 1505 handbook *Unshū ōrai* (Correspondence manual for [the state of] Unshū). This 畳 is analogous to other Japanese short forms like 塁 for 壘 and 摂 for 攝 described in the 轟 *hōng* section.

This 畳 seems to have become the more common short form, appearing in two of our 1900–1946 manuscripts compared with 畳 and 叠 in none. Reformers wavered, proposing in 1919 to permit 畳, in 1923 畳, in 1926 and 1938 畳 and finally in 1949 畳.

<div align="center">

蝶 *虮 *dié* butterfly
碟 *矶 *dié* plate

</div>

In 1960 a teacher from Shaoguan in Guangdong wrote to the committee that he had seen 蝶 written 虮. In 1981 this author saw plates labelled 㕛矶 (餐碟 *cāndié*) and butterfly-shaped cookies labelled 虮酥 (*diésù*) for sale in Guangzhou. In 1982 he noticed flowers labelled 蚨虮草 (蝴蝶草 *húdiécǎo*) in Nanning and plates with dragon ornaments labelled 龙矶 in Shaoguan.

Records are from Guangdong and Guangxi. 1981–1986 interviews confirmed that 矶 was known to informants in these provinces but not elsewhere.[83] The puzzling 入 *rù* component did not puzzle Cantonese speakers, who saw a 入 *jap* phonetic indicating the readings 蝶 *tip* and 碟 *tip*.

<div align="center">

東 东 *dōng* east

</div>

Forms like 东 appear already on Western Han wood slips. The 1955 Draft proposed to standardise handwriting to 东 but retain 東 in print. The 1956 Scheme rejected the handwritten norm, proposing 东, 陈 (陳 *Chén*), 冻 (凍 *dòng* freeze) and so on for all purposes. The proposal was implemented with the 1964 General List.

<div align="center">

董 *苳 *Dǒng*
懂 *忪 *dǒng* understand

</div>

The 1956 Scheme turned 種 (*zhǒng* species) into 鍾 (*zhōng* bell) and 腫 (*zhǒng* swell) into 种, 钟 and 肿. Four years later correspondents from Changzi in Shanxi and Zongyang in Anhui informed the Script Reform Committee that

---

83   矶 identified as 碟 in Guangzhou, Jiangmen, Maoming, Shaoguan, Zhanjiang and Zhuhai but not Huizhou, Meixian and Shantou in Guangdong and in Nanning, Beihai, Guilin and Lingshan but not Liuzhou and Yulin in Guangxi. Unknown in eighteen places in other provinces.

the masses had created anologies like 苸 for 董 and 忄 for 懂. Letters from Chengtai and Xiamen in Fujian, Hefei in Anhui and Pingnan in Guangxi in turn reported 㤅 with the phonetic 冬 *dōng*. In 1965 the Zhejiang teacher Huáng Shìzhōng mentioned the analogous 苳 for 董.

The 1977 Second Scheme opted for the apparently more common 苳 and 㤅. Yú Xiàlóng objected that the 冬 component might mislead learners to read in the first tone. The 1981 Revised Draft duly passed 董 and 懂 over.

動 动 *dòng* move

Yuan and Qing blockprinters shortened 動 somewhat by writing 動, 勁 or 劲. Later scribes transformed the cursive form into square style, writing the left side as 至 as in a 1932 song text urging Red Army soldiers to 行劲听命令 (*xíngdòng tīng mìnglìng* act on orders).[84]

Campaigns for all sorts of 運動 (*yùndòng* movements) and against everything 反動 (*fǎndòng* reactionary) created a need for for a still simpler form. We find one on a 1939 photograph showing a sign urging all compatriots to 紧急动员 (*jǐnjí dòngyuán* quickly mobilise).[85] Chén Guāngyáo explained this 动 in 1956: "This is analogous to 秐, an alternative short form for 種 [种 *zhǒng* species]. Perhaps 动 emerged as an analogy to [the somewhat older] 秐." 动 became official with the 1956 Scheme.

竇 窦 *dòu* hole

The 1964 General List simplified 竇 to 窦 analogously to 卖 for 賣. Some found even this too complex. Zēng Xiàndá reported in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that medics wrote 宣, a form called "informal" for 竇 in the 1615 *Zìhuì* and given the reading 竇 and sense of 'pit' in the 1039 *Jíyùn*. In 1966 one Ā Zhēng wrote: "Here [in Wenxi in Shanxi] there are people named Dòu […]. Even after simplification this character remains difficult […], so we write 豆 or 宧." Like the Nanjing doctor who diagnosed this author with 毕宧炎 (鼻窦 炎 sinusitis) in 1980.

鬭 鬪 鬦 鬥 鬧 斗 *dòu* struggle

Ambitious dictionaries operate with two traditional forms for 'struggle', the plain 鬥 and 鬭 with the phonetic 斲 (*zhuó* chop). Both appeared in *Shuōwén*, which defined 鬥 as "two warriors confronting each other" and 鬭 as "con-

---

84 *Song-Yuan yilai su zi pu*, p. 6. *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 87.
85 *Taihang geming genjudi huace*, p. 97.

front". At the time, however, only the full form seems to have been in use, although shortened. Sano Kōichi's register of Han wood slips contains six 鬭 with 門, 豆 and 斤 and three 鬭 with 門, 豆 and 寸, but no 鬥. From 517 to 1911 *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* registers thirteen inscriptions with 鬭 and thirteen with 鬪 but just one 鬭 with the prescribed 鬥 frame and none with the prescribed 斲 inside.

鬭 with the shorter phonetic 斗 (*dǒu* ten litres) appeared in the 1212 *Sìshēng piānhǎi* (Essays on the Four Tones), the further shortened 鬦 and 闰 in Yuan blockprints, 鬥 in a 1916 letter and the plain 斗 in a 1932 vow to 奮斗 (*fèndòu* fight) for the rights of workers in Fujian.[86]

Our 1900–1934 manuscripts contain five 鬥, four 闰 and five 斗. For its abortive 1935 List of Short Forms the Education Ministry chose 鬥, a form already in the dictionary. By the 1950s the novelty 斗 had taken over, turning up in twenty of our 1940–1954 manuscripts compared with 鬥 in five, 鬭 in one and 闰 in one. So the 1956 Scheme adopted 斗.

Forms with 斗 appeared even in Japan, 闰 in Matsumoto Guzan's 1803 *Seibun sankō* (A Study of Short Forms) and 鬭 in a 1916 police order to curb 鬭犬鬭鶏 (*tōken tōkei* dogfighting and cockfighting).[87] The idea seems to have come from China, as 斗 *to* is not a plausible substitute for 鬭 *tō* in Japanese. Did Matsumoto, a translator, pick up 闰 from Chinese blockprints?

The still shorter 斗 appears in a description of a 見苦しい戦斗 (*migurushii sentō* dreadful fight) in the 1937 diary of a Japanese soldier in Nanjing and in a 1938 report on 近接戦斗兵器 (*kinsetsu sentō heiki* close combat arms) by an army envoy returning from Central China.[88] Tellingly both of these early 斗 writers had spent time in China.

The Japanese 1923, 1926 and 1938 reform schemes proposed 鬭 and the 1942 one 鬪. In 1948 Language Council chairman Andō Masatsugu suggested something more radical: "There is no shortage of characters to take into consideration as short forms, like the 厂 (歴), 斗 (鬭), 云 (言), 県 (縣) and 庁 (廳) now used in society." The 1949 List of Forms settled for 鬪. 斗 advocates resurfaced in 1957, proposing that form in *Shimbun kenkyū* (News Research).

讀 读 *dú* read

See 賣 *mài*.

---

86 *Shuhai lizhu*, p. 208. *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 166.
87 National Archives 1916.7.5, p. 3.
88 *Nanjing da tusha tuzheng*, p. 158. National Archives 1938.12, pp. 4, 8.

獨 独 *dú* single
觸 触 *chù* bump into
燭 烛 *zhú* candle
濁 浊 *zhuó* muddy

'Single' was originally written 𧔥 (蜀) without 犭, as in the advice to 𣃻𠀠𧔥 (射其豜[堅]蜀 *shè qí jiān shǔ* shoot a single sturdy one of those [animals]) on the late Zhou Stone Drums from Qin. 𧔥 consists of the eye (罒) and body (勹) of a wormlike creature and another worm (虫) added after the Yin. *Shuōwén* plausibly said this meant "caterpillar". Already in the Yin, however, 𧔥 (罡) was loaned for the place name Shu (Sichuan) and in the Zhou, as we just saw, for 'single'.

The same character thus came to be used both for 'caterpillar', 'the land of Shu' and 'single'. To distinguish the latter sense some added 犭 (dog) like in 獨企 (獨立 stand alone) in one of the early Han silk manuscripts from Mawangdui. According to *Shuōwén* 'dog' was chosen because "sheep live in flocks but dogs are solitary." Convinced or not, later writers have stuck to 犭.

Song blockprinters shortened the enlarged 獨 to 独 by shedding 罡, the original part of the character. The analogous 烛 and 浊 appeared in blockprints from the Yuan onwards and 触 from the Qing.

独 and 触 became official in Japan in 1946 and ten years later in China, where 烛 followed in 1958 and 浊 in 1959.

短 *external form* *duǎn* short

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed a change from 短 to external form, a form known since 1950, when Huàng Ruòzhōu mentioned it in the Shanghai *Wénhuì bào* among characters "often seen". Huáng Guǒ objected in *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* (Notifications on Script Reform) that the 卜 "expresses neither sound nor sense", contributing to the removal of external form from the 1981 Revised Draft.

斷 断 *duàn* break off

The 256 Pìyù sutra warned against 滅愛断想 (eradicating love and suspending consideration), with 米 for the four threads (幺) cut by the axe (斤), analogously to the somewhat older 継 for 繼 *jì*. 断 was called "informal" by the early Tang writing guide *Gānlù zìshū* and "wrong" by its 776 successor *Wǔjīng wénzì*. Many missed that message, even some who were supposed to know better. On an 851 scroll excavated in Dunhuang a teacher named Ān Wéndé

had written a 継 with 米 for his student Sòng Wénxiàn to copy properly.[89] The practice was legalised in 1946 in Japan and ten years later in China.

隊 队 *duì* team

The short 队, a man behind a fortification, is a wartime invention. A hand-written proclamation from about 1944 urges the 人民扰日自卫队 (*Rénmín kàng Rì zìwèi duì* People's Self-Defence Force for Resistance against Japan) of Huaibei Jiangsu-Anhui Border Area to 给军队带路 (serve as guides for the troops).[90] By 1955 队 had become a familiar sight. The army teacher Xú Zhìqīng wrote: "Many worker and peasant comrades who were originally illiterate could even before the literacy campaign recognise some simple characters, among them short forms in the Draft, like 学习 and 突击队 [*tūjīduì* shock troops], but when they encountered the complex forms, these characters which they had once recognised often became irrecognisable". These comrades got some relief in June 1956 when 队 became official.

對 对 対 *duì* toward

对 with 文 on the left is known from the 1080 Dharani sutra onwards, 对 with 又 from Yuan blockprints. The former came to dominate in Japan and the latter in China. Our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts contain two hundred and twelve 对 against nine 対, 1900–1946 Japanese ones fifty-five 対 but no 对. Inevitably, Japanese reformers opted for 対 and their Chinese colleagues for 对.

噸 吨 *dūn* ton

In June 1956 噸 with the phonetic 頓 *dùn* became 吨 with 屯 *tún*. 吨 was no novelty, appearing in a 1953 complaint by Beijing Brick Company about the low quality of 壹百陆拾吨 (*yī bǎi liùshí dūn* one hundred and sixty tons) of recently purchased cement.[91]

蹲 *跥 *dūn* squat

In 1964 Zhōu Qíwēi wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that 跥 was widely used for 蹲 in the armed forces. The right side of 跥 is a square version of the cursive 专, analogous to the 专 which was designed nine years earlier on the basis of 专.

---

89 *Dunhuang baozang,* item 705.
90 *Jiangsu kangzhan,* p. 132.
91 Beijing Archives 4-13-35, p. 22.

The 1977 Second Scheme turned 跨 down, promoting instead the some-
what shorter 坉 with the phonetic 屯 *tún*, a form not on former record. Re-
actions were negative. Education bureaus or corresponding authorities in
fourteen provinces suggested 跨 analogously to the proposed 㝵 for 尊 (*zūn*
cup).[92] 坉 was nevertheless retained in the 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">奪 夺 <i>duó</i> seize</div>

奪 consists of a hand (寸) seizing a bird (隹) caught in a net (衣). Some of
the sense was lost in Han seal style, when the net lost its bottom and came
to look like 'big' and more when some writers shed the bird to write 夺, a
form Jiǎng Xīwén and Shào Róngfēn found in late Ming military notes. This
夺 became official in January 1956.

<div align="center">惡 惡 恶 <i>è</i> evil</div>

See 亞 *yà*.

<div align="center">兒 児 儿 <i>ér</i> son</div>

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council changed 兒 to 児, a form appearing
in China as 児 in the 256 Pìyù sutra and in Japan as 児 on the 471 or 531
sword from Inariyama. The shortened form was used even in China, for
example by the above-mentioned Tang teacher Ān Wéndé, who taught his
student to write 児, not 兒 or 児.

It would be hard to explain how 兒 could turn into 児. Fortunately we do
not have to. 児 is a contraction not of 兒 but of the older 兒 with the stroke
order ｜一一, not ノ｜一. Contraction of the second and third strokes turned
this 兒 into 児.

The Japanese adoption of 児 saved one stroke. This was not good enough
for Chinese reformers, who for their 1935 "plain stroke characters" and 1955
Draft chose 儿, the sign for *er* in the National Phonetic Alphabet.

The choice was not obvious. 儿 was unfamiliar, being absent in our pre-
1955 manuscripts, in which 兜 appears twenty-two times and 児 twice. The
reformer Chén Guāngyáo described 儿 as "newly coined." Xú Chuánxíng and
Hǎo Wàngsān pointed out that 儿 would easily be mistaken for 几. These
facts explain why 儿 was not awarded official status until 1959.

---

92   *Wenzi gaige tongxun* 1979:3-4, pp. 4, 6, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 33, 35, 39, 42, 46.

爾 尔 尓 *尒 ěr you
彌 弥 弥 mí full

We do not know what 爾 (爾) originally depicted and meant. When we meet it in the Yin it is used for a name, then for 'prosperous', then for 'you'.

In a pledge on the pre-309 BCE King of Zhongshan tripod not to forget 尒邦 (尒邦 your country) 爾 appears without the bottom. Thereafter full and bottomless forms competed, the latter turning into clerk style 尒 and square style 尓, 尔 and 尔. 尔 was advocated by the Sui model text *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* and was the form first exported to Japan, appearing in five of the seventh- and eighth-century inscriptions catalogued by Kitagawa Hirokuni alongside two 尒 but no 爾.

The Japanese Language Council excluded 爾 from its 1946 List of Characters for Current Use, but did select the analogous 彌 for its 1951 List of Characters for Use in Personal Names. Before that two short forms had been current, 弥 with ⼀ on top right appearing in seven of our Japanese 1900–1946 manuscripts and 弥 with ⼉ in one. The council chose the more common 弥.

In our Chinese 1900–1954 manuscripts the proportions are inversely six 弥 to one 弥 and fourteen 尔 to one 尔 and no 尒. The Script Reform Committee duly selected 尔 and 弥 with ⼉.

The split is analogous to the 称/称 split described in the *chēng* section.

發 発 发 fā send out

In 1934 Xú Zémǐn wrote that "發 has the different forms 发, 発, 潑, 㲠 and 㮇, 发 being the most convenient." Yes, our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain thirty-nine 発, twenty-one 㲠 and one 发, but also twenty 发, one 发, eight 発, five 発, forty-seven 㲠, forty-three 㲠, twenty-nine 㲠 and ten 茇.

The phonetic 癶 bō appears as 屮, 北 and 屮 already in the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts and as 廾 and 丷 on Western Han wood slips. 殳 (hand with implement) alternated with the almost-synonym 攴 or 夂 on Western Han wood slips. 弓 became ｜ in Yuan blockprints. 発 with 干 for 弓 and ク for 夂 appeared in Yuan blockprints and the further shortened 発 in an 1892 manuscript by a temple builder named Táo Gēngzá. 友 and 发 descend from cursive forms like the 发 seen on Western Han wood slips.

In 1935 Chinese reformers chose the not so short 發 for *Tàibái*'s "handy characters" and *Lúnyǔ*'s "plain stroke characters". Contributors to *Tàibái* were urged to use the chosen forms in their manuscripts, but found 發 wanting,

Huáng Huájié writing 嶐, Xià Gàizūn 茇, Xǔ Jié 烻 and Táng Tāo 嶐.[93] Later that year the Education Ministry chose the shorter 发 for its List of Short Forms, like the Script Reform Committee for its 1955 Draft. Xú Chuánxíng pointed out in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that "those who have always written 汗, 発, 导 and 厶 do not consent to writing 汉, 发, 孕 and 広." They nevertheless had to when 发 became official in 1959.

In Japan cursive forms like 发 and 乥 frequently appeared and appear in calligraphic handbooks but rarely in everyday handwriting. Our Japanese 1900–1946 manuscripts contain forty-two 発, eight 桊, ten 烾, one 発, one 嶐, one 茇 and one 菱 but no 发 or 发. Unsurprisingly the Language Council chose 発 for its 1923, 1926, 1938 and 1942 reform schemes and for its decisive 1946 one.

髮 发 *fà* hair

髮 became 发 in 1959. This was a novelty. In 1950–1954 surveys of barber shops by Beijing Industry and Trade Office, the 長 component appears reduced to 专, 干 or 丬 and 彡 to 久, 勹, ノ or 丨, but neither ever disappears.[94] Professor Liáng Dōnghàn opined in *Wénzì gǎigé* that "some simplified forms which are not established by custom are nevertheless very good, like 牵 for 牽 and 发 for 發 and 髮."

翻 *反 *fān* reverse

The 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì* said 反 was "already in use in [Shanghai] society" for 翻. In 1957 the Zhejiang teacher Fán Jiāng reported that 反 was used for 翻 by his students. In 1963 the practice was registered in Beijing:

> Report from Beijing Police Department: In Wangfu Food Store in Wangfujing Street one has recently discovered price tags of 翻毛月餅 [Fanmao moon cakes] written as 反毛月餅 [Resist Mao moon cakes]. It has now been established that this fault was caused by indiscriminate use of simplified characters by the personnel in charge. The concrete facts are as follows:
>
> On 24 August the cadres Hé Kāidí (party member) from Beijing Price Committee and Xiāo Yíngbì (of the [non-party] masses) from the Food Processing Section of Beijing Light Industries Bureau prepared

---

93 Facsimiles in *Taibai* 2:1, 2:2, 2:9.
94 Beijing Archives 4-2-293, p. 4; 22-10-851, p. 19; 39-1-539, pp. 6, 31, 53; J2-7-845, pp. 7, 12, 50.

a 'Directive on the Prices of 1963 Autumn Festival Moon Cakes' and came to write 翻毛月餅 as 反毛月餅. The comrades at Beijing Price Committee did not notice and correct the mistake. The final version was sent to the Light Industries Bureau, the Non-staple Food Trade Bureau and the Supply and Marketing Agency, and copies were sent to the Food Processing Section of Beijing Finance and Trade Office. The Food Processing Section mimeographed the original of this Directive and distributed it to its nine plants. On the basis of the Directive, Chén Ānlín (party member) of the Price Section of the the Sweets, Tobacco and Wine Company prepared a 'Directive on Retail Prices of 1963 Autumn Festival Cakes, also with the 反毛 mistake, which was printed in 168 copies and distributed to non-staple food and general merchandise units […].

An investigation of those responsible for the mistake, Hé Kāidí and Chén Ānlín, has found no flaw in their political history and present conduct. Striving for simplicity, they happened to misuse simplified characters and write like some people in the trade, and had no intentions of political impact. During the investigation one found that even other products were written with similar mistakes, like 翻毛皮大衣 [suede coat] as 反毛皮大衣 and 翻毛皮革 [suede] as 反毛皮革.[95]

The Script Reform Committee had another idea. The 1962 List of Simplified Characters included 扝 with the phonetic 凡 *fán,* and the comment that 翻 "is relatively common and the masses want it simplified. Writing 番 or 翂 would still leave many strokes. Writing 扝 is simpler, and easy to understand and to read." List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme repeated the proposal. Tianjin Culture and Education Section objected: "Even with a phonetic it is hard to make out characters like 扝 for 翻 […]." 扝 was duly excluded from the 1981 Revised Draft.

Writers have stuck to the simpler way. A 2015 web search registered two hundred and seven 反毛皮, compared with two hundred and twelve 翻毛皮.

礬 矾 *fán* vitriol

矾 is a late invention, absent in our 1900–1954 manuscripts and in the 1951 edition of Huáng Ruòzhōu's *Jiǎntǐzì huì* but present in the 1954 edition.

The Script Reform Committee seems to have been unaware of 矾, proposing instead the homonym 凡 in its 1955 Draft. In *Guāngmíng rìbào* Zhāng Yuǎntí described 凡 as "newly created" but "suitable". Professor Guǎn Xièchū

---

95   Beijing Archives 2-15-376, p. 3.

in turn warned that 凡是化学藥品, 它一定没有生命的 (chemical reagents are not living organisms) might come to mean "vitriol is a chemical agent so it is not a living organism".

Instead he suggested 矾, and was joined by Yuán Shūqīng and Xú Shìsōng. Professor Pān Yǔnzhōng of Zhongshan University argued: "In Guangdong 礬 is written 矾 and this has already become a custom. Moreover its meaning is explicit, while in the present list this character has become 凡, which may easily be mixed up with the other sense of 凡." The committee complied, recognising 矾 in June 1956.

範 萢 范 *fàn* model

The 1955 Draft proposed to give 範 a grass top, analogously to 答, 等, 第 and 篇. Guǎn Xièchū of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences saw no sense in introducing 萢 when the homonym 范, a surname, was readily available. So the 1956 Scheme replaced 萢 with 范. Chén Wénbīn pointed out that "some of the masses have already begun to use this character in this way." "Already" was an understatement; a wood slip dated 20 BCE noted that 卒 范客子 (*zú fàn kè zǐ* the exemplary retainer's son died).[96] In fact the full 範 character is absent in Han inscriptions; the oldest form with 車 is a 萢 on the 278 CE Bìyōng stele, already with a 'grass' top.

飛 飞 *㢟 *乤 *fēi* fly

In 1955 the proofreader Zhào Xī wrote in *Zhōngguó yǔwén* that "some write the character 飛 as 飞, others as 乤." Yes, we do find two 乤 in our 1940–1954 manuscripts, alongside four 㢟 but, notably, no 飞.

乤 with the 'go' bottom turns up in phrases like 乤身上馬 (*fēi shēn shàng mǎ* he dashed upon his horse) and 乤馬出東門 (he dashed out of the East Gate) in an 1874 blockprint of the Tang epic *Wǎgǎngzhài yǎnyì* (Tale of the Wagang Army).

㢟 without 升 was registered in the 657 Cuī Sù epitaph in Luó Zhènyù's 1928 *Zēngdìng Bēi biézì* (Enlarged and Revised Character Variants on Steles). In 1934 Hǎi Gē saw 㢟 used in Jiangsu. Had the first modern users read Luó?

飞, a halved 㢟, was a still newer form, first promoted in Chén Guāngyáo's 1936 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo* and mentioned in Huáng Ruòzhōu's 1950 *Chángyòng jiǎntǐzì huì* (Index of Common Short Forms) and in Zhào's 1955 article.

For their 1935 "handy characters" the *Tàibái* editors chose the short and

---

96   Juyan slip 28.13. More examples on slips 41.18B, 163.16 and 101.24.

common 飞. When the Script Reform Committee picked up the simplification task twenty years later, even 飞 had joined the contest. Like the *Tàibái* editors, the committee selected the shortest form on the table, which was now 飞.

Reformers never claimed 飞 was common. Wèi Jiàngōng mentioned 飞 among "newly coined short forms" and Jīn Míngshèng among "characters simply made up by the Script Reform Committee." Chén Guāngyáo argued somewhat defensively in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that 飞 was "easy to figure out at a glance". Not surprisingly the committee postponed the recognition of 飞 until June 1956.

廢 廃 废 *fèi* cancel

Analogously to 發, 廢 was officially simplified to 廃 in Japan and to 废 in China.

In Japan a still shorter alternative is on record. In 1933 Yamaguchi Power Company discussed 广新 (*haishin* abolition and renovation) of installations and in 1941 广止手数料 (*haishi tesūryō* cancellation fees).[97] This 广 was in use even for for 摩 (*ma* rub, see *mó*) and 廳 (*chō* office, see *tīng*) and was in the end adopted for neither. In 2014–2017 none of our Japanese informants identified 广 as any of the above.

費 费 *弗 *fèi* fee

The 1964 General List changed 費 to 费. By then impatient writers had already taken charge. In 1956 a cooperative in Qixia District in Nanjing listed its 生产弗用 (production costs) and Hangzhou Public Health Bureau its 药弗 (*yàofèi* expenses for medicine), while.[98] Such use of 弗 (*fú* not) for 'fee' was criticised by Chóng Wén in *Guāngmíng rìbào* and by Xiāo Tiānzhù in *Wénzì gǎigé*. 弗 was nevertheless included in the 1977 Second Scheme, although not in the 1981 Revised Draft.

Irregular use of 弗 has continued, prompting the 1998 *Xiàndài Hànyǔ guīfàn zìdiǎn* to warn that "费 cannot be shortened to 弗."

墳 坟 *fén*

In 1958 the Script Reform Committee changed 墳 to 坟, replacing the phonetic 賁 *bēn* with 文 *wén*. The practice can be traced back to the 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*: "坟; ancient form for 梅 [*méi* plum]. […]. Others say 坟 is informal for 墳."

---

97 Yamaguchi Archives 戰前 B 1101, 戰前 B 1100.
98 Nanjing Archives 8003-3-55, p. 47. Hangzhou Archives 87-2-35, p. 22.

奮 奋 *fèn* briskly

奋 became official for 奮 in February 1956. Liú Fù found 奋 in the 1862–1874 blockprint *Lǐngnán yìshǐ*. The 隹-less 奋 is an analogy to the older 夺 for 奪.

糞 粪 *fèn* manure

Chén Guāngyáo called 粪 a "newly coined short form." Spot on, as 粪 enters our records with the January 1956 Scheme. The novelty was authorised in June 1956, four months after the first batch of simplified characters.

豐 豊 丰 *fēng* abundant

Pre-Qin seal forms depict a vase or urn (豆) with contents (丯丯 or 木木). In Han clerk script this was rendered 豐 or, more often, 豊. The Han Xīpíng Stone Classics prescribed 豊, the Song *Guǎngyùn* and *Jíyùn* the more etymological 豐. Non-compliers were told off by the 1610 *Súshū kānwù*: "豊 is informally written 豐. This is wrong." The Japanese Language Council chose to make wrong right, including 豊 in its 1926, 1938 and 1942 reform schemes and then legalising the form in 1946.

In China the 咸豐 (*Xiánfēng*) era was hard to write. The banker Wáng Màoyín, for one, signed his letters 咸丰元年 (1851) and 咸丰二年 (1852) with 丰 (*fēng* beautiful) for 豐. Reformers included this 丰 in their 1935 and 1955 schemes and made it official for 豐 in February 1956.

Support was not complete. Chén Wénbīn wrote in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "Some say one should restore the top 丿 to 一 [as in *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*]. However, 丰 is already in use among the masses, so there is no need to change it again." And not only among the masses. From the Song to the Qing, *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* registers seven stone steles with 丰 but none with 丰. The 1964 General List nevertheless changed 丰 to 丰.

風 风 *凨 *几 *fēng* wind

Chén Guāngyáo wrote in 1956: "There are many short forms of this character, like 凨, 凩, 风 and 几, but 风 is the most common." We will now look closer at these forms.

凨 appears in the 256 CE Pìyù sutra and in the calligraphy of Suǒ Jìng (239–303). It is derived from 颪, a form we see on the 165 CE Xiǎn Yúhuáng stele.

凩 is a contracted 凨.

风 is a square version of the cursive form, appearing in square style in blockprints from the Yuan onwards.

几 is first seen in Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprints. This puzzling form may be a descendant of the variant 凩.

凤 was used for 風 in documents from the Taiping Rebellion, observed Guō Ruòyú. Before that, in Yuan and Qing blockprints, the 凤 design was used for 鳳 (*fèng* phoenix), and thereafter for both 鳳 and 風.

The age-old 凬 long remained the more common form, appearing in four of our 1900–1940 manuscripts compared with 凤 in one and 几 in none. For its 1935 List of Short Forms the Education Ministry followed custom, selecting 凬.

But did not Chén say that 风 was the most common form? By 1956, yes. Our 1940–1954 manuscripts contain twelve 风 against four 凤, four 几, two 凨, two 凬 and one 凬. The Script Reform Committee duly picked 风 for its 1955 Draft.

Guǎn Xièchū of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences found 风 too similar to 凤, the form selected for 鳳, suggesting instead 凬. Qiū Chángnù of Northeast Normal University disagreed: "Popularly 風 is written 几, while 鳳 is usually simplified to 凤. It is better to simplify these two characters in this way, following custom." 风, 枫 (*fēng* maple), 疯 (*fēng* crazy) and so on nevertheless became official in 1964.

In Japan neither form predominated. Our 1900–1946 manuscripts contain three 凨, three 凬 and two 凤. So the Language Council confined itself to a change from 風 to 風 with 丶 for 一. Shortening to 几 was suggested in 1962 by Fujikawa Sukezō in *Kokugo seikatsu* (Life of the National Language).

鳳 凤 *fèng* phoenix

Yuan blockprinters shortened 鳳 to 凤, their Qing successors to either 凤 or 凨. 凤 with 乂 remained the more common form, appearing in nine of our 1900–1954 manuscripts against 凨 in four. However, having reserved 风 for the more common 風, reformers simplified 鳳 to 凤. As we have seen, 凤 was criticised for its similarity to 风 and its official status was delayed until 1959.

佛 仏 *fó* Buddha

The now official Japanese 仏 appears in a 525 inscription declaring that Sū Húrén and others 成仏傷 (成佛像 made this Buddha statue). It continues in use in Sui and Tang sutras and statues but then disappears. In 1627 *Zhèng-zìtōng* called 仏 "an ancient form for 佛."

In Japan 仏 saw wider use, by Prince Shōtoku (574–622), Emperor Shōmu (670–756), the sect-founder Kūkai (774–835) and the poet Fujiwara no Teika (1162–1241), after which it faded away even in that country. Satō Minoru

registered 仏 in six sutras from the Kamakura period (1185–1392) but in none from the ensuing Muromachi and Edo periods. Dictionaries from 1803, 1917 and 1923 called 仏 "ancient".[99]

A revival was on its way, however. We find 仏 again in the 1882 manuscript to the novel *Agura nabe* (Sitting by the Beef-pot) and in a 1941 report on the postal remittance system in 猲仏ㄅ⑦ (獨佛兩國 *Doku-Futsu ryōkoku* Germany and France).[100] There was no 仏 revival in China, where reprints of the calligraphy of Kūkai and Teika were absent and where no short form was needed to write 佛国 (*Fukkoku* France) which in Chinese is 法国.

The official adoption of 仏 was not unanimous. In August 1946 the Language Council's Committee on Character Survey put the form on a list of "short forms which will not be adopted".[101] In the end 仏, however, made it into the 1949 List of Forms.

厶 has been taken for an accidental substitution for the phonetic 弗 *fú*. Zhāng Yǒngquán points out, however, that 厶 was once used as short for 某 (*mǒu* a certain) and that 仏 may therefore be a taboo character referring to 'a certain man', namely Buddha, which may explain the disappearance of 仏 as taboos fell out of use.

Having discarded 仏, Chinese writers invented another form, 伕 with the phonetic 夭 *yāo*, registered by Liú Fù in Ming and Qing blockprints. In 1960 伕 turned up in a letter to the Script Reform Committee from a teacher in Heyuan. In 1986 the bus stations in Maoming and Zhongshan displayed timetables to 伕山 (佛山 Foshan).

The recent records are from Guangdong. In 1981–1986 伕 was identified by informants in Guangzhou, Haifeng, Huizhou, Meixian and Shaoguan in that province but not elsewhere. The reason is obvious. 伕 remained in use in Guangdong where it was needed to write the place name Foshan. Today, however, 伕 is unknown even to Guangdong informants.

膚 肤 *fū* skin

膚 consists of the phonetic 盧 *lú* and 肉 (meat). The 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* and 1008 *Guǎngyùn* gave the alternative 肤 with the phonetic 夫 *fū*. Text examples of this 肤 are wanting.

The 1955 Draft ignored 肤, proposing instead 肎, an analogy to the proposed 虏 for 虜 (*lǔ* captive) and 悥 for 慮 (*lǜ* ponder). All three were discarded in the 1956 Scheme, which opted for 肤 which, wrote Chén Guāngyáo, "is

---

99   Sato 1978, p. 10. Matsumoto 1803, p. 5. *Kan-Wa daijirin*, p. 48. Kanno 1923, p. 104.
100   Suzuki 1986, p. 363. National Archives 1941, p. 3.
101   National Archives 1946.6.4–1946.12.19, p. 73.

already much used in the medical profession." Even so 肤 was authorised only in 1959.

幅 *巾 *fú* width

Emori Kenji wrote in 1986: "巾 is not the character for *haba* [幅 width]: it is read *kin* and means a small piece of cloth." Yes, the dictionary says 巾 is read *kin* in Japanese, *jīn* in Chinese and means 'cloth', and 幅 is read *haba* or *fuku* in Japanese, *fú* in Chinese and means 'width'. So why bring it up?

Because so many in Japan use 巾 for 幅. We can trace this practice back to an 1874 plan for a 道巾取廣 (*michihaba torihiroge* road broadening) in Aioi in Hyogo Prefecture.[102] By 1964 it had become mainstream enough for *Kenkyusha's New Pocket Japanese-English Dictionary* to render *habaki* (幅木 skirting-board) as 巾木. In 2016 Google registered one hundred and ninety-two 巾木 against one hundred and eighty 幅木. Which is no wonder, as many writing programs propose 巾 before 幅 when one types *haba*.

Chinese writers have not put 巾 to any alternative use, needing the character in its original sense to write 毛巾 (*máojīn* towel), 围巾 (*wéijīn* scarf) and 手巾 (*shǒujīn* handkerchief), where Japanese manages with タオル *taoru*, スカーフ *sukaafu* and ハンカチ *hankachi*.

副 *付 *fù* deputy, vice

Wú Liángzuò found 付主將 for 副主將 (junior general) and 付天官 for 副天官 (deputy head of cadres department) in documents from the Taiping Rebellion. By the 1950s, Wú added, 付 had come to be "generally used even in government bulletins" for 副.

The 1955 Draft suggested making this practice official. Guǎn Xièchū of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences pointed out that if so, 这是付处长的一百塊錢 (these one hundred yuan are to be paid to the director) would come to mean even 'these one hundred yuan belong to the vice director'. The paleographer Róng Gēng argued that writing 副主席 (the vice chairman) as 付主席 would mix this phrase up with 傅主席 (Chairman Fu), which many already wrote as 付主席. The proposal was duly withdrawn from the 1956 Scheme.

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed 付 for both 副 and 傅. New critics objected that this would merge expressions like 傅队长 (team leader Fu) with 副队长 (the deputy team leader).[103] The 1981 Revised Draft retreated,

---

102   National Archives 1974.10.30, p. 1.
103   Song 1978. Zhang 1978. Jilin sheng (1978) 1979, p. 15.

with the comment: "付 is extremely common [for 副]. The Second Scheme simplified even 傅 to 付, but this might easily cause misunderstanding. We now adjust to simplifying 副 to 付 while retaining 傅."

The 1981 scheme failed but the practice continued. In 1998 *Xiàndài Hànyǔ guīfàn zìdiǎn* warned: "The 副 in 正副 [regular and deputy] may not be written 付." A 2017 web search nevertheless yielded one hundred and thirty-eight 付队长 compared with one hundred and fifty 副队长.

傅 *付 *fù* master

Liú Fù found 付 for 傅 in blockprints from the early Qing onwards. List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme proposed to legalise this habit together with 付 for 副. As we saw above, this proposal was criticised and excluded from the 1981 Revised Draft. Use nevertheless continued. The 1998 *Xiàndài Hànyǔ guīfàn zìdiǎn* warned: "The 傅 in 师傅 [master] may not be written 付." But people do. The author's collection of 2007–2012 parcel dispatch notes contains five 付 senders or recipients against one 傅, which is the proper form of the surname Fù.

婦 妇 *fù* wife

妇, an analogy to the older 归 for 帰, appears in blockprints from the early Qing onwards. Both became official in February 1956.

復 复 *fù* return
複 复 *fù* repeat

The 1956 Scheme simplified 復 and 複 to 复, a practice referred to in the 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn*. The reformer Chén Guāngyáo justified 复 as the "ancient original character", on the basis of the Qing commentator Duàn Yùcái: "复 means 'return', but the 彳 section [of *Shuōwén*] even contains 復 [in that sense]. 復 has prevailed while 复 has been discarded. I suspect that 復 with 彳 has been added later." Duàn has been proved right by unearthed Yin forms, which have no 彳 (step), and needed none, as the movement was already expressed by the 夊 (foot) below.

覆 复*覄 *fù* overturn, reply, return, cover

Jiǎng and Shào found 覄 with the phonetic 伏 *fú* in late Ming military notes and Liú Fù in Qing blockprints. This became the common way to shorten 覆;

our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain five 批覆 (*pīfù* written replies) against one 批复.

The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms proposed 覄. The Script Reform Committee's 1956 Scheme in turn simplified 覆 to 复, merging it with 復 and 複. The following year Cáo Bóhán on behalf of the committee suggested a revision to 覄, which never came about. The 1964 General List restored 覆 in the senses of 'overturn' and 'cover', retaining the shortened 复 in the senses of 'reply' and 'return', explaining: "Simplifying 復, 複 and 覆 to 复 may cause mixing up. One cannot for example know whether 复国 means 復国 [restore the state] or 覆国 [overturn the state]." The 1971 edition of *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn* restored 覆 even for 'reply' and 'return', followed by later editions. 覄 was unsuccessfully advanced again in the committee's 1981 Revised Draft.

富 *实 *fù* rich

In October 1957 the calligrapher Mǎ Gōngyú complained in *Wénzì gǎigé* about a letter containing the unfamiliar character 𠇮. This form was soon to become familiar. In 1959 Hǎo Niànxún wrote that 𠇮 was "already in common use among the masses", and the following year 𠇮 was mentioned in letters to the Script Reform Committee from Lu'an in the north to Xiamen in the south.

Some found a still shorter way. In 1958 Zhào Dì counted forty 实 for 富 in stencilled librettos and twenty-two in meeting notes. The idea of writing 实 may have come from Chén Guāngyáo, who mooted this form in his 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ*.

For its 1962 and 1977 reform schemes the committee selected the shorter form. Yunnan Script Reform Leading Group and Sichuan Interim Script Reform Working Group criticised the phonetic 夫 *fū* for its misleading first tone, contributing to the exclusion of 实 from the 1981 Revised Draft.

蓋 盖 *gài* lid

Forms without 厶 and with 丷 for 龷 appeared on Western Han wood slips and became official in China in 1956.

乾 干 *乹 *gān* dry

Some writers dropped 乚 to write 乹, notably the Jin calligrapher Wáng Xīzhī. This 乹 was later outcompeted by the significantly shorter 干, a homonym originally meaning 'shield' or 'offend'. A cure carved on a 548 Buddha statue by one Dàoxīng recommends 蒼耳陰干 (*cāng'ěr yīngān* Siberian cocklebur

dried in the shade) taken with water. The 1039 *Jíyùn* confirmed that 乾 "is commonly written 干." With the 1956 Scheme it became even officially so, except when 乾 was read *qián* and meant 'heaven'.

趕 赶 *gǎn* to rush

赶 meant "rush off with one's tail fluttering" according to *Shuōwén* and was read like 乾 *qián* according to *Jíyùn*. Text examples in this sense are wanting. Writers picked up this rare 赶 to use it for 趕 (*gǎn* to rush), as in the phrase 遣赶出寺者 (遣趕出寺者 *qiǎn gǎn chū sì zhě* those sent out of the temple) on the 1354 Shèngzhǐ stele. This use of 赶 became official with the 1956 Scheme.

感 *忈 *gǎn* feel

Use of 忈 with the 干 *gàn* phonetic was reported in 1957 articles by Zhū Qìngxià from Jiangsu and Fán Jiāng from Zhejiang and in 1958 by Gāo Sōng from Liaoning and Zhōu Qǐfèng from Anhui. The idea may have come from Chén Guāngyáo, who proposed the form in his 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ*. The 1977 Second Scheme proposed to make 忈 official. The education bureaus of Jilin, Shanxi, Qinghai, Fujian, Yunnan and Xi'an and corresponding authorities in Beijing, Tianjin, Hebei, Hubei, Sichuan, Jiangxi and Guangdong pointed out that 忈 was very similar to 忎 which served for 愚 (*yú* foolish) in List Two of the scheme. The 1981 Revised Draft discarded the latter, retaining 忈.

幹 干 *gàn* trunk, perform duties, cadre

The 143 CE Jǐng jūn stele mentioned the office of 故干 (故幹 *gùgàn*), the 186 Zhèng Jìxuān stele that of 直事干 (*zhíshìgàn* 直事幹). In 1950 Huáng Ruòzhōu said 幹部 (cadre) used to be shortened 干部, as did Tài Yáng and Bái Jùnrú The 1955 Draft, however, shortened 幹 not to 干 but to 仐. Lǐ Xīzhòng objected: "We common people have already shortened 幹 to 干, so why shorten it anew to 仐?" A *Guāngmíng rìbào* reader identified as Rén pointed out that "幹 is [in daily use] written 干, there is no need to create the new form 仐." The reformer Yì Xīwú disapproved of "discarding the habitual 干部 to create 仐部."

   The Script Reform Committee complied. Chén Wénbīn explained: "Aware that 幹 and 干 differed in tone, the committee initially intended to keep the two apart. So, on some people's advice, 幹 became 仐 in the original Draft. After proposals from the broader masses and further consideration by those concerned, the choice was made to let 干 serve for both and have two readings."

We have a hunch who these "some people" were. 全 was introduced in Chén Guāngyáo's 1954–1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ* as "a form made up of a characteristic part" even though 干 was "the character in common use" for 幹. Soon after that Chén took up work in the committee.

贑 贛 贛 *干 *圲 *Gàn* Jiangxi

The 1955 First List of Regulated Variants abolished 贑 to retain 贛. The former was not a shortened version of the latter. The Song geographer Wáng Xiàngzhī pointed out that 贛 consisted of 章 *Zhāng* and 貢 *Gòng*, the tributaries which join up to become the river Gan which has given its name to the province of Jiangxi. Thus 贑 is the original form. Who added 夂? Presumably someone who mixed up 贑 with the now obsolete 贛 (*gòng* bestow).

A short form had appeared by the 1930s. In a regulation issued in 1933 by the Grain Distribution Office of Fujian and Jiangxi, these two provinces are called 闽干省. A 1947 document mentions the 闽粤干 (*Mǐn-Yuè-Gàn* Fujian, Guangdong and Jiangxi) border area.[104]

List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme proposed to make this use of 干 official. Luó Rónggēng of Nanchang Education Bureau objected in *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn*:

> If one replaces 贛 with a homonym like 干 or 甘, the sense may easily be mixed up. 干河 (the informal name for 贛江) may be taken for a dried up river, 浙干铁路 [the Zhejiang-Jiangxi railway] for Zhejiang's trunk line, 干糖 (short for Ganzhou Candy Factory) for dry candy […]. The masses have therefore invented the short picto-phonetic character 圲 for 贛. […] For the last few years 圲 has been adopted and used by the entire people of Jiangxi […]. In daily use by the masses of Jiangxi one hardly finds a trace of 贛.

The fiery 圲 was certainly common. Passing through southern Jiangxi in 1986, this author registered ten 圲 州 or 圲 县 against two 干州 and no 干县. In 1981–1986 圲 was identified as 贛 by informants in Nanchang, Ganzhou, Jingdezhen, Ji'an, Jinggangshan, Jiujiang, Ruijin and Shangrao in Jiangxi and Yong'an in neighbouring Fujian, but was unknown or identified as 焊 (*hàn* weld) elsewhere. 圲 had been in use for longer than "the last few years", being identified in 1986 by one informant who had left Jiangxi for Sichuan in 1951 and been back just once, for two days in 1958. He insisted that 圲 had "always" been used for 贛.

---

104   *Fujian geming shi huaji*, pp. 191, 324.

Avoiding the ambiguous 干 and the ambiguous 忓, the 1981 Revised Draft suggested a change of 贛 to 贑, a form absent in earlier and even in later records.

剛 刚 *gāng* just
鋼 钢 *gāng* steel
綱 纲 *gāng* programme, guideline
岡 冈 *gāng* ridge
崗 岗 *gǎng* mound

We find 刚 in the 496 Wáng Qiān epitaph and in blockprints from the Yuan onwards, 钢 and 岗 in Qing prints and 纲 in a 1912 directive by Beijing Education Office to distribute 拟订纲 (laid-down guidelines).[105]

Why did 纲 appear so much later? Because the form was already taken, having been in use for 網 (*wǎng* net) since the Jin. The need to write 'guidelines' had by the twentieth century outpaced that for 'net'.

The 1955 Draft opted to apply the 冈 component for 岡 only, shortening 網 to 纲. Not surprisingly, some stuck to the older habit. Lì Chéng wrote in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "The 1956:22 issue of *Xīn tǐyù* [New Sports] features an article titled 纲球練習 [Tennis training]. I first read the 纲 as 鋼, then saw that it must be 網."

The Draft also shortened 崗 to 冈. Xú Yīhuī wrote: "If we shorten 崗 to 冈 it will easily be mixed up with the short form 冈 for 同. The form we use today is 岗." Yes, 冈 was often used for 同, seventeen times in our 1940–1954 manuscripts compared with no 冈 for 岡. Xú Chuánxíng worried: "钢 (鋼) is easily mistaken for 銅 [*tóng* copper]. One has heard of trade disputes over mistaken deliveries caused by this character." As late as in 1965 Guǎng Yì complained that his Changchun pupils "have picked up 钢 (銅) from their physics teacher". These ambiguities delayed the recognition of 刚, 钢, 纲 and 冈 until 1964.

Our records of 纲 for 網 and 钢 for 銅 cease with the above examples. Use of 冈 for 同 was more persistent, seen as late as in 1985 on a letter sent from Xiangtan in Hunan to one 王艺冈志 (Comrade Wáng Yì) in Heilongjiang.

---

105 Beijing Archives J4-3-26, p. 50.

<div align="center">高 *乇 *gāo* tall</div>

Handwriting for 高 is 髙. List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme advocated 乇, an analogy to the already official 专 for 叀 (專). This 乇 was called "unfamiliar" by Xi'an Education Bureau, "unbalanced, lopsided and hard to define" by Shanxi Education Bureau and "difficult to write and hard to grasp for pupils" by the Nanjing teacher Gāo Shòuyǒng. Unsurprisingly, the form was excluded from the 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">搞 *扥 *揢 *gǎo* do
稿 *秼 *gǎo* manuscript</div>

稁 with the phonetic 告 *gào* was mentioned in 1958 by Zhōu Qǐfèng from Anhui among "short forms not in the Scheme but widely used in the written works of young students" and in 1959 by the northeasterner Liú Hé among "simplified characters created by the masses". In 1960 the analogous 揢 was reported to the Script Reform Committee by correspondents from Rongjiang and Pengshan in the west to Zhangzhou and Xiamen in the east.

The 1977 Second Scheme ignored these forms, suggesting instead 扥 and 秼 analogously to 乇 for 高. Criticism of 乇 involved even 扥 and 秼, effectively barring both from the 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">个 箇 個 *gè* piece</div>

The pre-Qin classics contain both 箇 and 个. It is hard to tell whether 个 is a shortened 箇 or 箇 an enlarged 个. Most experts opt for the latter.

個 appeared later, in a comment by Zhèng Xuán (127–200) on the passage 俎釋三个 (*zǔ shì sān gè* apply three sacrificial vessels) in *Yìlǐ* (Book of Protocol and Rites): "个 means 'piece'. When counting things some now use the informal 個, which is read identically." For centuries 個 remained informal. The Qing *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* said: "個 has been added by later writers. Correct writing is 个 or 箇." Nevertheless 個 thrived and was even shortened, to 佪 without 十 by 1929 and to 伬 without 古 by 1949.[106]

Reformers opted for something both shorter and older, however. In 1935 *Tàibái*'s "handy characters" and *Lúnyǔ*'s "plain stroke characters" included 亇 and the Education Ministry's List of Short Forms 个, which then became official with the 1956 Scheme.

---

106   *Anhui geming shi hua ce*, p. 58. Beijing Archives 4-2-27, p. 50.

<div align="center">鞏 巩 *gǒng* strengthen</div>

㧬 (巩), a man holding an object, originally meant 'embrace'. By the Han it had come to mean 'strengthen', a sense which was specified by the addition of 革 (leather) below, after which the original 巩 disappeared. In 1944, however we find it again in instructions by Central China Office to 巩固 (鞏固 consolidate) revolutionary base areas in Jiangsu.[107] Such use of 巩 for 鞏 was sanctioned by the 1956 Scheme.

<div align="center">購 购 *gòu* purchase

溝 沟 *gōu* ditch

構 构 *gòu* structure</div>

The Script Reform Committee's choice of 购, 沟 and 构 was not obvious. Apart from fifteen 购 or 沟, our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain ten 賻 or 洴, two 賻 or 溝, one 贩 and eighteen 賻 or 溝.

沟 with the 勾 *gōu* phonetic "was in use in North China before the [1955] Draft" wrote Gāo Jǐngchéng (born in 1916) in 2008. To be sure, our records of forms with 勾 begin in North China, with a 1938 pamphlet describing a guerrilla attack north of 门头沟 (*Méntóugōu*) outside Beijing and a 1949 Beijing City report on artisans who 收购 (buy) their own products. However, 勾 forms had spread south by 1954, when Hangzhou Trade Office penned plans to increase its 批购 (*pīgòu* wholesale purchases).[108]

溝 without 冉 appears on a 1944 photograph of a placard displaying the Inner Mongolia place name 平溝 (Pinggou) and the further shortened 賻 in a 1951 report from Beijing Industry and Trade Office on 套賻 (illegal purchases) of fruit.[109]

溝 with the 云 top is described in the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* as a variant of 溝 and has been common ever since. It is analogous to a 講 we find for 講 (*jiǎng* speak) in the 503 Yú Huī epitaph and a 搆 for 構 in the 659 Yáng Shì epitaph.

贩 is a shortened 賻 first recorded in Huáng Ruòzhōu's 1950 article in the Shanghai *Wénhuì bào* and then in a 1954 report by Hubei People's Government.[110] In 1981 this author saw 贩 in Wuhan in Hubei, Nanchang and Jiujiang in Jiangxi, Guangzhou and Huidong in Guangdong and Chengdu and Wanxian in Sichuan. In 1981–1986 贩 was identified as 购 by informants

---

<div style="font-size:smaller">

107   *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 130.

108   *Beijing kangzhan tushi*, p. 141. Beijing Archives 4-2-24, p. 5. Hangzhou Archives 29-1-8, p. 3.

109   *Renmin zhanzheng bi sheng*, p. 162. Beijing Archives 22-12-1441, p. 21.

110   Hubei Archives SZ75-2-126.

</div>

in Sichuan, Yunnan, Guizhou, Hunan, Hubei, Jiangxi and parts of Guangxi and Guangdong but not further east and north.[111]

The 1955 Draft proposed to simplify 講 to 讲 but keep 購, 構 and 溝. The proofreader Zhào Xī objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Replacing […] 購, 構, 製 and 準 with […] 购, 构, 制 and 准 is something the masses have been used to for a long time. It is necessary to add these characters to the simplification scheme and announce them with the rest." Pān Yǔnzhōng reported from a meeting at Zhongshan University:

> As northerners see it, the simplified form 讲 for 講 is based on the similarity in reading [of 井 *jǐng* and 講 *jiǎng*]. As we southerners see it, however, 井 for 菁 is not based on readings [which here in Guangzhou are 井 *tʃɪŋ* 35 and 講 *kɔŋ* 35], but on reducing the shape of the right side. Therefore characters like 構, 購 and 溝 may well be simplified analogously using 井. In fact many people already write like that.

The committee chose to preserve a clue to reading rather than preserving the analogy to 講, recognising 构 and 沟 in 1958 and 购 in 1959. The delay of the latter was probably due to indecision as to the 贝 component.

A fourth form for 'purchase', also local, later appeared in southern Fujian. In 1981 this author saw 欢迎选贴 (welcome to buy) signs in Xiamen and five years later an invitation to 贴花 (buy flowers) in Yong'an. Informants in Xiamen, Zhangzhou and Longyan in southern Fujian could identify 贴, unlike those in Quanzhou, Putian and even Yong'an further north and those in surrounding provinces. The 古 *gǔ* phonetic is read *kɔ* 51 in Xiamen and so gives a good clue to the reading of 购 *kɔ* 33.

The Yong'an record is our last of 贴 for 购 and a 1988 欢迎选贩 sign in Shantou in Guangdong our last of 贩. Today informants recognise neither.

穀 榖 谷 *gǔ* grain

谷 is said to depict hillsides surrounding a valley or water flowing through a valley. Either way the character meant 'valley'. The 1956 Scheme adopted

---

111 贩 identified as 购 in Chengdu, Wanxian and Yajiang but not Chongqing and Guanxian in Sichuan, in Kunming and Qujing in Yunnan, in Changsha, Chaling, Chenzhou, Hengyang, Lianyuan, Xiangtan, Yueyang and Zhuzhou in Hunan, in Wuhan, Huangshi, Shashi and Yichang in Hubei, in Nanchang, Ji'an, Jinggangshan, Jiujiang, Ruijin, Shangrao and Xiushui in Jiangxi, in Wuzhou but not Nanning, Bohai, Guilin and Lingshan in Guangxi, in Meixian and Zhaoqing but not Haifeng, Huizhou, Maoming and Zhanjiang in Guangdong and in Anqing in southernmost Anhui.

this 谷 for the homonym 穀 (grain) since, argued Professor Chén Wénbīn, writing 谷 for 穀 "is already common in society."

"Already" was an understatement. we find receipts of 谷二石一斗 (two dan and one dou of grain), 谷又石 (five dan of grain) and the like on on Western Han wood slips excavated in Juyan.[112] This great age explains why writers plumped for 谷 and not for, say, the still shorter 古 *gǔ*. In the distant past 穀 *kuk* was read like 谷 *kuk* but not like 古 *ko*.

The Japanese Language Council more modestly changed 穀 to 穀 without the 一 over 禾. Even this was an old habit; the early Han inscriptions from Mawangdui have no 一. This contradicted *Shuōwén*, which prescribed writing 穀 with 禾 and the phonetic 殸 *què*. Few followed that prescription. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains seventy-three Han to Qing inscriptions with 穀, against nine 穀 with 一. The Language Council did not break with tradition.

雇 *僱 *伫 *gù* hire, employ

The 1955 First List of Regulated Variants discarded 僱 and kept 雇. 雇 is not a shortened 僱, which is an enlarged form still absent in the Song *Yùpiān* and *Jíyùn*.

A shortened form of 僱 did appear later. In April 1949 the leadership of front-supporting activities in Wuwei County in Anhui prescribed contributions by 伫佣工匠 (*gùyōng gōngjiàng* employed artisans). Two years later a letter from Nanjing Employment Office dealt with 私伫工人问题 (the question of self-employed workers).[113] Our records cease with a 1981 account outside the police station in Xiamen of a felon who had 伫車 (taken a car) to flee.

顧 顗 顾 *gù* look back

The cramped 隹 in 顧 was early squeezed beyond recognition. The 185 Jiē Tán stele has a 顗 with 乙, the 205 Fán Mǐn stele a 顗 with 匕 and the 300 Zhāng Lǎng stele a 顗 with 乚. Only the latter survived.

The above-mentioned homonym 雇 has also been used as short for 顧, as Liú Fù found in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. The Ming *Piānhǎi lèibiān* (Assorted Essays) confirmed that "雇 is also written 顧."

The 1955 Draft passed 顧 over. Jīn Lúnhǎi of Jiangsu Normal Institute and Guǎn Xièchū of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences argued for 顾, which was adopted and became official in 1959.

Then a still shorter form turned up. In 1965 Xiāo Tiānzhù warned in *Wénzì*

112   Slips 203.4, 203.3, 203.12, 203.15, 203.23, 203.27 and 203.32.
113   *Anhui geming shi huace*, p. 265. Nanjing Archives 5013-3-36, p. 30. 伫 also on p. 28.

gǎigé: "顾 is not written 伫. 顾客 [*gùkè* customer] should not be written 伫客." This 伫 was originally short for 雇, as we saw in the preceding section. Records cease in 1981 with a 欢迎伫客 sign observed in Jiujiang in Jiangxi.

刮 颳 *guā* blow

刮 originally meant 'scrape', as the 'knife' on the right hints. By the Tang it had come to mean 'blow', as in the poet Cén Cān's (715–770) 霜風刮天地 (a freezing wind blew through air and land). 颳 with the more explicit 'wind' component is a later form known since the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng*. This 颳 did not completely replace 刮; the 1938 edition of *Cíhǎi* said "the blowing of a strong wind is called 刮."

The 1956 Scheme abolished 颳, prescribing the simpler 刮 both for 'blow' and 'scrape'.

關 関 关 *guān* shut

Shuōwén said 關 "consists of 門 and the phonetic 𢇅." Few if anyone heeded the latter directive. On Han wood slips the character is written 關 with 丝, on the 158 CE Liú Píngguó stele 関 with 糸, on the 165 Xiǎn Yúhuáng stele 關 with 纟 and on the 180 Zhào Kuān stele 闗 with 纟. The 關 with 𢆶 which we know from later dictionaries was introduced only by the Tang *Gānlù zìshū*.

Even that norm was disregarded. 關 with 弁 for 𢆶 turns up in the 505 Lǐ Ruí epitaph, 関 with 关 in the 705 Ān Lìng epitaph and 関 with 关 in a 975 blockprint.[114] Somewhat puzzlingly, the fourteen-stroke 関 came to outcompete the thirteen-stroke 關 and 関. Liú Fù's survey of Song to Qing vernacular blockprints registered 関 or 関 in ten and the formerly very common 關 in none.

関 took over also in Japan. Our 1900–1946 manuscripts contain one hundred and eight 関 or 関 with 关 but no 關 with 弁. A still shorter alternative did turn up, however. In 1926 the deputy-governor of Yamaguchi Prefecture wrote to the 下关水上警察署 (*Shimonoseki suijō keisatsusho* Shimonoseki Water Police) concerning irregular fishing nets, and in 1929 the Postal Money Orders and Savings Bank in Tokyo sent a 遅延ニ关スル件 (*chien ni kansuru ken* letter concerning the delay) of a remittance.[115]

Our Japanese records of 关 for 關 cease with this, however, leaving reformers with 関, which was proposed in their schemes of 1923, 1926, 1938, 1942 and 1946, when it finally became official.

---

114 *Zhongguo banke tulu*, item 4.
115 Yamaguchi Archives 戦前 A 農業 571. National Archives 1929.10.22.

Chinese reformers followed suit. In 1935 the bimonthlies *Tàibái* and *Lúnyǔ* adopted 関 in print, and the Education Ministry included 関 in its abortive List of Short Forms. By then, however, 关 had turned up in China too. Nanjing students asked by Xú Zémǐn in 1934 to write fast characters used 关. In 1935 the guerrillas in Sidu in Fujian issued an order 关扵动员群众 (關於動員群眾 concerning mobilisation of the masses).[116]

Unlike their Japanese colleagues, Chinese writers did not snub 关. Our 1940–1954 manuscripts contain fifty-two 关 among ninety-three 関, eleven 冈, nine 関 and five 闪. In 1956 the shortest form was selected for official use.

Why had no one launched this simple 关 before? In fact someone had, but for other purposes, in Japan for 癸 *guǐ*, the tenth heavenly stem, and in China for 矣 *yǐ*, an old-fashioned suffix corresponding to the modern 了. Lǔ Xùn, for one, wrote 价铢一半关, meaning not "the price is half closed" but 價錢一半矣 (the price will be half) in a January 1925 letter. When the western calendar replaced the traditional one and 了 replaced 矣, 关 became free to use for 關.

観 観 观 *guān* look
歡 歓 欢 *huān* rejoice
權 権 权 *quán* power
勸 勧 劝 *quàn* urge

The 雚 (*guàn* heron) phonetic ended up as 隺 in Japan and as 又 in China. The transition from 雚 to 隺 is puzzling but traceable. 勸 with 厸 for 吅 appears on a 159 BCE wood slip from Gangu, 観 with 丷 for 厸 in a 494 CE inscription mourning Bǐ Gān, 観 with 一 for 丷 in the 524 Guō Xiǎn epitaph and 勧 with 宀 for 亠 in the calligraphy of Fujiwara no Yukinari (972–1027).

From this point Chinese and Japanese habits split. Most Chinese writers shortened by retaining the 卝 top and contracting 吅 to 一, writing 観, 歓, 権 and 勧. Liú Fù found 権 with 卝 in seven Song to Qing blockprints but 権 with ⺅ in two only. In Japan the latter came to dominate. The sixteenth-century Manjuya edition of the *Setsuyōshū* writing guide recommended 権門 for *kenmon* (man of influence) and 権輿 for *ken'yo* (origin). Our 1900–1946 manuscripts contain fourteen 権 against no 権. In 1919 the Education Ministry proposed to permit 観, 歓, 権 and 勧 with 隺, a proposal repeated in 1923, 1926, 1938 and 1942 and implemented in 1946.

Simplification by five or six strokes did not interest Chinese reformers, who opted for the shorter 观, 权, 劝 and 欢 which had been current in

---

116   *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 228.

blockprints since the Yuan. These forms were proposed by the *Tàibái* and *Lúnyǔ* editors and by the Education Ministry in 1935 and were adopted by the Script Reform Committee in 1956.

又 forms were not unknown in Japan. Tanaka Dōsai wrote in 1757 that 权, 观 and 劝 were short for 權, 觀 and 勸 respectively. At a Japanese Language Council meeting on 1 June 1948 one member argued: "Students and others write 權 as 权. I think there are those who would even find it acceptable to use 观 for 観 in handwriting." The chairman advised caution, since "some wonder if even the present scheme is not going too far."[117] In 2008 the netizen bankokusikikko asked: "Why do people in the Faculty of Law write the 権 in 権利 (*kenri* rights) as 木又?" But not everybody, we take it. In 2014–2017 权 was identified by seven of our twenty-four Japanese informants, 观 by none.

灌 *㳁 *guàn* irrigation

In 1958 Gāo Sōng from Shenyang wrote in *Zhōngguó yǔwén* that "accountants in some agricultural cooperatives write […] the 灌 in 灌溉 [*guàngài* irrigation] as 㳁 when registering commune members' workpoints". In 1965 Sūn Xiǎohuī from Sichuan Agricultural Institute mentioned 㳁 among "habitually used short forms". 㳁 was proposed in the 1977 Second Scheme and 1981 Revised Draft, which described it as "very common."

㳁 had an insignificant competitor. In 1982 the bus station in Huaiyin in northern Jiangsu displayed timetables to 浧云, and buses leaving were marked 浧云, 茇云 or 灌云, the name of a county further north. 浧 was recognised by informants from Huaiyin, Yancheng and Lianyungang in northern Jiangsu and Bengbu in northern Anhui but not by those further north and south. Only locals needed a short form to write Guanyun.

罐 *缶 *䍩 *鈝 *guàn* jar

In 1960 teachers from Xiamen and Changtai in Fujian wrote to the Script Reform Committee that pupils shortened 罐 to 䍩. Two years later Chóng Wén cautioned against another short form in *Guāngmíng rìbào*:

> 缶: this character is read *fǒu*. It indicates a ceramic vessel with a small opening and big belly. Some now use it as short for 罐, writing 罐头 [tin can] as 缶头. Some shops write 葡萄酒 [*pútaojiǔ* wine] as 卜缶酒. This way of writing has no basis whatsoever in the Simplification Scheme and is absolutely wrong.

---

117   Inokuchi 1982, p. 102.

A further shortened 矼 was in use locally. In 1981 this author saw cans sold as 矼头 in Xiamen in Fujian and Shantou in Guangdong, in 1982 bamboo shoots priced 每矼 (per can) in Guangzhou and a tanker truck marked 矼车 in Wuzhou in Guangxi. 矼 turned out to be familiar to informants in Guangdong, Guangxi and southern Fujian but not further north.[118]

矼 seems to have been the more common form, mentioned in six 1973–1977 articles and letters compared with 缶 in one and 鈇 in one.[119] The 1977 Second Scheme duly included 矼. Yunnan Script Reform Leading Group and corresponding organs in Sichuan, Hubei, Henan and Xinjiang pointed out that 矼 for 罐 was inconsistent with the proposed 浃 for 灌. 矼 was then changed to 鈇 in the likewise rejected 1981 Revised Draft.

The original 缶 may have been needed to label pre-Han fou vessels in museums in China, but those are sparse in Japan. So Japanese writers felt even freer to slice off the right side of 罐 (which they read *kan*). This must have begun by 1942, when the Language Council's 1942 List of Standard Characters proposed 缶 for 罐. The proposal was realised in 1981, when 缶 became a Character for Common Use in the sense of 'jar'. An objection by Harada Minoru that 缶 was needed to recount "the famous Warring States story of Xiāngrú from the state of Zhao singing Qin songs for the king of Qin while drumming on a fou" was not taken into account.

<div align="center">

廣 広 广 *guǎng* wide
礦 鑛 鉱 矿 *kuàng* ore
擴 拡 扩 *kuò* expand

</div>

廣 is shortened 広 in Japan and 广 in China. The Japanese form is the older. Yamashita Mari found 鉱 in an 1889 contract, 広島縣 (Hiroshima Prefecture) in an 1891 list of residents in Yamano Village and a 扩業人 (鑛業人 *kōgyōnin* miner) in an 1896 document from Ōbayashi District in Akita. In 1938 the Forestry Association in Yamaguchi planned a 扩張 (*kakuchō* increase) of the planted area.[120] 广 does not appear as the separate character 廣 in our Japanese manuscripts, which is not surprising as 广 was already in use for 摩 (*ma* rub), 魔 (*ma* demon) and 磨 (*ma* grind), as we shall see in the 摩 *mó* section.

---

118 矼 identified as 罐 in Guangzhou, Maoming, Zhanjiang, Zhaoqing, Shaoguan, Shantou and Meixian but not Huizhou and Jiangmen in Guangdong, in Nanning, Beihai and Wuzhou but not Liuzhou in Guangxi, in Longyan, Xiamen and Zhangzhou but not Fuzhou, Putian, Quanzhou and Yong'an in Fujian. Unknown in twenty-one places further north.

119 矼 in Jiang and Lu 1973, Rong 1973, Xiang 1974 and letters from Jinan, Mengcheng and Wuyang. 缶 in letter from Yunyang. 鈇 in letter from Jinan.

120 Yamaguchi Archives 農業 489, letter dated 17 June, 1938.

Forms with 広 were not only older but also more common than those with 广. Yamashita found eight hundred and sixty-four pre-1946 鉱 against one hundred and fifty-four 矿. Even so, 鉱, 拡 and 広 were passed over in the 1946 reform, to be included only in the 1949 List of Forms.

Hasegawa Motoi considers the ム in 広 to be a phonetic, as in 宏 (*kō* great), 弘 (*kō* wide), 厷 (*kō* vast) and 肱 (*kō* arm). This may explain why 広 never spread to China, where 廣 *guǎng* bears little resemblance to 宏 *hóng*, 弘 *hóng*, 厷 *gōng* and 肱 *gōng*.

Forms with 广, however, turn up even in China, first on a letter sent in 1922 from Beidaihe to one 吴静广 (Wú Jìngguǎng) in Beijing. By then other short forms were already in use. In a Beijing account book from 1909 one customer is called 廣仁園 and then 庌仁園, another 庌兴号 and then 廣兴丿. A 1925 letter from the Fujian leftist activist Lán Yùyè requests advice from 庌委 (the Guangdong committee). A 1949 report from Hangzhou Employment Office urges a 庞泛 (*guǎngfàn* extensive) promotion of production. In 1950 Huáng Ruòzhōu recalled "coming upon a 廣 with the inner 黄 changed to 王; only after a long scrutiny of the context could the reader make this out as 廣."[121] Here 广 is 廣 minus 黄, 庌 is 廣 minus the end, 庌 is 庌 minus 一, 庞 is 广 with the phonetic 光 *guāng* and 庄 is 广 with the still shorter 王, read *ɦuɑ̃* 113 in Shanghainese, like 廣.

Our 1940–1954 manuscripts contain twenty 广, 矿 or 扩; twelve 庌, 硴 or 㧖, four 庞 or 硶, one 庌 and no 庄. The choice might look simple: 广 was both shortest and most common. The snag was that 广 had other uses. The 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn* said: "广 1. The short form for 廣. 2. There are also those who write 房 [*fáng* house] as 广." The 1928 *Cíhǎi* regarded 广 as the "same as 庵 [*ān* hut]." In its comment to the 1935 List of Short Forms, the Education Ministry explained that it had adopted "ancient characters" like 广 for 庵 but not "forms used for different characters, like 广 which stands for 廣 but also for 慶". Ōyáng Zhēn wrote: "广 is short for 廖 [*Liào*], 庵 etc. If it appears for the name 廖 or in 庵廟 [*ānmiào* nunnery] the reader can always make out the reading and sense from the context." Chén Guāngyáo's 1936 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo* said "房, 廣, 慶 and 廠 are all informally written 广 or 广".

Use for 廣 was the most widespread. In our 1920–1954 manuscripts we find eleven 广 for 廣 compared with six for 廠 and none for 房, 庵, 慶 or 廖. 广 was nevertheless excluded from the 1955 Draft. Jīn Míngshēng and Tián Qíchāng then suggested a change of 廣 to 庞, Huáng Fùjià to 庌 or 广. Guǎn

---

121   Mizuhara 1992, vol. 8, p. 214. Account book in Manuscripts and documents. *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 17. *Jiefang zhanzheng shiqi Beiping*, p. 18. Hangzhou Archives 94-1-1, p. 3. Huang 1951 (1950), p. 8.

Xièchū in turn advocated reserving 广 for 慶. The October Revised Draft mooted both 广 and 庂, with the comment that the former was common in the south and the latter in the north (obviously not entirely, as our records of 广 begin in Beidaihe in Hebei and those of 庂 in Hangzhou in Zhejiang). In the end the 1956 Scheme came to include 广, 矿 and 扩.

龜 亀 龟 *龟 *guī* tortoise

Yuan and Qing blockprinters contracted the tortoise to 亀 with a 口 head or 亀 with a 田 head. The latter became common in Japan, where it appeared in the 1496 version of the *Setsuyōshū* writing guide and in twenty-six of our 1900–1946 manuscripts, where 亀 (like 龜) is absent. It was therefore no great upheaval when 亀 entered the List of Characters for Use in Personal Names in 1951 and the Revised List of Characters for Common Use in 2010.

Chinese writers shortened 亀 further. Records are much more sparse than in Japan, however, since the Chinese regard tortoises as homosexuals and so exclude this character from names. The 1829 *Zìxué qī zhǒng* (Seven Studies on Characters) said "龜 is informally written 亀", with 口 for 田. In a 1915 report on sales of false elixir of life, two police clerks wrote 亀齡 (*guīlíng* high age), another 黾齡 and yet another 亀齡 or 亀齡.[122] 亀 was proposed for official use by Qián Xuántóng in his 1922 *Guóyǔ yuèkān* article and by the Education Ministry in its 1935 List of Short Forms.

By then the still shorter 龟 had turned up, first to our knowledge in Chén Guāngyáo's 1931 *Jiǎnzì lúnjí*, then in books and articles by Róng Gēng, Huáng Ruòzhōu, Jiāng Yuánsēng and Yì Xīwú and, finally, in the 1956 Scheme.

歸 帰 归 *guī* return

Yin and Zhou forms were 𢼸 (𨔣) at the biggest and 𠂤 (帚) at the smallest. By the Han 歸 with 𠂤, 止 and 帚 had come to dominate. The first part of this to be assaulted by shorteners was 止, which appears as 凵 in the early Han manuscripts from Mawangdui and as 山, 十, 一, 大 or 厶 on steles from the Later Wei onwards. Later writers dropped the top left, as in 帰 in the 547 Yáng Fèngxiáng epitaph. This later quite common form may have been contrived by some reader of *Shuōwén*, which said 歸 was written 婦 (嫦) in the pre-Qin big seal script. Others contracted the whole left side, as in the 帰 on the 730 Lùshān Temple stele or the 帰 in Song blockprints. Yuan blockprinters dropped the last five strokes to write 归. This became the most

122 Beijing Archives J181-19-19769, pp. 2, 4, 8, 5, 7.

popular form, appearing in thirty-two of Jiǎng and Shào's late Ming military notes compared with 帰 in six and 婦 in none.

So the 1956 Scheme included 归. Chén Wénbīn argued:

> This simplified character has a very broad basis among the masses. True, some people disapprove of it, finding it easy to mix up with 旧 [*jiù* old]. However, they cannot come up with a better form with a broad mass basis. Some propose 帚, but that is another character [*zhǒu* broom] so it was not adopted. It is in fact possible to distinguish 归 and 旧; during their long-time use by the masses there has been no mixing up of the two.

归 did not make the crossing to Japan, where 帰 became official in 1946.

癸 关 *guǐ* the tenth heavenly stem

In 1705 Arai Hakuseki called 关 "informal for 癸." This shortened Japanese form can be traced back at least to 1019, when we find the time 关丑 (*kichū* 1 p.m.–3 p.m.) in the diary of Fujiwara no Michinaga.[123] The heavenly stems were mainly used to denote years, so the practice died out as the western calendar replaced the traditional Chinese one.

The Chinese calendar was used even in China, of course, but not 关, which we instead find for 矣 and then for 關 *guān*, as we saw in that section.

櫃 柜 *guì* cupboard

柜 *jǔ* traditionally means 'Chinese purple willow'. Liú Fù found this character used for 櫃 in a 1796–1820 blockprint of *Jīn Píng Méi*. This practice was accepted by the 1953 *Rénmín xīn zìdiǎn*: "柜 (1) ㄐㄩ *gy* [*jǔ*], name of the tree 杞柳 [*qǐliǔ*] (2) Same as 櫃."

The 1955 Draft proposed to confirm the practice. Yè Gōngchuò explained: "As for replacing [...] 價 with 价 and 櫃 with 柜, these characters are homonyms in the Wu dialect area [where the latter two are read *dʑy*] but not elsewhere. However, they are already very widely used, and other areas provide no good way to simplify them, so we adopted these forms." Qiū Chángnù objected: "It is better to use 匱, the ancient form for 櫃. This provides both a semantic component [匚 case] and a phonetic [貴 *guì*]. Using 柜 is no good." True, the 匱 in *Shuōwén* and on Han steles precedes the

---

123 *Kokuhō* vol. 11, item 33.

enlarged 櫃 which appears in the Later Wei, but then disappears. From the Qing onwards *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* registers only 櫃.

The 1956 Scheme retained 柜, which became official in 1959.

<div align="center">

鍋 锅 *guō* pot
禍 祸 *huò* misfortune
窩 窝 *wō* nest

</div>

The 咼 component appears as 㕣 on Han wood slips and as 呙 in Qing block-prints. The resulting compounds 锅, 祸, and 窝 became official in 1964.

<div align="center">

國 国 *囯 *囻 *guó* country

</div>

'Country' was originally written shorter, with a 囗 (city wall) guarded by 戈 (halberds), as in the 𰻞 (中或 central lands) on the early Zhou Hé cup and 𰻝 (東或 eastern lands) on the Bǎo carafe. As 𢦏 (或) came into use for 'some' and 'or', writers began to specify the 'country' sense as 國 (國) with an additional city wall.

The added wall turned out to be the most resilient part of the character. *Zìhuì* referred to one early short form: "*Shāng jūn shū* [The Book of Lord Shāng] says 民弱囗強民強囗弱有道之囗務在弱民 [a weak people makes a strong state and a strong people a weak state, so a well-run state strives to keep its people weak]. In ancient versions [the modern version's] 國 is written 囗." We have one other indication of this old use of 囗 for 國. *Gōngyáng zhuàn* (Gōngyáng's Commentary) says 惡乎近, 近乎圍也 (How close are they? Close enough to lay siege to us). The Tang commentator Xú Yàn said older versions had 國 for 圍, an unexplicable error unless we presume that some still older version had a 囗 for 圍 (as in *Shuōwén*) which was taken for 國 by a later scribe used to seeing 囗 for 國.

A less radical simplification was recorded by the Tang scholar Sū È: "Characters like 囗 plus 王 for 國 and 文 plus 字 for 學 were made up and became popular in the Later Wei. They are not used in educated circles." This fits our records. In 1955 Cáo Rúpíng described a newly excavated statue carved in 527 by one Tián Míngshēng, inscribed 上爲国家下爲父母 (first serve the country, then your parents). Guì Fù (1736–1805) quoted the still earlier, allegedly Han inscription 張国私印 (personal seal of Zhāng Guó [?]) but gave no details. An essentially identical 囯 was called "informal" in the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng*. 国 with an added point appeared sporadically from the 550 Lǐ Sēngyuán carving onwards (the 玉 component began to be shortened to 王 in the Han and since then the two components have been mixed

up). *Lóngkān shǒujìng* even informed that "圀 is read 國." This form with 民 (people) not 王 (king) for 或 was first recorded on the 539 Sānjí fútú stele.

Of the above forms, 国 with 王 became the most common by far. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* records 国 on fifteen Tang to Qing steles, 囯 or 国 on two, 囻, 旺 and □ on none. Liú Fù found 国 in ten Song to Qing blockprints, 囯, 囻, 旺 and □ in none. The latter three would reappear, however, 囻 in a letter dated 中華民囻元年 (first year of the Republic, i.e. 1912), □ in a 1928 declaration welcoming the victory of the proletariat in 俄□ (*Éguó* Russia) and 旺 on a Harbin bakery receipt dated 民旺卅六年 (thirty-sixth year of the Republic).[124]

国 remained the more common form, appearing in sixteen of our 1920–1934 manuscripts against □ in four and 囯 in one. Unsurprisingly the *Lúnyǔ* editors chose 国 for their 1935 "plain stroke characters", as did the Education Ministry for its ensuing List of Short Forms.

Then habits split further. Our 1940–1954 manuscripts contain fifty-six □, thirty-two 国, seven 囯, two 囮, two 旺 and one 旺. 囻 was absent. Ōuyáng Zhēn explained in 1935 that "after the 1911 revolution 國 was generally written 囻." But not in the 1930s, we take it. 囮 with 'masses' for 'king' or 'people' was a novelty first observed on a 1942 Shanxi, Chahar and Hebei Border Area placard inscribed 中华民囮的囮民 (citizens of the Republic of China).[125]

□ was ruled out as an official form by its similarity to 口 (*kǒu* mouth). Huáng Ruòzhōu provided an example of mixing up in 1950: "This year's new year issue of *Wénhuì bào* carried an advertisement for 美口牌 [*Měikǒu pái* The Delicious Brand] which in print came out as 美國牌 [The American Brand]." The typographer had taken □ for 國.

This left 囯, which the 1952 *Xué wénhuà zìdiǎn* presented as "informal" for 國 and the 1953 *Rénmín xīn zìdiǎn* as "the same as 國", hinting at an imminent official status for 囯. The 1955 Draft, however, passed 囯 over. Yì Xīwú revealed the reason in *Yǔwén zhīshí*:

> Which should we choose as the short form for 國? We opted for 国 […]. Some object that 王 implies feudal thinking and cannot be used. […]. However, the claim that '王 implies feudal thinking' is false. […] Wú Dàchéng, Wáng Guówéi and Luó Zhènyù say that in bone and bronze script 王 looks like a flame in the ground, expresses the sense of 'great' and should be read as 旺 [*wàng* brilliant]. […] Qián Dàxīn [1728–1804] said: 'A big lump of tree moss [女蘿 *nǚluó*] is called a 王女, a big 掃帚

---

124   Envelope in *China Philately*, March 1986, p. 29. Declaration in *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 34. Receipt from Harbin fleamarket.

125   Photograph in *Renmin zhanzheng bi sheng*, p. 143.

[*sǎozhǒu* broom] a 王彗 [*wánghuì*] [...]. Of old everything big can be called 王.' The present use of 王 is analogous. A nice big 板栗 [*bǎnlì* chestnut] is called a 板栗大王, a 獅子 [*shīzi* lion] 獸王 [*shòuwáng* the king of beasts] [...]. China is a big country and a 王 in 國 will express that.

One Xiǎn, presumably Wáng Xiǎn of the Academy of Social Sciences, made a similar point in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*:

> I recommend using 囯, simple, age-old, widespread and [unlike 囗] not prone to be mixed up with other characters. Some say there are no oppressing 王 [kings] in present-day China so 囯 with 王 is inconsistent with the facts and cannot be used for 國. [...] This [use of 囯], however, would be just as we now write 貨 [*huò* money] with 貝 [shell] and 幣 [currency] with 巾 [cloth] although we no longer use shells or cloth as means of exchange.

Guāngmíng rìbào published letters from other 囯 advocates, but also from backers of 囗 and 吀, as well as a report from a meeting of the Chinese Writers' Association where Gě Luò supported 囗, Zhōu Lìbō 囯 and Féng Yìdài both plus 囯. According to Yè Làishì, even Guō Mòruò defended 囯, on the grounds that the modern 王 was a surname, not 'king'.[126]

The Script Reform Committee nevertheless trod carefully. At the October script reform conference Yè Gōngchuò announced the adoption of the less short and less common 国, which then became official in June 1956.

In Japan 国 was more common, turning up in fifty-eight of our 1900–1946 manuscripts against 囯 in nine, 囗 in eleven, ⼞ or ⼞ in twenty, 囯 in one and 囵 in one.

These Sino-Japanese differences were noticed already by Edo scholars. In 1705 Arai Hakuseki mentioned 国 among forms used "in this country", and in 1750 Kondō Saigai described 国 and 王 as "Japanese" variants of 國. Japanese preference for 国 may be linked to reading: Japanese 玉 *gyoku* rhymes with 国 *koku* but Chinese 玉 *yù* does not rhyme with 国 *guó*.

⼞ is a 国 with 丷 for 冂, first registered in 1750 by the above-mentioned Kondō Saigai. The also Japanese-only 囵 was recorded by Yamada Tadao in a sixteenth-century transcript of *Wa-Kan rōeishū shichū*. 囗 was mentioned in 1910 by Kuroyanagi Isao in a list of characters he would no longer de-

126   Yuan 1955. Pan 1955. Liu Naizhong 1955. Jin 1955. Renmin zhengxie 1955. Tian 1955. Zhongguo zuojia xiehui 1955. Ye 1995, p. 11.

duct points for in his pupils' compositions, eighteen years before we find the form in China.

Somewhat surprisingly, the Japanese 1923, 1926 and 1938 reform schemes opted for the not too common 囯 with 王, perhaps because this form was mentioned in *Zhèngzìtōng* and *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*, albeit with the label "informal". As late as on 2 August 1946 the 囯 proposal was repeated by the Textbook Office of the Education Ministry. Also on 2 August, however, the Language Council's Committee on Character Survey included 囯 in a list of "short forms which will not be adopted", adding that "the problem with 囯 is that it contains the character 王."[127] As in China, regiphobia prevailed, ousting 囯 from the November List of Characters for Current Use and opening for the adoption of 国 with 玉 in 1949.

国 has even been mooted in Taiwan. In 1954 Luó Jiālún suggested adopting several short forms including 国. Professor Pān Zhòngguī replied in *Xīnshēng bào*:

> Mr Luó supports the 国 which has been declared official in Japan, as a simpler and more practical form […]. If we were to arrange a vote among citizens, would they support the eight-stroke Japanese product peddled by Mr Luó, or the three-stroke home-made and home-grown 囗?

Needless to say, no poll was held.

過 过 *guò* pass

过, a square version of the cursive ⻌, appears in blockprints from the Yuan onwards and became official with the 1956 Scheme.

還 还 *hái* still

See *huán*.

韓 韩 *䪍 *Hán* Korea

The 1964 General List changed 韓 to 韩 analogously to 韦 for 韋 and 违 for 違. List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme advocated the still shorter 䪍.

车 for 𩵋 on the left is analogous to 𫐓 for 朝 above. Use of 卜 for 韋 on the right can be traced back at least to 1864, when we read in a Beijing account book that 佟府䪍卜久尒の百卄 (佟府韓爺欠錢四百二十 Mr Hán at the

---

127   National Archives 1946.6.4–1946.12.19, pp. 4, 73.

Tóng mansion owes 420 qian).[128] 卧 can hardly stem from 韓 or 韩, more likely from the variant 韓.

Debaters were not kind to 卧. Huáng Guǒ thought the 卜 in 卧 "expresses neither sound nor sense". The Education Bureau of the Revolutionary Committee of Jiangsu Province found the form unfamiliar: "Seeing forms like 屵 (微), 卧 (韩), 忈 (德) […] there is no way of making out which characters they have been simplified from." Unsurprisingly, 卧 was removed from the 1981 Revised Draft.

漢 漢 汉 *Hàn* Chinese

Liú Fù found 汗 (*hàn* sweat) for 漢 in a 1796–1820 blockprint of *Jīn Píng Méi*. Jiǎng Rúlín's 1921 description of the Chaozhou dialect said "汗: same as 漢." The practice was not yet common, however. When Professor Qián Xuántóng sighted a 汗書 (漢書) in a Beijing bookshop in 1922 he found that unusual enough to be worth mentioning in *Xīn Qīngnián*. 汗 was soon to become usual for 漢, however, occurring in five of our 1930–1939 manuscripts.

By then it had met competition. In 1934 Xú Zémǐn reported that his students wrote 汉 for 漢, analogously to the older 难 for 難. The *Tàibái* editors found this practical and included 汉 in their 1935 "handy characters", alongside 难 and 艰. Later that year, however, the Education Ministry's List of Short Forms omitted "short forms which are occasionally seen but have not yet become common, like 汉 for 漢 and 仅 for 僅."

汉 remained rare, appearing in two of our 1950–1954 manuscripts compared with 汗 in twelve. The Script Reform Committee nevertheless chose the disambiguous 汉 for its 1955 Draft.

The archaeologist Chén Mèngjiā complained: "Whole groups have been changed, like 观, 欢, 仅, 汉 and 叹. The latter are forms I do not recognise. They seem to be read *yòu*, since the phonetic is 又." One Zuǒ Huànrén challenged Chén's article, but admitted: "Frankly, when the scheme was published and I saw forms like 尘, 仅, 汉 and 叹, even I could not make them out […]." A report by the committee conceded: "In the Draft there are some characters which are not consistent with the established-by-custom principle, like 孕, 杂 and 汉 for 導 (导), 雜 (什) and 漢 (汗)."[129] Róng Gēng put in a word for the proposed form: "If we change 漢 to 汗, 漢書 will become 'A Sweating Book'. Therefore I support a change to 汉." So did even the committee, which recognised 汉 in June 1956, four months after 难 and 艰.

---

128 Beijing Archives J106-1-1.
129 *Wenzi gaige cankao ziliao*, p. 4.

The Japanese Language Council changed 漢 to 漢 with ⺽ for 廿 in 1949, analogously to 難 for 難.

焊 *𤊓 *hàn* weld

In 1977 a teacher from Wuyang in Henan wrote to the Script Reform Committee that 𤊓 was often seen for 焊. Later that year the committee entered the form in List Two of its Second Scheme.

Zhejiang Education Bureau pointed out that "the reading of the phonetic does not fit the standard language and may lead to misreading. This will not help teach and promote the standard language." Moreover, as we saw in the 贛 *gàn* section, discussions revealed that in Jiangxi 𤊓 was in use not for 焊 but for 贛 *Gàn*, the shortname of that province. These objections barred 𤊓 from the committee's 1981 Revised Draft.

薅 *荞 *hāo* pull up weeds

The 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* took 荞 for an informal form for 薅 and the 1039 *Jíyùn* for a kind of weed pronounced 耗 (*hào* destroy). *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* recognised the latter view and was followed by ensuing dictionaries.

The former view made a come-back in 1960, when a teacher in Rongjiang in Guizhou informed the Script Reform Committee that 荞 was commonly seen there in the sense of 薅. In 1965 Sūn Xiǎohuī from Sichuan Agricultural Institute proposed to adopt "habitually used short forms" like "荞 for the 薅 in 薅秧 [*hāoyāng* thin out seedlings]". The committee followed that proposal up in its 1977 and 1981 schemes.

號 号 *háo* wail *hào* name, number

Shuōwén said 号 meant 'cry of pain' and 號 'call' or 'exhale'. In practice the two were equivalent. *Hán Fēi zǐ* said that the inventor of tree houses 號之曰有巢氏 (was called the Master of Houses) with 號 for 'call', while a bell from the 433 BCE grave of Marquis Yǐ of Zeng is inscribed 𠈱𠆜𤯌𦤻𧆀𠬝𤔔𢇬王 (吕音之才 [在]楚号爲文王 in Chu the *lǚ* music style is called 'the king of tunes') with 号.

Reformers followed practice, prescribing 号 all over in Japan in 1946 and in China in 1956.

闔 阁 合 *hé* entire

闔 *hé* means 'shut' as its 'door' top suggests, but early came to be used even for 'entire'. The shorter 阁 *gé* meant 'a small side gate' but had by the Ming found use as a short form for 闔, as when Yuán Hóngdào (1568–1610) mentioned

吳閣縣之生民 (the inhabitants of the entire Wu County). Wú Liángzuò found this 閣 shortened further to 合 in documents from the Taiping Rebellion. Mathews' 1931 dictionary gives examples like "合家 the whole family. 合府 (or 合郡) the whole county."

The 1964 General List changed 閣 *hé* to 合. *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn* nevertheless kept a 閤 *hé* entry, legalising both 闔家, 合家 and 閤家 until the 1998 edition eliminated the latter alternative.

合 盒 *hé* box

合 depicts a lid closing a box or opening and meant 'close' and 'join' and, with time, even 'box', as in the 635 *Liángshū* (Book of the Liang), where the emperor gives Fù Shāo a 漆合 (*qīhé* lacquered case).

The enlarged 盒 is a later invention appearing in the 1008 *Guǎngyùn*, there in the sense of 'lid'. By the Ming it had come to mean 'container', as the 1615 *Zìhuì* registered: "盒 […] is informally used for a kind of vessel."

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed replacing 盒 with 合. This scheme failed, but use of 合 for 'box' continued. In 2006 Huáng Xuětíng from Baise in Guangxi disapprovingly reported goods sold per 合, and in 2011 Wáng Guólín from Lin'an in Zhejiang complained of restaurants selling 合饭 (meals in boxes).

鶴 鹤 *崔 *hè* crane

The 1955 Draft proposed to simplify 鶴 to its left side 崔. Although *Shuōwén* defined 崔 as "high-reaching", the form was used for 鶴 already in the phrase 崔鳴一震 (the crane uttered a cry) on the Han Liú Xióng stele. Liú Fù found 崔 again in the early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì*. The 1615 *Zìhuì* and 1839 *Zìxué jǔyú* pointed out: "崔 is informally used for 鶴. This is wrong." In 1935 Hú Xíngzhī sighted 崔 for 鶴 in Shanghai.

崔 was nevertheless excluded from the decisive 1956 Scheme. In The 2011 the form was quietly revived by a new *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn* entry: "崔 *hè* ㄏ ㄜ (anc.) (1) Bird flying high. (2) Same as 鶴."

轟 叓 轰 *hōng* boom
聶 聂 *Niè*
鑷 *鎳 镊 *niè* tweezers
攝 摄 摄 *shè* absorb, take a photograph

ㄑ (二) meant 'same as above' already on Yin bones, corresponding to the 々 used in modern texts. Japanese writers continued to use ㄑ and applied this

sign even on character components. The 1496 Meiō version of *Setsuyōshū* advocated 摂 and 鍱 with 以 and the 1597 Kien version 裏 and 枩 (森 *mori* forest) with 𠂤.

Both 𠂤, 𠂤 and 以 bottoms occur in our 1900–1946 manuscripts. Script reformers preferred the explicable 𠂤. The Japanese Education Ministry's 1919 Character Regulation Scheme advised permitting 裏, 摂, 枩, 疊, 壘 (*rui* rampart), 桑 (桑 *kuwa* mulberry), 枩, 渋 (澁 *shibu* puckery), 恊 (協 *kyō* joint) and 脥 (脅 *odosu* threaten), the following 1923 scheme 裏 and 摂, the 1926 scheme 摂, 疊 and 脥, the 1938 scheme 摂, 疊, 桑, 恊 and 脊 and the decisive 1949 List of Forms 摂, 壘 and 渋. (See also 疊 *dié,* 壘 *lěi,* 澁 *sè* and 協 *xié* sections.)

The 𠂤 component was unknown in China, where writers instead turned to double 又 (*yòu* again). Jiǎng and Shào recorded 聶 in their late Ming military documents and Liú Fù 裦 in his early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì.*

In 1959 the Script Reform Committee authorised 轰, 镊 and 摄. Wú Zōng-huá objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "攝 gets simplified to 摄 and 鑷 to 镊, but 聶 does not become 聂." The committee took note and let all 聶 become 聂 in 1964.

後 后 *hòu* after

后 means 'queen' but has been used for its homonym 後 (after) at least since the early Han Lǎo zǐ A manuscript, which said one can 失德而后仁 (lose virtue and then humanity). The competing short form 伇 or 伇 turned up in the early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì* and came to outcompete 后, appearing in seventy-nine of our 1950–1954 manuscripts compared with 后 in eighteen. However, the left sides of 伇 and 伇 were unsuited for print, leaving the 1956 Scheme with 后.

Even in Japan 后 *kō* is a fitting substitute for 後 *kō* and, unlike in China, writers stuck to this form. In our 1900–1946 manuscripts we find six 午后 (午後 *gogo* afternoon) but no 午伇 or 午伇. 后 even found its way to postmarks, like on a letter cancelled 大連中央 10.10.8 后 4–8 (Dairen Central, 8 Oct. 1935, 4–8 p.m.).[130] 后 did not find its way to the List of Characters for Current Use, however.

鬍 胡 *hú* beard

Shuōwén said 胡 is "what hangs down from a cow's throat. It is written with 肉 [meat] and the phonetic 古." Later the character came into use even for

---

130   *Nihon kitte meikan,* vol. 6, fig. 158.

'beard' and was enlarged with 髟 (hair), according to *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn* first in the Ming narrator Huáng Pǔ's 為官不要好文章, 只要鬍鬚及胖長 (to be an official one needs no skill at writing, just a long beard and a stout figure). 鬍 was absent in the 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* but was included in later dictionaries. In 1964 it was officially shortened back to 胡.

胡 蝴 *蚨 *hú* butterfly

The Song *Yùpiān* called a butterfly 胡蝶 *húdié*. The enlarged 蝴 appears later, in the Yuan drama *Húdié mèng* (The Butterfly Dream). This did not make it standard. The 1916 *Zhōnghuá dà zìdiǎn*, for one, said "蝴: informal for 胡 […] originally written 胡; informally written 蝴 with an added 虫."

In 1958 Jì Dá wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that "everybody shortens 蝴 to 蚨". In 1960 a teacher at Sun Yaf-sen Memorial Middle School in Shaoguan in Guangdong reported the same form to the Script Reform Committee. In 1982 this author saw 蚨蝶苏 (蝴蝶酥 butterfly-shaped pastries) on offer in Guangzhou, 蚨蚨草 (蝴蝶草 wishbone flowers) in Nanning and a drawer marked 蚨蝶 (butterflies) in a Hongkong philatelic shop. Cantonese speakers grasp that 蚨 with the 夫 *fū* phonetic refers to the 蝴 which they read *fu*. In 1981–1986 蚨 was identified by informants in Guangzhou, Maoming, Shaoguan and Zhaoqing in western Guangdong and Wuzhou in eastern Guangxi but not elsewhere.

滬 沪 *Hù* Shanghai

As the obscure river name 滬 came into use as the short name for the growing city of Shanghai it became liable to simplification. Dropping 邑 on the right left the handy phonetic 户 *hù*, as in a 1912 letter announcing a sale of a 沪屋值七万 (Shanghai property worth seventy thousand).[131] This 沪 became official in 1958.

護 护 *hù* protect

The 1956 Scheme simplified 護 to 护, the most common of several short forms for 護, appearing in six of our 1940–1954 manuscripts against 护 in one, 茯 in one and 芦 in two.

护 appears on a placard on a 1940 photograph from Shanxi, Chahar and Hebei Border Area urging its citizens to 拥护中央双十綱領 (Support the Central Committee's Twenty Principles). 护 has no component in common with

---

131   Beijing Archives J222-1-22, p. 28.

its template 護 and so looks like a radical invention, but is more probably a gradual development. A 1949 document in Beijing Archives contains a list of 䕶士 (*hùshì* nurses) with the inserted phonetic 户 *hù* for 隻, and the 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì* registers the further shortened 䕶.[132] These forms may well be older. Plausibly 護 became 護, then 萨, then 䕶 and then 护.

茙 without 隹 was registered by Liú Fù in the early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì*.

芦, the above-mentioned 萨 minus 言, appeared in a 1932 article in the mimeographed *Pǔtián gōngnóng bào* (Putian Workers' and Peasants' Bulletin) stating that the Land Law of the Chinese Soviet Republic could be carried through only with the 直接拥芦 (*zhíjiē yōnghù* direct support) of the peasant masses.[133]

In 1953 Zhèng Línxī wrote that "擁護 has come to be shortened 拥护, there are even those who go further and write 拥户."

華 花 *huā* flower

華, an image of a plant, originally meant 'flower', then 'flourishing', 'splendid' and 'China'. For the former sense writers then introduced the shorter 花 with the 化 *huà* phonetic. The Qing philologist Gù Yánwǔ observed: "If we seek the character 花 before the Northern and Southern Dynasties, we do not find any in the documents." Nor do we in stone inscriptions; the first 花 in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* appears on a 520 Maitreya Bodhisattva statue carved by Ā Huān. The 1008 *Guǎngyùn* said: "花 is informal [for 華]. It is now in common use." By the Ming 花 had become the common form, appearing in six Ming and Qing 蓮花 (*liánhuā* lotuses) in our database against 蓮華 in three. The 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* recognised 花 by giving it a separate entry.

Neither the Script Reform Committee nor the Japanese Language Council brought up 花, regarding this short form as fait accompli.

華 华 *huá* flourishing, splendid, China

While 華 in the sense of 'flower' came to be written 花, use of 華 for 'splendid' and 'China' continued. Eventually the 化 phonetic found use even in these cases. On a photograph taken in 1941 in the Liberated Areas in Shanxi or Hebei, four men are standing under a sign inscribed 在华日人反戦同盟 (Anti-War League of Japanese Residents in China). On another photograph from the following year we discern a 中华民族 (the Chinese people) without

---

132 *Renmin zhanzheng bi sheng*, p. 134. Beijing Archives 135-1-36, p. 10.
133 *Minzhong geming shi huace*, p. 54.

the ⺾ top.[134] The topless 华 came to dominate, appearing in seven of our 1950–1954 manuscripts against 苹 in one.

So the 1955 Draft proposed 华. The Script Reform Committee member Yè Gōngchuò admitted that "there are some people who think simplified characters are ugly and unimposing, for example the 华 for 華 in 中華人民共和國." Is this why official status for 华 was delayed until June 1956?

畫 画 画 huà draw, picture

Liú Fù found 昼 with the cursive-based 尺 for 聿 in blockprints from the Song onwards and 画 with 一 for 聿 from the Yuan. 画 outcompeted the less short 昼, appearing in twenty-one of our 1900–1954 manuscripts against 昼 in two. The 1956 Scheme included common 画.

In 1946 the Japanese Language Council turned 畫 into 画 with a 由 centre, a form found in seven of our 1900–1946 manuscripts compared with 画 with 申 in fifteen and 画 with 田 in five. Corresponding Chinese manuscripts contain fifteen 画 with 田 and six 画 with 申 but no 画 with 由. A Chinese rejection of the Japanese version was unavoidable.

劃 剾 划 huà delimit huá scratch

The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms proposed 剾 for 劃 analogously to 画 for 畫. Soon after we find a still shorter alternative, first in a 1944 計划 (jìhuà plan) by the Central Jiangsu Party Committee to attack Japanese puppet troops.[135] This 划 huá, originally meaning 'to row', soon caught up with 剾. Our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain twenty-eight 計划 against twenty-nine 計剾 and three 計剒. The 1956 Scheme opted for the shorter 划.

This idea never occurred to Japanese scribes, who write 漕ぐ (kogu) for 'to row' and are hardly aware of the character 划. Instead the Japanese Language Council replaced 劃 with the homomonym 画 kaku in 1946.

懷 懐 怀 huái bosom, cherish
壞 壊 坏 huài bad

The cramped ⻖ component was the first to be axed by shorteners, as in a 懐 on a Western Han wood slip from Juyan. In the following centuries few

---

134 *Renmin zhanzheng bi sheng*, pp. 291, 143.
135 *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 144.

bothered to write that component; Umehara Seizan's register of Later Wei forms contains thirty 懷 without 龷 and just one unclear 懷 with 龷.

Yuan blockprinters dropped the top 亠뿔 and distorted the bottom 衣, writing 怀 and 坏, which their Qing successors shortened further to 怀 and 坏, two forms which then became official in China in 1956.

怀 and 坏 were mentioned in Japan by 1753 by Dazai Shundai and in 1757 by Tanaka Dōsai but gained no foothold in that country, where instead the 龷-less 懷 and 壞 were recognised in 1949.

<div align="center">

歡 歡 歓 欢 *huān* rejoice

</div>

See 觀 *guān*.

<div align="center">

*還 还 *huán* go back *hái* still
環 环 *huán* ring

</div>

The 1617 *Zìkǎo* said "all characters with 睘 are written with 口." A truism? No, because in practice, people did not write with 口. All Han to Ming forms in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* are 還 with 厶, not 口. The tide turned after 1716, when the authoritative *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* followed *Zìkǎo* in prescribing 口. Why was 口 better? Because it was deemed closer to the ○ in *Shuōwén*'s seal form.

The 口 ruling meant little to the slackest writers, who had long dropped both 뿔 and 厶 to write 还, a form which was called "informal for 還" by the 1212 *Sìshēng piānhǎi*, appeared in blockprints from the Yuan onwards and became official in China in 1956 together with the analogous 环.

Forms with 不 were not unknown in Japan. 还 was mentioned by Dazai Shundai in 1753 and Ōnishi Katsutomo in 1897, but records of actual use are lacking in Japan, where the full forms 還 and 環 became Characters for Current Use in 1946.

<div align="center">

徽 *灰 *huī* emblem

</div>

In 1958 the Anhui teacher Zhōu Qǐfèng wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that students often wrote 灰 (*huī* ash) for the 徽 in 安徽 (*Ānhuī*) and 徽州 (the present Huangshan City). In 1960 teachers from Hefei, Bengbu and Qianshan in Anhui sent similar reports to the Script Reform Committee.

The committee nevertheless created the new form 炟 for its 1962 List of Simplified Characters, commenting: "The character 徽 is too complicated and has little use. Merging it with 輝 [*huī* splendour] to 炟 will make it easier to use and to write." The 1962 scheme was never published, but the merger idea resurfaced in the 1977 Second Scheme, which proposed 辉 for both.

Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn published an objection: "The 徽 in Anhui is usually written 灰 in that province. Why has it not been adopted in the scheme?" The editors explained:

People from Anhui often write 安灰, and even some from elsewhere. Replacing 徽 with 灰 in a place name is no problem, but 徽 is also used in other contexts, like 国徽 [state arms], 帽徽 [*màohuī* cap badge] and 徽章 [*huīzhāng* badge]. Replacing these with 灰 would not be suitable, so one opted to replace 徽 with 辉, including this in List Two to solicit opinions.[136]

Opinions were obviously negative, ousting 辉 from the 1981 Revised Draft.

迴 回 *huí* revolve

The 1956 Scheme merged 迴 (revolve, encircle, winding) into 回 (*huí* return, turn round), a character obviously of the same root, like 洄 (*huí* whirl), 蛔 (*huí* roundworm) and 徊 (*huái* pace up and down). 迴 was a relative novelty, absent in the 100 CE *Shuōwén* and optional in the 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*, which quoted the Ming *Zhèngyùn* (Correct Rhymes): "迴 […] same as 回."

The 迴 to 回 change seems not to have been a top priority for the reformers, overlooked in the 1955 Draft and then delayed until the 1964 General List.

會 会 *huì* meeting

会 became official in Japan in 1946 and ten years later in China. We find forerunners like 会 on a Western Han wood slip, 会 in the calligraphy of Zhāng Zhī (d. 192) and 会 in that of Suǒ Jìng (239–303).

惠 恵 *huì* kindness

Since 1949 the Japanese dictionary form 恵 has been shorter than the Chinese 惠. It is not clear what was eliminated in the ˚Japanese form. Karlgren held the 厶 in 叀/叀 for the tail of an insect, Guō Mòruò for the bottom of a shield, Sūn Hǎibō for a part of a loom, Lù Màodé for the shaft of a three-pointed lance, Táng Guìxīn for a rope pulling an ox and Shirakawa Shizuka for the knot of a sack. ○/厶 had begun to disappear already in the Warring States, as in a 叀 (惠) in the tomb of the king of Zhongshan. With time, 厶-less forms took over. Fushimi Chūkei's register of Han inscriptions holds eleven 恵 with

---

136   "Guanyu 'Di er ci'", p. 29.

宙 compared with nineteen 惠 with 叀, Umehara Seizan's list of Tang forms fifteen 惠 against two 惠.

Why did the Japanese Language Council bother to shorten this character which the otherwise more radical Script Reform Committee of China left alone? One reason may have been that 恵 was analogous to the new official Japanese 専 for 專. In China this analogy was absent, as 專 became 专, not 専.

匯 *滙 汇 huì converge, remit

The older form is 匯, the phonetic 淮 huái inside a box, which according to *Shuōwén* is the original sense of this character. Scribes relieved crowding inside the box by writing 滙, then eliminated it by writing 汇, as in a 1948 report by the Bank of Communications on 汇款 (remittances) and in a 1949 application from Western Beijing Coal Mining Company for 外汇 (foreign currency) to buy machinery.[137]

Reformers included 汇 in their 1955 Draft and 1956 Scheme. Chén Guāngyáo asserted that 汇 "is already much used in banks." But not elsewhere, according to Zhāng Zhōu: "There are some characters which most people are not used to seeing, but which have become common in particular fields, like the 汇 used in banks […]." This may explain why 汇 did not gain official status until 1959.

彙 汇 huì collect, classify

In 1935 Ōuyáng Zhēn mentioned 彐, the top of the variant 彚, among "short forms already common." The 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì* rendered this as 彑, closer to the dictionary form 彙.

We have no more records of 彐 or 彑 for 彙. Nor, it seems, had the Script Reform Committee, which instead suggested 汇, the short form of the homonym 匯, and let that form become official for 彙 in 1959.

夥 伙 huǒ band, companion

'Band' was originally written shorter than the above. *Xīn Tángshū* (New Book of the Tang) says 十人為火, 火有長 (ten men make up a troop, and each troop has one leader). The 'fire' is supposed to be their campfire.

Later writers specified the 'band' sense by borrowing the character 夥, originally used for a southern dialect word meaning 'much', as one might guess from its 多 component. *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn* records of this practice begin

---

137 Beijing Archives J32-1-2784, pp. 30, 45, 46; 4-13-1, p. 9.

with the Yuan drama *Lǐ Kuí fùjīng* (Lǐ Kuí Makes an Apology), where the chieftain Sòng Jiāng vows to 聚三十六大夥 (assemble thirty-six brave fellows).

More recent writers have found a simpler way to distinguish 'companions' from 'fire' by enlarging 火. *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn* records of this begin with the 1909 *Èrshí nián mùdǔ zhi guài xiànzhuàng* (Two Decades of Amazing Events) whose protagonist once 同衆伙友相見 (saw all his friends).

The 1955 Draft proposed to change all 伙 to the shorter 火. One Yān Zhèngyào pointed out in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that this would merge phrases like 張三專能吃伙食 (Zhāng Sān is good for nothing but eating) and 張三專能吃火食 (Zhāng Sān eats only cooked meals). The reformer Cáo Bóhán countered that that sense could be made out from the context. In the event it was decided to shorten 'companion' to 伙, thus keeping it distinct from 'fire', and retain 夥 in its original sense of 'much'.

獲 获 *huò* catch
穫 获 *huò* reap

Jiǎng and Shào found 隹-less 荻 for 獲 in late Ming military documents and Liú Fù in the Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì*. The former listed 荻 among forms "still in common use" in their 1952 article. Among other variants, that is. In Beijing Archives we find a 1934 pledge by the police to 務获 (*wùhuò* apprehend) the burglar who stole gems and bedclothes from one Jǐng Báilún.[138] This 获 with two 'dogs' came to dominate, appearing in six of our 1940–1954 manuscripts against 护 with the phonetic 户 *hù* in one and 荻 in none.

So the 1955 Draft proposed 获. A 狯 adherent objected at a meeting: "It is better to simplify to 狯. Although 狯 is not so common as 获, this lets us shorten 護 and 穫 to 䜵 and 秽. This way 獲, 護 and 穫 can be simplified analogously."[139] The committee stuck to practice, however, changing 獲 and 穫 to 获 and 護 to 护 in 1956.

雞 鷄 鸡 鸡 *jī* hen

'Hen' has been written with either 隹 (bird) or 鳥 (bird) on the right. Forms with 隹 are older, appearing on Yin bones and in *Shuōwén*, which conceded that "in the big seal 雞 was written with 鳥." Later dictionaries recognised either 雞 or both forms.

鷄 with 一 for 幺 appears in the 640 Yuàn Xuán epitaph. In 1705 the Japanese scholar Arai Hakuseki warned: "Writing a character containing

---

138   Beijing Archives J183-2-5932, p. 15.
139   Renmin zhengxie 1955.

奚, like 鷄 or 溪, with �ée is wrong." This did not prevent 鷄 from becoming correct in 1949.

Chinese writers managed without 鷄, having invented the still shorter 鸡, a form recorded by Liú Fù in Qing blockprints and proposed in the 1955 Draft. The recognition of 鸡 was delayed until 1959, as reformers pondered how to deal with the 鳥 component, as described in the *niǎo* section.

擊 擊 击 *畫 jī strike

Writers first shed 殳 and 手, then 曰. A 1928 instruction by Jiangyin County Party Committee promoted 游畫作战法 (guerrilla warfare) in the Wuxi area and a 1929 letter signed Máo Zédōng urged 向刘步焦击 (向劉張進擊 attacking [Kuomintang commanders] Liú and Zhāng).[140] Both forms continued in use, 畫 appearing in six of our 1940–1954 manuscripts and 击 in five. The Script Reform Committee opted for the shorter 击.

The Japanese Language Council confined itself to a change from 擊 to 撃 with 車 for 畫, a substitution we can trace back to a 轂 on the 161 CE Chéng Bà stele. Forms with 車 became at least as popular in Japan as in China, appearing twelve times in Kitagawa Hirokuni's dictionary of Japanese calligraphy where 撃 with 畫 is absent.

The Chinese short form 畫 was not completely unknown in Japan. A document from 1944 contains plans to 畫破ス (*gekiha su* attack and destroy) the enemy by repeated 攻畫 (*kōgeki* assaults).[141] 畫 was ignored by the Language Council but was proposed in a 1957 issue of *Shimbun kenkyū*.

積 积 jī store up

Envelopes printed in 1945 by Binhai Wartime Post in Jiangsu display a vow to 积極 (actively) fight for the revolution.[142] The phonetic 只 *zhī* in 积 does not fit 積 *jī* in Jiangsu and elsewhere in the north, but does in parts of Guangdong and Fujian, where 積 and 只 are both read *tsik* and where 积 was probably invented.

积 was bypassed in the 1955 Draft, presumably because of its misleading phonetic. Jīn Míngshèng pointed out that 积 was "already in common use", Tián Qíchāng that it was "often used by people" and Wáng Tónghàn that it had "a broad basis of use among the masses". The committee complied,

---

140 *Wuxi geming shi huace*, p. 582. *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 75.
141 National Archives 1944.8, pp. 2, 9, 43.
142 *A Rare Collection of Chinese Stamps*, pp. 72–75.

sanctioning 积 in its June 1956 Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters.

幾 几 *jī* nearly *jǐ* how many
機 机 *杺 *jī* machine

Liú Fù found 机 (*jī* stool) for the homonymous 機 in blockprints from the Yuan onwards and 几 (*jī* stool) for 幾 from the Qing. It is no accident that these replacements were made in the Yuan, when readings began to converge. As late as in 1039 *Jíyùn* placed 幾 and 機 in the 微 *wēi* rhyme but 几 and 机 in the 脂 *zhǐ* rhyme.

The 幾 to 几 change in the 1956 Scheme was not undisputed. The reformer Chén Wénbīn admitted that "some think this character will be mixed up with 九 and 儿." Qiū Chángnù of Northeast Normal University suggested a remedy: "When 几 (幾) is used as a separate word, it is better to simplify 幾 to 㐣 as established by custom, only when used as a character component should it be shortened to 几," this way "one can avoid mixing up with characters like the 几 in 茶几 [*chájī* tea table], 儿 and 凡 [*fán* all]."

True, 㐣 was established by custom, but less so than 几. Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain two 㐣 against five 几 and four 枛 against sixty-five 机. So there was a somewhat stronger case for 㐣 than for 枛, but far from strong enough to oust 几 from the decisive 1956 Scheme. Our last record of 㐣 is a sum of 㐣千元 in a 1981 street notice in Hengyang in Hunan.

Use of 几 and 机 for 幾 and 機 has been reported even in Japan by Dazai Shundai in 1753, Matsumoto Guzan in 1803 and Ōnishi Katsutomo in 1897, after which tracks disappear. Instead we register another, undoubtedly homegrown Japanese form, first in a 1933 record by the Japanese troops posted in Tianjin of two 重杺 (*jūki* heavy machine guns) and six 軽杺 (*keiki* light machine guns) at a police station in Xiǎoguān Street in Hedong District.[143] This 杺 with the katakana キ *ki* phonetic has seen much use and was identified by eight of our twenty-four 2014–2017 Japanese informants.

極 极 *jí* extreme

极 with the phonetic 及 *jí* enters our records in June 1949 with a plan by Hangzhou Employment Office to 徉积极方面 (從積極方面 actively) reduce unemployment.[144]

The 1955 Draft passed 極 over. The army teacher Tián Qíchāng argued

---

143 *Showa junen zengoki Shina chutongun monjo*, p. 134.
144 Hangzhou Archives 94-1-1, p. 9.

in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that 极 was "often used by people", Pān Mò that "there are some characters which have been used in the years since Liberation and are familiar to people, which one could also approve, like 积, 极, 拥 and 护." So 极 was added to the 1956 Scheme and authorised in 1959.

籍 *笈 *jí* register

As we saw in the 筆 *bǐ* section, Han writers began to shorten 'bamboo' tops to 'grass'. This affected even 籍, mixing it up with 藉 (*jiè* mat). On Western Han wood slips we find more than twenty 名藉 (name lists) but no 名籍. Even the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* advocated writing 藉甚 for 籍甚 (*jíshèn* renowned wide and far). The Tang *Gānlù zìshū* on the other hand stressed the distinction: "藉籍: the former means 藉草 [straw mat], the latter 簿籍 [records]." Later dictionaries followed the latter.

In 1959 Liú Hé reported a more radical simplification in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "Lately the masses have created an abundance of simplified characters. One encounters them all over in billboard verses, slogans, written instructions and wall posters, like […] 籍–笈 […]." In 1960 this 笈 with the phonetic 及 *jí* was mentioned in letters to the Script Reform Committee from Baotou in the north to Guangzhou in the south. The committee fruitlessly proposed 笈 in its 1977 Second Scheme and 1981 Revised Draft.

靃 集 *亼 *jí* gather

Shuōwén took 集 to be a shortened 靃: "靃 [靃]: birds in a tree. Consists of 雥 and 木. 集 [集]: 靃 also appears shortened." This theory lost credibility in the early twentieth century when excavated Yin bones turned up early forms like 集 (集), but was rehabilitated in 1962 when a 靃 (靃) turned up on the Yin Mǔ goblet.

The Script Reform Committee included 亼 in its 1977 Second Scheme. The idea came from *Shuōwén*: "亼: three things converging. […] Read as 集." Ancient text examples of this 亼 are lacking. This *Shuōwén* entry is a section heading, perhaps inserted to provide an etymology for 合 (*hé* to close) and 會 (*huì* assemble) and does not necessarily represent a character in use at the time.

Posterity, however, tried to revive 亼. In May 1912 Lǔ Xùn recorded a purchase of 李太白亼 (collected works of Lǐ Tàibái) in his diary. In 1920 Qián Xuántóng proposed in *Xīn qīngnián* to simplify the script by "adopting ancient characters, like […] 亼 for 集." In 1934 Xú Zémǐn found that his students wrote 亼 for 集 when asked to write fast. In 1955 Bào Yòuwén argued for a change of 集 to 亼. Lǐ Jīngyuǎn promoted characters "like 坔, 亼 and

厶 [私] which are not used by people now but have traits easy to recognise and will be very easy for the masses to grasp if introduced." In 1962 the reformer Chén Yuè opined that "nothing prevents restoring ancient forms like 人 for 集". The 1977 Second Scheme 人 in its List Two of characters for further discussion.

Discussions revealed that 人 was unfamiliar to most. Zhū Ruìhuá praised the committee for having "boldly created new, simple characters like 兲 for 寡 [*guǎ* few], �approx for 微 and 人 for 集." Guangxi Script Reform Leading Group wrote that 人 "increases the number of new characters and makes no clear sense." Sichuan Interim Script Reform Working Group pointed out that "by the shape of the character itself it is very hard to make out its sense." Shanxi Education Bureau said "the sense is unclear and everybody has objections." Education organs in Jiangsu and Jiangxi called 人 ugly. Not surprisingly, 人 dropped out of the 1981 Revised Draft.

An alternative existed. In 1960 correspondents from Heyuan, Wuhua and Yangchun in Guangdong and Ningbo, Pingyang, Wenzhou and Taishun in Zhejiang informed the committee that locals wrote 朵. The latter correspondent specified that 朵 had a history of at least three years. In 1962 Zhāng Yǒngmián noticed 朵 in the works of Zhejiang students.

Reports come from just two provinces. 1981–1986 interviews confirmed that 朵 was known in Zhejiang and Guangdong but unknown elsewhere.[145] Was this distribution linked to pronunciation?

	Beijing	Shanghai	Hangzhou, Zhejiang	Huangyan, Zhejiang	Wenzhou, Zhejiang	Xiamen, Fujian	Guangzhou, Guangdong
集	*tɕi* 35	*ziə* 2	*dziəʔ* 12	*zieʔ* 12	*zai* 212	*tsip* 5	*tʃap* 22
人	*ʐu* 51	*zəʔ* 2	*szəʔ* 12	*zieʔ* 12	*zai* 212	*dzip* 5	*jap* 22

Obviously it was. The 人 phonetic fits reasonably in the southeast and perfectly in southern Zhejiang.

濟 济 济 *jì* help
劑 剂 剂 *jì* medicine

See 齊 *qí*.

---

145   朵 identified as 集 by informants in Guangzhou and Meixian but not Maoming, Zhanjiang, Shaoguan and Huizhou in Guangdong, in Huzhou, Ningbo and Wenzhou but not Hangzhou, Jiaxing and Shaoxing in Zhejiang and in Yancheng but not elsewhere in Jiangsu. Unknown in other provinces.

繼 継 继 *jì* continue

繼 consists of five threads. Once they were four, as in the 夫之而不繼 (失之而不繼 what loses this [balance between yin and yang] will not prevail) in the early Han *Shí wèn* (Ten Questions) text from Mawangdui. Later Han texts all have the fifth thread.

Some added 丨, writing 繼. This form was then shortened to 継 with 、 for each 幺 as on the 179 Chén Qiú stele. This 継 became common, outnumbering 繼 fifteen to five in Umehara Seizan's collections of Later Wei and Tang inscriptions. In 1946 継 became official in Japan and in 1959 in China, as 继.

The Chinese change from 糸 to 纟 is described in the 纟 (*sī*) section.

際 际 *jì* border

The 1928 handwritten rules of the Chinese Communist Youth League defined that body as a branch of the 少共国际 (Communist Youth International).[146] The topless 际 was included already in the Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms and then in the Script Reform Committee's 1956 Scheme.

冀 *異 *北 *Jì* Hebei

Shuōwén said: "An area in the north. Consists of 北 [north] and the phonetic 異 [*yì*]." Few writers complied. On Han to Tang steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* we count one hundred and eighty 異 with 丷 against six 冀 with 北. The 837 writing manual *Jiǔjīng zìyàng* explained the split: "冀異 […]. The former is the *Shuōwén* form, the latter the shortened clerk style form." The latter was about to lose status. While the Song *Yùpiān* and *Guǎngyùn* said "異 is the same as [冀] above," the Yuan *Zìjiàn* said "冀 is informally written 異" and the Ming *Súshū kānwù* declared that "writing 異 is wrong." Criticism worked. On Qing steles in our database the 異 to 冀 the proportion is one to eighteen.

The campaign for the 北 top may have been unnecessary. 冀 is now regarded as a descendant of 🦌 or 🦌, a horned ogre, which was borrowed for the name of an area.

Later writers hit back by inventing a still shorter form. The full text of the 1941 sign described in the 華 *huá* section reads 在华日人反战同盟晋察異支部 (Anti-War League of Japanese Residents in China – Shanxi, Chahar and Hebei Branch), but in the photograph we also glimpse another sign inscribed 察北支部.

---

146 *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 169.

The 1977 Second Scheme included this 北. Professor Xú Zhōnghuá of Beijing Normal University pointed out: "In the two lists of the Second Scheme 一 is used for five or six different components: in 尸 for 戋, in 亠 for 亘, in 氿 for 寅, in 芑 for 豕, in 北 and 羽 for 異; on top of that, 一 replaces all 灬." The 1981 Revised Draft recanted: "The simplification to 北 in the [1977] draft was too far off from the original character. This draft changes this to 兆, analogously to 粪 (糞) and 虏 (虜)." Of this 兆 we have no former records, nor later ones.

<div align="center">

夾 夹 *jiā* squeeze
陝 陕 *Shǎn* Shaanxi
峽 峡 *xiá* gorge
狹 狭 *xiá* narrow
挾 挟 *xié* clasp

</div>

In the early Han manuscripts from Mawangdui 'clasp' is written 挾 with 夾, on a somewhat younger wood slip from Wuwei 挟 with 夹. Forms with 夹 outnumber 夾 on steles from the Eastern Han onwards.

峡 and 狭 were legalised in Japan in 1949 and 挟 in 1981. In China 夹 was recognised in 1958 and analogous forms in 1964.

<div align="center">

傢 家 *jiā* utensils

</div>

'Household utensils' were called 家火, 家具 *jiājù* or 家什 *jiāshí*, as in the 1624 *Jǐng shì tōngyán* (Plain Words to Warn the World): 無家火在手邊，教周氏去灶前捉把劈柴斧頭 (*wú jiāhuo zài shǒu biān, jiào Zhōu shì qù zào qián zhuō bǎ pǐchái fǔtou* she had no utensils at hand, so she asked Mrs Zhōu to go to the stove and fetch a wood axe). 亻 was added by later writers, as in the 1750 *Rúlín wàishǐ* (The Scholars): 吃了一餐，撤下傢伙去 (he ate the meal and cleared the cutlery). The 1956 the Scheme abolished the newish 傢 in favour of the shorter 家.

<div align="center">

家 宎 宂 *jiā* home

</div>

At a 1957 meeting of writers, Lǐ Chángzhī complained: "Parts of the masses make up short forms themselves, making mockery of simplified characters. Captions of Guangdong operas contain forms like 宁 (家) and 忄 (慢)." The following year Xióng Kāiyín censured people who "simplify at will" and write characters like 宁 or 宎 for 家. In 1959 Hǎo Niànxún mentioned 宂 as a form "already in common use among the masses." A 1960 letter to the Script Reform Committee from a teacher in Taishun in Zhejiang gave 宂 "a history of five to ten years."

That would make 叐 with 'man' for 'boar' the oldest of the three forms. It was surely the most common, mentioned by twenty-seven of the committee's 1960 correspondents compared with 宊 by fourteen and 㤅 by seven.

However, commonness was not the committee's sole priority. For its 1962 List of Simplified Characters it chose 㤅, explaining: "The masses demand simplification. There are also the short forms 叐 and 宊, but they do not match the reading, as 㤅 does [with its 加 *jiā* phonetic]." This point was downgraded in the 1977 Second Scheme, which opted for the shorter and more common 叐. The education bureaus of Fujian, Shandong, Shanxi, Qinghai and Zhejiang along with corresponding organs in Hubei and Yunnan pointed to this form's similarity to 穴 (*xué* hole), effectively ousting 叐 from the 1981 Revised Draft.

假 仮 *仦 *jiǎ* fake *jià* vacation

In 1705 the Japanese scholar Arai Hakuseki listed 仮, the beginning and the end of 假, among characters "informally used in this country". In 1946 仮 became the formal form.

仮 was absent in China, where writers came up with something still simpler. In 1960 letters to the Script Reform Committee from Anqing in Anhui and Pingnan in Guangxi reported use of 仦 with the phonetic 下 *xià* for 假. The committee included this 仦 in List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme. Shanghai Interim Script Reform Leading Group and the education bureaus in Anhui and Shanxi feared 仦 might be misread *xià* and so impede tuition of the standard language. 仦 was duly barred from the 1981 Revised Draft.

價 价 価 *jià* price value

'Price' was once shorter. The 156 CE Hán Chì stele, for one, says 工不爭賈 (工不爭價 the craftsmen did not dispute the price). Our first 價 enlarged with 亻 appears on the 524 Lǐ Yuànhuá epitaph.

The 1956 Scheme shortened this 價 to 价. Professor Chén Wénbīn explained:

In society the following short forms are in use for 價: 价, 価 and 伱. There are also those who propose 伝, 伻 or 俱, but these have no basis among the masses. Although 価 and 伱 do have a certain mass basis, they are not as simple and not so close in reading as 价 [*jiè*]. 价 has long been in use in society. True, this 价 was another character with another sense [*jiè* servant] in ancient times, but that sense is no longer current and need not be taken into account.

Professor Huáng Bóróng presented a hypothesis on the origin of 价: "Some forms were first current in one dialect area but with time became common all over the country, like 葉 (叶) and 价 (價) which were first current in the Wu dialect area south of [the lower part of] Changjiang."

Records confirm 价's high age and its eastern pedigree. The 1907 *Shina keizai zensho* (All About China's Economy) reproduced a Shanghai customs receipt of 羊皮圭伯五拾歩价|三元 (羊皮壹佰五拾張價13圓 *yángpí yī bǎi wǔshí zhāng jià shísān yuán* one hundred and fifty sheepskins, price 13 yuan). Lǔ Xùn, a native of Zhejiang living in Shanghai, wrote 价乡 (價錢 price) and the like in his letters. A 1924 report from Jiangsu Forestry Centre No. 1 in Nanjing quotes a 全价 (total price).[147] In 1927 the Shanghai *Píngmín zìdiǎn* described 价 as "an informal form for 價."

This East China preference for 价 is explained by local readings:

	Beijing	Nanjing, Jiangsu	Shanghai	Sha-oxing, Zhejiang	Hang-zhou, Zhejiang	Fu-zhou, Fujian	Nanchang, Jiangxi	Wuhan, Hubei
價	tɕia 51	tɕia 44	<u>ka 33</u>	<u>tɕia 33</u>	tɕia 334	ka 13	ka 55	tɕia 35
介	tɕie 51	tɕiɛ 44	<u>ka 33</u>	<u>tɕia 33</u>	tɕiɛ 334	kai 13	kai 55	kai 35

佮 appears later, in a 1933 Beiping police report about one Xíng Qìngcháng who had 給佮四角 (*gěi jià sì jiǎo* offered a price of forty cents) for stolen ammunition. In 1947 we find 佮 in Hubei and in 1950 in Sichuan.[148] 佮 is derived from 伄, a shortened 價 seen in blockprints from the Yuan onwards.

価 without 貝 appears in a 1947 decree by Shanxi, Chahar and Hebei Border Area Finance Office setting the 米価 (*mǐjià* price of rice) at sixteen hundred yuan per pound. In 1948 Henan, Anhui and Jiangsu Industry and Commerce Office No. 3 issued a pamphlet exposing the soaring 物価 (*wùjià* prices) in Kuomintang areas. Who would take up an eight-stroke 価 if a six-stroke 价 was already in use? Perhaps someone who had business with Japan, where this character had been in use at least since 1912, when we find it in correspondence of Yamaguchi Prefectural Office concerning 時価 (*jika* current prices) and 單価 (*tanka* item prices) of building materials.[149]

伝 turns up in the 1932 Temporary Regulations of the Red Post in Jiangxi,

---

147 *Shina keizai zensho*, vol. 9, p. 250. *Lu Xun shougao quanji, shuxin di yi ce*, p.
137 Nanjiing Archives 1005-1-289, p. 58.
148 Beijing Archives J181-21-1389, p. 6. Hubei Archives LS19-5-7726, p. 9. Receipt from Chengdu.
149 Beijing Archives 1-8-1, p. 3. *Anhui geming shi huace*, p. 241. Yamaguchi Archives 戦前 A 土木 435.

which regulates 邮票之伝值 (the price of stamps). In 1936 the Jiangxi teacher Ōuyáng Zhēn described 伝 as "a common short form used in shops for 價." In 1946 Hubei Construction Bureau registered 伝钦 (價款 *jiàkuǎn* payment) for building materials. In 1981 this author saw merchandise priced 伝 in Jiangxi, Hunan and eastern Sichuan.[150]

Why then did Chén Wénbīn write that 伝 had "no basis among the masses"? Perhaps because he lived in Beijing, where 價 is not on record. In 1981–1986 伝 was identified as 价 by informants in twenty places in Jiangxi, Hubei, Hunan, Guizhou and Yunnan, but was unknown elsewhere 伝 except in the Northeast where it was identified as 传.[151]

价 succeeded because it originated in East China, where early reformers tended to live. In 1935 they selected 价 for *Tàibái*'s "handy characters", *Lúnyǔ*'s "plain stroke characters" and the Education Ministry's List of Short Forms. With time 价 spread outside its core Wu area, appearing in nineteen of our 1950–1954 Beijing manuscripts compared with 佈 in twenty-three and 価 in nine (the ratio in our less numerous Nanjing and Hangzhou manuscripts is an unsurprising six 价 to one 佈 and two 価). 价 was thus familiar to the Beijing-based Script Reform Committee which made this form official already with its first batch of simplified characters in February 1956.

The Japanese Language Council was familiar only with 価, which it included in its 1949 List of Forms.

<center>

艱 艰 *jiān* distress
</center>

See 難 *nán*.

<center>

殲 殲 歼 *jiān* destroy
</center>

See 纖 *xiān*.

---

150 *Chise youzheng zanxing zhangcheng*, 1932. Hubei Archives LS31-8-30, p. 2. 伝 seen for 价 in 1981 in Hengyang, Yueyang, Zhuzhou, Wuchang, Jiujiang and Wanxian, in 1986 in Chaling, Yongxin and Ganzhou.

151 伝 identified as 价 in Nanchang, Jinggangshan, Ruijin, Shangrao, Xiushui, Yongxin, Huangshi, Shashi, Changsha, Chenzhou, Hengyang, Lianyuan, Shaoyang, Xiangtan, Zhuzhou, Yichang, Guiyang, Xingyi, Kunming, and Qujing.

堅 坚 *jiān* firm
監 监 *jiān* supervise *jiàn* chancellor
緊 紧 *jǐn* tight
腎 肾 *shèn* kidney

Early writers began 臣 either with the top 一 or with the left 丨. 丨 writers tended to contract the right side to 刂, like Wáng Xiànzhī who wrote 肾 for 腎 in the fourth century. Forms with 刂 for 臣 became common both in China and Japan but official only in the former.

鹼 *鹻 *碱 硷 *jiǎn* alkali
碱 *城 *jiǎn* soda

In 1960 Yè Yǒngliè wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "In everyday use some people write 碱 [for 鹼], but that will not do in chemistry, since alkalis differ from sodas by definition. Soda is only one form of alkali. Only alkalis which dissolve in water are called sodas."

The two characters had been mixed up for a long time. In 1916 *Zhōnghuá dà zìdiǎn* described 碱 as an "informal form for 鹼." The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms proposed a change of 鹼 to 碱, as did the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft. At the script reform conference in October that year, however, the committee member Yè Gōngchuò announced that "following people's suggestions […] we will not merge characters which are distinguished in science or technology, like 鏇 [*xuàn* turn on a lathe] and 銑 [*xiǎn* cast iron], 鹼 and 碱, and 圓 and 元". Instead the December First List of Regulated Variants merged 鹼 and 鹻 to 鹼 and 碱 and 城 to 碱, retaining the difference.

So the twenty-five-stroke 鹼 remained, begging to be dealt with. The 1956 Scheme came up with 硷, a hybrid between 鹼 and 碱 which was, however, recognised only with the 1964 General List.

What held the committee back? Perhaps objections by the likes of Zhào Tàimóu, who called 硷 a form "hitherto unseen or newly created". Or fears of ambiguity: 硷 was a contracted version of 礆, which *Zhèngzìtōng* and *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* called a variant of 險 (*xiǎn* danger), not of 鹼.

繭 茧 *jiǎn* cocoon

茧, the beginning and end of 繭, was mentioned in Huáng Ruòzhōu's 1950 list of "now common short forms with a relatively broad basis among the masses". The reformer Chén Guāngyáo called 茧 "established by custom". It became official in June 1956.

東 *东 *jiǎn* abridge, visiting card
揀 拣 *jiǎn* select
練 練 *练 练 *liàn* practise
煉 煉 *炼 炼 鍊 錬 *liàn* smelt

The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms proposed 练 and 炼 on the basis of cursive forms. Twenty years later the Script Reform Committee opted for 练, 炼 and 拣 with 东, not 东. Liú Wànxīn explained: "In old cursive script both 東 and 柬 are written 东, although they are in fact different characters. To distinguish the two senses 柬 was simplified to 东, allowing 东 to serve for 東."

That is not to say that forms with 东 were entirely unknown before 1955. Zhào Mèngfǔ (1254–1322) wrote 𦳝 (蘭 *lán* orchid) and Wáng Shìmào (1536–1588) 练. In our 1900–1954 manuscripts we find two 蕳 (蘭) with 东 (among twenty with 东).

Wú Zōnghuá and Qiū Chángnù criticised the inconsistency in changing 練 and 煉 but not 柬. The committee duly proposed 东 for 柬 in its 1977 Second Scheme but excluded the form from the ensuing 1981 Revised Draft.

The Japanese Language Council turned 練 and 鍊 into 練 and 錬 with 東 for 柬 in 1949.

The once distinct ᭦ (objects) in the 柬 (bag) began to merge already in the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts, where the 柬 component is written either 柬 or 東. The latter has dominated, as on Tang steles where *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* registers twenty-nine 練 against six 練.

檢 检 検 *jiǎn* examine
儉 俭 倹 *jiǎn* frugal
劍 剑 剣 *jiàn* sword
臉 脸 臉 *liǎn* face
簽 签 *qiān* sign
險 险 険 *xiǎn* danger
驗 验 験 *yàn* test

The Japanese Language Council simplified the 僉 component to 㑒 and the Script Reform Committee of China to 佥.

Forms with 㑒 are first seen in Chinese blockprints from the Song and Yuan but became even more common in Japan, where our 1900–1946 manuscripts contain twelve 検 against one 检 and eight 険 against one 险. 検, 倹, 剣, 険 and 験 were duly included in the 1949 List of Forms.

Forms with 佥 are known since the third century ce, when Huáng Xiàng wrote 桧 for 檢. These came to dominate in China, where our 1900–1954

manuscripts hold thirty-four 检 against one 檢 and seven 验 but no 驗. Unsurprisingly the 1955 Draft comprised 检, 俭, 剑, 脸, 签, 险 and 验.

There were counterproposals, but not from 佥 writers. Liú Kuímín wrote in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "Character simplification should as far as possible follow people's habits. [...] In all characters with this component 佥 is written 介, like in 枌 and 剠." A letter to the committee from Guangdong Education Bureau suggested 枯, 刮, 阽 and 玷 with 占 for 佥 like the "new simplified characters used in parts of Guangdong". In *Guāngmíng rìbào* Wēn Yìngshí proposed 竿 instead of 签 which "the masses still do not use much". Xú Yīhuī argued in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that "the form in common use today is 馸, which is much better than 验."

枌 and 剠 may have been invented in some area where *-n* endings disappear, like Shanxi where both are read *tɕie*45. In any case the habit spread. In 1949 we find a 枌查委员 (inspector) in a Harbin police report and 枌查 (checks) in a notice from Quanzhou Working Committee in Fujian.[152] Our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain eight 枌 or 馸, compared with thirteen 检 or 验. Records cease with a 1986 street advertisement for staff with 经驴 in Ganzhou in Jiangxi.

占 forms were less widely spread. In 1951 the Central and Southern Working Committee in Wuhan reported on its 经玷 (experience). 枯 or 玷 were mentioned in 1960 letters to the committee from Xiamen and Zhangzhou in Fujian and Shaoguan, Meixian, Heyuan and Wuhua in Guangdong. Teachers from Dongguan in Guangdong in 1961 and a colleague from Wuzhou in Guangxi in 1964 all complained of students writing 枯 and 玷.[153] Records cease in 1986 with a 拈查站 (control post) by the road to Yangjiang and a 市枯察院 (public prosecutor) mentioned on a Meixian billboard.

枯 and 玷 records cluster in the south, bearing out Guangdong Education Bureau's claim of their use "in parts of Guangdong". 1981–1986 interviews confirmed that 枯 was identified by informants in Guangdong and parts of neighbouring Fujian and Guangxi but not elsewhere. This distribution of 占 is explicable: Guangzhou 占 *tʃim* rhymes with 验 *jim* and Xiamen 占 *tsiam* with 验 *giam*.

千 forms enter our records in 1954, when Nanjing Statistics Bureau conducted a 杆查 (survey) of countryside households.[154] In 1960 and 1977 杆, 竿 or 玕 were mentioned in letters to the committee from Hefei in Anhui, Sihong, Yancheng and Hai'an in Jiangsu and Huzhou and Taishun in Zhejiang. In 1962 Wáng Yún reported in *Wénzì gǎigé* that some pupils in Ningbo in

---

152   Police report provided by Michael Schoenhals. Notice in *Jinjiang geming shi huace*.
153   Hubei Archives SZ29-4-47, p. 4. Dongguan shifan 1961. Liu 1964.
154   Nanjing Archives 5023-3-55, p. 2.

Zhejiang wrote 杆 for 检. Our records cease in 1988 with a 仃车扦查 (停车检查 stop for control) sign outside Huzhou and a painted 扦 (检 checked) on a shaky three-wheel taxi outside Wenzhou in Zhejiang.

杆, 竿 and 馯 records cluster in the east. In 1981–1986 informants in Anhui, Jiangsu and Zhejiang identified 杆 as 检 but none elsewhere.[155] This eastern distribution of the 千 phonetic is accidental: 千 *qiān* reads like 签 and similarly to 检 even in the standard language.

馯 turned up for 驗 in Xú Zémǐn's 1934 test of Nanjing students' handwriting, in a 1953 discussion of 测馯 (*cèyàn* testing) methods by Hangzhou Public Health Bureau, in the 1957 headline 推广冬种先進經馯 (Spread the advanced experience of winter sowing) in the Wenzhou *Zhènán dàzhòng bào* (Southern Zhejiang News for Everyman) and in 1960 letters to the committee from Huzhou, Ningbo and Wenzhou.[156] In 1981 this author saw a sign heralding a 检馯 (inspection) at a Shanghai market and in 1988 a demand for 臨馯証 (*línyànzhèng* temporary control certificates) in a Wenzhou billboard health bulletin.

馯 records are confined to Zhejiang, Shanghai and southern Jiangsu. In 1981–1986 only informants from these areas could identify the form.[157] This fits the local speech, in which 驗 is read with a *n-* initial and so coincides with 廿 (*niàn* twenty), the phonetic in 馯. The *n-* initial is also present further upstream in Jiangxi, Hubei and Sichuan where writers however have not seen any need for as shorter 验.

So forms with 千, 占 and 廿 were local and thus ruled out as candidates for official use. The more widespread 介 had a different drawback: 儉 and 險 could not become 价 and 阶, as these forms were earmarked for 價 *jià* and 階 *jiē*. So the committee stuck to its plan and turned all 僉 into 佥 in 1964.

鑑 鑒 鋻 鉴 *jiàn* mirror

鑑 (mirror) originally consisted of the eye (臣) of a man (人) looking into a bowl (皿). The 'metal' added in the Zhou proved hard to squeeze in in clerk style and ended up on the left as in 鑑 or below as in 鑒.

---

155 杆 identified as 检 in Shanghai, in Nanjing, Huaiyin, Lianyungang, Suzhou, Wuxi and Yancheng in Jiangsu, in Hefei, Fuyang, Ma'anshan and Sùzhou in Anhui and in Hangzhou, Huzhou and Jiaxing but not Ningbo in Zhejiang. Unknown in other provinces.
156 Hangzhou Archives 87-1-15, p. 33. Zhenan dazhong bao 1957.9.26, p. 2.
157 馯 identified as 验 in Shanghai, in Hangzhou, Huzhou, Shaoxing, Ningbo, Linhai, Jinhua, Lishui and Wenzhou in Zhejiang, in Huaiyin, Suzhou and Yixing but not Nanjing, Lianyungang, Nantong, Wuxi, Xuzhou and Zhenjiang in Jiangsu and in Shangrao in easternmost Jiangxi but not in Ji'an, Jingdezhen and Jiujiang further west. Unknown in other provinces.

The former became 鑑 analogously to 監 for 監, the latter 鑒 analogously to 覽 for 覽 (*lǎn* look), then 鉴, then 釜, then 釜, as in the calligraphy of Mǎ Shìqí (d. 1644). 釜 became the more common form by far, appearing in twenty-four of our 1900–1954 manuscripts compared with 釜 in two, 鉴 in three and 鑑 in three.

For their 1935 "plain stroke characters" the *Lúnyǔ* editors rejected the common 釜 for the somewhat more explicable 釜. Twenty years later the Script Reform Committee opted for the more elaborate 鉴, retaining the analogy to the proposed 览 for 覽 and 揽 for 攬 (*lǎn* embrace), and authorised that form in 1959.

The Japanese Language Council changed no 臣 to ⺊, but alleviated the crowding in 鑒 somewhat by retaining the 鑑 variant.

艦 舰 *艦 *舡 *jiàn* warship

The 1955 Draft proposed to shorten 艦 to 艦 analogously to 監 for 監. Yú Xīnbó urged in *Yǔwén zhīshí* and Zhào Xī in *Zhōngguó yǔwén* to shorten it further to 舡. At the October script reform conference, however, the Script Reform Committee member Yè Gōngchuò presented 舰, which "is already common in the navy […] although perhaps unfamiliar to the general public." One who did find 舰 unfamiliar was Zhào Tàimóu, who mentioned it among "hitherto unseen or newly created short forms." The reformer Chén Guāngyáo explained why 舰 was nevertheless preferred: "舰 is a new picto-phonetic character, written with 舟 [*zhōu* boat] and the phonetic 见. […] This character is also written 舡, a form much used in the navy, but since the reading of 千 differs from 舰, that form was not adopted." Nor was 舰 until 1959, when it became official as 舰, apparently delayed by indecision on the 見/见 component.

Records of 舡 cease in 1962, when Zhāng Yǒngmián saw it in the papers of Zhejing students.

薦 荐 *jiàn* recommend

薦 originally meant 'fodder' but came to be used for 'recommend'. 荐 meant 'straw mat' but came to be used for 'recurring'. As late as in 1039 *Jíyùn* gave them different readings, 作甸切 (*tsien*) for 薦 and 才甸切 (*dzien*) for 荐. Later voiced initials disappeared and both came to be read *jiàn*. Mixing up followed. The 1627 *Zhèngzìtōng* said "薦: same as 荐." The 1956 Scheme abolished the former to keep the latter.

建 *㐄 *迠 *jiàn* establish

In 1960 a correspondent from Ankang in Shaanxi informed the Script Reform Committee that locals wrote 建 as 㐄 or 迠. The 占 *zhàn* and 介 *jiè* phonetics make little sense to speakers of the standard language. To some others they do:

	Beijing	Taiyuan, Shanxi	Xi'an, Shaanxi	Chengdu, Sichuan	Changsha, Hunan	Yangzhou, Jiangsu	Suzhou, Jiangsu	Wen-zhou, Zhejiang
建	tɕiɛn 51	tɕiɛ 2	tɕiã 55	tɕian 13	tɕiẽ 55	tɕiẽ 55	tɕi 334	tɕi 42
占	tʂan 51	tsæ 2	tʂæ̃ 55	tsan 13	tsɤ̃ 55	tɕiẽ 55	tsi 334	tɕi 42
介	tɕie 51	tɕiɛ 2	tɕie 55	tɕiai 13	kai 55	tɕiɛ 55	tɕiɒ 334	ka 42

The 占 phonetic fits in parts of Jiangsu and Zhejiang. An East China origin of 㐄 is consistent with early records: a pre-1945 instruction by the Jiangsu party committee to 㐄立 (establish) contacts in the countryside, a 1947 transcript of a speech by party secretary 饒子㐄 (Ráo Zǐjiàn) in Huaibei in Anhui, a 1950 article by Huáng Ruòzhōu in the Shanghai *Wénhuì bào*, a 1955 proposal by the Nanjing-based jurist Jīn Míngshèng to legalise the "already commonly used" 㐄, and 1957 articles by Fán Jiāng from Yuqian in Zhejiang and Zhū Qìngxià from Suzhou in Jiangsu.[158]

The 介 phonetic in turn fits in Shanxi. A Shanxi origin of 迠 is compatible with our records. 迠 was first registered in Chén Guāngyáo's 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ*. On 13 May 1958 the Hubei *Máchéng bào* carried the headline 我縣第一座半機械化小高炉迠成 (The first semi-automatic small-scale blast furnace in our county has been completed). In 1960 迠 was reported in letters to the committee from Hanzhong and Changzhi in Shanxi, Pengshan and Xichang in Sichuan, and Ankang in Shaanxi. In 1963 students' use of 迠 and 㐄 was criticised by Ní Shìzhōng from Jincheng in Shanxi and in 1965 by Zhāng Ruìlín from Yicheng in the same province. In 1976 迠 was mentioned in a letter from Santai in Sichuan and in 1977 in one from Liling in Hunan. In 1981–1982 this author saw 迠 in Taiyuan in Shanxi, in Xi'an and Tongchuan in Shaanxi and in Chengdu and Chongqing in Sichuan.

This long list contains no site east of Shanxi and Hubei and none south of Hunan. 1981–1986 interviews confirmed that 迠 was known by informants in Shanxi, Shaanxi, Sichuan and parts of Hunan and Hubei but unknown in twenty-nine places in surrounding provinces.

While the spread of 迠 halted, the eastern 㐄 proved unstoppable. In 1959

---

158   *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 23. *Anhui geming shi huace*, p. 228.

the Guangdong *Zhōngshān bào* displayed the headline 明春水利辿設規划图 (Chart of the Planned Mingchun Irrigation Project), while Lǐ Cuìhé reported 辿 from the Hunan countryside and Liú Hé from "all over the Northeast". In 1960 辿 was reported alongside 迠 in letters from Xichang in Sichuan and Ankang in Shaanxi. In 1963 Ní Shìzhōng reported 辿 from Shanxi, the presumed birthplace of 迠.

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed 辿. Reactions were negative. Sichuan Script Reform Working Group pointed out that "辿 renders the reading inaccurately," Jilin Education Bureau that "辿 has exactly the same stroke number as 建 [because its three-stroke 辶 replaces the two-stroke 廴]." This ousted 辿 from the 1981 Revised Draft.

But not from use. In 2001 Wáng Màiqiǎo reported from a village election in Jiaocheng County in Shanxi:

> The electorate in Sanjiao Village consists of 220 voters. Candidates were Rén Yǒngwàng and the former village head. Whoever got over half of the votes would be elected. Some voters wrote the right side of 旺 in Rén Yǒngwàng as 玉 and had their ballots rejected. The final result was Rén Yǒngwàng 80 votes, the former village head 0 votes, Rén Jiànmíng (the son of the former village head) 130 votes. According to the rules Rén Jiànmíng had won. However, among Rén Jiànmíng's 130 ballots 25 were miswritten, some with 占 at the right top of 建, others with 介. Were these 25 votes valid? Both sides argued without result and the election was left unsettled.

The proposed change from 廴 to 辶 in 建 was part of a plan to merge the two components, which handwriters already tended to merge to ㇏, ㇏ or ㇄. In principle 廴 and 辶 are identical, descending from Zhou 㣟 (彳止 foot on road).

<p style="text-align:center">見 见 jiàn see</p>

See 貝 *bèi*.

<p style="text-align:center">疆 *畺 *畕 *壃 jiāng border</p>

One may wonder why a border, a line on the map, needs to be expressed by the nineteen-stroke 疆. Early writers did not see that need. The Yin 畕 (畕 fields) was enlarged in the Zhou with borderlines to 畺 (畺), or with a bow to 彊 (彊), or with both to 疆 (疆). For good measure earth was added in the Spring and Autumn, giving us 疆 (疆) and 壃.

But do not dictionaries call 疆 a variant of 强 (*qiáng* strong)? Yes, in early

inscriptions 彊 meant either 'border' or 'strong'. Xǔ Shèn believed that the 'bow' in 彊 represented 'strength' and so regarded 'strength' as the original and correct sense of the character. Others take the bow to be a measure of land and 'strength' to be a borrowed sense. Dictionaries have followed Xǔ.

Some nevertheless continued to use 彊 for 'border'. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains four 無彊 (boundless) from the Tang to the Ming, alongside one 無畺, three 無壃 and twenty-five regular 無疆. Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain two 新彊 (Xinjiang) and one 新畺.

The 1955 Draft opted for 畺. Lǐ Yǒng objected in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "We should as far as possible adopt characters which are established by custom and avoid creating oddities like 畺 for 疆". The 1956 Scheme duly abandoned 畺.

New oddities were nevertheless created. From 1960 to 1977 use of 弓 for 疆 was reported three times in letters to the press or to the Script Reform Committee: 亜 twice, 彊 once, 弜 once, 江 once, 弘 once, 畺 once and 畺 twice.[159]

Reformers wavered. The committee's 1962 List of Simplified Characters included 亜 and the comment "畺 is the original character, of which 亜 is a characteristic component. 亜 is easy to distinguish from 画." After the cancellation of that scheme, the committee organ *Wénzì gǎigé* published a proposal for 亚 by the calligrapher Mǎ Gōngyú and one for 江 by the teacher Lǐ Yǒng. The dictionary draft showed to Helmut Martin in 1973 had 彊. List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme proposed 畺 with a vertical line straight through. Respondents found this too complex. Sichuan Interim Script Reform Working Group and the education bureaus of Shandong and Zhejiang suggested 亜, Xinjiang Script Reform Committee 亚 or 江 and Xi'an Education Bureau 江 or 彊. The latter was chosen for the likewise abortive 1981 Revised Draft.

Short forms lived on, unsurprisingly, in Xinjiang. 1988–1989 postal orders reproduced in philatelic publications turn up senders' addresses like 籺江昌吉 (Changji, Xinjiang) and 新亚于田, and even postmarks of 新畺昌吉 and 新疆乌鲁木齐 (Ürümqi, Xinjiang). A 1991 traveller noticed trucks marked 新畺 and 新疆.[160]

---

159 Jin 1966 (彊). Rong 1973 (畺). Zhong 1974 (江). Liu 1975 (畺). Letters from Luoyang, Bengbu and Anyang (弓), Lüda (弘), Dehong (彊), Gejiu and Jinan (亜) and Hui'an (畺).
160 Zimmermann 2002, pp. 36, 32. Michel-Lodders 1989, p. 8. Traveller, Laura Newby.

<center>薑 姜 *jiāng* ginger</center>

'Ginger' was first written with the above-mentioned 畺 (border), as in prescriptions for 枯 畺 (*kū jiāng* dried ginger) and 桂畺株朱 (桂薑椒茱 *guì jiāng jiāo zhū* cassiabark, ginger, pepper and medicinal cornel) in the early Han manuscripts from Mawangdui. The ⺿ top appears on first century BCE wood slips from Wuwei and Dunhuang.

More recent writers borrowed the surname 姜 *Jiāng* for 'ginger'. In 1920 Qián Xuántóng advocated "adopting commonly used homonyms like 姜 for 薑 […]." The proposal was implemented with the 1956 Scheme.

<center>將 将 将 *jiāng* soon *jiàng* general
蔣 蒋 蒋 *Jiǎng*</center>

Forms with 丬 for 爿 (plank) and 夕 or ⺌ for 夕 (meat) turn up already on Western Han wood slips. The ⺌ (爫 claw) top became more common than respected. The Yuan *Zìjiàn*, for one, complained that 將 "is informally written 将 with 爫. This is wrong."

The Japanese Language Council made 将 right in 1949. In China the 1955 Draft saved one more stroke with its 将. Qiū Chángnuò of Northeast Normal University objected: "It is better to use the more common 将." 将 was indeed more common, appearing in twenty-one of our 1950–1954 manuscripts against 将 in seven. The Script Reform Committee nevertheless chose the shorter 将, authorising that form in 1958.

⺌ writers persisted. The 1964 General List reminded them: "The top right corner is written 夕, not 夕 or ⺌." As late as in 1998 *Xiàndài Hànyǔ guīfàn zìdiǎn* repeated: "The top right corner of 将 is 夕, not 夕 or ⺌."

<center>漿 浆 *jiāng* syrup
獎 獎 奖 *jiǎng* prize
槳 桨 *jiǎng* oar
醬 醬 酱 *jiàng* bean sauce</center>

The 1955 Draft proposed 冰 for 漿 and 酉 for 醬. As we saw in the 塵 *chén* section, the public objected to "reviving obscure ancient characters like 氷 and 坔." 氷 and 酉 were undoubtedly old. A Warring States wood slip from Xinyang mentions a jar of 飤酉 (食酉 sauce), and already the 100 CE *Shuōwén* called 𩰫 (氷) and 䣪 (酉) "ancient". 氷 and 酉 were also obscure, being absent in our 1900–1954 manuscripts. Professor Jīn Lúnhǎi of Jiangsu Normal Institute wrote: "If one adopts ancient characters which have never been much used, like 氷 for 漿 and 酉 for 醬, people will need to think hard to make them out."

The 1956 Scheme switched to 浆 and 酱 without 寸 (hand). Even these forms were ancient and unfamiliar. The hand is absent in the 牆 on Han wood slips and stone steles, in *Shuōwén*'s 牆 (牆) and in Wáng Xīzhī's 牆, first appearing in a 漿 in the 524 Yuán Zǐzhí epitaph. The added 寸 was quickly accepted and is never absent in the Tang to Qing inscriptions in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* or in our 1900–1954 manuscripts. Unfamiliarity delayed the legalisation of 酱, 浆, 奖 and 桨 until 1958.

Why would sixth-century writers add a 寸 which was absent in *Shuōwén*, the highest of authorities? Because *Shuōwén*, although advocating the 寸-less 牆 (牆), theorised that the character "consists of 水 and the phonetic 將 shortened." The 524–1958 寸 interlude was an attempt to restore a deduced pre-*Shuōwén* form.

酱 remained bothersome. In 1959 Beijing Non-staple Food Trade Office made plans for the supply of 㐬豆付 (fermented bean curd). In 1963 Wú Nánxīng reported seeing 平果㐬 (苹果酱 apple jam) for sale in Beijing, and a circular from Beijing Non-staple Food Trade Office criticised shop signs like 黄㐬 for 黄酱 (soya paste).[161] In 1974 Xiàng Huī reported seeing 㐬 for 酱.

List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme mooted the still shorter but apparently less common 㐬. Zhejiang Education Bureau pointed out that 酱 had already been simplified once, and 㐬 disappeared from the 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">

講 讲 *jiǎng* speak

</div>

In the 溝 *gōu* section we quoted Pān Yǔnzhōng: "As northerners see it, the simplified form 讲 for 講 is based on the similarity in reading [of 井 and 講]. However, as we southerners see it, 井 for 冓 is not based on reading [which here in Guangzhou is 井 *tʃɪŋ* 35 but 講 *kɔŋ* 35], but on reducing the shape of the right side."

Records nevertheless indicate that even northerners first set out to reduce the shape, not to introduce a new phonetic. In Beijing Archives we find bottomless 讲, 讲 and 讲 with a reduced but still not phonetic right side in documents from 1949 onwards but 讲 with the phonetic 井 only from 1951.[162] The Script Reform Committee chose the simpler 讲, which became official in 1959, delayed by indecision as to the 讠 component.

The lower 一 in 讲 was last heard of in a 1962 complaint by Zhāng Yǒng-mián about students who "arbitrarily create deviant simplified characters, like […] 讲 for 講."

---

161   Beijing Archives 119-1-343, p. 29; 2-21-69.
162   Beijing Archives 1-6-174, p. 4; 4-2-24, p. 2; 123-1-211, p. 31; 152-1-105, p. 45.

膠 胶 *jiāo* glue

The philatelist Wáng Jǐngwén found 胶 on letters sent in 1949 to 山東省胶東區 (Jiaodong District, Shandong) and 胶东五龍 (Wulong, Jiaodong). The following year Huáng Ruòzhōu mentioned 胶 among forms he had seen in Shanghai.

The 1955 Draft included 胶. The reformer Chén Guāngyáo described 胶 as "established by custom". Zhào Tàimóu of Shandong University disagreed, listing 胶 among "hitherto unseen or newly created short forms" with "an unfamiliar appearance". Doubts delayed the recognition of 胶 until 1958.

階 阶 *阤 *jiē* stairs

The 階 in 階級 (*jiējí* class) became common in the Liberated Areas, and so liable to simplification. In 1943 the Administrative Office of Southern Jiangsu urged all 社会阶层 (social strata) to unite in the struggle against the enemy. In 1944 Central China Office listed urgent tasks at the 目前阤段 (present stage).[163]

The 1955 Draft proposed no short form for 階. Jīn Lúnhǎi wrote that 阤 had "a very strong basis among the masses" and Tián Qíchāng said that that form was "often used by people". Huáng Fùjià in turn pointed out that "some people write 階 as 阶". Jīn's "masses" comfortably outnumbered Huáng's "some people"; our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain eight 阤 against one 阶.

The 1956 Scheme nevertheless opted for 阶. Chén Guāngyáo explained: "阶 is a character established by custom, written with 阝 and the phonetic 介 [*jiè*]. Habitually it is also written 阤, but that form is similar to 陛 [*bì* steps up to a palace], and it may make people take 比 for a phonetic [and read *bǐ*], so it was not adopted." After further deliberation 阶 became official in June 1956.

街 *亍 *jiē* street

In September 1956 Beijing Industry and Trade Office registered workshops in 天桥大亍 (Daqiao Street).[164] In 1958 Huáng Míngyuǎn remarked in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "In Zhengzhou I once saw 亍 on a sign, used as a short form for 街." 亍 quickly ceased to be remarkable, mentioned in 1960 letters to the Script Reform Committee from Harbin in the north to Guangzhou in the south.

So the committee included 亍 in its 1977 Second Scheme. The form was

---

163   *Jiangsu kangzhan*, pp. 110, 130.
164   Beijing Archives 2-1-136, pp. 17, 26.

criticised for being close to 于 (*yú* at) and identical with 亍 (*chù* walk), however, and was removed from the 1981 Revised Draft.[165]

A rare alternative existed. In 1957 the calligrapher Mǎ Gōngyú, a native of Wenzhou, wrote: "In letters and documents I have received recently there are many newly created short forms. Some I have made out, like 宀 (宣), 衶 (街) […]." In 1960 this 衶 was mentioned in letters to the committee from Wenzhou and nearby Pingyang. In 1982 the form was identified by informants in Wenzhou but not in surrounding Ningbo, Jinhua and Fuzhou. 衶 was used exclusively in Wenzhou because the 甲 phonetic fits just there:

	Beijing	Ningbo, Zhejiang	Jinhua, Zhejiang	Wenzhou, Zhejiang	Fuzhou, Fujian
街	*tɕie* 55	*tɕia* 52	*tɕie* 435	_ka_ 44	*kɛ* 44
甲	*tɕia* 214	*tɕiɒ* 55	*tɕiə* 45	_ka_ 323	*kaʔ* 23

Our last record of 衶 is a 1988 Wenzhou street notice from 松台衶道爱卫办 (Songtai Street Sanitation Office).

癤 疖 *jiē* furuncle

The 1955 Draft proposed 疖 for 癤 analogously to 节 for 節 (*jié* joint). Bào Yòuwén, president of Huizhou Normal School, suggested in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "Rather than 节 for 節 one could write 卩 like the ancient form [mentioned in the 1013 *Yùpiān*], and so write 癤 with its 節 phonetic as 疖." The committee rejected the first proposal but accepted the second, legalising 疖 in 1959.

節 节 *莭 *筇 *jié* joint

Like other characters with the 'bamboo' top, 節 was commonly written with 'grass' already in the Han, and the Sui model text *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* even promoted 莭 as standard. Liu Fù found this form further reduced to 节 in a blockprint from the Yuan and to 筇 from the Qing. 莭 remained the more common short form, however, appearing as 莭, 節 or 即 in seventeen of our 1900–1954 manuscripts compared with 节 in one.

The *Tàibái* editors selected 筇 for their 1935 "handy characters" and the Script Reform Committee 节 for its 1955 Draft. As we saw in the preceding section, Bào Yòuwén then advocated 卩. Chén Guāngyáo countered: "The ancient form of 節 is 卩 […]. However, this character is rather unfamiliar,

---

165 Xu 1978. Li Jingyuan 1980. Song 1978.

and easy to mix up with 阝 (邑), so it was not adopted." Perhaps more damagingly 卩 was also easy to mix up with the 卩 which had come into use for 部.

傑 杰 *jié* outstanding

Kāngxī zìdiǎn said the surname 杰 "is informally borrowed for the 傑 in 豪傑 [*háojié* hero]." The practice became formal with the 1955 First List of Regulated Variants.

潔 洁 *jié* clean

洁 is not on record before 1955. Chén Guāngyáo presented it as "a new picto-phonetic character, written with 氵 (水) and the phonetic 吉 [*jí*], analogous to 結 [*jié* knot]."

洁 became official with the 1959 Fourth Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters.

藉 借 *jiè* make use of

Both 藉 (straw mat, make use of) and 借 (borrow) include the phonetic 昔 (*xī* formerly) and must have been close or identical in reading since early times. So writers mixed them up. *Shījīng* says 借曰未知 (under the pretext that you have not yet achieved wisdom), *Hànshū* 藉曰未知. The Qing *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* maintained that 借 was equal to 藉.

The 1956 Scheme prescribed 借 for all senses. Some 藉 were then restored in a note to the 1964 General List: "The 藉 in 藉口 [use as a pretext] and 凭藉 [*píngjiè* rely on] are simplified to 借, the ones in 慰藉 [*wèijiè* to comfort] and 狼藉 [*lángjí* in disarray] remain 藉."

金 *仝 钅 (*jīn*)

The 金 character was not affected by the reform, but the 釒 component in 銷 (*xiāo* sell), 錫 (*xī* tin), 錯 (*cuò* wrong), 鍋 (*guō* pot) and so on was. Before the reform this component was mostly shortened 釒. The curved bottom was hard to render in square style, but no short form with straighter strokes was reasonably common; our 1940-1955 manuscripts yield just one 铁 (*tiě* iron) with 钅, one 铁 with 钅, one 铁 with 仝, one 销 with 金, one 锡 with 钅, one

错 with 钅, one 鉤 with 𢎨, one 钌 (銅*tóng* copper) with 全 and one 锏 with 钅 among innumerable 釒.[166]

The 1955 Draft proposed a 钅 norm for handwriting but 釒 for print. After plans for a separate handwritten norm were abandoned, the 1956 Scheme envisaged an overall change to 钅. Soon after, however, the Script Reform Committee associate Chén Guāngyáo wrote: "As stipulated in the [Scheme's] Table of Simplified Character Components the 金 component will become 钅."[167] Then in 1957 Cáo Bóhán wrote on behalf of the committee: "Originally the components 金, 鳥 and 魚 were to become 钅, 乌 and 重. We now propose a change to 全, 乌 and 鱼." This plan was reversed by the 1959 Fourth Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters, which authorised 钥 (鑰 *yào* key), 镊 (鑷 *niè* tweezers), 钟 (鐘 *zhōng* clock) and 钻 (鑽 *zuān* drill) with 全. This 全 was then abandoned in the 1962 edition of *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn*, which stipulated 钥, 镊, 钟 and 钻 with 钅. A note in the 1964 General List warned writers: "钅: the second stroke is a short 一, the middle is a double 一 and 丨 does not stick out at the top."

The first warning has remained necessary. The Jiangsu *Zhènjiāng jiàoyù xīnwén* (Zhenjiang Education News), for one, complained in 2004: "On street signs the 镇 in 镇江 is often seen mistakenly written with 丶 for the second stroke in 钅." The text was accompanied by a photograph of a 镇江市规划局 sign outside Zhenjiang City Planning Bureau. The photograph was not necessary to prove the point: the title page of *Zhènjiāng jiàoyù xīnwén* itself was neatly handwritten 镇江教育新闻 with 丶.

緊 紧 *jǐn* tight

See 堅 *jiān*.

僅 僅 仅 *jǐn* only

仅 is an almost-analogy to the Yuan 难 for 難 and Ming 艰 for 艱. We first hear of it in 1934, when Xú Zémǐn saw 仅 used by his students. The Education Ministry, however, excluded "short forms which are occasionally seen but have not yet become common, like 汉 for 漢 and 仅 for 僅" from its 1935 List of short Forms. Use of 仅 for 僅 was certainly not universal. The 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn* on the contrary said 仅 was informally used for 僕 (*pú* servant) and a 1947 report from Fujian, Guangdong and Jiangxi Border Area Working

166   Beijing Archives J6-1-214, p. 30; 79-1-156, p. 22; 1-9-42, p. 20; 4-9-118, p. 25; 4-8-124, p. 20; 38-1-90, p. 11; 22-10-1349, pp. 28, 18; 4-13-44, p. 15.
167   Chen Guangyao 1956, pp. 35, 48, 49, 51.

Committee urged activists to 仅存 (保存 *bǎocún* keep up) propaganda work in the white areas.[168]

The 1955 Draft adopted 仅 for 僅. The choice was not uncontroversial. We saw in the *Hàn* section above that Chén Mèngjiā and Zuǒ Huànrén had problems recognising 仅 at first sight, and even the reformer Jīn Míngshèng called 仅 "rather unfamiliar." Chén Yuè and Hǎo Wàngsān pointed out that a handwritten 仅 could come out very close to 反. Dù Dìngyǒu said many complained there were too many forms with 又, like 对, 欢, 观, 权, 难, 邓, 汉, 戏 and 仅 and would prefer 伩 for 僅, a form not on former record.[169] Not surprisingly, 仅 became official only in June 1956, four months after the first batch of simplified characters.

謹 謹 谨 *jǐn* cautious

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council shortened 謹, 勤, 漢, 難 and 嘆 by one stroke each to 謹, 勤, 漢, 難 and 嘆. The shift between 廿 and 卝 tops is described in the 難 *nán* section.

盡 尽 *jìn* utmost, use up

The square style version of the cursive 尽 has been known since the Song. The 1205 *Shì ér biān* (For my Children) relates:

> When [the poet] Chéng Zhāi [1127–1206] did his scholar's examination in Hunan, he shared his examination chamber with a candidate doing *Yìjīng*. Chéng Zhāi saw that 盡 was written 尽 in his paper and urged him to discard it. The examiner, a learned man, insisted that this was not allowed. Chéng Zhāi said: 'When the results are revealed tomorrow, people will joke that this examination produced a 尺二秀才 [*chǐ èr xiùcái* two-inch scholar], then what will we look like?'

They would look like most others. Liú Fù surveyed twelve vernacular block-prints from the Song to the Qing and found 尽 in all of them.

尽 became official in Japan in 1949 and in China in 1956.

---

168 *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 324.
169 Renmin zhengxie 1955.

儘 尽 *jǐn* utmost, to finish

儘 is an enlarged 盡 seen from the Tang onwards. When Fàn Chéngdà (1136–1193) wrote 聞鵝鴨船到閶門儘未關 (they heard the quacking of ducks and geese, and when the boat reached Changmen it had not quite ceased), he added the note: "The character 儘 has been used informally for a long time. In fact it is used just like 盡." Even *Zìhuì* and *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* regarded 儘 as the same as 盡.

Liú Fù found the shortened version 侭 in blockprints from the Yuan and Ming. In 1935 *Tàibái* adopted this form for its "handy characters". The 1956 Scheme instead merged 儘 and 盡 to 尽.

進 进 *込 *jìn* enter

The 1955 Draft proposed no short form for 進. In *Yǔwén zhīshí* Yùn Huī and Jùn Tāo brought up 込, a form "nowadays used by broad layers of the people." Xú Yīhuī countered that "the now common 进 should be easier for the masses to adapt to than 込." In *Zhōngguó yǔwén* Zhào Xī declared that writing 进 for 進 "is something the masses have been used to for a long time."

込 was first mentioned in 1934 by Xú Zémǐn, who saw his Nanjing students used it. The idea may have come from Japan, where dictionaries had since long taken up words like 込む (*komu* be crowded) and 込める (*komeru* squeeze into) with the *kokuji* 込, a Japanese-made character with no Chinese counterpart. Chinese writers seeing surnames like 込山 (Komiyama) and 込戸 (Komido) may have taken 込 for a shortened 進 and adopted it as such.

进 appears just discernibly in a 进攻 (*jìngōng* attack) and 进行 (carry through) in a wartime document of Jiangsu Party Committee. In a 1947 speech manuscript the party secretary in Huaibei in Anhui vowed to 进入反攻 (launch a counter-attack).[170] In 1951 the Shanghai *Jiǎnbǐzì* said 進 was usually shortened 込 or 进.

The phonetic 井 *jǐng* fits 进 *jìn* badly in Beijing speech but better farther south, where *-in* and *-ing* endings merge, and best in Shanghai, where the high departing tone of 进 merges with the rising tone of 井 and both characters are read identically. Our early 进 records are from Shanghai and adjacent Jiangsu and Anhui. Does this explain why the Beijing-based Script Reform Committee at first passed 进 over?

In the end the committee put up with the misleading phonetic, recognising 进 in June 1956 with its Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters.

---

170   *Jiangsu kangzhan,* p. 23. *Anhui geming shi huace,* p. 228.

<div align="center">驚 惊 *jīng* startle</div>

Liú Fù found 京 used for 驚 in blockprints from the early Qing onwards. In 1922 Professor Qián Xuántóng proposed in *Guóyǔ yuèkān* to shorten characters "on the basis of short forms now in use among the people" and write 京 for 驚. The *Tàibái* editors instead chose 惊 with 'heart' for their 1935 "handy characters". The reformer Chén Guāngyáo wrote that before the reform both 京 and 惊 were "in common use" for 驚. In the end the 1956 Scheme opted for 惊.

<div align="center">

經 経 经 *經 *経 *jīng* pass through
莖 茎 茎 *莖 *茎 *jīng* stalk
頸 頚 颈 *頸 *頚 *jǐng* neck
徑 径 径 *徑 *径 *jìng* diameter
勁 劲 *jìng* strong *jìn* strength
輕 軽 轻 *輕 *轻 *qīng* light

</div>

Japanese shortened the left side of 經 and so on to 圣, Chinese to 조. 圣 stems from Zhou 巠, Qin 巠, Han 坙 and Jin 圣, which became 圣 in Song blockprints.[171] Chinese 圣 is a novelty, as we shall see below.

Intermediate forms did not disappear. Our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts contain one hundred and nineteen 経, sixty-one 經 and forty-six 経; 1900–1930 Japanese ones thirty-one 経, sixteen 経 and seven 経.

Not predictably, the Japanese Education Ministry chose the outnumbered 経, 莖, 頸 and 軽 with 巠 for its 1919 Character Regulation Scheme. These were changed to the more common 経, 径 and 軽 with 圣 in the 1923 and 1926 schemes, to 経, 径 and 軽 with 圣 in the 1938 scheme and back to 経, 茎, 径 and 軽 in the 1942 and 1946 schemes. The latter choice had by then become inevitable, as use of 圣 had surged; our 1940–1946 manuscripts contain twenty-one 経 against one 経, one 経 and two 圣. The gap between Japanese and Chinese habit had widened.

Even Chinese reformers wavered. The *Tàibái* editors chose 経 and 軽 with 圣 for their 1935 "handy characters" and the Script Reform Committee 経, 頚, 径, 劲 and 軽 with 巠 for its 1955 Draft. Respondents to the committee's query pointed out that "the 坙 in 勁 and 經 is written 巠 in the list of simplified characters but 圣 in the list of handwritten character components."[172] The committee then endorsed the novelty 圣 with 工 below both in print and handwriting, implementing that decision in 1964. Liú Wànxīn justified

---

171 Zhou Ke tripod. Han Mawangdui manuscripts. Calligraphy of Wang Xizhi.
172 "Ge di renshi", p. 38.

圣 in *Jiàoxué cānkǎo zīliào*: "Before there were people who shortened to 经, but that right side is easily mixed up with 圣 (聖 *shèng* sacred). In order to keep these two apart 坙 was simplified to 圣."

Were Japanese reformers not worried about mixing up 經 and 圣? Not at all. In Japan the stripped 圣 had come into use for 経 and 径, as in a 1912 order for building materials with a 中央圣 (中央徑 *chūō kei* diameter) of four inches, a 1921 list of materials with 圣壱寸 (徑壹寸 *kei issun* a diameter of one inch) and a 1922 diagnosis of 神圣症 (神經症 *shinkeishō* neurosis).[173] In 1986 this author even noticed a list of 圣由 (經由 itineraries) as far south as in Taiwan. In 2014–2017 圣 was identified as 経 or 径 by seven of our twenty-four Japanese informants. Similarity between 経 and 圣 would cause no misunderstanding.

Nor was the similarity between 経 and 怪 (Chinese *guài*) a problem in Japan. Hasegawa Motoi wrote: "怪 *kai* and 徑 *kei* have similar readings [in Japanese], so 径 has probably borrowed its component from 怪." Yes, the similarity between 怪 and 徑 readings may have contributed to the popularity of 径 in Japan. But no, it was no that similarity which sowed the idea of writing 径 and 軽, which appear in Chinese blockprints already in the Song, when輕 was read *k'ieŋ* and 怪 *kuai*.

經 and 徑 had not always been the norm. The 175 CE Xīpíng Stone Classics and the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* prescribed 経 and 軽 with 坙. This agreed with the practice seen in Han silk, wood and stone inscriptions and on Sui steles. 坙 did not, however, agree with *Shuōwén*, which said: "坙 [坙]: a vein of water. Consists of 川 [flowing water] under 一. 一 represents earth. The reading is indicated by a shortened 壬 [*ting*]." *Shuōwén* thus took 坙 for the primary form of 巠 (*jīng* flow). 坙 contained no water and so defied this highest of authorities. The early Tang *Gānlù zìshū* restored the water by prescribing 經 and 輕 with 巛. Other authorities hesitated. The Tang *Yùpiān* had 經 with *Shuōwén*'s 一 and 川 but also 硜 (硜 *kēng* knocking sound) with 坙, the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* had 頸 but also 徑. Only from the 1006 *Guǎngyùn* onwards have dictionaries agreed to write 坙.

The 'flowing water' etymology has been challenged by later finds. 巠 records now begin with 巠念 (經念 lasting memory) on the tenth-century BCE Dà Yù bronze tripod and 惪巠 (德經 moral rules) on the ninth-century Dà Kè tripod, both with 巠 for 經, not 巠 (*jīng* flow). Since 經 also means 'warp', 巠 is now regarded as a picture of threads on a loom, not water under a surface.

---

173 Yamaguchi Archives 戦前 A 土木 435; 戦前 B 2996. National Archives 1922.1, p. 10.

If so, the Tang and Song restoration of 'water' in 㞣 was unwarranted. If not for and *Shuōwén* and *Gānlù zìshū*, we might still have been writing 㞣.

警 *井 jǐng alert, police

The nineteen-stroke 警 was an obvious but elusive target for reformers. In 1955 Professor Jīn Míngshèng suggested replacing it with the fourteen-stroke 儆, a character of identical reading and the sense of 'warn'.

Unimpressed, the public took more radical action. A 1956 document from Hangzhou Employment Office records a salary increase for the 民井 (People's Police). Three years later we find lists of men leaving Beijing's 人民武装井察 (People's Armed Police) for health reasons.[174] In 1973 Liú Lóngliáng from Yuguang Electronics Factory in Guizhou promoted this practice in *Guāngmíng rìbào*:

> The broad masses of workers, peasants and soldiers [...] have displayed great wisdom and creativity in the field of script reform and created new simplified characters like [...] 皿 (器), 忈 (感), 氿 (酒), 井 (警) [...]. These characters are frowned upon by some people, but the broad masses are right in saying: 'The simplified characters already announced were made up by the masses, so why should we not create even others?'

Letters from Liú Xīngēng, Zhōng Zhìxiáng, Xiàng Huī and Shandong Normal Institute staff greeted 井 with similar enthusiasm.

List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme nevertheless included 怑 with an added 'heart' for 警. Guangdong Script Reform Committee objected: "The number of newly created characters should be kept as low as possible. Characters like 怑 for 警 [...] are very hard to decipher." Reformers took note and excluded 警 from their 1981 Revised Draft.

競 竞 *竞 jìng compete

For a long time writers wavered. On Tang steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* we find thirty 競, fourteen 竞, thirteen 竸, nine 覓, two 䜶 and two 兓. Although this may look anarchic, the majority followed the 競 norm set by the Han Xīpíng Stone Classics, the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén*, the Tang *Gānlù zìshū*

---

174   Hangzhou Archives 94-1-104, p. 77. Beiing Archives 123-1-660, pp. 1, 2, 22, 23, 29, 32.

and the Liao *Lóngkān shǒujìng*. The latter added, however, that the ancient form was 競.

Why this reservation? Perhaps the author had opened the newly reprinted *Shuōwén*, which explained 競 as two men (儿) quarrelling (言). This implied a 口, not 日 in the centre. The 1008 *Guǎngyùn* complied, prescribing 競 with 口. By the Ming writers too had closed ranks. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* holds seventeen Ming and Qing 競 but no 竸.

Liú Fù found the shorter 兢 (*jīng* cautious) used for 競 in blockprints from the Song onwards, and in 1951 we find a 兢選 (*jìngxuǎn* competition) for model workers arranged by the Sanitation Team of Beijing District No.1. A stickler for rules had crossed the latter 兢 out, inserting the proper 競.[175]

The fourteen-stroke 兢 did not satisfy the Script Reform Committee, which passed 競 over in its 1955 Draft. Reformers seem to have been at a loss. Jīn Míngshèng asked in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "[…] 競, 騎 [*qí* ride], 霸, […] is there absolutely no way of simplifying these characters?" Yè Gōngchuò announced a way at the October script reform conference: "When necessary, we have applied the above rules to create a small number of new short forms, like 竞 […] not established by custom […]." This 竞 became official in June 1956 with the Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters.

境 *坘 *jìng* border
鏡 *钘 *jìng* mirror lens glass

The abortive 1977 Second Scheme proposed to legalise the still shorter 坘 with the phonetic 井 *jǐng*, alongside the analogous 钘 for 镜. 坘 was first mentioned in the 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì*. In 1955 the form was written off in the Chinese Writers' Association: "If one simplifies 境 to 坘, there will be a disparity between tongue-tip articulation [of 井 *jing*] and back-tongue articulation [of 境 *ging* in southern dialects], which means that only part of the people will comprehend."[176] The analogous 钘 was reported in 1958 by Hǎo Wànquán in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "If one pays a little attention in one's daily life, one may notice that people often write […] 鏡 as […] 钘 […]."

酒 *氿 *jiǔ* wine

A 1959 document from Beijing Price Committee registers prices of 氿精 (alcohol) and 白氿 (spirit).[177] The same year 氿 with the phonetic 九 *jiǔ* was

---

175 Beijing Archives 45-5-40, p. 58.
176 Zhongguo zuojia xiehui, 1955.
177 Beijing Archives 9-1-167, p. 47.

reported by Liú Hé from the Northeast and the following year by correspondents from Changzhi in Shanxi in the north to Songxi in Fujian in the south.

氿 was included in the 1977 Second Scheme but abandoned in the 1981 Revised Draft.

韭 *韮 *尤 *jiǔ* chives

韭 depicts a plant sticking up from the ground. The grass-topped韮appearing in some dictionaries is a post-Han tautology.

In handwriting 韭 became 业. In the 1940s, however, 业 came into use for 業. This created a need for a new simple way to write 韭. Chén Guāngyáo promoted two 韮-based alternatives in his 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ*: "尤 or 艾 for 韭, characters like these are suitable new picto-phonetic characters, although before Liberation many did not know them." Only 尤 caught on, first registered in a 1957 directive from Beijing Agriculture, Forestry and Irrigation Office pricing 尤 and 青尤 (青韭 leek seedlings).[178] A still shorter form surfaced in 1963, when Wú Nánxīng complained in *Qiánxiàn* of restaurants serving 九才 (韭菜).

尤 was included in the 1977 Second Scheme but not in the 1981 Revised Draft.

舊 舊 旧 *jiù* old

The 臼 component has been written 旧 in 兒 at least since the third century CE and in 舊 at least since the time of Lǐ Sēngqián (426–485). In those days 臼 was written 臼 with the stroke order ｜一一丁, which by contraction became｜｜丁, leaving 臼 as 旧 and 舊 as 舊.

Yuan blockprinters cut the top of 舊 to write 旧, a form which lived on and became official for 舊 in Japan in 1946 and in China in 1956.

舉 挙 举 *擧 *羍 *jǔ* lift
譽 誉 *謄 *耆 *yù* reputation

Japanese 挙 with its distinct 'hand' below expresses the etymology better than Chinese 举, but is not older. In clerk style the seal bottom 𠔿 (hand) turned into the obscure 干, which is the only bottom seen on Han silk scrolls, wood slips and stone steles.

Attempts were made to educate writers. The 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* stressed that "舉 is written with 扌". The 1617 *Zìkǎo* spelled out: "*Shuōwén* says 擧 is

---

178   Beijing Archives 119-1-180, p. 23.

written with 手. 擧 is wrong. Today this [舉] is used in [reprinted] classics and histories. There is no need to not keep on with that." Which writers nevertheless did. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains hundreds of Tang to Qing 舉 and 擧 and our 1900–1954 manuscripts have twenty-one 舉, seven 擧, two 舉 and two 䍦; but no forms with 手. For Chinese reformers the choice of 卄 was thus obvious.

Did habits differ in Japan? For a long time they did not. Kitagawa Hirokuni's dictionary of Japanese calligraphy records thirty-one 舉, 擧, 舉, 擧 or 举 with 卄 from the seventh to the fourteenth century but no form with 手. Sixteenth-century versions of *Setsuyōshū* recommended writing 举状 or 䍦 状 for *kyojō* (letter of recommendation). Then, however, the etymologiocally correct bottom that was rejected by the Chinese public took root in Japan. In our 1860–1889 manuscripts we find three 手 bottoms among eleven 卄, in 1900–1919 the proportion is six to four and in 1930–1946 ten 手 to nil 卄.

Japanese reformers wavered as much as their Chinese colleagues, but in the end went with the turning current. The Education Ministry's 1919 Character Regulation Scheme proposed 举 with 卄, the 1923 scheme 举 with 手, the 1926 and 1938 ones 举 with 卄 again and the 1942 one 挙 with 手 which finally became official in 1946.

As we saw above even tops had come to vary. 擧 has developed from the contracted 擧 seen in the calligraphy of Wáng Xīzhī, the 擧 of the 517 Lady Lǐ epitaph and the 舉 of the 656 Hán Xuán epitaph. 举is a 擧 without the central 与 and 二. 䍦 and 斉 are analogies to 孝 for 學 and 竟 for 覺.

The reformers at *Tàibái* chose 䍦 and 斉 for their 1935 "handy characters", while their colleagues at *Lúnyǔ* and the Education Ministry opted for the less short but more common 举 and 誉, as did the Script Reform Committee in 1956.

<div align="center">

具 *具 *jù* tool
眞 真 *真 *zhēn* real
直 直 *直 *zhí* straight

</div>

In the early Han manuscripts from Mawangdui 具, 眞 and 直 are written with a distinct 目. Contracted 具, 真, 直, 具, 直, 貝 and 直 appear on first century BCE wood slips, but were never recognised. The 1617 *Zìkǎo* warned: "具 is written with 目. 具 is wrong […] 直 is written with 亡 and 目 in the centre. 直 is wrong."

More liberal voices have been heard. In 1955 Xú Chuánxíng wrote in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "There are two horizontal strokes in the rectangles in 目, 且 and 其 but three in 直 and 真. It is arduous to memorise when to write three and not two. Writing the three strokes as two would in fact cause no

problem. Why not change them to two?" In 1973 Jiāng Huī and Lǔ Gē went further in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "In characters like 直, 宜, 真 and 厦 pupils often cannot make out whether there should be two strokes in the frame or three. In Lǔ Xùn's manuscripts they are often written 直, 宜, 真 and 厦 with one connected stroke. This is easy to write and easy to memorise."

The Script Reform Committee agreed, proposing 具, 真 and 直 in its 1977 Second Scheme. This caused a split in the committee's Character Group. A 1979 memo quoted three views in the group:

1. 具, 真 and 直 are easily miswritten, under the influence of 且. Here one must be systematic. The scheme's solution is unsystematic, and increases the number of character components. If we turn the three horizontal lines into two, these characters will match 且 and will not be so easy to miswrite.

2. Retain [the 具, 真 and 直 of] the original scheme. The masses have not objected. Not shortening is better than shortening by one stroke.

3. Cannot present a clear standpoint.[179]

The first faction prevailed, adding 具, 真 and 直 to the 1981 Revised Draft.

懼 惧 *jù* fear

The shortened 具 *jù* phonetic has assumed varying shapes. Liú Fù found 惧 and 惧 in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. The 1747 Jìn Temple inscription has a 惧. The "erroneous" 惧 was condemned in the 1839 *Zìxué jǔyú*. The 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn* said the "informal form for 懼" was 惧.

The 1955 Draft proposed 惧 with 具. Pān Yǔnzhōng reported an objection from a meeting at Zhongshan University: "具 has not been shortened to 具, so why is 懼 shortened to 惧 and not to 惧? This fits neither custom nor analogy." Xú Chuánxíng had a different view: "It is very good that 懼 is simplified to 惧 in the Draft, but 具 itself has not been simplified to 具. This way the phonetic in 惧 has no basis."

The Script Reform Committee followed the former advice, legalising 惧 in June 1956 with its Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters.

惧 had found its way to Japan by 1753, when Dazai Shundai referred to 惧 as a short form for 懼. In 2010 the shorter form was included in the Revised List of Characters for Common Use.

---

179 *"Cao'an" di yi biao xiuding qingkuang shuoming*, 1979, p. 8.

據 据 拠 *jù* seize, depend on

The Japanese Language Council changed 據 to 拠 and the Script Reform Committee of China to 据

据 with the phonetic 居 *jū* was early used for 據, The 111 CE *Hànshū* had 据法守正 for *Shǐjì*'s 據法守正 (the law was adhered to and order maintained).

拠 has a more intricate origin. Some mixed up the puzzling 豖 in 據 with 匆 to write 㨿, as on the 143 CE Jǐng jūn stele. Knowing 虜 as a variant of 處, some turned 㨿 into 㩀, as on the 170 Xià Chéng stele. In Yuan block-prints this 㩀 was reduced to 拠.

In early twentieth-century China 拠 was the more common form, appearing in seven of our 1900–1939 manuscripts compared with 㨿 in four and 据 in two. Reformers nevertheless wavered, proposing 拠 for *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters" but 据 for *Lúnyǔ*'s "plain stroke characters". Then 据 took over, appearing in fifty-five of our 1950–1954 manuscripts compared with 拠 in seven and 㨿 in four. The committee duly chose 据.

Japan looked like going the same way. Dazai Shundai wrote in 1753 that "据 and 據 are read alike and each is used for the other." Then writers came up with new use for 据. 居 had been used both for *iru* (be at) and *sueru* (install), but came to be specified by a 'hand' in the latter sense, as mentioned in the 1917 *Kan-Wa daijirin*: "In this country 据 is [also] read *sue* […] and used in the sense of 'defer' or 'install.'" As 据 was in demand in this new function, 拠 came to serve alone for 據. The Japa nese Language Council included 拠 in all its reform schemes and made that form official for 據 in 1946. 据 entered the List of Characters for Common Use in 1981 as a s eparate character read *sueru*.

劇 剧 *jù* drama

剧 with the 居 *jū* phonetic was recorded by Huáng Ruòzhōu in 1950 and became official for 劇 in 1956 like the analogous 据 for 據.

剧 had one competitor, mentioned by Chén Guāngyáo in 1956: "In some parts of Guangdong this character [劇] is written 㓷, which may be a sim-plified 剧." In 1960 㓷 was reported to the committee by a correspondent from Shaoguan in just Guangdong. In 1964 Liú Wànxīn, a teacher in Wuzhou in neighbouring Guangxi, wrote: "Here in Guangdong and Guangxi some people write 㓷. This looks simpler than 剧, but 尺 [*chǐ*] is not read like 剧." Nor is it in the local Cantonese, in which 尺 is *ʧʼɛk* 33 and 剧 *kʼɛk* 22. This 尺 *ʧʼɛk* 33 phonetic is nevertheles somewhat closer to 剧 *kʼɛk* 22 than the 居 *køy* 55 in the official form. The form was not very well known even in Guangdong,

recognised in 1981–1986 by informants in Guangzhou and Maoming but not in Huizhou, Meixian, Shaoguan and Zhanjiang, nor in Wuzhou.

<h2 style="text-align:center">捲 卷 juǎn roll up</h2>

The 1956 Scheme merged 捲 (*juǎn* roll up) with 卷 (*juàn* book). 卷 had served also as a verb, like in *Shījīng*'s 我心匪席不可卷也 (*wǒ xīn fěi xí, bù kě juǎn yě* my will is not a mat, it will not bend). The 'hand' on the left of 捲 is obviously a late addition, since the 大 in 卷 represents 廾 (two hands).

<div style="text-align:center">

決 决 jué decide, bursting dike
減 减 jiǎn diminish
淨 凈 净 浄 jìng clean
況 况 kuàng situation, in addition
涼 凉 liáng cool

</div>

China's 1955 First List of Regulated Variants replaced 决, 况, 减, 凉 and 淨 with 決, 況, 減, 涼 and 凈. The Japanese Language Council retained 氵.

Forms with 'water' are the older, as we might guess from their sense. In stone inscriptions the shorter 冫 occurs in 決 from 174 CE, in 況 from 221, in 減 from 521, in 涼 from 575 and in 淨 from 1282.[180] With time 冫 forms came to dominate. Our Chinese 1900–1954 manuscripts contain seventy-one 决 against five 決, while the Japanese ratio is more even at fifteen to thirteen. This may explain why the Japanese Language Council was less keen on 冫 than the Script Reform Committee of China.

The 淨 to 净 shift is described in the 爭 *zhēng* section.

<h2 style="text-align:center">開 开 kāi open</h2>

The 开 which became official for 開 in January 1956 first turns up in the 1943 Principles of Administration of Southern Jiangsu, which regulated compensation to cadres who 离开本鄉 (*líkāi běn xiāng* leave their own area) for more than one month.[181] 开 may have been inspired by the 关 for 關/関 which had appeared eight years earlier.

---

180   174 Zhou Jing inscription. 221 Kong Xian stele. 521 Sima Xianzi epitaph. 575 Yuan Shao epitaph. 1282 Fang Gong tower inscription.
181   *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 110.

靠 *伩 *kào* lean to

In 1959 Lǐ Cuìhé of South China Normal Institute pondered ways to simplify 靠: "If a character has no common short form but is complicated and common, there is no harm in making a bold creation, publishing it for trial use and letting the masses make the final choice. Just like 塵 was simplified to 尘, 靠 can be simplified to 伩 […]."

The masses were less bold. In 1960 correspondents from Changtai and Xiamen in Fujian, Wuhua in Guangdong and Rongjiang in Guizhou informed the Script Reform Committee that people had begun to shorten 靠 to 伩 with 亻 for 非. This 伩 was proposed in the 1977 Second Scheme but withdrawn from the 1981 Revised Draft.

殼 殻 壳 *壳 *ké qiào* shell

Tanaka Iwao found 壳 for 殼 in a Ming version of *Xīyóujì* (Journey to the West). The 1666 *Zìhuìbǔ* said "壳 is short for 殼." The 一-less 壳 became the more common, appearing in fourteen of our 1900–1954 manuscripts compared with 壳 in none.

So the Script Reform Committee chose 壳 and recognised it with its Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters in June 1956. Some 壳 writers seem to have remained active. The editors of the 1964 General List found it necessary to add a note: "There is no 一 above the 几 in 壳." As late as in 1998 *Xiàndài Hànyǔ guīfàn zìdiǎn* repeated: "Over the bottom 几 there is no short 一."

剋 克 *kè* set a time limit

In 1956 the Script Reform Committee replaced 剋 with 克, a shorter homonym meaning 'can', 'overcome' or 'restrain'. Lǐ Lèyì points out that 剋日 (set a date) was written 克日 already in the Jin *Sānguó zhì* (Records of the Three Kingdoms). The Qing commentator Duàn Yùcái wrote: "克 appears in the classics but not 剋. Common people do not distinguish 克 and 剋."

懇 恳 *kěn* earnestly
墾 垦 *kěn* cultivate

The 1956 Scheme dropped 豸, leaving the phonetic 艮 *gèn*. Chén Guāngyáo called both short forms "established by custom". The more established was 恳 which was found by Jiǎng and Shào in late Ming military documents, while 垦 was first registered by Xú Zémǐn in 1934.

袴 褲 裤 *袄 *kù* trousers

Ambitious dictionaries enter the alternatives 褲 and 袴. The shorter form is older. *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn* records of 袴 start with the Han *Fāngyán* (Idioms of the Regions), of 褲 with the Qing *Hóng lóu mèng* (Dream of the Red Chamber). Even so the 1955 Draft List of 400 Retained and Abolished Variants ousted 袴 to retain 褲. Objectors pointed out that 袴 was shorter and therefore better.[182] Yīn Huànxiān in turn found it "evident that the basis of […] 褲 among the masses is much broader than that of […] 袴." The critics' argument was weakened in 1964 when the committee simplified 車 to 车 and 褲 to 裤.

By then a still shorter form had appeared, a 袄 registered in the 1954 edition of Huáng Ruòzhōu's list of Shanghai short forms. Readers might have suspected a mistake. How could 袄 with a 夫 *fū* phonetic represent *kù*? The practice was confirmed, however, in 1960 letters to the committee from Nanjing in Jiangsu, Pingnan in Guangxi and from Guangdong Education Bureau. The latter is a clue to the origin of the form. Cantonese speakers read 裤 as *fu* and find the 夫 phonetic helpful. 袄 was then picked up by unreflecting *kù* speakers further north. 袄 also spread to or was independently invented in partly Cantonese-speaking Singapore, where the Ministry of Education included this form in its 1969 Table of Simplified Characters.

List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme included 袄 (with even the left side shortened). The education bureaus of Beijing, Anhui and Shanxi feared that 袄 would encourage misreading and impede tuition of the standard language. That point excluded 袄 from the 1981 Revised Draft.

庫 库 *庋 *kù* magazine

The 1964 General List turned 庫 into 库 analogously to 车 for 車. A shorter alternative existed, at least locally. A 1977 report deals with the construction of 冷庋 or 冷藏庋 (cold storage facilities) in a Zhanjiang factory.[183] In 1981 this traveller saw two 车庋 (garages) and a 倉庋 (storehouse) in Guangzhou, in 1982 a 仓庋 (仓库) in Shaoguan and in 1986 a 仓庋 in Yangjiang. All these records are from Guangdong, where locals read 库 as *fu* and find the 夫 *fu* phonetic helpful. Unlike the analogous 袄, 庋 did not spread to non-Cantonese areas, where writers have been content with 库.

---

182   Dai 1955. "Zhongguo minzhu cujinhui", 1955. Bao 1955.
183   Guangdong Archives 253-2-275-123~125, pp. 3, 4.

誇夸 *kuā* boast

夸 appears in the pre-Han classics and is regarded as the original form of 誇. Official use of the speechless 夸 for 'boast' was proposed by the Nanjing Education Ministry in 1935 and sanctioned by its Beijing successor in 1956.

塊 块 *扑 *kuài* piece

Wú Liángzuò relates an early attempt to simplify 塊:

> In the Taiping Rebellion, 魂 […] 塊 and 魏 were changed to �械 […] 㙔 and 㪻, which not only saved strokes, but also had the progressive aim of combating superstition. These forms with shortened components were prescribed in the official *Qīndìng jìng bì zìyàng* [Imperial Decision on Character Forms to Esteem or Avoid].

Writers came to prefer other forms. The 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn* said "when merchandise is described in shops, 一塊 [per piece] is written 一左". This 左 may be derived from *Shuōwén*: "𡊍 [凷]: lump. Consists of a shovelful of 土 [earth]. 塊 [凷]: 凷 may also be written with 鬼." Contraction of 土 to 圡 and ∐ to 丶 leaves 左. Although Xǔ Shèn regarded 凷 as the proper form, it had by his time been outcompeted by 塊, which appears on eight of the Han wood slips surveyed by Sano Kōichi against 凷 on none.

块 was first registered in 1934 in the fast-written notes of the students of Xú Zémǐn. The phonetic 夬 *guài* is analogous to that in 快 (*kuài* quick).

扑 turns up for 塊 in 1948 in a note from Tunliu Branch of Bank of Southern Hebei warning against false Southern Hebei currency appearing in 各种版式混合在一扑 (*gèzhǒng bǎnshì hùnhé zài yíkuàir* all kinds mixed together).[184] 扑 may have been picked out of *Shuōwén,* which entered 圤 (扑) as a variant of 墣 (*pǔ* clod of earth). 扑 became quite common, appearing for 塊 in seven of our 1940–1954 manuscripts compared with 块 in two.

块 was suggested in *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters", 扑 in the Script Reform Society's 1950 List of Common Short Forms and 块 in the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft. The Chinese Association for Promoting Democracy found 块 unfamiliar: "Some comrades thought that the character [塊] should be kept for the time being, to avoid problems with understanding." At a meeting of the Chinese Writers' Association, Zhào Shùlǐ warned: "Characters which can cause misunderstanding or are unusual need not be adopted immediately, like 块 for 塊 […]."[185]

---

184   Document of Jinan yinhang.
185   "Zhongguo minzhu cujin hui", 1955. Zhongguo zuojia xiehuì 1955.

Then why not 卜? The October 1955 Revised Draft explained: "Some people advocate 卜, but this form may be confused with the southern character 卜 for 鹽 [*yán* salt]." At the script reform conference that month the committee member Yè Gōngchuò specified: "In some areas 塊 is shortened to卜, in others even 鹽 is. Whether we use 卜 for 鹽 or for 塊, some people will object. Therefore the Draft has not adopted 卜." Jiǎ Yuán repeated: "Learning short forms at place A does not make one recognise those of place B. For 塊, for example, the northern form is 卜 and the southern form 块."

With hindsight, this fits. Xú's 块-writing students were at Central University in Nanjing. The 块-promoting *Tàibái* was edited in Shanghai. The 块-bashing Association for Promoting Democracy assembled in Beijing. The anti-块 Zhào Shùlǐ was a northerner from Shanxi. The 卜 majority in our pre-1955 manuscripts stems from a Beijing Archives dominance.

In 1957 Qiū Chángnù still campaigned for 卜 in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "It is more practical to use 卜 than 块 (塊). 鹽 is written 盐 [in the Scheme] and will therefore not be mixed up with 卜 [塊]". Needless to say, Qiū was a northerner, working at Northeast Normal University in Changchun. This did not sway the committee, which authorised 块 in 1959.

The north-south split remained in 1982, when this author saw 卜 for 块 in Beijing, Qingwangdao and Taiyuan and for 盐 in Shanghai, Nanjing, Hangzhou, Guiyang and Kunming. The dividing line was determined more closely with the help of informants, who identified 卜 as 块 in Jinan, Kaifeng, Luoyang and ten places further north but as 盐 in Lianyungang, Xuzhou, Huaibei, Zhengzhou, Xi'an and thirty-five places further south. Thus the isogloss dividing northern 卜-for-块 writers from southern 卜-for-盐 writers ran through Shaanxi, northern Henan and southern Shandong.

That border is now history. Our youngest informant to identify 卜 as 块 was a man from Jiamusi in Heilongjiang born in 1982 and the youngest to read it as 盐 a student from Zhoukou in southern Henan born in the same year.

款 *欻 *牧 *扻 *kuǎn* sum of money

The 1955 Draft proposed shortening 款 to 欻, a variant known since the 1013 *Yùpiān*, which called it "informal". Preceding forms reveal that its 匕 is a 土 turned 上 turned 匕 and its 矢 a 示 turned 夫 turned 天 turned 矢. Yùn Huī and Jùn Tāo pointed out in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that 欻 was not much shorter than 款. The 1956 Scheme abandoned the change.

Shorter alternatives existed. In 1925 Beiping Police Department urged newspapers to follow relevant 条牧 (*tiáokuǎn* regulations). A 1951 receipt from a Chengdu bookshop records 書扻 140.000 元 (books to the amount of

140 000 yuan).[186] The shorter form with 扌 soon caught up with 牧, appearing in five of our 1952–1977 manuscripts compared with 牧 in six.

The Script Reform Committee chose 牧 for its 1977 Second Scheme. Yunnan Script Reform Leading Group pointed out that this form might be confused with 牧 (*mù* herd), Zhejiang Education Bureau that "the masses are used to writing 款 as 扝, which is also one stroke shorter than 牧, so it is better to simplify to 扝." The public agreed. 扝 was proposed in seventy-two of the ten thousand replies received by the committee, making this the most voted-for change to the 1977 scheme. Reformers were split. A 1979 memo from the committee's Character Group said "opinions have differed and agreement has not been reached," as some members wanted to "retain the original proposal, which is the more common" while others thought that 牧 might "easily be confused with 牧 and should be changed to 扝." [187] In the end the committee sidestepped 款 in its 1981 Revised Draft.

況 况 *kuàng*

See 決 *jué.*

礦 矿 鉱 *卝 *kuàng* ore

The 1955 Draft proposed 矿 for 礦 analogously to 广 for 廣. Yuè Sìbǐng took on critics in *Guāngmíng rìbào*:

> Some look to what existed before and propose to shorten 礦 to 卝, not 矿 [...]. But the focal point of the Draft is what exists now. True, simplifying 礦 to 卝 would be ancient-looking and cultured as well as simple, and the former [1935] scheme did employ 卝 for 礦. However, that character has weak links to the people. To workers, peasants and soldiers it would be a completely new character, whereas 矿 is a form which people are very accustomed to using.

卝 was certainly old. *Shuōwén* said: "𥑮; ancient form for 礦. *Zhōulǐ* says 卝 人 [miner]." To that *Zhōulǐ* passage, however, the commentator Zhèng Xuán (127–200) added that "卝 means 礦", not expecting his readers to understand this already then obsolete form.

In the twentieth century 卝 was revived, first presumably by some erudite

---

186   Receipt from Chengdu Sanlian shudian, from flea market. Beijing Archives J181-17-44, p. 3.

187   *Qunzhong dui "Cao'an"*, p. 1. *"Cao'an" di yi biao xiuding qingkuang*, p. 7.

Shuōwén reader, then by miners. In 1933 the Hubei company Hànyěpíng sent a note to its 各廠卝 (every factory and mine), mentioning one 李舒副卝長 (vice mine director Lǐ Shū).[188]

It was therefore no big surprise when the Chinese Education Ministry chose 卝 for its 1935 List of Short Forms. After that, however, tracks of 卝 again disappear. In its stead 矿 became official in June 1956.

The Japanese Language Council chose 鉱 an analogy to 広 for 廣 based on the variant 鑛 with 'metal' for 'stone'.

<div align="center">虧 虧 亐 *亏 kuī lose</div>

Ming and Qing blockprinters cut off the left side to write 亏, a form the *Tàibái* editors selected for their 1935 "handy characters", the Education Ministry for its ensuing List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee for its 1955 Draft. The 1956 Scheme changed this to 亐, which may have been the more common form, appearing in one of our 1950–1954 manuscripts against 亏 in none.[189]

<div align="center">睏 困 kùn tired, sleepy</div>

Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn records of 睏 begin with the 1903 *Wénmíng xiǎoshǐ* (Brief History of Modern Times). Before that 'tired' could be written with 困, the character for 'trouble', as in the phrase 昨夜乎困 (Did you sleep last night?) in *Hòuhànshū*. The 1956 Scheme abolished the newfangled 睏, leaving 困 as the official form.

<div align="center">擴 扩 kuò enlarge</div>

See 廣 *guǎng*

<div align="center">臘 腊 là sacrifice made in the
twelfth month of the lunar year
蠟 蝆 蜡 là wax</div>

It is not obvious how 腊 and 蜡 came to be used for 臘 and 蠟. 昔*xī* is neither a fitting phonetic for 臘 *là* nor a plausible contraction of 鼠, nor was 腊 in its older reading *xī* and sense of 'dried meat' a conceivable substitute for 臘. Chén Guāngyáo imagined that writers had mixed up 臘肉 (*làròu* dried

---

188 Hubei Archives LS56-1-30, pp. 39–40.
189 盈亐 (*yíngkuī* profits and losses) in Beijing Archives 31-2-160, p. 4.

meat for winter sacrifice) with 腊肉 (*xīròu* dried meat) and so taken up 腊 for 臘. In any case, our records of 腊 for *là* begin with a 旡岁腊月 (無歲臘月 the twelfth month, no year) date in a 1925 inventory list from the Palace Museum in Beijing.[190]

腊 became official in 1958 and 蜡 the following year.

來 来 *lái* come

来 (來), originally a drawing of a cereal, was used for 'come' already on Yin bones. On Han clerk style wood slips and stone steles 来 became 來 or, much more often, 来. The further contracted 耒 is seen from the 471 Golden Light Sutra onwards.

Early writing models like the Han Xīpíng Stone Classics, the Wei Zhèngshǐ Stone Classics, the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* and the Tang *Yùpiān* recommended the common 来 with 丷. The Song *Guǎngyùn* switched to the more *Shuōwén*-like 來 with 从 and was followed by later dictionaries. The 来 norm was restored in 1946 by the Japanese Language Council and in 1956 by the Script Reform Committee of China. In the latter country the common and still shorter 耒 was brought up by Sòng Zhòngxīn and Tián Qíchāng, but that form was disqualified by its similarity to 耒 (*lěi* plough handle).

蘭 蘭 兰 *lán* orchid

In 1922 Qián Xuántóng wrote that 兰 with 二 for 闌 was "in use among the people" for 蘭. Five years later *Píngmín zìdiǎn* recorded the more 蘭-like 芏. Our 1940–1954 manuscripts contain eight 芏, four 兰 and one 芏.

As we shall see below, 兰 had by then come into use even for 藍 (*lán* blue). The 1955 Draft proposed to employ 兰 for that character but not for 蘭. The 1956 Scheme overturned this proposal, reserving 兰 for 蘭. Remaining doubts delayed official status for 兰 until 1958.

兰 was unknown in Japan, where the 1951 List of Characters for Use in Personal Names instead turned 蘭 into 蘭 with 東 for 柬.

藍 蓝 *lán* blue

In 1935 the cartoonist Fēng Zǐkǎi (1898–1975) recalled how at the age of ten he had seen the dyers in his parents' workshop "write 三藍 [third grade blue] as 三艹, except for an added twist to the last stroke in 艹." This form was rendered 艹 by *Píngmín zìdiǎn* in 1927 and by Xú Zémǐn's students in

---

190   Mueum of History 史 5678, p. 6.

1934. In 1960 a correspondent from Shaoguan in Guangdong informed the Script Reform Committee that there were those who wrote 艹.

With this tracks of 艹 and 艹 disappear. In their stead writers had begun to use the above-mentioned 兰 even for 'blue', as in a 1949 letter from one Wáng Huáng to Beijing General Publishing Office asserting that his manuscript was not pornography but a 兰夲 (藍本 draft) intended for the Shanghai journal *Bànyuè xìjù* (Drama Bimonthly).[191]

The 1955 Draft proposed 兰 for 藍, not 蘭. Bào Yòuwén objected: "If 藍 is simplified to 兰 the character will be hard to recognise without the phonetic. It is better to write 蓝." The committee complied, recognising 蓝 in 1964.

Not surprisingly, many preferred the five-stroke 兰 to the thirteen-stroke 蓝. In 1965 Xiāo Tiānzhù's language column reminded its readers: "兰, 篮 [*lán* basket] and 蓝 must not be mixed up. 篮球 [*lánqiú* basketball] and 蓝布 [blue cotton cloth] may not be written 兰球 and 兰布."

The 1977 Second Scheme nevertheless renewed the 兰 for 'blue' proposal. Jilin Education Bureau complained that "if 兰 replaces 蓝, it will be hard to make out whether 兰花 is a blue flower or the name of the flower [orchid]." Hubei Script Reform Leading Group and Shanghai Interim Script Reform Leading Group joined in, effectively barring 兰 from the 1981 Revised Draft.

籃 篮 *兰 *lán* basket

The 1956 Scheme turned 籃 into 篮 analogously to 蓝, 监 and 坚. Some went further; in 1957 Fán Jiāng found 竺 in the works of his Zhejiang students. In our 1960–1977 manuscripts we find nine 兰球 (篮球 basketball), one 芏球, one 芏球, one 竺球 and one 竺球 against five regular 篮球.

The 1977 Second Scheme followed the majority, proposing 兰 for 篮, as it did for 蓝. The abolition of that scheme did not eradicate the practice. A 2016 web search yielded one hundred and fifty seven 兰球赛 (basketball matches).

欄 欄 栏 *lán* fence, hurdle
攔 拦 *lán* to bar
爛 烂 *làn* rot

The modified grass top in 兰 shows that this component originated from 蘭, not 闌. So 栏, 拦 and 烂 must be more recent than 兰.

Much more recent, it seems: neither is on record before 1955. As late as in March that year Jīn Míngshèng, obviously at a loss, asked in *Guāngmíng*

---

191   Beijing Archives 8-2-72, p. 7.

rìbào: "Take 懶 [*lǎn* lazy], 爛, 轉, 騙 [*piàn* cheat], […] is there absolutely no way of simplifying these characters?" The Script Reform Committee responded by entering 栏, 拦 and 烂 in its 1956 Scheme. Chén Guāngyáo called each a "new picto-phonetic character". This newness explains why their official status was delayed until 1958.

In Japanese 欄 became 欄 with 東 for 柬 analogously to 蘭 for 蘭.

<div align="center">

讕 谰 *讠 *lán* slander
瀾 澜 *氵 *lán* billows
懶 懒 *忄 *lǎn* lazy
濫 滥 *氵 *làn* flood

</div>

讠, 氵 and 忄 were proposed in List One of the 1977 Second Scheme. Prior records are lacking.

<div align="center">

覽 覧 览 *lǎn* look
攬 擥 揽 *lǎn* embrace
纜 纜 缆 *纟 *练 *lǎn* cable

</div>

覽 has the same phonetic as 藍 and 籃 but not the same legroom, so Jin writers compressed 皿 to 一, 丶 or nothing and gave us forms like 覧 on the 283 Zhèng Liè stele and 覧 on the 511 Zhèng Wén stele. "Common" but not "correct", said the Tang *Gānlù zìshū*, "wrong", said the 1617 *Zìkǎo*. The Japanese Language Council ignored both and made 覧 official in 1949. The Script Reform Committee of China chose instead 览, 揽 and 缆 with ⺊ for 臣, a contraction common in both countries, as described in the 堅 *jiān* section.

In 1965 Chén Lìsēn of Fujian Construction Bureau proposed in *Wénzì gǎigé* to simplify 缆 further to 练. Later Yunnan Script Reform Leading Group mentioned 练 as an example of frequent "irregular use of characters". Who would come up with the idea of using 来 *lái* as a phonetic for 缆 *lǎn*? Perhaps someone in the Wu dialect area near Shanghai, where both nasals and diptongs disappear, leaving both 纜 and 来 as *lɛ*.

The 1977 Second Scheme opted for the more lucid 纟, a form said to be "often seen on the industrial front" in a 1974 *Guāngmíng rìbào* article signed Xiàng Huī. It was withdrawn from the 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">

勞 労 劳 *láo* toil

</div>

See 營 *yíng.*

樂 楽 乐 *lè* joyful *yuè* music

樂 depicts strings supporting a musical instrument on a wooden frame. The strings were reduced to ﹀ by Mǐ Fú (1051–1107) and to ⺍ by Song blockprinters. The resulting 楽 became common enough to be condemned as "wrong" in the 1617 *Zìkǎo*.

Japanese reformers did not waver, including 楽 in their 1923 and 1926 simplification schemes and in the decisive 1949 List of Forms.

Their Chinese colleagues more ambitiously proposed 乐 for their Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms, a form which became official with the 1956 Scheme. Chén Wénbīn answered critics: "Some people think this character is easily confused with 东 and suggest adopting 楽. However, 楽 is not so short, while 乐, the square version of the cursive form [乐], is already widely used by people, without any confusion with 东 being noticed."

靁 雷 *léi* thunder

The phonetic 畾 *lěi* depicts the piled earth between the fields and is the primary form of 壘 below, but was borrowed for the sense of 'thunder'. In that sense we find it with four fields in the 🔤 (𤲅) on Western Zhou bronze vessels, three fields in the 𦊆 on the sixth-century Marquis of Qí vase, four fields in the 𤴐 on the fourth-century Baoshan wood slips, two fields in the 𤳳 of the pre-Qin "ancient script" quoted by *Shuōwén*, two or three fields in the 畾 and 𤱿 in the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts, three fields in the 靁 on Western Han wood slips from Juyan and Dunhuang, and one field in the 雷 on first century BCE wood slips from Wuwei.

In *Shuōwén* Xǔ Shèn chose 靁 and 靁 with three fields, retaining the analogy to 壘 and 纍. Scribes ignored him and wrote 雷 on the 156 Hán Chì stele, the 168 Wǔ Róng stele and the 169 Shǐ Chén stele. The 175 Xīpíng Stone Classics adjusted to practice, advocated 雷 with one field and set the later standard.

壘 垒 塁 *lěi* build by piling up, rampart

Shuōwén distinguished 壘 (rampart) from 垒 (pile bricks). Writers did not, using 壘 in both senses. From the Later Wei to the Qing, *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains no 垒 but seventy-one 壘, including phrases like 壘石 (pile stones) and 壘土 (pile earth).

The prevailing 壘 had eighteen strokes. Reducing it analogously to 雷 for 靁 and 累 for 纍 was impractical, as the result would be 里 (*lǐ* village). We saw in the 轟 *hōng* section, however, how repeated components were shortened to ⺍ by Japanese writers and to 双 by their Chinese counterparts.

This even affected 疊. Yamada Tadao encountered 㲪 in a sixteenth-century copy of *Wa-Kan rōeishū shichū,* and Jiǎng and Shào found 㲪 in late Ming military documents, adding however that the latter was, in 1952, "no longer in common use". The Japanese use of 㲪 on the other hand continued and became legal in 1949.

While the Chinese use of 㲪 waned, use of 叠 was recorded by Ōuyáng Zhēn in 1935 and by *Jiǎnbǐzì* in 1951. The idea may have come from *Shuōwén,* or from the analogous 叠 for 疊. The 1955 Draft dodged 疊, but a change to 叠 was prescibed by the 1956 Scheme and implemented with the 1959 Fourth Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters.

纍 累 *lěi* accumulate

Pre-1956 dictionaries reserved 纍 for *lěi* (accumulate) and the shortened 累 for *léi* (piles of) and *lèi* (tired). The 1956 Scheme merged all to 累. The idea was not new. A 纍山里 (Leishan village) mentioned on Juyan slip number 35.16 reappears on slips 190.35 and 231.27 as 累山里. On the 169 CE Shǐ Nóng stele the vassal Shǐ Nóng 累息屏營 (*lěixī bīngyíng* holds his breath in fear), with 累 not 纍.

類 類 类 *lèi* type

On the Warring States wood slips from Guodian 'type' is written 頪 with a face scrutinising rice. 犬 was added because, says *Shuōwén,* "of nothing are there more types than of the dog." The faceless 类 appeared in the 1212 dictionary *Wǔ yīn jíyùn* (Rhymes of the Five Articulations) and became official in China in February 1956.

类 had made its way to Japan by 1910, when the Wakayama teacher Yanagi Isao declared that he would no longer correct this form in his students' works. 类 was not included in any of the Language Council's reform schemes, but was on the table in 1963, when council chairman Abe Shinnosuke wrote the education minister that "we need to consider the adoption of suitable short forms used to some extent in society today but not included in the [1949] List of Forms […] like […] 迭 (選), 离 (離) and 类 (類)."

The Council did not leave 類 completely unscathed, but dropped a point in 犬 to write 類, as it did in 器, 臭 (*shū* smell), 突 (*totsu* sudden) and 涙 (*rui* tear). Pointless 類 with 大 were known even in China; appearing on seven Han to Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* among one hundred and eleven 類 with 犬. In Japan, however, pointless forms were even more common, outnumbering 犬 forms twelve to one in Kitagawa Hirokuni's compilation of Japanese calligraphers.

<div align="center">

淚 泪 *lèi* tear

</div>

Both variants had appeared by the Han, 𡢽 (眣) on a Warring States seal and and 淚 on the 143 CE Jǐng jūn stele. *Shuōwén* enters neither, *Zìhuì* and *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* both. 淚 became the more common, outnumbering 泪 one hundred and six to thirteen on Han to Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*.

The 1955 Draft List of 400 Retained and Abolished Variants retained 淚 to abolish 泪. Dài Tiānjiàn objected in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "As for selecting and discarding variants, I think one should look to shortness rather than to custom. It would be better to change [...] 淚 to 泪 [...]." The Script Reform Committee complied, including 泪 in its December First List of Regulated Variants. This in turn annoyed friends of custom. Professor Gāo Jǐngchéng wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Some of the selected characters are unusual and unknown to lots of people, like 泪 (淚), 弃 (棄) and 异 (異)." 泪 nevertheless remained on the list.

The Japanese Language Council more modestly opted for 涙 with 大 for 犬. But, says Sasahara Hiroyuki of the National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics, 泪 is still used by song writers "to achieve a special nuance".

<div align="center">

離 离 *lí* leave

</div>

離 once meant 'oriole' but early came to be used for 'depart'. Han writers realised that this sense would get through even without the sparrow on the right, like the author of the Lǎo zǐ B manuscript, who wrote 𢛇德不离 (恒德不離 *héng dé bù lí* not to deviate from lasting virtue). 离 was used for 離 in eleven of the twelve Song to Qing blockprints surveyed by Liú Fù. The practice was officially recognised in February 1956.

There is some record of this form even in Japan, starting with a 巨离 (*kyori* distance) on a sewage chart from 1938 and ending with a call to 分离授业 (*bunri jugyō* boycott classes) in a student bulletin from 1969.[192] The closest 离 came to official status in Japan was a 1963 report by Language Council chairman Abe Shinnosuke to the education minister that "we need to consider the adoption of suitable short forms used to some extent in society today but not included in the List of Forms [...] like [...] 选 (選), 离 (離) and 类 (類)."

---

192 Yamaguchi Archives 戰前 B2522. Matsumoto 1969, p. 77.

釐 厘 *lí* rule, one hundredth

The early Ming *Piānhǎi lèibiān* said "釐 is informally shortened to 厘", its successor *Zhèngzìtōng* "厘: informal for 廛 [*chán* bazaar]." The Script Reform Committee chose to use 厘 in the former sense, including it in its 1955 First List of Regulated Variants.

In Japan 厘 was called 厘 "informal for 釐" by Nakane Genkei in 1692 and became official in 1946.

裏 裡 里 *lǐ* inside

Ambitious dictionaries enter two complex forms for 'inside', 裏 and 裡. Their components are identical, a phonetic 里 *lǐ* plus a 衣 (robe) indicating the original sense of 'inside lining'. 裏 is the older, appearing as 𢁛 in the Zhou and as 裏 in the Han. Some later scribe moved the 'cloth' to the left to write 裡, saving one stroke and leaving more room for 里. *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn* records of this 裡 begin with the 1136 *Lèi shuō* (Assorted Tales).

This makes 裏 senior to 裡 but not to 里, a character originally meaning 'village' but early on borrowed for 'lining' and 'inside', as on the early Zhou Duke Chén tripod, which describes a carriage on which 㡇里幽 (裦里幽 *tū lǐ yōu* the inside lining of the cloth cover is black). On Tang to Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains twelve (城里 inside the city walls) against two 城裏. In 1956 the paractice became official.

禮 礼 *lǐ* ritual

Originally this character was written with its right side only, consisting of offerings in a ritual vessel (豊), as in the 豊宜 (*lǐyì* 豊宜 [禮義] rituals) described on a vase from the pre-309 BCE tomb of the king of Zhongshan.

Writing it without 示 (altar) may already have been old-fashioned at the time. *Shuōwén* said "礼 [礼]: ancient form of 禮," implying that 示 was added before the Qin, and that writers had already tired of the bulky result and begun to shorten the right side to a bent stroke.

In clerk and square style 礼 took the shape of 礼. This form became so widespread that the Tang *Gānlù zìshū* called both 礼 and 禮 correct. Shortened forms were also the first ones to cross to Japan; Kitagawa Hirokuni found six 礼 and one 礼 but no 禮 on the seventh- and eighth-century Japanese steles he surveyed. Use of the form continued, and the recognition of 礼 in Japan in 1946 and in China ten years later caused no stir.

<div align="center">隸 隸 隶 lì subordinate</div>

In 1946 the Japanese Language Council shortened 隸 with 木 at top left to 隸 with 士. 木 was the component recommended by *Shuōwén*, which identified the left side as 柰 (*nài* a fruit tree), hence 木 (tree). The 士 top appears in a 縢 on a Western Han wood slip from Wuwei, was prescribed by the Tang *Gānlù zìshū*, accepted by later dictionaries then condemned as "wrong" by the 1615 *Zìhuì*.

While 隸/隸 was a rarity in Japanese, Chinese writers had to cope with 直隸省 (*Zhílì shěng* The Directly Ruled Province). In 1935 Ōuyáng Zhēn wrote that 隸 had been written 隶 "for a long time". In 1928, however, Zhili became Hebei Province, after which the character fell into disuse. 隶 was ignored in the 1955 Draft but included in the 1956 Scheme, becoming official in June 1956.

<div align="center">歷 歴 历 lì sequence
曆 暦 历 lì calendar</div>

In 1946 the Japanese Language Council shortened the 秝 in 歷 and 曆 to 林. Both variants can be traced back to Yin bones. It is uncertain which is original, whether the foot below is walking by a field of grain or through a forest of trees. In any case the shorter form came to dominate, appearing nineteen times in Kitagawa Hirokuni's anthology of Japanese calligraphers against one unclear 歷 with 秝. The Language Council's step was undramatic.

There was a shorter alternative, as pointed out by Language Council chairman Andō Masatsugu in 1948: "There is no shortage of characters to take into consideration as short forms, like the 厂 (歷), 斗 (鬪), 云 (言), 県 (縣) and 庁 (廳) now used in society." And not only "now". Already in 1803 Matsumoto Guzan observed: "Informally 雁 [*gan* goose] is shortened to 厂 here [in Japan]. Apart from that, other characters with 厂 like 歷 and 曆 are also written 厂." By Andō's time the latter use had become the more common; our 1900–1946 manuscripts contain three 厂史 (*rekishi* history) and one 厂代 (*rekidai* former) but no 厂 for 'goose'.

The same idea occurred to or was picked up by Chinese writers. The 1945 manuscript of the novel *Lǚliáng yīngxióng zhuàn* (Heroes of Lüliangshan) mentions 皆厂年关 (*jiùlì niánguān* new year by the old calendar). A 1947 directive from Fujian, Guangdong and Jiangxi Border Area Working Committee refers to 厂史教训 (*lìshǐ jiàoxùn* the lessons of history).[193]

厂 was not the oldest Chinese short form of this character. In 1936 the

---

193 *Guojia tushuguan cang*, p165. *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 324.

playwright Xià Yǎn dated a manuscript 旧历の月中旬 (*jiù lì sì yuè zhōngxún* the middle of April by the old calendar). This 历 withstood competition from the shorter 厂; our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain three 历史 against one 厂史 and two 历年来 (since years) but no 厂年来. The 1956 Scheme endorsed 历, reserving 厂 for 廠 *chǎng*.

<div align="center">

厲 厉 *lì* severe
勵 励 *lì* encourage, award

</div>

Liú Fù found 厉 for 厲 and 励 for 勵 in blockprints from the Song onwards. The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms proposed to make these forms official analogously to 萬 for 万.

As we saw in the preceding section, writers had by then begun to shorten 曆 to 历. Some seized the opportunity to use the shorter 历 even for 厲 and 勵. A 1948 pamphlet by Beijing students said the food crisis had 变本加历 (變本加厲 turned more severe).[194] In 1950 Huáng Ruòzhōu wrote in the Shanghai *Wénhuì bào* that the problem with using 历 for 歷 was that "in the Northeast this 历 is used as a short form for 勵." And not only in the Northeast. Our 1950–1954 mostly Beijing manuscripts contain one 严历 (*yánlì* severe) but no 严厉, two 鼓历 (*gǔlì* encourage) but no 鼓励 and three 奖历 (*jiǎnglì* awards) but no 奖励.

Yì Xīwú of the Committee for Research on Script Reform wrote in his *Jiǎntǐ zìyuán*: "厲, 歷 and 勵 have the same reading, so we can use 历 for all." The 1955 Draft less radically repeated the 1935 历 and 励 proposal, preserving 历 for 歷 and 曆. The cadre school teacher Lǐ Xīzhōng objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Most people think 勵 should be simplified to the already common 历 and see no need to resimplify it to 厉." The 1956 Scheme nonetheless retained 厉 and 励.

Many still take the easy way out. A 2017 web search yielded one hundred and ninety 奖历 and one hundred and eighty 严历.

In Japan 励 became a Character for Current Use in 1946.

<div align="center">

麗 丽 *㾖 lì* beautiful

</div>

In 1956 Chén Guāngyáo promoted the new official form: "丽 (麗): transformed ancient form. Duàn Yùcái's [Qing] commentary on *Shuōwén* says: 'In ancient script 麗 was written 丽 only; the deer was added later.' This shows that 丽 is very old." Old, yes, but not necessarily the oldest. Excavated Zhou

---

194   *Jiefang zhanzheng shiqi Beiping*, p. 111.

forms with 'deer' precede *Shuōwén*'s 'ancient script', which stems from the Warring States.

In any case the ancient 麗 had disappeared from use by the Han. Whenever its square version 丽 turned up in dictionaries like *Jíyùn* or *Liùshū zhèng-é*, it was accompanied by the reservation "ancient". In ordinary handwriting we first find 丽 in a November 1914 entry in the diary of Lǔ Xùn, a well-read person who must have known his *Shuōwén*.

Chén continued: "Since the two 一 above are hard to write, the character was changed to 丽 with one 一." True, the single top stroke seems to have been an innovation, absent in our 1950–1954 manuscripts amid five 丽 and one 丽.

Some wrote still shorter. In 1960 Lǐ Zǐxīn from Jinzhou Middle School No. 5 in Liaoning described how some comrades "demonstrate their originality by creating characters en masse, like 丁 (党), 冋 (丽) […]" and Wén Bīng noted how people in "some areas of Guangdong Province have coined further simplifications of those already recognised, like 冋 (丽), 囗 (国), 百 (面) and 卜 (盐)." As late as in 1982 this author noticed advertisements for 佳冋 (*jiālì* excellent) products in Zhūzhōu and 华冋 (magnificent) ones in Kūnmíng. Thereafter the shorter forms disappeared; the youngest informant to identify 冋 as 丽 was a man from Shenyang born in 1966.

These forms were probably coined neither in Liaoning nor in Guangdong, but in Shanghai or Beijing by a by now familiar activist. In 1935 Ōuyáng Zhēn wrote "a suggestion to Mr Chén Guāngyáo" that "short forms should be selected according to the principle of simplicity and commonness and should not be too strange and novel, like [Chén's] 丌 (the ancient form) for 其 and 冋 (half of the ancient form) for 麗." Undeterred, Chén launched the still shorter 冋 in his 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ*.

丽 never made the crossing to Japan, where the Interim Committee on the Japanese Language proposed 㒵 in its 1923 and 1926 reform schemes. This form had been recorded by Dazai Shundai in 1753 and Matsumoto Guzan in 1803 and before that in China by the 1617 *Zìkǎo*, which condemned it as "wrong". In the end the Japanese Language Council retained 麗.

璃 *珋 *玏 *li* glass

At least two short forms came to be used for 璃. In 1950 Nanjing Trade and Industry Office listed firms in the 玻珋 (玻璃 *bōli* glass) trade. The following year we find this 珋 in Hangzhou and in 1957 in Beijing.[195] In 1959 Liú Hé

---

195   Nanjing Archives 5059-4-1, p. 36. Hangzhou Archives SZ34-2-154, p. 14. Beijing Archives 115-1-107, p. 23.

mentioned 𢺵 with the still shorter phonetic 力 among short forms seen "all over in billboard verses, slogans, written instructions and wall posters". The latter came to outcompete the former, appearing in five of our 1970–1977 manuscripts against 㓜 in one.

So the 1977 Second Scheme proposed 𢺵. The Script Reform Committee's Character Group wanted to go further: "璃 is not used alone, so if we replace it with 力 there will be no confusion of sense."[196] Facing two proposals, the committee chose neither for its 1981 Revised Draft.

簾 帘 *lián* curtain

Students asked by Xú Zémǐn in 1934 to write 'curtain' fast applied the shorter homonym 帘 (*lián* the flag sign of a tavern). The 1955 Draft passed 簾 over. The Script Reform Committee associate Cáo Bóhán pointed out in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that 帘 and 簾 "have by some people become mixed up in writing". His colleagues took note and let 帘 replace 簾 in February 1956.

聯 联 *聏 *lián* unite

联 appears in the 1862–1874 blockprint *Lǐngnán yìshǐ*, eight hundred years after the analogous 関 for 關. Why this delay? Because 聯 and 關 were not analogous eight hundred years earlier. *Shuōwén* said 聯 was written with 絲 (*sī* thread) and 關 with the phonetic 丱 *guān*. Ensuing dictionaries upheld that distinction. The Tang *Wǔjīng wénzì* prescribed 聯 with 絲 but 關 with 丱, the Liao *Lóngkān shǒujìng* and the Song *Guǎngyùn* 聯 with 絲 and 關 with 丱. The Ming *Zìhuì*, however, wrote both 聯 and 關 with 𢆶, opening for analogies like the 關-based 聏, seen in the early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì*, and then for the 関-based 联.

Like 關, 聏 disappeared from China, leaving reformers with 联 for their 1935 List of Short Forms and 1956 Scheme.

The choice was less straightforward in Japan, where 聯 had lived on and mutated, appearing once in our 1930–1946 manuscripts alongside two 聮, nine 聏, three 联 and thirteen 联. In September 1946 the Language Council's Committee on Character Survey proposed 聏.[197] However, the decisive November list dodged the problem by replacing 聯 with 連 (*ren* link), rendering 聯合軍 (*rengōgun* the allied forces) as 連合軍 and so on.

---

196 *"Cao'an" di yi biao xiuding qingkuang*, p. 5.
197 National Archives 1946.6.4–1946.12.19, p. 234.

<center>憐 怜 *lián* compassion</center>

怜 appeared in the 597 epitaph of the 可怜 (pitiful) Lady Dǒng. 令 *lìng* could serve as phonetic for *lián* because, according to *Guǎngyùn*, it was read 力延切 (*lián*) in the place name 令居縣.

Views on 怜 have differed. The early Tang *Zhèngmíng yàolù* said 憐 was "the norm in the past" while 怜 was "preferred today". The ensuing *Gānlù zìshū* called怜 "informal", followed by the less tolerant *Guǎngyùn, Zìjiàn* and *Súshū kānwù* which called it "wrong". *Jíyùn* more liberally recognised 怜 as "the same as 憐". In spite of its long record, 怜 was given official status only in 1958.

<center>籢 匳 匲 奩 奁 *lián* ladies' toilet case</center>

Toilet cases are referred to on Sui and Tang steles as 奩, 匲 or 匳. The latter was condemned as "wrong" by the Yuan *Zìjiàn*, which instead prescribed 匳. This prescription was ignored by the Qing *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*, which stipulated 奩, although with the confusing reservation "*Shuōwén* says 籢. Commonly written 匳. Also written 匲, 幣 or 奁." The oldest part of the character is believed to be the 僉 *qiān* phonetic, which may have had an initial read *kl-* or *gl-* similar to that of 'toilet case'.

The 1955 Draft proposed to simplify 匳to 匼 analogously to 检 for 檢. The Chinese Writers' Association suggested instead a 奩-based change to 奁, which, argued the Chinese Department of Zhongshan University, "is both simpler and more common."[198] The committee complied and authorised 奁 together with 区 and 欧 in February 1956, depriving the toilet case of its original 僉 phonetic as well as its acquired semantic component 品.

<center>練 練 练 *liàn* practise
煉 炼 炼 鍊 鍊 *liàn* smelt</center>

See 柬 *jiǎn*.

<center>戀 恋 *liàn* love</center>

恋 became official in Japan and China analogously to 変 and 变 for 變 *biàn*.

---

198   Zhongguo zuojia xiehui 1955. Pan 1955.

<h1 style="text-align:center">糧 粮 liáng grain</h1>

Both the above forms have traditions. On the Warring States wood slips from Jiudian 'grain' is written 糧 with the 量 *liáng* phonetic, and Gāo Jǐngchéng refers to a 粮 with 良 *liáng* in a pre-Qin *Mò zǐ* manuscript. On Han stone steles and wood slips we find both forms. The shorter 粮 was called "erroneous" in the Tang *Wǔjīng wénzì* and Ming *Súshū kānwù* but "the same as 糧" in the Song *Guǎngyùn* and Qing *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*. With moral support from the latter, the Script Reform Committee shortened 糧 to 粮 in 1956.

The reformer Chén Guāngyáo admitted that "there is also a short form written 籵." This analogy to the older 姏 for 娘 *niáng* was first registered by Liú Fù in the early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì*. 籵 never outcompeted 粮, however, appearing only in one of our 1900–1954 manuscripts compared with 娘 in nineteen. The form nevertheless proved resilient. In 1962 Chóng Wén cautioned *Guāngmíng rìbào* readers: "There are also those who write 粮食 [*liángshi* grain] as 籵仐. This is wrong and should be stopped." Nevertheless, in 1977 use of 籵 was reported to the committee by correspondents in Mengcheng in Anhui, Sihong in Jiangsu, Yunyang in Sichuan and Wuyang and Changyuan in Henan. Our latest record of this form is a dispatch note of a parcel sent on 16 May 2002 by an employee of 保力籵库 (Baoli Grain Depot) in Liaoning.

<h1 style="text-align:center">兩 兩 两 両 liǎng two, 50g</h1>

The Japanese Language Council simplified 兩 to 両 and the Script Reform Committee of China to 两.

兩 is the older form, known from a poem inscribed in Língyán temple in 1080. Dodging 丨 was rational, but why change 入入 to 人人? In fact this was no change. 兩 had been written with 人人 ever since the Han. Umehara Seizan registered fourteen 兩 with 人 in Tang inscriptions but no 兩 with 入. This habit was challenged by the Yu an *Zìjiàn*: "The centre consists of two 入. The informal 兩 with two 人 is erroneous." Erroneous because *Shuōwén* said 兩 "consists of 一 and 网." Some but far from all writers complied. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* registers fifteen Qing 兩 with 入 but, still, twenty-seven 兩 with 人. In fact 人 writers need not feel inferior. Etymologists disagree whether 人/入 are objects on a balance or yokes on a chariot. In neither case dooes 人/入 represent 'enter'.

両 was found by Liú Fù in Ming blockprints and by Shibata Masao in the 1505 letter writing guide *Unshū ōrai*. 両 is a contraction of 雨, a short form known since the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts. 両 caught on in Japan, outnumbering 兩 forty-one to one in our 1900–1946 manuscripts, and was

included in the failing 1923, 1926, 1938 and 1942 reform schemes and in the decisive 1946 scheme.

In China 兩 held out, appearing in twenty-eight of our 1900–1934 manuscripts against 両 in ten and 刄 in five. The *Tàibái* editors nevertheless opted for the shorter 両 in their 1935 "handy characters", like the Script Reform Committee in its 1955 Draft. The 1956 switch to 两 was explained by Chén Guāngyáo: "両 is also established by custom, but is not so similar to the original character as 两."

The above-mentioned 刄 appears in the 1862–1874 blockprint *Lǐngnán yìshǐ* and on the 1906 invoice quoted in the *dān* section above. In Ming blockprints Liú Fù found the still shorter 刃, and in our 1864 account book we read that 常宅久艮圭刄一�riv卜 (常宅欠銀壹兩一錢六分 the Cháng household owes one liang one qian and six fen in silver) and 郭頭久艮三刄 (郭頭欠銀十三兩 Old Guō owes 13 liang in silver).[199] 刄 is a contraction of the cursive �58, which in turn is based on 雨, a variant of the Han short form 雨. The second stroke in 刄 may have been added to distinguish it from 刃 (*rěn* blade).

Even these have been on the reformers' table. In 1935 the Education Ministry announced its rejection of "symbols used only in account books and pharmacies, like 刀 for 初, 丿 for 月, 刄 for 兩, 丨 for 斤 and 卜 for 分." In 1955 Dǒng Jiànshēn pointed out in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that 兩 had "already been simplified rather thoroughly by the people" to 刄, so those "who have been using simpler forms will of course not take up forms which are harder to write."

For years many did not. In 1981 and 1982 this author noticed the grain measure 刃 in restaurants and shops in Shenyang and Dalian in Liaoning, Yanzhou in southern Shandong, Nanjing, Huaiyin and Changzhou in Jiangsu, Hefei and Bengbu in Anhui and Hangzhou, Huzhou, Ningbo and Wenzhou in Zhejiang; and 刄 in Chengdu in Sichuan, Chenzhou in Hunan, Shaoguan in Guangdong, Nanchang in Jiangxi, Zhengzhou and Luoyang in Henan, Taiyuan in Shanxi, Jinan and Qingdao in Shandong and in Tianjin.

刄 records are confined to the separate areas of East China and the Northeast. Interviews with informants confirm this distribution.[200] The puzzling distribution of 刄 to two extreme ends of the country becomes less

---

199   Beijing Archives 106-1-1.
200   刃 identified as 兩 in Qiqihar, Yichun, Changchun, Tonghua, Shenyang, Anshan, Shanhaiguan, Tianjin, Yanzhou, Huaibei, Sùzhou, Bengbu, Xuzhou, Lianyungang, Huaiyin, Nanjing, Zhenjiang, Wuxi and Ningbo, 刄 in Chengdu, Nanning, Yulin, Zhaoqing, Chaling, Ganzhou, Ji'an, Ruijin, Nanchang, Wuhan, Xinyang, Luoyang, Xingtai, Beijing, Baotou and Dalian.

so if we presume, as records indicate, that 刃 is an older form which has remained in these two outskirts.

As flour and rice rationing ceased, there was less need to write 'ounce' on every price tag and so less need for a short form. Our youngest informant to identify 刃 was a teacher from Shanghai born in 1972, and 刃 a man from Guangzhou born in 1981.

輛 辆 輌 *liàng* number of vehicles

輛 has been shortened analogously to 兩 to 辆, 輌 and unofficially to 轫 and 轫. The distribution of the latter two corresponds to that of 刃 and 刃 above. In 1982 and 1988 this writer saw signs banning 车轫 (vehicles) in Taiyuan in Shanxi and Yanzhou in Shandong, 车轫 in Yixing in Jiangsu and Huzhou, Hangzhou, Zhuji and Qingtian in Zhejiang. As late as in 2001 Yoshida Yoshio saw a sign instructing 外来车靭 (vehicles from outside) to halt at a Hangzhou gate.

Some inventive writer found a way to shorten the right side even further. In 1981 a sign at the railway station in Quanzhou in Fujian indicated where to take 车轧, in 1988 a petrol station in Haifeng in Guangdong offered 车轧 托管 (*chēliàng tuōguǎn* vehicle parking and safekeeping). The logic is simple: 二 means 'two' and so fills in for 兩. Simple or not, 轧 was rarely seen and rarely recognised by informants.

量 *昂 *liàng* quantity *liáng* measure

In 1957 the Script Reform Committee member Wèi Jiàngōng observed that

> at the the People's Political Consultative Conference in April this year, the phrase 力刃 appeared in delegate Zhào Pǔchū's speech. I thought he was quoting Buddhist texts and saw no mistake. It was only when I looked at the context that I saw it was an error for 力量. Perhaps the writer replaced 量 with the homophone 兩, which in the manuscript may have been written with the cursive form 刃, which the typographer and proofreader then took for 刃.

Would one really take 刃 for 刃? More plausibly the Anhui-born and Shanghai-based Zhào used the above-mentioned eastern form 刃, which a Beijing typographer was bound to take for 刃.

This hypothesis fits our records. Use of 刃 for 量 was mentioned in 1962 by teachers Zhāng Yǒngmián from Zhejiang and Wáng Yún from Ningbo and in 1975 and 1976 in letters to the committee from Shaoxing and Huzhou. In 1982 this writer saw a 大刃招工 (*dàliàng zhāogōng* large-scale recruitment of

workers) notice in Wenzhou. These records are from Zhejiang, where 刃 was already in use for 兩. A 2012 a note in a Chinese supermarket in Stockholm offered for sale a restaurant near which 有大刃办公大楼 (there are many office buildings [providing lunch customers]). Unsurprising if one bears in mind that Chinese restaurateurs in this city tend to hail from Qingtian or Wenzhou in Zhejiang.

There has existed a more distinct and more widespread short form. In 1948 the communist Administrative Office of Henan, Anhui and Jiangsu warned that the enemy was about to 大夛发行蒋币 (issue large amounts of Chiang Kai-shek currency) before a planned currency reform.[201] In 1958 Huáng Míngyuǎn from Zhengzhou saw 夛 with 力 *lì* for 里 *lǐ* in his students' works, and his colleague Zhang Ēnjìng from nearby Handan confessed to having written 夛 for 量 in teaching materials. And so on.

The committee selected 夛 for its 1962 and 1977 reform schemes. Nineteen respondents (out of six thousand), presumably from the above-mentioned areas, suggested a change to 刃 instead.[202] This did not move the committee, whose 1981 Revised Draft retained the "extremely common" 夛.

遼 辽 *liáo* distant

Implausibly, the 尞 *liáo* phonetic is a short form. 尞 is the original form of 燎 (*liáo* burn), consisting of sparks (丷) emerging from firewood (木) over a bonfire (火) and an unidentified object (日) added in the Zhou. The firewood was first reduced to 大 in a 燎 on the 165 CE Xīyuèhuáshān Temple stele and the fire to 小 in a 燎 on the the 179 Xiū Huáyuè stele.

The 1955 Draft offered further reduction of 遼 to 辽 with the phonetic 了 *liǎo*. Records of this form were recent. Jīn Míngshèng called 辽 a "liberation character, which means a short form created by the masses during the struggle for liberation." The Script Reform Committee member Yè Gōngchuò wrote in *Zhōngguó yǔwén* that 辽 "is in use in the Northeast," where it of course was needed to write 辽宁省 (Liaoning Province). Chén Guāngyáo held that 辽 "is now already very common in the north." But not in the whole north: Zhào Tàimóu of Shandong University mentioned 辽 among "hitherto unseen or newly created short forms." The committee trod carefully and recognised 辽 only with the second, June 1956 batch of simplified characters.

---

201 *Anhui geming shi huace*, p. 236.
202 *Qunzhong dui 'Cao'an'*, [1978], p. 3.

<div align="center">療 疗 *liáo* cure</div>

When the 1955 Draft proposed 疗, Professor Yuè Sìbǐng pointed out in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Older persons find 艺, 疗, 床, 态 and 卫 unfamiliar." At the October script reform conference Yè Gōngchuò countered that 疗 "is current in hospitals [...] but may be unfamiliar to ordinary people." This is plausible: we know 疗 from a 1953 plan for a 医疗门诊部 (medicare clinic) in Nanjing, but not from elsewhere.[203] This unfamiliarity delayed the recognition of 疗 until June 1956.

<div align="center">僚 *仃 *liáo* bureaucrat</div>
<div align="center">寮 *宁 *liáo* hut</div>
<div align="center">撩 *扔 *liáo*</div>
<div align="center">燎 *灯 *liáo liǎo* burn</div>
<div align="center">潦 *汀 *liǎo* careless</div>
<div align="center">镣 *钉 *liào* fetters</div>

The reformer Yì Xīwú wrote that the 1955 Draft "has created many new forms, like 疗, 汀, 扔, 仃, 钉 [...]." Newness may explain why the latter four were withdrawn from the decisive 1956 Scheme.

Writers picked up the new forms, however. In 1958 Zhōu Qǐfèng reported that his students wrote 仃 for 僚, analogously to the by then official 辽 and 疗. Two years later correspondents from Baotou in the north to Guangzhou in the south reported use of 扔, 宁 and 仃 to the Script Reform Committee. In 1965 one Fán Dīng wrote that 汀 was "often seen" for 潦.

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed 扔, 宁, 仃 and 灯, and 了 for 潦. The also abortive 1981 Revised Draft added 汀 for 潦.

<div align="center">瞭 了 *盯 *liǎo* understand *liào* watch</div>

Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn records of 了 for 瞭 start with 其所易了 (it is easy to understand) in Guō Pú's (276–324) preface to *Ěryǎ* (Guide to proper Usage). The 1955 Draft ignored this tradition and simplified 瞭 to 盯 analogously to 辽 and 疗.

Criticism of the invented 盯 abounded. Yì Xīwú complained that the committee had "thrown away 了然 and 了解 and created the new 盯然 and 盯解." The proofreader Zhào Xī wrote in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "Some characters have been simplified but not enough. It is for example [...] better to simplify 瞭 to 了 than to 盯." Wáng Shìxiāng argued in the same journal:

---

203   Nanjing Archives 5065-2-525, p. 11.

瞭 and 了 have long been used interchangeably in words like ㄌㄧㄠˇ然 [*liǎorán* understand], ㄌㄧㄠˇ解 [understand] and 明ㄌㄧㄠˇ [understand]. However, 瞭 can also be used alone and in the word 瞭望 [*liàowàng* look from afar] where the reading is different. I think we should prescribe 了 in words like ㄌㄧㄠˇ然, ㄌㄧㄠˇ解 and 明ㄌㄧㄠˇ and use 瞭 only when alone and in the word 瞭望.

So the committee simplified all 瞭 to 了 in February 1956. Some found this too rash. Qiū Chángnù asked: "How can one write 瞭望 as 了望? It is better to simplify to 盯." Hǎo Wàngsān: "Simplifying 瞭 to 了 is of course no problem in 了解, which is established by custom, but for 瞭望 it is much better to write 盯望 than 了望."

The committee had already burnt its fingers on 盯, however, and proposed instead in 1957 to restore 瞭 in 瞭望.[204] That restoration was belatedly implemented in the 1986 revision.

廖 *彣 *庁 Liào

In 1935 the Jiangxi teacher Ōuyáng Zhēn suggested shortening 廖 to 广, "but 廖 is also written 彡 or 彣." While records of 广 and 彡 for 廖 cease, 彣 reappears in a 1960 letter to the Script Reform Committee from an anti-illiteracy cadre in Longnan in Jiangxi, signed 彣新兴 (Liào Xīnxīng). That year letters from Gaozhou and Shaoguan in Guangdong and Xichang in Sichuan also reported use of 庁 with the phonetic 了. In 1964 the postman Lù Zhìwéi complained in *Běijīng rìbào* of people writing 廖 so-and-so as 庁 so-and-so. The committee included this 庁 in its 1977 Second Scheme. Correspondents pointed out that 庁 was bound to be mixed up with 疗, effectively barring 庁 from the 1981 Revised Draft.[205]

獵 猟 猎 liè hunt

Unlike Chinese 猎, the Japanese 猟 is explicable as a descendant of the 獵 in the 483 Huān Pǔxián sutra, the 獵 on the 855 Zen Master Dìnghuì stele and the 獵 in the 1702 manual *Teikin ōrai* (Home-taught Letter Writing). The now official 猟 appears in a 1915 police report on illegal transportation of 猟犬 (*ryōken* hunting dogs).[206]

Our Chinese manuscripts hold no 猟 or 獵. Instead the 1955 Draft proposed 猎 analogously to 腊 and 蜡. Reactions varied. Yì Xīwú of the disbanded

---

204   Cao 1957, p. 39.
205   *Qunzhong dui "Cao'an"*, p. 11.
206   Shibata 1996, p. 319. National Archives 1915.11.25, p. 4.

Committee for Research on Script Reform called 猎 "newly created" and Zhào Tàimóu of Shandong University "hitherto unseen". Qiū Chángnù of Northeast Normal University in Changchun urged in *Guāngmíng rìbào* for the cancellation of this "very rarely seen" form, but was contradicted by the Zhejiang teacher Yú Chuánxián, who asserted that 猎 "is in fact very often seen, I cannot understand why Mr Qiū says it is rarely seen." The reformer Chén Guāngyáo maintained that 猎 "is established by custom, even the title page of [the 1954 translation of Turgenev's] *A Hunter's Diary* is written 猎人日記."

So 猎 was known by some but not all. This may explain why this form was authorised only in 1958.

臨 嗚 临 *lín* oversee

刂 or 刂 for 臣 is analogous to Jin 堅 for 堅. 口 appears in blockprints as 丶 and 皿 as 田 from the Song onwards.

The 1955 Draft shortened 臨 to 嗚. Xú Yīhuī objected in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that "the form used at present is 临." The Script Reform Committee did not mind further cuts and made 临 with 田 official in June 1956 with its Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters, changing this to 临 with 刂 for 刂 in its 1964 General List.

鄰 邻 皿 *丛 *lín* neighbouring

The Song epigrapher Hóng Kuò found 皿 for 鄰 on the now lost Eastern Han Sūn Gēn and Héng Lì steles. Analogously *Hànshū* said 東丛虐而殲仁兮 (the eastern neighbour harassed and destroyed Rén) with 厶 for 口. After that records cease. The *Hànshū* commentator Yán Shīgǔ found it necessary to explain to his Tang readers that "丛 is an ancient form for 鄰".

It took writers a thousand years to produce another short form, a 邻 with the 令 *lìng* phonetic first reported by Chén Guāngyáo in 1931. Three years later Xú Zémǐn noticed that his Nanjing students wrote 邻 for 鄰 when hurried. This relatively new form was bypassed by the 1955 Draft but included in the 1956 Scheme. Comments explain the delay. Zhào Tàimóu from Shandong University complained that 邻 was "unphonetic" and "based on dialect pronunciation", more exactly on the dialects of East China including Nanjing, where *lin* and *ling* merge to *lin*. In the event 邻 became official in 1958.

磷 砱 *lín* phosphorus

After 邻 had become official, records turn up of an analogous 砱 for 磷, first in a 1960 letter to the Script Reform Committee from Chao'an in Guangdong. 砱 was included in the 1977 Second Scheme and faced the same kind of criticism as 邻. Shanxi Education Bureau complained: "The representation of sound in the new picto-phonetic characters is not exact enough. For example, the phonetic in the character 磷 has the front nasal *-in,* while the simplified phonetic 令 is read with the back nasal *-ing.* This will make it harder to teach the standard language in dialect areas." Like in Shanxi itself, where 磷 tends to be read *ling.* This and similar objections from authorities in Jiangsu, Fujian, Heilongjiang and Shanghai got 砱 removed from the 1981 Revised Draft.

零 *另 *líng* zero, fractional

零 has two shorter near-homonyms, 另 (*lìng* another) and 令 (*lìng* order). Both have been used as short forms. In his 1936 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo* Chén Guāngyáo wrote that "零 is shortened 𗊥 [in this book], and not in the habitual way which is to use 另". The catalogue of Beijing Archives contains twelve pre-1949 另件 among one hundred and eighty-five 零件 (*língjiàn* spare parts).

The catalogue contains no 令件. This practice was first reported in 1960 by a Beijing teacher: "It is very common to write 令 for 零. The 零 in 零售商店 (*língshòu shāngdiàn* retail shop) is almost always written 令. Although this is a new character, we have already got used to it, and it can be adopted as an official short form."[207]

For its abortive 1962 scheme, however, the Script Reform Committee chose 另, which "is already very common in society. In practice it has caused no misunderstandings." Not entirely convinced, the committee excluded 另 from its 1977 Second Scheme.

This did not exclude it from use. A 2017 web search yielded one hundred and twenty-six 另件, neck and neck with one hundred and twenty-four 令件.

齡 龄 *令 *líng* age

In 1950 Huáng Ruòzhōu wrote that 令 was in common use for 齡. The 1955 Draft more modestly simplified 齡 to 龄 analogously to 齿. The Chinese Writers' Association suggested simplifying "more bravely" to 令. That idea was brought up again in the 1977 Second Scheme. Zhejiang Education Bureau

---

207 "Hanzi jianhua zuotan hui jiyao (er)".

pointed out that this would mix up 军令 (military orders) with 军龄 (service years). Quoting this, the committee abandoned the change.[208]

An alternative existed, although a rare one. In 1960 and 1977 letters from Sihong and Huaiyin in northern Jiangsu and Mengcheng in northern Anhui informed the committee that locals wrote 龄 as 舲, with 白 (white) for 齿 (teeth). These records are conspicuously close. 1981–1986 interviews confirmed that 舲 was known just in northernmost Anhui and Jiangsu.[209]

靈 霊 灵 *líng* clever, spirit

霝 was read like 靈 *líng* and meant 'dripping rain', as one might expect from a character made up of 雨 (rain) and 吅 (drops) but came to be used for 'spirit', as in the phrase 神得一以霝 (the gods attain harmony through spirituality) in the early Han Lǎo zǐ B manuscript from Mawangdui. For clarity, later Han scribes added 巫 (sorcery), which they more often than not contracted to 王, 亚, 𤣩 or 土.

The 1008 *Guǎngyùn* had a 灵 entry with the reading 郎丁切 (*líng*) and sense of 'small hot surface', aptly designed by 'hand' and 'fire'. But how often does one write 'small hot surface'? Never, judging by *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*, which gave no text examples of 灵 in this sense. So Yuan blockprinters put the unemployed 灵 to use for the burdensome 靈. This practice continued and became official in China in 1956.

Not so in Japan, where records cease with a 灵 recorded by Yamada Tadao in a sixteenth-century edition of *Wa-Kan rōeishū shichū*. In 1946 the Japanese Language Council instead adopted 霊 with 一 for 吅 and 亚 for 巫, a form appearing as 霊 in the calligraphy of Suǒ Jìng (230–303) and later used by the 627–649 emperor Tàizōng. The latter promotion may have contributed to its popularity just as writing spread to Japan, where we find 霊 in seven of the 668–816 inscriptions catalogued by Kitagawa Hirokuni, compared with 霛 in one, 靈 in one and 靈 in none.

嶺 岺 岭 *lǐng* mountain range

At first 'mountain range' was written without the 山 top, as in the biography of Huò Zhí in the Han *Shǐjì*: 領南沙北固往往出鹽 (salt has been produced from

---

208   Zhongguo zuojia xiehui 1955. "'Cao'an' di yi biao xiuding qingkuang".
209   舲 identified as 龄 in Fuyang, Sùzhōu and Bengbu in northern Anhui and in Xuzhou, Lianyungang, Huaiyin and Yancheng in northern Jiangsu and in Yanzhou in southern Shandong. Not recognised in surrounding Linyi, Qingdao, Zibo, Jinan, Dezhou, Xingtai, Zhengzhou, Shangqiu, Xinyang, Hefei, Ma'anshan, Nanjing, Yangzhou and Wuxi,

the mountains in the south to the deserts in the north). 嶺 with 山 appears in the Jin calligraphy of Wáng Xīzhī. As late as in 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* said 嶺 "is also commonly written 領."

A shorter character close in sense and reading appeared in the 郎丁切 (*líng*) section of the 1039 *Jíyùn*: "岭: deep mountains. This character is also written 岑." This 岭 was uncommon, with no text examples in *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn*. In 1803 Matsumoto Guzan, a student of Chinese texts, identified 岑 / 岭 with 嶺: "嶺 is informally written 岑." In 1931 Chinese use of 岭 for 嶺 was promoted in Chén Guāngyáo's *Jiǎnzì lùnjí*.

Which of the above-mentioned forms were in use for 嶺 at the time of the reform? We can confirm only 岑, from a 1952 survey of labourers, middle peasants and landlords in Silingxiang in Hubei, which repeatedly called that village 皿岑鄉, occasionally 皿嶺鄉 but never 皿領鄉 or 皿岭鄉.[210]

The 1955 Draft passed 嶺 over, but the 1956 Scheme stipulated a change to 岭. Chén Guāngyáo, the 1931 promoter of that form, as late as in 1956 called 岭 "a new picto-phonetic character [...]. The 山 component is moved to the left side [...]. This is not only easier to write, but also avoids confusion with 岑 [*cén* hillock]." We take it that 岭 was a break with habit. That may explain why its official status was delayed until 1958.

畄 畱 留 畱 *畱 *甾 *liú* remain

Variation is old. Zhou 畱 became Han 畱, 畱 and 畄. The Han Xīpíng Stone Classics, Wei Zhèngshǐ Stone Classics and Tang *Yùpiān* advocated the latter. This defied *Shuōwén*, which prescribed 畱 with 丣, a variant of 卯 *mǎo*. Ambitious writers attempted to adapt the *Shuōwén* form to square style. On steles we find 畱 with 夗 from 534, 畱 with 夘 from 594, 畱 with 卯 from 623 and 畱 with 丣 from 630.[211] Dictionaries joined in, the Tang *Gānlù zìshū* and Song *Guǎngyùn* recommending 留 with 卯, the Liao *Lóngkān shǒujìng* 畱 with 夗, the Ming *Zìkǎo* 畱 with 亞 and the Qing *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* 畱 with 丣. *Zìkǎo* stressed that "畱 is written with 亞. 留 is wrong. Today the latter is used in [new editions of] classics and histories. There is no need to abide by that." As late as in 1948 *Xīn zìdiǎn* held 畱 for correct and 留 for informal.

While the ambitious restored the top according to Xǔ Shèn's directions, the easygoing shortened it. In the Jin calligraphy of Wáng Xīzhī 甾 and in Yuan blockprints 畱. Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain twenty-five 甾 and four 畱.

----

210   Hubei Archives SZ3-1-233.
211   534 Magistrate Zhang epitaph. 594 Zen Master Xinxing stele. 623 Ku Di epitaph. 630 Zhaoren Temple stele.

The Education Ministry chose 峃 for its abortive 1935 List of Short Forms. The Script Reform Committee passed 留 over in 1956 but proposed 峃 in its soon discarded 1977 Second Scheme.

峃 was proposed for official use by the Interim Committee on the Japanese Language in 1923 and 1926 and for optional use by the Language Council in 1938 and 1942, but was rejected in the decisive 1946 scheme. Not everybody was satisfied. In 1962 Fujikawa Sukezō wrote in *Kokugo Seikatsu*: "營, 榮, 單, 獸, 譽, 擧, 覺, 學 and 櫻 have already been simplified to 営, 栄, 単, 獣, 誉, 挙, 覚, 学 and 桜, so there would be no harm in also simplifying 留 to 峃." The following year Language Council chairman Abe Shinnosuke reported to the Education Ministry that "we need to consider the adoption of suitable short forms used to some extent in society today but not included in the List of Forms [...] like [...] 峃(留), 才(第), 筼 (簿), 耺 (職) [...]."

<h2 style="text-align:center">劉 刘 Liú</h2>

Analogously to 留, 劉 became 劉, 劉, 劉, and 劉. Yuan blockprinters turned the latter into 刘, keeping the initial 丶, contracting 〵 to 一, turning 𠆢 into 乂 and shedding the rest of 金. The resulting 刘 became official in 1956.

<div style="text-align:center">

*龏 龍 竜 龙 lóng dragon
*瀧 瀧 滝 泷 lóng waterfall
籠 篭 笼 lǒng basket

</div>

The 卜 on top right of 龍 is a novelty, absent in the 龏 and 龏 on Han bronzes, 龏 on Han seals, 龍 in early Han silk manuscripts, 龍 and 龍 on Western Han wood slips and 龍 and 龍 on Eastern Han stone steles. The top 卜 can be traced back to *Shuōwén*'s 龏. Only after that dictionary do we find an inscription with an enlarged 龍, on the 173 CE Lǔ Jùn stele. This did not make enlarged forms standard. The 175 CE Xīpíng Stone Classics advocated 龍, the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* and Tang *Yùpiān* 龍. It was the Tang *Gānlù zìshū* which first prescribed the *Shuōwén*-like 龍 with 卜 and so set the later standard.

Why did Xǔ Shèn defy practice in his *Shuōwén*? Perhaps to adapt to the etymology he concocted, explaining 立 as a shortened phonetic 童 *tóng*, 月 as 'flesh' and 𣄼 as a distorted 飛 (fly). True, the right side of 龏 did resemble the right side of 𣄼 (飛), but it would resemble it even more if it had a 卜 top. So Xǔ added one. We now know this etymology to be false. Xǔ had not seen Yin bone forms like 龏, which reveal that the character is simply a drawing of a dragon.

The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform

Society's 1950 List of Common Short Forms proposed 尨, a form known since the 586 Lóngcáng Temple stele and appearing twice in our 1900–1954 manuscripts alongside eight 龍, seven 龒 and two 龍. The 1955 Draft changed this to 龙. Chén Guāngyáo explained: "尨 is identical with the 尨 [*máng*] which means 'hairy dog'. Further it is not so easy to write, so the character was shortened to 龙." Official recognition of 龙 was delayed until June 1956.

This novelty needed promotion. Fù Cháoyáng instructed *Guāngmíng rìbào* readers that a correct 龙 "has one left-falling stroke at bottom right, not three." In 1962 Wáng Yún of Ningbo Cadre Literacy School complained of students writing 尨虎 for 龙虎 (dragons and tigers) in their compositions (on what subject, one wonders). In 1985 Chén Qìngwǔ complained that the use of mistaken characters like 尨 for 龙 had recently "reached a shocking level". With that, however, complaints cease.

The now official Japanese 竜 consists of the beginning and the end of 龍. Forebears like 竜 appear on the 562 Yì cíhuì pillar and 竜 in the 597 Lady Dǒng epitaph, and then disappear from use but not from memory: the 1039 *Jíyùn* registered that "龍 was previously written 竜." 竜 was later revived by Yuan blockprinters, who may have seen it in *Jíyùn*. Then 竜 again disappeared. The 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* and called it "ancient". In our 1900–1954 Chinese manucripts 竜 is absent.

In Japan, however, 竜 lived on, appearing in five of our 1900-1946 manuscripts compared with 龍 in two and 龙 in none. The Interim Committee on the Japanese Language proposed in 1923 and 1926 to permit 竜 and 滝, as did the Language Council in 1938 and 1942. When short forms were finally implemented in 1946, 滝 was accepted among the 1850 Characters for Current Use but not 竜, as the new orthography was to use katakana, not characters, for animals, dragons counting as such. As we saw in Chapter 2, however, the newspapers decided to adopt 竜 from April 1954, animal or not. This made 竜 so common in print that the form was accepted as a Character for Common Use in 1981.

<div align="center">

婁 婁 娄 *Lóu*
樓 樓 楼 *柚 lóu* storey
數 數 数 *籹 *畂 shù* number

</div>

We find 楼 with 娄, a contraction of the 婁 variant, from the 646 Jìn Cí inscription onwards. Friends of order came to disapprove. The 1610 *Súshū kānwù* insisted: "樓 is informally written 楼. This is wrong." The 1617 *Zìkǎo*: "婁 is the same as 婁. 娄 is wrong." Nevertheless the Japanese Language Council simplified 樓 to 楼 and 數 to 数 in 1946, followed by the Script Reform Committee of China in 1956.

By then even shorter forms had come into in use. In addition to forty-four 数, our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts contain seven 籹, two 籹, eleven 㪇, two 㪇, two 叔 and two 畝.

We trace the 女-less 籹 back to 1333, when a Japanese contract established that provisions of carp should not depend on 人籹増減 (*ninzū no zōgen* variations in the number of people). A more distinct 籹 appears in a 1797 tourist guidebook estimating the 日籹 (*nissū* number of days) needed for a visit to Ise Temple.[212] In China we find 籹 on a 1904 customs receipt for duty on goods 其籹在五両以上 (of a quantity exceeding five liang).[213] Is it an accident that our first Chinese record of 籹 is from the customs office, a body in frequent contact with Japan?

Unlike 数 and 籹, 畝 is based on the new, *Shuōwén*-based norm 數, which in part explains its late appearance. An August 1953 letter from Hú Shì says certain new book editions 大畝不殊 (in most cases do not differ) from earlier ones. After the reform 畝 gained popularity. In 1958 Jì Dá wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that "it is better to simplify 數 to 畝". Wáng Yún of Ningbo Cadre Literacy School reported: "One student wrote the character 畝. I wanted him to change it to 数, but he said: 'The maths teacher always writes like this on the blackboard!'"

The committee made an attempt to endorse 畝 in List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme. Education authorities in Hebei, Jiangsu and Jiangxi objected that a second change would bewilder learners. The committee saw the point and excluded 畝 from its 1981 Revised Draft.

By then an analogy to 畝 had turned up. In 1965 Zhāng Sānwèi and fellow army teachers wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào* of "the 第X柚 (第X楼) signs hanging on buildings". After that 柚 was reported to the committee in letters from Taihe and Mengcheng in Anhui. In 1981 and 1982 this author saw 柚 in Beijing, Sùzhou in Anhui, Yanzhou in Shandong, Xinyang in Henan and Taiyuan and Changzhi in Shanxi.

In 1982 an informant wrote 柚 in his address. A bystander from Guilin protested. This prompted our usual geographical survey, which revealed that 柚 was identified as 楼 by informants in the north as far south as Xi'an, Xinyang, Hefei and Nanjing, but not in Chengdu, Chongqing, Wuhan, Huzhou, Shanghai and places further south.

Why would southerners reject such a practical character, if they had accepted the analogous 畝? Because, as many pointed out, 柚 was the *yòu* in *yòuzi*, a citrus fruit growing only in the south.

---

212 *Enshu komonjo sen: Shoen hen*, item 75. *Ise sangu meisho zue*, vol. 5下, p. 71.
213 *Zokusho seika*, p. 10. *Shina keizai zensho*, vol. 3, unnumbered page after p. 314.

This may explain why 柚 found no takers Sichuan and Zhejiang. But why did not 柚 come into use for 楼 in Hubei, where *yòuzi* reportedly do not grow? Because Hubei writers had invented a still shorter form. In 1960 Biàn Huá from the Minzu Road Red and Expert School in Wuhan notified the committee that 楼 was shortened 杕, followed by correspondents from Lichuan in Hubei and Yunyang in Eastern Sichuan. In 1981–1986 杕 was identified as 楼 by informants in five places in Hubei and in some places in neighbouring Hunan, Sichuan and Henan. To Hubei readers the sense of 杕 was obvious:

	Beijing	Wuhan, Hubei	Changsha, Hunan	Chengdu, Sichuan
楼	*lou* 35	*nou* 312	*nɤu* 41	*nəu* 31
六	*liou* 51	*nou* 312	*nou* 24	*nu* 44

The form has now disappeared from sight. Our youngest informant to recognise 杕 was a native of Wuhan born in 1971.

<div align="center">

爐 炉 *lú* stove
廬 庐 *lú* hut cottage
蘆 芦 *lú* reed
盧 卢 *Lú*
瀘 泸 *Lú* Lu River
驢 驴 *lú* donkey

</div>

Tang and Song writers wrote 廬 for 盧. Quitting after the fourth stroke left 严 then 戸 then 户, the component appearing in the 炉, 庐 and 驴 seen in blockprints from the Song onwards.

The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms proposed to allow 炉, 庐, 芦 and 驴, a proposal repeated in the 1955 Draft, with the addition of 卢 and 泸. Liú Nǎizhōng and Wú Jìng objected to splitting the 盧 component into 户 and 卢, the former suggesting 卢 in all cases, the latter 户. Cáo Bóhán defended the committee:

> The principle of analogy and the principle of custom […] have both been applied, although this has created contradictions. For example, in order to distinguish 濾 and 滬 we decided to simplify 濾 to 泸 and 滬 to 沪. Other characters with 盧 have not been simplified analogously to 卢 but are written according to custom with 户.

In 1956 Chén defended 卢 as "a character established by custom, very

common in Hunan and other provinces." Common? Hmm. Jīn Míngshèng criticised "characters simply made up by the Script Reform Committee, like 仓, 卢 […]." Zhào Tàimóu of Shandong University mentioned 卢 among characters "hitherto unseen or newly created short forms". The Sichuan middle school teacher Yǐn Bīnyōng wrote: "If a simplified character is already very common (like 战, 联 or 学), I write the simplified form straight away, but if it may still be unfamiliar to the students (like 灭, 书, 卢 or 无), I write the simplified form but add the complex form below". Our only pre-1955 record of 卢 is Chén Guāngyáo's 1936 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo*. Is he not the inventor of the character, and the one who brought it into the 1955 Draft?

泸 was recognised it as new even by reformers. The committee member Wèi Jiàngōng wrote: "The Draft has used this technique [of preserving the frame] to create some characters, like 倉仓, 尋寻 and 濾泸."

This debate explains why 炉, 庐, 芦, 卢, 泸 and 驴 were not adopted until 1959.

A 1496 edition of the Japanese dictionary *Setsuyōshū* says "火爐 [fireplace] is also written 地炉." In 1946 炉 became the official Japanese form.

鹵 滷 卤 *lǔ* halogen, stew

The 1955 Draft passed 鹵 over. Zēng Zhāolún then proposed in *Guāngmíng rìbào* to "remove the four points and simplify to 卤." The committee complied and sanctioned 卤 in 1958. Chén Guāngyáo described 卤 as a "newly coined short form". Or at least recently coined, as we find 硝䃳 (硝滷 *xiāolǔ* halogen nitrate) in a list of products taxed by Guangdong Tax Office in 1950.[214]

虜 虏 *lǔ* captive
慮 虑 *lǜ* ponder

The 1955 Draft shortened 虜 and 慮 to 虏 and 虑 respectively, shedding the cauldron in the centre and imitating the cursive 𠂇 (虍) top, which in turn was a contraction of the Han clerk style form 彑. The decisive 1956 Scheme imposed 虏 and 虑, closer to the traditional forms but still described as "newly coined" by Chén Guāngyáo, "new simplified characters" by Zhāng Zhōu and "characters simplified too far from former tradition" by Zhōu Zǔmó. Unsurprisingly, recognition of 虑 was delayed until June 1956 and of 虏 until 1958.

---

214   Guangdong Archives 295-1-7-160, p. 1.

陸 陆 *lù* land *liù* six

Chén Guāngyáo described 陆 as "a character transformed from cursive to square form, originating from 阥." Our records of this begin with an 1860 account book notice that 慶誠花店存錢陆拾 (Qìng Chénghuá's shop deposits an amount of sixty qian) and peak with 陆's appearance in the 1956 Scheme.[215]

錄 錄 录 *lù* to record
祿 祿 *lù* prosperity
綠 綠 *lǜ* green

The 录 phonetic on the right has been put to different uses. Liú Fù registered it for 綠 and 祿 in Yuan and Qing blockprints, as did Huáng Ruòzhōu in the 1950 streets of Shanghai. In 1934 Xú Zémǐn in turn observed 彔 for 錄 in the notes of his Nanjing students.

The 1955 reformers chose to employ 录 in the latter sense. Chén Guāngyáo argued that *Shuōwén* gave 录 the sense of 'carve wood', identifying it with 錄 (to record). The official change to 录 was nevertheless delayed until June 1956.

Chinese and Japanese reformers both discarded *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*'s 彐 tops for the handier 彐. The latter is not a shortened 彐. Clerk and square style records begin with an early Han 祿 (祿) with 王 from Mawangdui and continue with 王 and 彐 tops. The first 彐-like form in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* is a 錄 on the 1608 Mèng zǐ Temple stele in Zouxian. The idea may have come from the Yuan *Zìjiàn*: "*Shuōwén* says: 'This character means good fortune. It consists of 示 and the phonetic 彔.' The top of 彔 is 彐." The Ming *Súshū kānwù* joined in: "祿 is informally written 祿. This is wrong." Ensuing dictionaries adopted 彐.

律 *彴 *lǜ* law

Use of 彴 for 律 was recorded in 1951 in the Shanghai *Jiǎnbǐzì* and in 1960 in letters to the Script Reform Committee from Hangzhou and Taishun in Zhejiang, Yancheng and Hai'an in Jiangsu, Anqing in Anhui, Modong in Yunnan and Xiamen in Fujian.

Tellingly, these reports come from the central parts of the country, where 律 merges with 力 to *li* or *liʔ*. In 1981–1986 was recognised by informants in Nanjing, Suzhou, Shanghai and Ningbo but not by those in Jinan and Beijing to the north or in Fuzhou, Guangzhou and Nanning to the south.

---

215   Beijing Archives J106-1-1, unnumbered page.

In 1977 the committee included 彴 in List Two of its Second Scheme. The education bureaus of Zhejiang and Fujian objected that the 力 phonetic would induce pupils to read *li* for 律 and spoil their standard language. The committee agreed and removed 彴 from its 1981 Revised Draft.

Our records of 彴 cease with a 1988 note offering employment as a 彴师 (lawyer) in Wenzhou in Zhejiang. Our youngest informant to recognise 彴 was an man from Nanjing born in 1963.

亂 乱 *luàn* disorder

The left side of 亂 consists of a hand (⺥) disentangling threads (幺) in a loom or frame (冂) assisted by another hand (又). The Warring States addition 乚 has been held for a thread sticking out, a sitting person, a standing person, a handle, a tool for marking cloth, a symbol for order or just an empty ornamental stroke. The authors of the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts kept the upper hand and shortened to 乩, a practice which soon disappeared.

Analogously to 辞 for 辭, writers shortened 亂 to 乱, a form first seen on the 511 Zhèng Xī stele. This prompted the Tang scholar Yán Zhītuī to decry "despicable vulgarisms like 舌 for the [left] side of 亂, 揖 [*yī* bow] without 耳 […]."

Worse was to come. On 13 May 1912 Lǔ Xùn recorded in his diary that his brother had written to him that 绍兴于十日兵� (soldiers rioted in Shaoxing on the tenth). In 1930 Beiping Police Department reported that Wáng Qìngchēng's gang had 擾乚治安 (*rǎoluàn zhì'ān* disturbed order).[216] In 1934 Xú Zémǐn noticed that his Nanjing students rendered 亂 as 乚 when asked to write fast.

乚 did not outcompete the older form, appearing in only two of our 1900–1934 manuscripts compared with 乱 in six. For its 1935 List of Short Forms the Education Ministry selected the more common 乱. 乚 then faded away: 1940–1954 manuscripts contain thirteen 乱 but no 乚. 乱 became official in China in February 1956, as it had been in Japan since 1946.

---

216   Beijing Archives J181-31-3364, p. 5.

俞 仑 *lún* logical sequence
輪 轮 *lún* wheel
淪 沦 *lún* sink
倫 伦 *lún* human relations, logic
論 论 *lùn* discuss

Liú Fù found 论 for 論 in the Yuan blockprint *Jīngběn tōngsú xiǎoshuō* (Capital Edition of Popular Stories). Records resume only in the 1930s. A handwritten and mimeographed *Pǔtián gōngnóng bào* from 1932 has a distinct 论 in a blurred context. In 1935 Chén Yún wrote about the 争论 (disputes) leading to the Zunyi conference.[217] Our 1940–1954 manuscripts contain six 論 or 论.

As we saw in the 倉 *cāng* section, 仓 was also used for that character and for the 倉 in 槍, 搶 and 創. The Script Reform Committee, however, chose to employ 仑 for 侖 and find another way with the 倉 component, changing all 侖 components to 仑 in 1964.

仑 is said to be a square version of the cursive 仑. The change of the bottom 丶 to 凵 in *Jīngběn tōngsú xiǎoshuō* is unexpected but not impossible. A second spontaneous change of 丶 to 凵 is hard to imagine, however. More likely the first modern 仑 writers had seen 论 in Liú Fù's 1930 *Sòng-Yuán yǐ lái súzì pǔ* and copied the idea.

If so, the adoption of 仑 for 侖 is pure accident. If Liú Fù had regarded *Jīngběn tōngsú xiǎoshuō* as a forgery, as many do, and excluded it from his study, he would not have registered any 论, twentieth-century shorteners would not have adopted 仑 for 侖, 仑 would have continued in use for 倉 and there would have been no need to invent 仓.

羅 罗 *luó* sieve

Liú Fù found 罗 in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. The bottom seems to be the bottom left 糹 turned into cursive 夕 turned back into square 夕. In 1952 one Bǎo Qí wrote in *Zhōngguó yǔwén* that "there are not many people who write 羅 and 劉 all their lives." In 1956 罗 became legal.

罗 came into use even in Taiwan. In 1954 the Kuomintang politician Luó Jiālún promoted short forms, but was mocked by Professor Pān Zhòngguī:

> Speaking of saving strokes, Mr Luó picks Professor Tái Jīngnóng's surname as an example. Mr Luó praises Mr Tái for changing his name from 臺 to 台, saving strokes […]. Why then does not Mr Luó change his own honoured surname and adopt the form written with 四 and

---

217   *Minzhong geming shi huace*, p. 54. *Changzheng tujian*, p. 103.

歹, known by every man in the street, but insists on writing with 四 and 維? As far as I have seen, the books Mr Luó has signed, signs he has written and inscriptions he has made for our youth are all written with 四 and 維.

Luó's answer is not on record.

麻 蔴 *má* hemp

The original character for hemp' is 麻, a bundle of hemp (林) hanging on a wall (广). By the Song 麻 had come into use also for 'numb'. To distinguish the senses, writers added 'grass' to 'hemp'. This happened relatively late; 蔴 was absent still from the 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*. Not every writer added 'grass'; our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain seven 蔴刀 (*mádao* hemp) but also five 麻刀.

The 1955 Draft proposed a change from 蔴 to 麻. It then struck someone that 麻 was already a dictionary form, being the *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* form for 'hemp'. The abolition of 蔴 was therefore announced not in the 1956 Character Simplification Scheme but already in the December 1955 First List of Regulated Variants.

馬 马 *mǎ* horse

The bottom was squeezed in the 馬, 馬 and 馬 seen on Han wood slips and the top in the 马 appearing in Song blockprints. The 馬 character and component remained the more common, appearing in eighty-five of our 1900–1954 manuscripts against 马 in two. The Script Reform Committee contracted the latter further to 马 and authorised that form in 1964.

買 买 *mǎi* buy

Yuan blockprinters shortened 買 to 罘 analogously to 俫 for 價 above. Records of this 罘 cease in the Qing.

The 1955 Draft proposed 买. Yú Xīnbó objected in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "Some of the [proposed] simplifications do not agree with those the masses are already accustomed to. […] For example: […] 买 (買), the habitual short form is 罘." True, 买 is absent in our 1900–1954 manuscripts, but so is 罘; what we do find are eleven 贝.

贝 was not short enough for the Script Reform Committee. At the October script reform conference the committee member Yè Gōngchuò defended 买 but admitted its newness: "When necessary, we have applied the above rules to create a small number of new short forms, like 竞 (競, shortened shape), 买 (買, from the cursive form) […]." What cursive form, one wonders; we

find no form akin to 买 in calligraphy anthologies, nor in our 1900–1954 manuscripts. 买 seems rather to have been contrived in 1955 as an analogy to 卖 for 賣 (*mài* sell).

买 became official in June 1956 with the Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters.

<div align="center">

賣 卖 売 *mài* sell
讀 读 読 *dú* read
續 续 続 *xù* continue

</div>

The similarity between the character 賣 and the right side of 讀 and 續 is accidental. *Shuōwén* said the former consisted of 貝 (money), 网 (net) and 出 (give), the latter of 貝 and the phonetic 𧷓 (*mù* peaceful). In practice 出 and 大 had merged to 土 by the Han, and 囧 had become ⺕ by the Han and 网 by the Jin.

Perfectionists found a way to restore the *Shuōwén*'s 网/囧 distinction. While the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* and Tang *Yùpiān* promoted 續 with the habitual ⺕, the Tang *Wǔjīng wénzì* and Song *Yùpiān* prescribed 續 with the more 囧-like 四, and were followed by later dictionaries. But not by writers: *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains fifty-six Ming and Qing 續 with ⺕ but only two with 四.

Cursive 卖 consists of the top and bottom of 賣. Chinese writers adapted this form to square style in different ways. We first find a 读 with 卖 in a manuscript from 1888, then forms with 卖, 卖, 卖 or 卖.[218]

Reformers wavered. *Tàibái*'s 1935 table of "handy characters" advised 卖, the Education Ministry's ensuing List of Short Forms 卖, and the Script Reform Committee's 1956 Scheme 卖. The latter became official in June 1956 and the analogous 读, 续 and 窦in 1964.

The Japanese 売 looks like yet another variant of 卖 but has a different origin. While 卖 consists of the top and bottom of 賣, 売 comes from the above-mentioned 𧰼, the top of 賣, which in Japan lost another 一 and turned into 売, a form first registered by Yamada Tadao in a sixteenth-century transcript of *Wa-Kan rōeishū shichū*. In Japan this 売 came to outcompete cursive-based forms. While our 1900–1919 manuscripts contain four forms with 卖 against one 売, 1920–1946 ones hold six with 売 but none with 卖 or 卖. Not surprisingly, reformers chose 読 and 続 for their 1919, 1923,

---

218   Chen 1888, vol. 8, p. 9-2660. 1892 manuscript by Tao Gengza, p. 48a. Rong 1936, p. 3. Beijing Archives J181-21-17380, p. 5; J6-1-214, p. 225.

1926, 1938 and 1942 schemes and for the decisive 1946 List of Characters for Current Use. 壳 was added in 1949.

脈 脉 *mài* vein

The 1955 First List of Regulated Variants abolished 脈 to keep 脉. The 永 component stems from Zhou 𠂢, streaming fluid, and 𠂢 from 𠂢, a reversed 𠂢.

The Song *Guǎngyùn*, *Yùpiān* and *Jíyùn* treated 脈 and 脉 as equals. The 1297 *Yùnhuì* did not: "脈 consists of 肉 and 𠂢. The form with 永 is wrong." *Zìjiàn* added: "脈 […] is written with 𠂢 […] the informal form 脉 with 永 is wrong." Ensuing dictionaries followed suit. Even so, 脉 outnumbers 脈 twenty-one to five on Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*.

What was wrong with 脉? Its absence from *Shuōwén*, whose 𧖅 section conceded that "𧖅 may also be written with 肉", thus sanctioning 脈 but not 脉.

麦 麥 *mài* wheat

The Japanese Language Council changed 麥 to 麦 in 1946 and the Script Reform Committee of China in 1956. Reformers emphasised the long tradition of 麦, Sūn Bóchún and Yú Yùnzhī referring to a 麦 on the Han Xī Xiá inscription and Lǐ Lèyì to a 麦 on a Qin wood slip from Shuihudi.

Pointing to this stele and that slip was not really necessary. All 'wheat' on Han slips and steles listed by Fushimi Chūkei and Sano Kōichi, fifty-four in all, have 龶 tops. The early Tang *Gānlù zìshū* still prescribed 麵 (*miàn* flour) and 麨 (*chǎo* dried grain) with 龶. Its 837 successor *Jiùjīng zìyàng*, however, declared that "the cereal 麥 comes from heaven and is therefore written with 來 [come]," twisting *Shuōwén*'s "來 [wheat] comes from heaven and is therefore used for 'come'." This logic convinced dictionary editors and part of the public to take up 麥.

蠻 蛮 *mán* rough

蛮 became official in Japan and China analogously to 变 for 變 *biàn* etc.

慢 *忟 *màn* slow

In 1957 Lǐ Chángzhī complained: "Parts of the masses make up short forms themselves, making mockery of simplified characters. Captions of Guangdong operas contain forms like 宀 (家) and 忟 (慢). […] Ask one of the supporters of simplified characters to make that out, I should think he can't."

忟 puzzled Professor Lǐ of Beijing Normal University, but it would not

puzzle a Guangdong opera audience, which would easily make sense of its 万 phonetic:

	Guangzhou, Guangdong	Chaozhou, Guangdong	Xiamen, Fujian	Fuzhou, Fujian	Hangzhou, Zhejiang	Beijing
慢	*man* 22	*maŋ* 11	*ban* 33	*maŋ* 242	*mɛ* 113	*man* 51
万	*man* 22	*maŋ* 11	*ban* 33	*uaŋ* 242	*vɛ* 113	*wan* 51

The 万 phonetic is thus helpful in Guangdong and southern Fujian. Not surprisingly, ensuing reports of 忄万 come from that area, in 1960 letters to the Script Reform Committee from Guangzhou, Chaozhou and Xiamen.

Thereafter 忄万 spread. In 1974 Zhāng Shènglín of Fushun Electrical Equipment Factory in Jilin wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Using a homonymous or almost homonymous phonetic to replace a more complex phonetic is one way to simplify characters. 埌 for 壤, 炂 for 爆, 辺 for 道, 忄万 for 慢 and other forms now common among the masses are examples of this." In 1976 忄万 was reported in letters to the committee from Wenling and Huzhou in Zhejiang and in 1977 from Wuyang in Henan.

So the committee included 忄万 in List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme. Jilin Education Bureau objected that "pupils will be inclined to read this character as *wàn*" and was joined by Fujian Education Bureau. In consequence, 忄万 was left out of the 1981 Revised Draft. It also seems to have disappeared from use. This author's last record is a 忄万 sign seen by a Shantou roadside in 1988.

貿 贸 *觅 *mào* trade

Shorteners have treated 貿 like 留, writing 叕 in cursive and 覔 in square style. List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme proposed to shorten 貿 to 觅 analogously to 甾 for 留. The square form 觅 turned out to be unfamiliar to the public. The Education Bureau of the Revolutionary Committee of Jiangsu Province wrote that 觅 "has saved us a couple of strokes in exchange for having to learn a newly created character", Shanxi Education Bureau that "觅 will be mixed up with the phonetic in 锁, 琐 and 唢". Unsurprisingly, 觅 was excluded from the 1981 Revised Draft.

帽 *牦 *mào* cap

We first hear of 牦 in 1959, when Liú Hé mentioned it among short forms seen "all over in billboard verses, slogans, written instructions and wall posters". The Script Reform Committee included 牦 in its 1977 Second Scheme but not in its 1981 Revised Draft.

<center>皃 貌 *mào* face</center>

In 1980 Gāo Míngjìng wrote in *Yǔwén xuéxí*:

> One day I passed a temporary parking lot full of trucks. Most bumpers were inscribed 尊章守纪, 礼貌行车 [Respect regulations, uphold discipline and drive courteously] in white. However, a closer look revealed considerable creativity in writing 貌. There were roughly four types: 1, 礼貌行车, 2, 礼皃行车, 3, 礼兒行车, 4, 礼豹行车. The former two are correct, the latter two wrong. Most perplexing is 礼兒行车. Should one drive as courteously as one's son [兒]? Of course not. How can such a mistake crop up? I believe that the main reason is the mixing up of 皃 and 兒.

Truck drivers were not the first to mix up 皃 and 兒. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains four 貌 with 兒 from the Tang to the Qing. Writers seem to prefer familiar components to unfamiliar ones, in this case兒 (son) as in 倪 (*Ní*), 睨 (*nì* look askance) and 鬩 (*xì* strife), to 皃 which occurs in 貌 only.

Both 貌 and 皃 are old enough to appear in *Shuōwén*: "皃 [皃]: appearance. Consists of 人 and 白 which represents a face. […]. 犺 [貌]: in the [pre-Qin] big seal 皃 was written with a shortened 豹 [*bào* panther as phonetic]." By the Yuan 貌 had come to dominate, appearing on forty-two Yuan, Ming or Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* compared with 皃 on three.

The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft proposed shortening to 皃. In *Yǔwén zhīshí* Yú Xīnbó pointed to the risk of mixing up with 兒. The decisive 1956 Scheme then left 貌 in peace.

The public did not. In 1960 a teacher from Lu'an in Anhui and a typographer from Baotou in Inner Mongolia informed the committee that the masses wrote 豹. The above-mentioned Gāo explained: "Writers regard 貌 as being made up of 豸 and 兒. Since 兒 has been simplified to 儿, it becomes logical to write 貌 as 豹."

Perhaps so, but the committee even so opted for 皃 in its 1962 and 1977 schemes. Objectors reminded the committee of 皃's similarity to 兒, suggesting 豹 instead.[219] The 1981 Revised Draft upheld 皃, however, since "兒 has been simplified to 儿 [and so will not be mixed up with 皃]."

---

219   *Qunzhong dui "Cao'an"*, p. 2.

麼 麽 么 *庅 me

Shuōwén says "麿 [麼]: small. Consists of 幺 [*yāo* small] and the phonetic 麻." Few if any adhered to the etymology. When we first find the character in square style in the 512 Hé Bóchāo epitaph it is is written 麽 with �site, as it was in dictionaries like the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* and 1039 *Jíyùn*. Later authorities were stricter. The 1610 *Súshū kānwù* said: "麼 is informally written 麽. This is wrong." The 1627 *Zhèngzìtōng*: "The bottom is 幺. The informal form 麽 is a mistake."

By then informal users had made more cuts. 庅 was registered by Liú Fù in Ming blockprints and 么 by Jiǎng and Shào in late Ming military notes. Both forms came to compete for official status. 么 was promoted by the editors of *Tàibái* and *Lúnyǔ*, 庅 by the Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft.

Kǒng Xiángdé objected to the latter in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "庅 is easy to mix up with 应. Moreover everybody writes 什么, so we find it more suitable to simplify 麼 to 么." Yùn Huī and Jùn Tāo promoted 么, "the short form in common use today". Tián Qíchāng found shortening to 庅 "not thorough enough" as "people usually write 么". True, our 1940–1954 manuscripts contain seventeen 么 against ten 庅. The committee swung. Chén Wénbīn explained in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*:

> In the original Draft 麼 was simplified to 庅. This form is quite common in society. However, after the publication of the Draft the masses proposed 么, which also has a basis among the masses and is shorter than 庅 by three strokes. Therefore we have accepted the masses' opinion and changed to the present form.

Reading this one wonders why the committeee did not opt for 么 straight away. One reason may have been fear of ambiguity. 么 was already in the dictionary as a variant of 幺 (*yāo* young). The committee averted that clash by adding a note to the 1964 General List: "The 么 which is read *yāo* must be written 幺." 么 was also at risk of being mixed up with 公, which very often came out as 厶 in handwriting. This habit has disappeared after 么 became an official character.

黴 霉 *méi* rot, bacteria

霉 (*méi* moist) had come into use for 黴 (*méi* rot) by the Qing, when the commentator Zhū Jùnshēng observed that "黴 is written 霉 in informal script." That practice became formal in February 1956.

<h1 style="text-align:center">煤 *灶 *méi* coal</h1>

In his 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ* the inventive Chén Guāngyáo suggested writing 㷱 for 煤, "analogously to 妹 [*mèi* sister]". Writers showed no interest in this eight-stroke form but invented something still shorter. In 1959 Liú Hé wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that "I have seen characters like 宀 (家), 廴 (建), 妖 (耀), 廷 (鞋), 宀 (賽), 卩 (部), 灶 (煤) all over the Northeast, and also in every major city south of Shanhaiguan." The following year 灶 was reported to the Script Reform Committee in letters from Baicheng in the north to Dehong in the south. The form was proposed in the committee's 1962 and 1977 schemes but abandoned in its 1981 Revised Draft.

The variant 炃 was reported to the committee in 1960 in a letter from Beijing and in 1976 in one from Huzhou in Zhejiang. In 1981 this author saw a 炃油炉 (kerosene stove) on offer in Nanjing and 炃并 (煤饼 coal briquets) in Hangzhou and in 1986 炃球 (coal briquets) in Qingtian. These observations are confined to Zhejing and Jiangsu. In 1981–1986 炃 was identified by informants in these two provinces and adjacent parts of Anhui but not elsewhere, including Beijing.[220] How then could the above-mentioned Beijing correspondent know about 炃? Because he worked in the the Ministry of Coal Industry and presumably read reports from all over the country.

<div style="text-align:center">

每 每 *měi* each
毒 毒 *dú* poison
海 海 *hǎi* sea
悔 悔 *huǐ* regret
梅 梅 *méi* plum
敏 敏 *mǐn* nimble

</div>

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council changed 母 in 每, 毒, 繁, 海, 悔, 梅, 敏 and 侮 to 毋. Forms with 毋 had been standard before. The 175 Xīpíng Stone Classics advocated 毎, 海, 毒 and 悔, Zhì Yǒng's *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* 每 and 海. On Later Wei steles Umehara Seizan registered thirty-eight 海 against two 海. This defied *Shuōwén*, which said 每 "consists of 屮 and the phonetic 母." So the 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* reminded writers: "梅 is written with 毎. 毎 has 母 below. Forms with 毋 are wrong." Its successors wavered. Our

---

220 炃 identified as 煤 in Nanjing, Huaiyin, Lianyungang, Nantong, Suzhou, Wuxi, Yanzhou and Zhenjiang but not Xuzhou and Yancheng in Jiangsu, in Hangzhou, Huzhou, Jiaxing, Shaoxing, Ningbo, Jinhua, Linhai, Wenzhou in Zhejiang and in Hefei, Bengbu, Ma'anshan and Wuhu but not Fuyang, Huaibei, Huangshan and Jingxian in Anhui. Unknown in other provinces.

Song edition of *Guǎngyùn* advocated 梅 but *海*, *Jíyùn* 毎 in even tone but 毎 in falling tone. Later dictionaries have stuck to 每 with 母.

But not writers. Our Chinese 1950–1954 manuscripts contain forty-eight 毎 against one 每, Japanese ones from 1900 to 1946 eighteen 毎 but no 每. Japanese reformers chose to follow custom, their Chinese colleagues did not.

<h2 style="text-align:center">門 门 mén gate</h2>

Alongside twelve 门, our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts contain forty-one 门, eight 门 and three 门. Counter-intuitively, three-stroke forms are senior to four-stroke ones, turning up as 冖 or 冖 already on Western Han wood slips.

The Education Ministry selected 门 for its 1935 List of Short Forms. The Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft recommended 门 for handwriting but left the printed form intact. The army teacher Tián Qíchāng objected: "Some short forms often used by people are not included in the Draft; I think they should be added, like 门 […]." The committee saw the need but added not 门, but 门 to its 1956 Scheme. In 1965 *Wénzì gǎigé* used its "Zhèngzì xiǎo zìhuì" [Index of Correct Characters] column to remind the public that "门 is not written 门". Later reminders were deemed unnecessary.

门 and 门 were common also in Japan but today appear only sporadically. In 1999 Yoshida Yoshio, apparently a young man, found a 大同门 (Daidōmon) restaurant sign so extraordinary that he included it in his *Photo dictionary of rare Chinese characters*.

<h2 style="text-align:center">矇 蒙 mēng deceive
濛 蒙 méng misty</h2>

The 1956 Scheme shortened 矇 and 濛 to 蒙. The idea was not new. *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn* quoted early examples like 蒙王 (deceive the king) from *Zuǒ zhuàn* and 霧集蒙合 (the fog thickened and the mist ascended) from *Hànshū*. The senses of 'deceive' and 'mist' are in any case believed to be cognate to 蒙 (*méng* cover) below.

<h2 style="text-align:center">蒙 *𭥣 *芏 méng cover Měng Mongolia</h2>

In 1958 Rén Shuāngyàn of Beijing Normal University Workers' and Peasants' Middle School urged the Script Reform Committee to "consider simplifying some now very common short forms, like the 氵 in 演員, the 𭥣 in 蒙古 […]." Two years later 𭥣 was reported to the committee in letters from Baotou in Inner Mongolia and Ankang in Shanxi. The ⺌ top is, like 艹, a descendant of 屮屮/艸/艹.

The 1973 dictionary draft shown to Helmut Martin contained 芏, while the 1977 Second Scheme kept closer to the standard with its 苎. Wú Jiǎfēng regarded 苎 as too similar to the 苎 in 苎麻 (*zhùmá* ramie, a plant), Xú Zhōnghuá as too similar to the 宀 proposed for 宣. Of the letters sent to the committee, five proposed the more distinct 芏, five 苎 and six 芡 analogousy to 灾 for 家.[221] The 1981 Revised Draft then tried 苎.

夢 梦 *mèng* dream

梦 with 林 appears in the calligraphy of Cài Xiāng (1012–1067) and in Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprints. The editors of *Tàibái* chose this form for their 1935 "handy characters" and the Script Reform Committee for its 1955 Draft.

In spite its long record, 梦 turned out to be unfamiliar to some. At a meeting of the Chinese Writers' Association one delegate objected to "some characters which people have not seen at all, or characters whose sense is unclear, like 梦 […]."[222] This may explain why 梦 was authorised only in 1958.

密 *宓 *mì* dense
蜜 *宓 *mì* honey

In 1942 Central Jiangsu Party Committee planned to resist Kuomintang through 秘宓斗争 (*mìmì dòuzhēng* secret struggle).[223] This 宓 seems to have been unfamiliar even to reformers like Chén Guāngyáo, who in his 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ* suggested writing 蜜 as 宻. The public, however, continued to write 宓. In 1956 Lǐ Wénxiū informed readers of *Guāngmíng rìbào* that in the Tíngzǐqiáo Cooperative near Suzhou "one writes 蜜枣 [*mìzǎo* candied dates] as 宓枣. […] This 宓 has been used both for 赛, 蜜 and 密." In 1962 Zhāng Yǒngmián noted in *Wénzì gǎigé* that Zhejiang students wrote 宓 for both 赛 and 密. In 1960 and 1976 use of 宓 for 密 was reported to the committee by correspondents from Hefei, Xiamen, Fuzhou and Wenling.

This was not enough to convince the Script Reform Committee, which in List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme instead opted to replace 密 and 蜜 with 宓, a rare homonym meaning 'calm'. That idea was abandoned in the 1981 Revised Draft.

---

221   *Qunzhong dui "Cao'an"*, p. 3.
222   Zhongguo zuojia xiehui 1955.
223   *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 97.

麵 麵 面 *靣 *丏 *miàn* flour
面 *靣 *miàn* face

Xīnhuá zìdiǎn lists 麵 with the 面 *miàn* phonetic as the complex form and 麵 with 丏 *miǎn* as a variant. 麵 has not always been second-rate, being prescribed by *Shuōwén* and *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*. The latter was not in doubt: "麵 is also written 麵. This is not correct."

面 was read like 麵 and perhaps inevitably came into use for that character. Zhāng Yǒngquán found 恰如粉面一般 (like dust) and 一石面 (one dan of grain) in Dunhuang scrolls from the Tang. The practice had resurfaced by 1922, when Qián Xuántóng wrote in *Guóyǔ yuèkān* that sightings "like 同元 for 銅圓 [copper coin], 面包 for 麵包 [bread], 又 for 義 [*yì* justice] and 几 for 幾 are truly countless."

This 面 came to be shortened further. A 1939 meeting of the New Fourth Army discussed the problems 在我們靣前 (facing us). A 1948 Report on Front Support in the Third District of Changjiang-Huaihe Military Area recommended setting up one 総靣站 (grain supply station) in each county with six days' provisions of 靣粉 (grain).[224]

Reformers looked bent on 靣, which was advanced in 1950 by the Script Reform Society's List of Short Forms and in 1952 by Dīng Xīlín of the Committee for Research on Script Reform. The 1955 Draft, however, confined itself to a change from 麵 to 面.

Even this met objections. Táng Bóxiān wrote in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "If not in a meal account, the characters 白面 will leave one speculating [whether it means 'wheat flour' or 'pale-faced']. Also the phrase 面熟了 [*miàn shú le*] will after this need pondering [whether it means 'that face is familiar' or 'the noodles are ready']." Others like Dài Tiānjiàn and Guǎn Xièchū advocated a more radical change to 靣. Zhù Júxiān went still further: "Why not simplify 麵 by using its distinctive component 丏? The peasants are using 丏 for 麵 in accounts all the time."

Squeezed from all sides, the committee retained 面 and let it replace 麵 in February 1956. Chén Guāngyáo argued: "This character is also written 丏 […] which is the phonetic in 麵, but that form is not so common as 面. 丏 is also easily mixed up with 丐 [*gài* beg], so 面 was adopted."

Doubters remained. In 1957 *Guāngmíng rìbào* published a plea for 丏 by Qiū Chángnù and *Wénzì gǎigé* one for the status quo by Chéng Yí. Editors answered the latter that "the committee is now about to revise the characters 面 (麵) and 曲 (麴)." As we know, revisions came to nothing and 面 stayed.

Reformers did not cave in, proposing the "among the masses already

---

224   *Dajiang nanbei*, p. 59. *Anhui geming shi*, p. 230.

widely used" 百 in 1962 and again in 1977, with negative reactions. The education bureaus of Shanxi and Liaoning called 百 "very ugly" and their Fujian colleagues thought it "looks like a hat." Yè Nán wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "百 has become a big white splotch, saving only three strokes from 面 in return for demolishing its shape. The gain does not outweigh the loss by far." The 1981 Revised Draft duly abandoned 百.

廟 *庿 庙 *miào* temple

Shuōwén said 廟 "consists of 广 [room] and the phonetic 朝 [*cháo*]. 庿 [庿]: ancient form." In *Shuōwén* "ancient form" means not "the most ancient form", but "one ancient form". This 庿 appears in the phrase 天子之庿 (天子之庿 the temple to the son of heaven) in a text on a vase from the pre-309 BCE tomb of the king of Zhongshan. Writers must have found the 苗 *miáo* phonetic handier and, possibly, more helpful than 朝 *cháo*, which may have been close to 廟 *miào* in the Yin, but perhaps not in the Warring Staes.

Authorities were not hostile to 庿. The Tang *Gānlù zìshū* "廟 庿: both are correct" and the Song *Guǎngyùn* "廟 […] is also written 庿." Liú Fù found 庿 in blockprints from the Song and Yuan and the further shortened 庙 from the Yuan onwards. Of this form dictionaries were less tolerant. The 1610 *Súshū kānwù* said "庙 is informal for 廟", the 1615 *Zìhuì* "廟 is informally written 庙. This is wrong."

庙 nevertheless thrived, outnumbering 庿 forty-eight to three in our 1900–1954 manuscripts. The Education Ministry included 庙 in its 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee in its 1955 Draft. Qiū Chángnù of Northeast Normal University objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "It is better to write 庿 than 庙 (廟). *Shuōwén* says: '庿: ancient form of 廟'. Informally one mostly uses 庿. Since this form uses the phonetic 苗 [*miáo* seedling], it is easy to recognise and easy to remember. Using 由 [*yóu* from] as a phonetic is problematic." Yú Chuánxián countered: "We should not use 庿 for 庙 (廟), because 庙 is very common, while I have never seen 庿."

In Japan 庿 appears to have been still in use in 1910, when the teacher Yanagi Isao wrote he would no longer deduct points for use of short forms like 庿, and in 1919, when the Education Ministry included 庿 in its Character Regulation Scheme. Thereafter records cease. The 1940 *Shōkai Kan-Wa daijiten* described 庿 as an "ancient character for 廟".

巀 蔑 *miè* disdain

In 1956 the Script Reform Committee replaced 巀 with the shorter homonym 蔑 (*miè* none). The practice was mentioned in the 1627 *Zhèngzìtōng*: "污巀 [slander] is commonly written with 蔑."

滅 灭 *miè* extinguish

Huáng Ruòzhōu's 1950 article and the 1952 *Xué wénhuà zìdiǎn* called 灭 the short form for 滅. The Script Reform Committee adopted the idea and included 灭, the centre of 滅, in its 1955 Draft.

The public was puzzled. Yáo Jiāzhēn wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Some comrades disapprove of 尘 and 灭 and find them difficult to understand." Professor Jīn Lúnhǎi of Jiangsu Normal Institute: "I am afraid 灭 is unfamiliar even to literate persons. This character is easy to understand for people raised in the grasslands who [according to *Shuōwén*] use poles to put out fires, but those are a minority. This character has insufficient basis among the masses."

Reformers did not contest the latter point. Chén Guāngyáo and Yì Xīwú called 灭 a "newly created" but not yet "customary" form, Zhōu Yǒuguāng a "recently created character [...] not established by custom."

Xú Xīn argued in *Wénzì gǎigé* that "尘 and 灭 were previously not in use, but the masses have come to like them." Wáng Màocái wrote that "applying the established-by-custom principle alone is not sufficient, one can also introduce some new forms if suitable. Characters like 尘, 灭, 厅, 卢 [...] truly demonstrate the creative wisdom of our people." Advocates were joined by Lǎo Shě:

> At first even I did not make 尘 and 灭 out. However, after paying just a little attention I learned them. They are certainly not so hard to learn as the seal script. Some intellectuals patiently study seal characters, but say simplified characters are hard to understand. That is a bit odd. Since I learned to know them, 尘 and 灭 have become my friends. I do not care to write 塵 or 滅 any more – too much trouble.

灭 became official in June 1956 with the Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters.

摩 *广 *mó* rub
魔 *广 *mó* demon
磨 *广 *mó* polish *mò* grind

Chinese writers used 广 for 庵 from the Yuan onwards and then for 廣. These practices never spread to Japan, where 广 had already assumed another sense. Japanese records of 广 for 摩, 魔 and 磨 begin in 1140 with phrases like 广尼 (摩尼 *mani* manichéan), 閻广 (閻魔 *Enma* King of Hades) and 紫广金 (紫磨金 *shimakin* red gold) in Buddhist narratives surveyed by Yamauchi Yōichirō and and cease with letters sent in 1943 and 1944 to 南巨广郡 (南巨摩郡 Minamikoma District) and 西多广郡 (西多摩郡 Nishitama District).[225] In 2014–2017 广 was recognised by none of our twenty-four Japanese informants.

What finished 广 off? One cause was waning demand. One function of 广 was to fill in for 摩 in 薩摩藩 (*Satsuma han* Satsuma Domain), which, however, became Kagoshima Prefecture in 1871. Another cause was competition. From 1914 onwards we find 广 for 廳 (*chō* office, see *tīng*) and from 1933 for 廢. Lingering 摩 writers sought new ways out. In 1953 we find a map of 西多厃郡 in Tokyo Archives.[226] Paternity of this 厃 with its katakana マ *ma* phonetic was claimed by Ishida Yasuhiro in a 1984 issue of *Seimitsu kikai* (Precision Instruments):

This was about 1955, when I worked with pulverising medicine. 研磨 [*kenma* pulverise] has long been written 研摩, which many have struggled to write. 'Would not 研厃 do?' I asked my colleagues, and put the idea into practice. Today there are many who write 研厃 in their personal notes. I have also seen 研厃 in pharmacy advertisements.

In 1993 Jīn Ruòjīng observed that "in Japanese one may see 職 written as 耺, 傘 as 仐, 経 as 圣, 第 as 才 and 摩 as 厃." With this records cease. 2014–2017 informants were just as unfamiliar with 厃 as they were with 广.

To Chinese writers both forms were unpalatable, 厃 with its Japanese phonetic and 广 which they read as 廣. However, after 麼 became 么 in 1956 some saw a chance to shorten also 磨 or 摩. In 1962 a handwritten Unified Price List for Bicycle Repairs in Beijing City set the price for 么齒 (磨齒 gear grinding) to 40 fen, in 1994 this author saw an advertisement for 水么石 (水磨石 terrazzo) floors outside Gu'an in Hebei and in 2005 Huáng

---

225   *Nihon kitte meikan*, vol. 1, fig. 130; vol. 2, fig. 100.
226   Tokyo Archives ウ 208.20.06, p. 129.

Xuětíng criticised advertisements for 厶托车 (摩托车 motorbikes) in Baise in Guangxi.[227]

某 *厶 *mǒu* a certain

Gǔliáng zhuàn (Gǔliáng's Commentary) says 寀候鄭伯會于鄧 (Marquis Cài and Count Zhèng met at Deng). The commentator Fàn Níng (339–401) added: 鄧厶地 (Deng is a place). Lù Démíng (556–627) clarified: "The real sense is 某. He does not know the location and so writes 厶地." This 厶 is presumably a shortened 牟 *móu*.

In 1039 厶 was recognised by *Jíyùn*: "厶 is a repetition mark. It is [also] commonly used for 某." By the Yuan everybody was expected to understand the form. The blockprinted drama *Zǐyúntíng* (Purple Cloud Pavilion) takes place in 厶年厶月 (a certain month of a certain year) and *Dōngchuāng shìfàn* (The Affair of the Eastern Window) features 厶姓岳 (a person named Yuē).[228] Chinese records cease, however, with the 1610 *Súshū kānwù*: "某 is informally written 厶. This is wrong. 厶 is the ancient form for 私." This ancient practice was later revived, as we shall see in the 私 *sī* section.

Japanese records extend somewhat longer. Dazai Shundai wrote in 1753 that "厶 is the same as 某", but fifty years later Matsumoto Guzan observed that "In the past 某 was written 厶." 厶 has, however, survived as the katakana 厶 *mu*.

畝 亩 *mǔ* 0.067 hectares

Shuōwén gave the variants 𤰜 (畮) and 𤱑 (畞), specifying that 畞 "consists of 田, 十 and 久." Writers preferred the latter, admittedly shortening 十 to 亠 and 久 to 又, 攵, 𠂊卜, 人 or 厶, as on Later Wei, Tang and Song steles, on which *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* records six 畝, six 畞, three 畒 and one 畞. Then someone recalled that *Shuōwén* prescribed 久. The now so familiar 畝 with 久 first appears in our database on the 1545 Shèngmiào stele. Thereafter it was entered as "informal" in the 1627 *Zhèngzìtōng* and as standard in the 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*. Even writers embraced the newfangled 畝, using it on twelve of our Qing steles, compared with 畒 on seven, 畞 on four, 畝 on two and 畞 on two.

Some dodged the choice by dropping the right side altogether to write 亩, a form included in *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters" and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft. In a letter to the committee from Changsha an

227   Beijing Archives 90-1-326, p. 58.
228   *Quan Yuan zaju*, vol. 1, pp. 4303, 2409.

assembly of Hunan teachers instead recommended 厶 or 幺, the simplified form of 麼 *me*. The committee nevertheless adopted 亩 in June 1956.

Use of 幺 for 亩 continued for a while, reported in 1960 letters to the committee from Wugang and Shaoyang in Hunan and Fuzhou in Fujian and, lastly, in one sent in 1976 from Taihe in Anhui.

幕 *帒 *mù* curtain

幕 consists of 巾 (cloth) and the phonetic 莫 *mò*. Ancient writers would at times make do with the phonetic only. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains four 莫府 (幕府 *mùfǔ* camp headquarters) on Sui, Tang and Song steles.

Modern writers worked hard to find a still shorter form. In 1960 a teacher at Hefei Normal Institute wrote to the Script Reform Committee that he had seen 茆 in students' examination papers, and a proofreader from Shanghai reported 帒. The committee's 1962 List of Simplified Characters suggested neither, including instead 帗 with the phonetic 木 *mù*.

Only one of these forms was heard of again, 帒 which was proposed in the committee's 1977 Second Scheme. One respondent feared "帒 may be mistaken for the short form of 帶."[229] Who could take 帒 for 帶? Someone from the far south, as we saw in the 帶 *dài* section. This may explain why 帒 was excluded from the 1981 Revised Draft.

男 *为 *nán* male

The 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì* said 为 was short for 男. First-hand records begin with a 1955 Nanjing census form registering one middle peasant as being 性别: 为 (of male sex). Even the four-stroke 为 has been contracted. A Tianjin Shoe Factory Number 3 form from 1961 registers five 力 (male) relatives of the worker Liáng Yùfēn.[230] Subsequent records abound.

We find no proposals to replace 男 with 为 or 力. The latter was obviously too close to the 力 used and proposed for 身 (*shēn* body).

南 *宁 *nán* south

Reformers were at a loss for a short form for 南. Róng Gēng promoted 宂 with 十 in his 1936 *Jiǎntǐ zìdiān* and Chén Guāngyáo 甸, from cursive 㐆, in his 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ*.

The Script Reform Committee found these too far-fetched and passed南

---

229   *Qunzhong dui "Cao'an"*, p. 4.
230   Nanjing Archives 5023-3-55, p. 154. Factory form provided by Wang Jialin.

over in 1956. Writers then took up the bottomless 亐, first reported in a 1960 letter from a teacher in Nanchong in Sichuan. This form appealed more to the committee, which included it in List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme.

Reactions were negative. The education bureaus and corresponding organs in Tianjin, Shandong, Jiangsu, Jiangxi, Guangdong, Yunnan, Qinghai, Xinjiang and Shenyang called 亐 "ugly", "really ugly" or "very ugly". Only Shenyang Script Reform Office quoted a dissenting voice, "a teacher at the Chinese Department of Liaoning University" who felt that when "亐, 岗 [商], 皿 [皿] and 百 have been used for some time, we will get used to them in the same way as we got used to 厂, 严, 气 and 产." The committee followed the majority and lifted 亐 out of its 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">

難 艱 难 *nán* difficult *nàn* calamity
艱 艱 艰 *jiān* distress

</div>

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council replaced the 廿-topped 難 and 漢 with 艹-topped 難 and 漢. The idea was not new. On wood slips and stone steles Han scribes wrote 漢, 漢, 漠, 潬 or 潬 with 'grass' where the older Mawangdui manuscripts have 艹.

This disagreed with *Shuōwén* and seal style, which distinguished the 廿 tops in 難, 艱 and 漢 from the 艸 (艹grass) in 蒼, 草 and so on. A minority of writers tried to maintain this distinction even in clerk and square style by rendering 廿 as 廿, as in a 漢 on the 177 CE Yǐn Zhòu stele, but not again until the 570 Lóng Dōng stele.

Early authorities like the 241 Zhèngshǐ Stone Classics, Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* and Tang *Gānlù zìshū* accepted the majority's unetymological 艹 tops. Consensus was broken by the 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì*, which instructed: "All characters of the 熯 [*hàn* roast], 漢 and 艱 type are written with 莫." Later dictionaries followed suit, prescribing 廿 or 廿 tops. Grass tops nevertheless lived on to annoy regulators. The Yuan *Zìjiàn* condemned 漢 as "informal" and the 1610 *Súshū kānwù* as "wrong".

The compiler of the 1610 *Súshū kānwù* did not waste space to condemn the analogous 難 with 艹, hastening to deal with a new and more serious offence: "難 is informally written 难. This is wrong." 难 had been seen in blockprints since the Yuan and 艰 since the Ming. The 1956 Scheme made both correct.

<div align="center">

囊 *申 *náng* bag

</div>

In 1960 a proofreader from Shanghai and an army recruitment officer from Wuhua in Guangdong wrote to the Script Reform Committee about people

who shortened 囊 to 朿, the first five strokes plus the last one. In 1974 Xiàng Huī wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that the still shorter 朿 was "often seen on the medicine and sanitation front".

The committee wavered, choosing the shorter 朿 for its unpublished 1962 scheme, the perhaps more common 朿 for the 1973 dictionary draft seen by Helmut Martin in 1973, 朿 again for its 1977 Second Scheme and neither for its 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">

*脳 腦 脳 脑 *nǎo* brain
*惱 惱 恼 恼 *nǎo* annoyed

</div>

The 惱 prescribed in the Tang *Gānlù zìshū* was changed to 惱 in the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* and 1008 *Guǎngyùn*, in line with *Shuōwén*'s ruling that "巛 depicts the hair and 囟 the brain." 惱 contained no brain, so 惱 be it. Writers adjusted. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* registers eleven 惱 and two 惱 before 997, compared with two 腦, two 惱 and no 惱 after 1008.

Not surprisingly, the top 'hair' was cut short. We find 惱 in the calligraphy of Sū Shì (1036–1101), 惱 in that of Mǐ Fú (1051–1107), 恼 in the Yuan blockprint *Gǔjīn zájù* (Musicals Old and New) and 恼 and 脑 in the early Qing *Mùliánjì*.

The latter forms lived on, represented by two 脑 and three 脑 in our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts. Reformers chose the shorter 恼 and 脑 for their 1935 "handy characters" and for the decisive 1956 Scheme.

Similar forms were known even in Japan. In 1705 Arai Hakuseki warned: "惱 means 惱. Writing characters like 瑙 and 腦 with 凶 is wrong." In 1897 Ōnishi Katsutomo mentioned use of 脳 for 腦. Neither form dominated; our 1900–1946 manuscripts contain three 脳, three 脳, one 惱, two 脳 and one 脳. The 1919 Character Regulation Scheme and the 1923 List of Characters for Common Use advocated the shorter 惱 and 脳, the 1926 Proposal for the Regulation of Character Forms the perhaps more common 惱 and 脳, which then became official in 1946.

<div align="center">

擬 拟 *nǐ* draw up

</div>

拟 replaced 擬 in February 1956. We can trace this form back to an 1892 order to 拟撥 (拟撥 *nǐbō* choose and allocate) materials for repair of barracks near the Old Summer Palace.[231]

The origin of 拟 is not obvious. 以 *yǐ* is hardly phonetic. We do get a clue

---

231   Beijing Archives J2-7-22, p. 9.

from Jiǎng and Shào, who found fifty-two 擬 for 擬 in military notes from the late Ming. Is not 拟 the first five and last two strokes of this 擬?

嬢 孃 娘 *奵 niáng mother, girl, woman

The first dictionary to mention 娘 with the 良 liáng phonetic, the 1008 Guǎngyùn, distinguished "孃: a mother" from "娘: a girl." Duàn Yùcái commented: "Tang writers made a clear distinction between these two characters and would never write 耶孃 [爺孃 yé niáng father and mother] with 娘, but now [in the Qing] very few are aware of this."

Already ancient writers wavered, however. On the 572 Lǐ Yuánhǎi stele relatives pledge to 養孫女幼孃 (provide for infant granddaughters). A 659 statue sponsored by one 李大娘 (Lǐ dàniáng Mrs Li) commemorates her deceased husband. The oldest 娘 quote in Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn is from the 978 Tàipíng guǎngjì (Records of the Tàipíng era), where a daughter asks 娘欲寫何經 (Which sutra does mother want me to copy?).

So 娘 served for 孃 from its appearance. Already the 1039 Jíyùn found Guǎngyùn's distinction untenable and defined 娘 simply as 'woman'. The 1955 First List of Regulated Variants replaced 孃 with 娘 for all purposes.

A still shorter form had existed, a 奵 registered by Liú Fù in Yuan and Qing blockprints. The puzzling 卜 on the right seems to be a cursive 𠃊 minus 𠃌. In 1935 the Tàibái editors selected this 奵 for their "handy characters". With that, records of 奵 cease, but not of the 卜 phonetic, which lived on in the analogous 籵 for 粮 liáng.

The Japanese Language Council retained both variants, distinguishing 娘さん (musumesan your daughter) from お嬢さん (ojōsan young lady). 叩 in the latter was shortnened to 丷, analogously to 醸 for 釀 (jō brew, see niàng), 壌 for 壤 (jō soil, see rǎng) and 譲 for 讓 (jō yield, see ràng).

釀 酿 *酛 niàng brew

The 1955 Draft shortened 釀 to 酛 analogously to 让 for 讓, a form known from Huáng Ruòzhōu's 1950 Wénhuì bào article. This did not make it commonly known, not even by people in the trade. Wáng Yǒngkāng told the 1955 script reform conference: "A brewery apprentice saw 酛 in the Draft and said, overjoyed: 'Before, brewery workers did not know how to cope with 釀, but now I can write it.'" The reformer Yì Xīwú wrote: "The implementation of a new character cannot ignore the established-by-custom principle. The newly created 酛, 圵 [rǎng soil], 尘 and 灭 […] will not become customary right away."

So the 1956 Scheme changed 酛 to 酿. Soon Guāngmíng rìbào's "Wèntí

jiědá" (Questions and Answers) column had to tackle the question: "Why have not the right sides of 酿 (釀) and 让 (讓) been simplified identically? Answer: 釀 is read ㄋㄧㄤ [*niang*] in Beijing speech, not ㄖㄤ [*rang*] like 让]. It is easier to read out 釀 and 娘 if they have the same phonetic 良 [*liáng*]. Apart from that 酿 has a basis among the masses."

One was soon reminded that even the discarded 酞 had a basis among the masses. In 1957 Zhū Qìngxià wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that many preferred to write 酞 "according to their own habit" rather than the prescribed 酿.

Whose basis was the firmer? Perhaps neither. The pro-酿 *Guāngmíng rìbào* was edited in Beijing, while the pro-酞 Zhū wrote in Suzhou and the pro-酞 Huáng in nearby Shanghai, the presumable birthplace of the analogous 讠上. In the end the Beijing-based committee authorised 酿 in 1959.

Wavering continued. The committee's 1977 Second Scheme renewed the 酞 proposal. Hebei Interim Script Reform Leading Group pointed out that this implied "simplifying once and then again, increasing the burden of learning, like 數–数–敄 and 釀–酿–酞." 酞 was duly removed from the 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">

鳥 乌 *niǎo* bird

</div>

In most of our 1900–1955 manuscripts the 'bird' component is written 鳥 with 一 for ⺣, in some 鸟 without the central 一 and in one from 1954 乌 with a square version of the cursive 鸟.[232]

Reformers wavered. The *Tàibái* editors' 1935 "handy characters" promoted 鸟, the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft 乌, but only for handwriting. The 1956 Scheme imposed 乌 for all purposes. A change was announced in 1957 by Cáo Bóhán: "Originally the components 金, 鳥 and 魚 were [to be-come] 仝, 乌 and 重. We now propose changing to 全, 鸟 and 鱼. We further propose to add the following components: 乌 (烏 [*wū* crow]) [...]." Apart from 仝, these proposals were implemented in 1964. In other words, the rarely seen 乌 was replaced by the hardly ever seen 鸟 in order to make space for a short form for 'crow'.

<div align="center">

聶 聂 *Niè*
鑷 錜 镊 *niè* tweezers

</div>

See 轟 *hōng*.

---

232   鸡蛋 in Beijing Archives 22-12-1637, p. 8.

寧 寍 宁 *níng* calm *nìng* would rather

Yin bones have a shorter 𡧢 (寍) for 寧 as in 王�𡧢 (王今夕寧 the king is having his night rest). The 'heart' was a Zhou addition which came to be badly squeezed in clerk and square style, to 土 in the 寍 on Western Han wood slips from Juyan, to 八 in a 寍 on a 159 CE slip from Gangu, to 一 in a 寍 on the 457 Cuàn Lóngyán stele, to 二 in a 寍 in the 516 Tùgǔhún Jï epitaph and to 丅 in a 寍 in the 547 Yáng Fèngxiáng epitaph.

The latter came to live on and irritate sticklers for rules, like the editors of the 1610 *Súshū kānwù* and 1617 *Zìkǎo* who condemned 寍 as wrong. 寍 nevertheless slipped into the 1873 edition of *Shuōwén*, whose 甯 entry says that it 从用寍省聲 (consists of 用 and the phonetic 寍 shortened) where older editions more plausibly say 寍省聲.

The radically shorter 宁 is a later arrival, first reported from Shanghai by Huáng Ruòzhōu in 1950.

The 1955 Draft advanced 寍. The army teacher Tián Qíchāng objected that "some characters are not simplified thoroughly enough," like 寍, which "people often write as 宁." At a meeting of the Chinese Writers' Association Lǐ Jì said "寧 should be changed to 宁. This form is often seen. The projected 寍 is not short at all."[233] Yùn Huī and Jùn Tāo held 宁 to be "the short form in common use today". Zhāng Décún claimed that "everybody writes 寧 as 宁." Why then was not the common 宁 selected in the first place? Because, as Yáo Jiāzhēn and others pointed out, 宁 was properly read *zhù* and meant "the space between the throne and the retiring room behind it". So the October Revised Draft mooted 㝉, a novelty which was replaced in the final 1956 Scheme with the popular 宁. The *zhù* problem was tackled with a note: "The 宁 which means 'the space between the door and the screen-curtain' (an ancient and rarely used character) is read *zhù*. To avoid this 宁 getting mixed up with the simplified form of 寧, the character formerly read *zhù* shall be written 㝉." These complications delayed the recognition of 宁 until June 1956.

The official Japanese 寧 has 罒 for 皿, a reduction seen already on Western Han wood slips.

農 农 *nóng* agriculture

The 辰 in 農 is a transformed 𠂤, presumably an agricultural implement. The top appears as 𦥑 (臼 hands), 艸 (⁺⁺ grass) or 林 (林 trees) on Yin bones, as 林, 田 (田 field), 𦦎, 𦦢 or 𦦏 on Zhou bronzes, as 𦥑, 西 or 臼 on Western

---

233   Zhongguo zuojia xiehui 1955.

Han wood slips and as 冊, 田, 西, 曲, 腼 or 曲 on Eastern Han stone steles. Jin writers plumped for the latter, making the character look like 'a crooked morning', which is hardly its original sense.

So it was no big loss of sense and heritage when some started writing 农, as in a 1943 program for protecting 佃农的佃权 (*diànnóng de diànquán* tenant farmers' rights) handwritten and issued by the Administrative Office of Southern Jiangsu.[234]

Chén Guāngyáo described the 1956 Scheme's 农 as "a cursive form turned into square style." This was not obvious, the cursive form promoted in writing manuals was 㐱. One might rather say that 农 writers kept the first two and last three strokes of 農, replacing the rest with ノ. Nevertheless, since 农 was regarded as a modified cursive form it was adopted only with the second, June 1956 batch of characters, together with 导, 发 and 买.

瘧 疟 *nüè yào* malaria

疟 was launched in Chén Guāngyáo's 1931 *Jiǎnzì lùnjí* and included in the 1955 Draft, perhaps by Chén himself. Yú Xīnbó objected in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "Some of the [proposed] simplifications do not agree with those the masses are already accustomed to […]. For example: […] 疟 (瘧), the habitual short form is 疠." In 1956 Chén admitted that 疟 was a "newly coined short form". Doubts delayed 疟's offical status until 1964.

虐 *彐 *nüè* cruel

虐 consists of a 虍 (tiger) with an oversized 彐 (爪 claw). In 1960 correspondents from Tianjin and Jilin informed the Script Reform Committee that they had seen 虐 written 彐, a form clear enough for those who know their etymology. The committee proposed this 彐 in its 1977 Second Scheme but withdrew it from its 1981 Revised Draft.

稬 穤 糯 *籾 *粨 *nuò* glutinous

The 1955 First List of Regulated Variants abolished 穤 to retain 糯, reversing a long campaign against 米. The 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* said: "糯 is informal. […] The correct form is 稬." The 1617 *Zìkǎo*: "稬 is written with 禾. 糯 is wrong." The 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* found even 稬 improper, calling both 稬 and 糯 informal and endorsing 穤, a form closer to *Shuōwén's* 穤.

Wáng Tónghàn argued against the selected 糯: "If the masses have already

---

234 *Jiangsu kangzhan,* p. 110.

created a short form, like […] 籼 for 糯, we should not retain the original character." This 籼 was later reported in letters to the Script Reform Committee from Rongjiang in Guizhou and Pengxi in Sichuan. In 1982 this author saw 籼米 (glutinous rice) for sale in Kunming and Guiyang.

籼 had a competitor. A 1960 letter from an employee of Sandun District Grain and Oil Purchase and Sales Point in Hangzhou informed the committee that the peasants wrote 糯 as 粞. In 1981 this author saw 粞米粥 (*nuòmǐzhōu* rice gruel) on a restaurant menu in Hengyang in Hunan and 粞米 for sale in Guangzhou, in 1986 also in Wuhan in Hubei and Wuhua, Meixian and Maoming in Guangdong, and in 1988 in Huidong in Guangdong. 粞 records cluster in the far south. 1981–1986 interviews confirmed that 粞 was known in Guangdong, Guangxi and parts of Hunan but unknown in the north.

This left the Beijing-based Script Reform Committee with 籼 which received a place in List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme, but not in the 1981 Revised Draft.

盤 盘 *盍 *pán* tray

盍 turns up in the 1862–1874 blockprint *Lǐngnán yìshǐ* and 盘 in a 1948 Beiping Public Health Bureau report on fake 盘尼西林 (Penicillin) detected in Kunming.[235] The latter outpaced the former, appearing in seven of our 1940–1954 manuscripts against 盍 in none. Unsurprisingly, the 1956 Scheme included 盘. Our 盍 records cease in 1981 with a 盍点 (stock-taking) in a Fuzhou shop and 盍元 (wire rods) for sale in Wuxi.

How could 盤 become 盍 in the first place? In handwriting 殳 (几 spear in 又 hand) has alternated with 攴/攵 (卜 stick in 又 hand), as in 般 (*bān* sort) which in Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprints appears as 舣 or distorted as 舷, 舷, 舩 or 猷. 盤 with the latter top appears in three prints and is obviously the ancestor of 盍.

闢 辟 *pì* open up

The 1956 reform merged 闢 (*pì* open up) and 辟 (*pì* law *bì* ruler) to 辟. Chén Guāngyáo justified 辟 as the "original character" for 闢, giving the example 辟土地 (open up land) from *Mèng zǐ* (Mencius).

---

235   Beijing Archives J5-3-925, p. 4.

票 *piào* ticket
漂 *piāo* float *piào* beautiful

See 要 *yào.*

凭 憑 凴 *píng* lean on, rely on

凭 is the older form for 'lean on'. *Shuōwén* said: "� [凭]: lean against a table. Consists of 几 [table] and 任 [serve as]." 憑 meant 'angry', as the 'heart' bottom suggests, but had according to *Xiǎo Ěryǎ* by the Han come into use for 'lean on'. The hybrid 凴 appears in the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng,* which held all three forms to be variants.

Writers came to prefer 憑. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains fifty-five post-Tang 憑, 憑 or 憑 against five 凭 and two 凴. The 1956 Scheme nevertheless replaced 憑 with the shorter 凭. The change was not implemented until 1959.

蘋 苹 *平 *píng* apple

The appendix to the 1927 *Píngmín zìdian* said: "The 蘋 in 蘋果 is also written 苹." The 1928 *Jiǎnyìzì shuō,* the 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì* and the 1952 *Xué wénhuà zìdiǎn* agreed. The Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft nevertheless proposed the still simpler 平.

No critic claimed that use of the homonym 平 for 蘋 was new or unfamiliar. However, the linguist and calligrapher Wú Sānlì thought the difference in sense between 蘋 and 平 was too wide, and Zhèng Yún considered that "it is better to simplify to 苹. This makes it easier to distinguish the two senses." The committee complied, recognising 苹 in June 1956 with its Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters.

This hesitation had a reason: the selected 苹 was already taken. *Ěryǎ* defined 苹 as 賴蕭 (*làixiāo* artemisia), *Lóngkān shǒujìng* as "another name for 萍 [*píng* duckweed]." Both definitions were repeated by later dictionaries. Use for 蘋 would give 苹 a third sense. The committee reduced this to one by dispatching the obsolete 'artemisia' sense from forthcoming dictionaries and making 萍, not 苹 compulsory for 'duckweed'.

Another problem was that 蘋 had two readings, *ping* for 'apple' and *pín* for 'clover fern'. On behalf of the committee Cáo Bóhán suggested amendments to the Simplification Scheme in 1957: "We propose to add a mark beside the following homophonous substitutions to indicate that the complex character should under certain circumstances be retained, while keeping those substitutions which are established by custom: [...] 苹 (蘋) [...]." In other words, to write 苹 for 'apple', which people were used to, but not for 'clover fern', which they were not. Although no such note was added to 苹 in the 1964

General List, dictionaries have followed this recommendation, retaining 蘋
in the sense of 'clover fern'.

Unsurprisingly, the shorter 苹 has survived. In 1994 Wáng Tiěkūn of the
State Language Commission complained that "in the streets it is not diffi-
cult to catch sight of linguistic garbage like 平果 […]." And not only in the
streets. A 2019 web search yielded ninety-seven 平果酒 against one hundred
and seventy 苹果酒 (cider).

撲 扑 *pū* beat

The Qing *Kāngxi zìdiǎn* had separate entries for 撲 and 扑, with examples
from *Shàngshū*'s 撲滅 (beat out [a fire]) and *Zhànguó cè*'s 扑一人 (beat a man
[to death]). This distinction was often ignored, as in the Tang *Wǔjīng wénzì*:
"扑 is read like 撲 and means 'to beat' or 'stick'. In *Shuōwén* it is written 撲.
In the scriptures both are used interchangeably." The Song *Jíyùn*: "攴 [*pū*
knock] […] is also written 撲 or 扑." The 1956 Scheme ended this peaceful
coexistence by changing 撲 to 扑.

僕 仆 *pú* servant

The 1955 Draft proposed a change of 僕 to 仆, a form replacing 僕 in the early
Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì* and the 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì*. The Script Reform Committee
member Wéi Què admitted its unfamiliarity: "Character simplification is
based on the short forms already in use. […] The committee adopted some
measures to increase the scope of simplification […] changing the phonetic
in 仆, 泸 and 忆 […]." Liú Nǎizhōng in turn pointed out in *Guāngmíng rìbào*
that 仆 clashed with the 仆 *pū* for 'fall forward'. So the committee spokes-
man Cáo Bóhán proposed in 1957 to cancel 仆 alongside twenty-seven other
homophonous substitutes. Cancellations came to nothing, however, and 仆
was authorised in 1964.

樸 朴 *pǔ* simple

Shuōwén distinguished 樸 (unworked wood) from the 朴 (bark), Both came
into use for 'simple'. *Shǐji* said 示敦朴爲天下先 (be honest and simple and
be an example for all). The 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* merged the two: "樸朴.
Both are correct. Read 疋角反 [*pǔ*]. [Sense of] unworked wood or simple."

The 1956 Scheme replaced all 樸 with 朴. Chén Yuè answered critics:
"Some say a change of 樸 to 朴 will mix this character up with the Korean
surname 朴 [Bak/Park]. However, use of 朴 for 樸 is already very common
in society."

Japanese dictionaries used to waver, entering 樸直 (*bokuchoku* simplicity

and honesty) and 純樸 (*junboku* simple-heartedness) as well as 朴直 and 純朴. Limbo ended in 1981, when the Language Council made 朴 but not 樸 a Character for Common Use.

棲 栖 *qī* dwell

Both 棲 and 栖 are heritage forms. In *Shījīng* 雞棲于桀 (*jī qī yú jié* hens sit on their perches), in *Zhuāng zǐ* the ancients 暮栖木上 (*mù qī mù shàng* dwelt in the trees at night). The early Tang writing guide *Zhèngmíng yàolù* said: "棲栖 […] although the above characters are different, their readings and shapes are in fact identical. The former were the norm in the past, while the latter are preferred today." Its successor *Gānlù zìshū* said "both are correct". Downgrading of 栖 started with the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng*: "栖 is informal, 棲is correct." With time, writers complied. On Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* 棲 outnumbers 栖 twenty-six to three.

Downgrading peaked with the 1955 Draft List of 400 Retained and Abolished Variants, which proposed to abolish 栖. It was pointed out that this contradicted the reject-the-long-and-keep-the-short principle.[236] Reformers took note and retained 栖 in their December First List of Regulated Variants.

漆 柒 *沏 *qī* varnish

The right side of 漆 depicts drops (⺧) of liquid (水) dripping from a tree (木). The drops on the left are a late addition, absent in the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts, which describe 丹桼 (丹漆 *dānqī* cinnabar varnish), 歕桼 (噴漆 *pēnqī* spraying varnish) and 桼髹 (漆髹 *qīqī* varnish with lacquer), but turning up on first century BCE wood slips from Juyan.

The somewhat similar 柒 *qī* originated as a river name but came to be used as an elaborate form for the numeral 七, and short for 漆 as on a 548 Buddha statue by Dàoxīng describing a 療沏瘡方 (cure for eczema caused by varnish). Such use of 柒 for 漆 was disparaged as "informal" by the Tang *Gānlù zìshū*, the Liao *Lóngkān shǒujìng* and the Song *Guǎngyùn*.

The 1955 Draft proposed to make it formal by advocating 柒 for 漆. Professor Xú Shìsōng objected in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "In cases like this I find it better to create new, separate characters. We can, for example, simplify 鬱 [*yù* bushy], 籲 [*yù* plead], 礬 and 漆 to 桜, 吁, 矾 and 沏. ([…] till now 柒 has in people's brains only had the sense of 'seven'.)"

The 1956 Scheme did not adopt this 沏, but writers did, as in a 1958 plan

---

236   "Ge di renshi", p. 38. "'Hanzi jianhua fang'an cao'an' gongbu yi ge duo yue lai".

for 北京市油忙厂 (Beijing Varnish Factory). In 1960 use of 忙 was reported in letters from places as disparate as Shanxi, Guizhou and Fujian.[237]

So the 1977 Second Scheme opted for 忙. Hunan Script Reform Committee objected that this collided with the Hunan habit of writing 忙 for 溪 (*xī* stream). This did not prevent their Beijing colleagues from retaining 忙 in their 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">

齊 斉 齐 *qí* even

濟 済 济 *jì* cross a river, help

劑 剤 剂 *jì* medicine

</div>

The 齊 component is shortened to 斉 in Japanese and to 齐 in Chinese. The former are, unsurprisingly, older. Records of 乂 for the central 巫 (hairpins) begin in China about 310 CE with a 斉軍 (Qi army) mentioned twice in the *Zhànguó cè* wood slips from Loulan. The 斉, 斉 or 斉 later seen on steles and in blockprints, were dismissed as "informal" by the Song *Yùpiān* and "wrong" by the Ming *Súshū kānwù*.

In Japan 斉 was treated with more respect. A 749 copper-plate version of an edict by the Shōmu emperor contains a 済. Luminaries like Fujiwara no Michinaga (966–1028), Fujiwara no Kintō (966–1041) and Fujiwara no Yukinari (972–1072) wrote 済 and 済. The sixteenth-century Manjuya version of the *Setsuyōshū* dictionary advocated writing 濟濟 (*seizei* assembly) as 済ミ.

The Japanese Education Ministry and Language Council were never in doubt, advocating 済 and 剤 with 斉 in their 1919, 1923, 1926, 1938 and 1942 reform schemes and finally in the 1946 List of Characters for Current Use. 斉 became official with the 1951 List of Characters for Use in Personal Names.

Chinese writers had by then invented a still shorter form. 齐 and 济 appear in blockprints from the Song onwards, admittedly together with 斉 and 済 which for a long time remained more common; our 1900–1939 manuscripts turn up ten 斉 or 済, six 齐 or 济 and six with 齐 or 济.

In 1935 *Tàibái* and the other Shanghai journals introducing "handy characters" chose to print 齐, 济 and 剂. Their colleagues at *Lúnyǔ* chose forms with 斉, as did the Education Ministry in its abortive List of Short Forms later that year. By the 1950s the shorter forms had gained ground. Our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain sixteen 齐 or 济 against five 済 or 済 and nine 斉 or 济. The Script Reform Committee chose the shorter and more common 齐 or 济.

237 Beijing Archives 36-2-93, p. 30. 1960 letters from Changzi, Rongjiang and Songxi.

<h1 align="center">豈 岂 qǐ how on earth</h1>

The cursive 乞 appears in square style as 岂 in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. 岂 was proposed for official use by the Chinese Education Ministry in 1935 and by the Script Reform Committee in 1955.

Professor Liáng Dōnghàn objected in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "The overwhelming part of the announced characters are 'established by custom' and have long been common in society […]. There is just a small number still worth discussing, like 症 for 癥, 余 for 餘, 忧 for 憂, 厌 for 厭, 肿 for 腫 and 岂 for 豈." Yè Gōngchuò clarified in *Rénmín rìbào*: "Some short forms are well known to older people (like 岂) but unfamiliar to the younger generation." At the script reform conference later in 1955 he played the problem down:

> We cannot demand that every simplified character established by custom be known by every literate person. For example, a secondary school student may not know the short form of the 豈 in 豈有此理 [nonsense!]. But if you ask his father, he will know it. However, when his father reads his letter, he does not recognise the short form [习] of 習 in 学習. We cannot just because of this claim that the short forms of 豈 and 習 are not established by custom.

Thus endorsed, 岂 became official in 1959.

In 1965 Xiāo Tiānzhù admonished *Wénzì gǎigé* readers: "The bottom of 岂 is written 己, without sealing the opening." This reminder must have surprised many. The 岂 proposed by the committee in 1956 and advertised as official in *Rénmín rìbào* on 15 July 1959 had a sealed 巳 bottom which was quietly changed to 己 in the 1962 edition of *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn* and the 1964 General List.

Why change the bottom? Presumably in order to teach it as the phonetic 己 *jǐ*, analogously to the 己 in 起 (*qǐ* rise) and 杞 (*qǐ* wolfberry).

<h1 align="center">啟 啓 启 qǐ open</h1>

Shuōwén gave 启 the sense of 'open' and 啟 (啟) that of 'teach'. In practice the character was written 啟 or 啓 and meant 'open'. In 1039 we read in *Jíyùn*: "启: *Shuōwén* says 'open'. This form is commonly used for 啓." Had 启 writers picked up the form from the 986 re-edition and reprint of *Shuōwén*?

启 was proposed for official status by the Education Ministry in 1935 and by the Script Reform Committee in 1955. Yáo Jiāzhēn wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that "There are still people who oppose characters like 厂, 矿, 产 and 启, which they regard as ugly." Is this why recognition of 启 was delayed until 1959?

<div align="center">棄 弃 *qì* discard</div>

It is not easy to see how 弃 could evolve from 棄. Actually it did not. 棄 consists of an object 厶, said to be an upturned 子 (child), a distorted 𠀠 (其 basket) held by distorted 𠬞 (廾 hands). Forms like 㚣 without the basket appear on Warring States wood slips from Guodian, Xinyang and Baoshan, but then disappear. The 100 CE *Shuōwén* called 𠔉 "an ancient form for 棄." Short forms turn up again, however, as 弃 in the 513 Yán Chén epitaph and in Song, Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprints, perhaps reintroduced by a *Shuōwén* reader. Thus 弃 is a reshaped 𠔉, not a reshaped 棄.

The Chinese Education Ministry included 弃 in its 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee in its 1955 Draft. It then struck someone that 弃 was already present in dictionaries, so it was moved to the First List of Regulated Variants, which became official in December 1955.

In Japan 弃 got a flying start, adopted by celebrities like Kūkai and Fujiwara no Yukinari and appearing in sixteenth-century editions of the *Setsuyōshū* dictionary.[238] By the twentieth-century, however, records had ceased and 弃 was never proposed for official use. What had repelled Japanese writers? Perhaps its similarity to 弁, which they had come into the habit of using for 辯 and 辨.

<div align="center">器 器 器 *〇 *qì* implement</div>

Ambitious dictionaries list the variants 器 with 犬 (dog) and 器 with 工 (work). The dog is the older component, appearing discernibly amid four mouths or bowls in the early Zhou 𤞤, then turning into 𤝗, 犭, 犬, 犭, 犭 or 犭 on Zhou bronzes, 于 or 亍 in the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts, 大 on Jiangling wood slips, 天 on Yinqueshan slips, 土 on Dunhuang slips, 工, 土 or 大 on Juyan slips, 工 or 土 on Wuwei slips and 工 in the 106 CE Mǎ Jiāng epitaph. Into anything, it seems, but 犬.

However, the 100 CE *Shuōwén* maintained that 器 depicted "mouths of bowls guarded by a dog." Clerk style for 'dog' was 犬. Some took *Shuōwén* at its word and wrote 器, as on the 153 Yǐ Yīng stele and 170 Xià Chéng stele. 器 was still far from mainstream, however. The Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* and the early Tang *Zhèngmíng yàolù* still prescribed 器, the latter emphasising that "器 is written with 工." This order was disturbed by the Tang *Gānlù zìshū*, which called 器 "common", promoted 器 with 'dog' as "correct" and was followed by later dictionaries.

---

238   弃置 for *kichi* (discard) in the Manjuya edition, 弃娟 for *kien* (give away) in the Ekirin edition.

Script reform barely touched 器. In 1926 the Interim Committee on the Japanese Language suggested writing 器, followed by the Japanese Language Council in 1938. Eventually the Japanese character lost 丶 in 1949 to become 器, analogously to 類, 涙, 臭 and 突.

The Chinese 1955 Draft instead endorsed the still common 噐. Yú Xīnbó objected in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "Some characters [like 噐] have not attained real simplification and should be simplified further." The committee had no idea how and so left 器 alone.

But others had. In 1959 we find 听診﹝ (*tīngzhěnqì* stethoscopes) in a purchasing list of the Planning Committee of Nanjing City.[239] The following year ﹝ was reported in letters to the Script Reform Committee from Baotou in Inner Mongolia in the north to Xichang in Sichuan in the south. The committee included ﹝ in its 1976 Second Scheme but not in its 1981 Revised Draft.

氣 气 気 *气 *qì* air, gas, vigour

Air was first depicted simply as 三, which became 𣅀 in the Zhou, 𠀁 in the Spring and Autumn and 气 in the Han. It is likely that the hooks and edges were added to distinguish 'air' from the confusingly similar 三 (三 three). By the Han 𠀁 and 气 had come into use for 'beg', as in a 气嘉命 (气嘉命 wish for good fortune) on the Spring and Autumn Marquis of Qí vase. This called for more distinguishing additions. One such appears with a 風氣 (風氣 blowing wind) described in the early Han Punishment and Virtue manuscript from Mawangdui. 氣 once meant 'to present' (which explains the 'rice' component), but came to be used as an elaborate version of 'air'.

While 气 for 'air' was expanded, 气 for 'beg' was shortened to Han 亡 and Jin 乞, which became standard in this sense. The last four-stroke 气 for 'beg' in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* is a 气願 (乞願 prayer) on a 589 Buddha statue by Gěng Xù.

Once 'beg' had become 乞, the risk of mixing up diminished and 气 became a tempting alternative to 氣. The 521 Sīmǎ Xiǎnzī epitaph describes a deceased lady's 妙气 (refined disposition) and the 523 Jì Fán epitaph another consort's 靈之气 (靈之氣 spiritual vigour). The 1039 *Jíyùn* noted that "气 […] is also written 氣."

Competing short forms for 氣 nevertheless turned up, 気 in Yuan and Qing blockprints, 気 in 1904 and 1918 letters and 気 in a handwritten 1941

239   Nanjing Archives 5019-2-73, p. 9.

anti-Chiang Kai-shek battle song from Shandong.[240] The new 気 spread fast. While our 1900–1939 manuscripts contain five 气, one 氕 and no 気, the 1940–1954 proportion is ten 気 to one 气 and one 氕.

In 1935 the Education Ministry chose the relatively common 气 for its abortive List of Short Forms. Twenty years later the Script Reform Committee followed suit, rejecting the by then more common but still less short 気.

In Japan 気 was noticed by Shibata Masao in the 1505 writing guide *Unshū ōrai*, 气 by Yamada Tadao in a sixteenth-century edition of the *Kagakushū* dictionary and 気 by this author in descriptions of Buddha's 気乃病 (*ki no yamai* anxieties) and 気萠 (氣崩 *kikuzure* depressions) in the 1846 blockprint *Shaka goichidaiki zue* (Life of Buddha). As in China 気 outcompeted the older forms. Our 1900–1919 manuscripts contain eight 気 against six 气 and two 氕, those from 1940–1946 have twenty 気 against two 气 and no 氕.

For its 1923 and 1926 reform schemes the Interim Committee on the Japanese Language chose the still predominant 气, as did the Japanese Language Council in 1938 and 1942. Then second thoughts came up. A council memo dated 15 July 1946 noted that "according to Takada Tadachika […] 气 is neither running nor cursive style; since 气 is the original form of 氣, 气 will do." The old but uncommon 氕 was not further contemplated, however. In August we again find 气 in a proposal from the Textbook Office of the Education Ministry, but also on a list of "short forms which will not be adopted" prepared by the Language Council's Committee on Character Survey.[241] This stalemate kept 气 out of the 1946 List of Characters for Current Use and paved the way for the by then ubiquitous 気 in the 1949 List of Forms.

Japanese records of 气 and 気 precede Chinese ones. The 1904 and 1918 Chinese letters with 气 were written by Lǔ Xùn, who lived in Japan from 1902 to 1909. 1942 Beiping Electric Light Company documents with 気 include a list of Chinese names arranged by their Japanese readings, which shows that some Japanese had a hand in the writing.[242] It seems Japan repaid the loan of 气 with interest by sending China 气 and 気.

<p style="text-align:center">韆 千 qiān swing</p>

See 鞦 *qiū.*

240   Liu 1930, p. 123. *Lu Xun shougao quanji, Shuxìn*, vol. 1, pp. 5, 49. *Zibo geming shi*, p. 100.
241   National Archives 1946.6.4–1946.12.19, pp. 78, 75, 73.
242   Beijing Archives J6-3-24, p. 22.

<h1 style="text-align: center;">遷 迁 qiān move</h1>

In the fifth-century BCE Houma Covenants 'move' is written (㘟) with hands (臼) hoisting an object (目) and two more hands (廾) pushing from below. Later scribes chose to stress the 'move' sense further, adding 行 (road) in the 㘟 (䙴) on Warring States pots, 止 (foot) in a 㘟 (䙴) on a wood slip from Wangshan and both these in the 䙴 (遷) and 䙴 (遷) in the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts.

The 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* said 迁 was read like 遷 but meant 'bury'. This simple character nevertheless came to be used for 遷, as in the Song to Qing blockprints examined by Liú Fù. The practice was recognised by the 1013 *Yùpiān,* which gave 迁 the sense of "move forward", and more decisively by the 1956 Scheme.

In Japan 迁 gained more respect and entered dictionaries sooner, like the sixteenth-century *Ikyōshū,* which recommended writing 迁化 (*senge* pass away) where the 1496 *Setsuyōshū* had 遷化. Dictionaries continued to call 迁 "informal for 遷", but the Japanese Language Council considered the shorter form too rare to include in the 1949 List of Forms.

<h1 style="text-align: center;">牽 *牵 牵 qiān pull</h1>

The 1955 Draft proposed to shorten 牽 to 牵 with 亠 for 玄. 亠 tops had appeared already in our earliest inscriptions, in a 牵 in a silk manuscript from Mawangdui and a 牵 on a wood slip from Dunhuang. As late as in the Tang 牵 with 亠 was prescribed in the writing guide *Zhèngmíng yàolù.* Our oldest square style 玄 top in fact appears in *Zhèngmíng yàolù*'s successor *Gānlù zìshū,* undoubtedly inspired by *Shuōwén*'s insistence that the top of the character is the phonetic 玄 *xuán.* Subsequent dictionaries stuck to 玄 tops, while writers wavered.

The 1956 Scheme shortened 牵 further to 牵 with 大 for 亠. 牵 was known previously, from a 1540 stele inscribed by the poet Liú Qīnshùn. Reformers seem to have been unaware of this, however. Chén Guāngyáo called 牵 a "newly coined short form", and Liáng Dōnghàn argued in *Wénzì gǎigé* that "some simplified forms which are not established by custom are nevertheless very good, like 牵 for 牵 and 发 for 發 and 髮." Unfamiliarity may explain why official status was denied 牵 until 1958.

<h1 style="text-align: center;">謙 谦 *讦 qiān modest</h1>

The Script Reform Committee's 1977 Second Scheme suggested changing 谦 to 讦. Records of this 讦 are scanty: a 1960 letter to the committee from Zhenyuan in Guizhou and 1977 letters from Yunyang in Sichuan, Mengcheng

in Anhui and Sihong in Jiangsu. In the committee's Character Group "one person advocated a change to 訦 [with the phonetic 欠 *qiàn*] to avoid similarity to汗 [which was proposed for 潛 *qián*]."[243] Rather than promoting an invented form, the committee left 謙 out of its 1981 Revised Draft.

潛 潜 *汙 *qián* hidden

Eastern Han steles are inscribed 潛 or 潜 with two 兂 (hairpins) on top right. One exception, the 163 CE Tóngbǎi Temple stele, has a 潜 with 夭. Such compressed tops soon ceased to be exceptional; *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains twenty-eight Later Wei 潜 with 夰 or 夫 against three with 兓. The Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* followed the majority, advocating 潜 with 夰.

The Tang *Gānlù zìshū*, the 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* and later dictionaries did not go along so easily, prescribing instead 潛 with the etymologically correct hairpins. Not everybody got the point. The Tang writing guide *Zhèngmíng yàolù* contains a list contrasting "correct" and "somewhat erroneous" forms. Our surviving copy, written on a Dunhuang scroll by a private teacher, confusingly includes the pair 潜潜. Presumably the original contrasted 潜 潛 or 潜潜, which the copying teacher slipped into rendering 潜潜, out of entrenched habit. That habit lived on, so the 1617 *Zìkǎo* had to repeat: "潜 is written with 兓. 潜 is wrong."

The 1955 Draft bowed to practice and proposed 潜 for 潛. It then occurred to someone that 潜 had the same stroke count as 潛 and so could not be called a simplified character. This explains why 潜 was legalised not in the 1964 General List of Simplified Characters, but in the 1955 First List of Regulated Variants.

Some wanted to go further. Zhāng Yuǎntí suggested in *Guāngmíng rìbào* to adopt the shorter phonetic 千 and write 汙, as did Chén Guāngyáo in his *Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo*. The idea was rejected by the committee, but not by the public. In 1960 letters from Siping in Jilin, Baotou in Inner Mongolia, Jinan in Shandong and Xiamen in Fujian informed the committee that local writers had taken up 汙 for 潜.

So the committee included 汙 in its 1977 Second Scheme. The education bureaus and committees in Jilin, Fujian, Tianjin, Yunnan, Hubei, Jiangxi and Sichuan pointed out that 汙 would be mixed up with 汗. Five correspondents also alerted the committee that "汙 is used as short for 溪 [*xī* stream] in the south" (actually in Zhejiang, as we shall see in the 溪 section).[244] In consequence 汙 dropped out of the 1981 Revised Draft.

---

243 *"Cao'an di yi biao" xiuding qingkuang shuoming*, 1979, p. 4.
244 *Qunzhong dui 'Cao'an'*, p. 4.

錢 錢 钱 *乡 *戋 qián money, 3.75 grams, copper coin

From the Later Wei onwards writers shortened 錢 to 錢 or 銭 analogously to 淺, 綫 and 殘 which were dealt with in the *cán* section. 錢 was the most common of the group and so the most liable to further reduction.

Radically shortended forms like 乡 and 尒 appear in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. Our 1864 account book says 張三卩欠乡佰 (張三爺欠錢佰 *Zhāng sān yé qiàn qián yī bǎi* the third Mr Zhāng owes one hundred).[245] In the 關 *guān* section we saw that Lǔ Xùn wrote 佲乡 for 價錢. Mathews' 1931 dictionary enters the variant 个. Ōuyáng Zhēn, Féng Liǔtáng and Yì Xīwú mentioned 乡 and 乆, which they held to be derivates of 桼 (泉 *quán* spring, coin). In *Dàgōng bào* Tài Yáng rendered the character 戋.

Less radical shorteners retained a left side but replaced 金 with the shorter 'man'. Liú Fù found 仸 in the 1862–1874 blockprint *Lǐngnán yìshǐ* and we find 仸糧 (*qiánliáng* taxes) in Lǔ Xùn's diary and in the stanza 互人们 劳不停 得互仸 数百文 (workers toil diligently; receiving pay, they count coins in the hundreds) in a 1932 Soviet area primer.[246]

The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms proposed 乡 and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft 钱, keeping the analogy to 浅, 线 and 残. We register one counterproposal, from a meeting of the Chinese Writers' Association where Gě Luò suggested 尐.[247] This did not sway the committee, which legalised 钱 in 1964.

Objectors lingered. In 1965 the Yunnan teacher Lǐ Yǒng argued in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "Could one not recognise the characters the masses have already adopted and let them be used legally, like 芷 (藏), 丁 (街), 佔 (儲), 尒 (錢) and 忈 (意)?" Professor Dǒng Wèichuān of Beijing Normal University wrote:

> To accomplish character simplification […] one must consult people of all trades. For example, pharmacists write the weight of Chinese medicine in qian as 加 because the simplified form of 錢 does not fill their needs. If one prescription contains ten kinds of medicine, one has to write ten 錢. What a waste of time!

The 1977 Second Scheme ignored these arguments and kept 钱.

Outside the People's Republic we encounter further variants. In Taiwan Pān Zhòngguī wrote in 1954: "In prescriptions written by Chinese medics

---

245   Beijing Archives J106-1-1.
246   *Lu Xun shougao quanji*: *Riji*, p. 214. *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 194.
247   Zhongguo zuojia xiehui 1955.

one finds characters like 刄 (錢) [...]." On the web, Joe Hing Kwok Chu warns fellow medics:

> A form written in shorthand can be confusing for herbalists from mainland China if you use the symbols commonly used in Hong Kong or among overseas Chinese elsewhere in the world. The herbalists from the mainland might read your shorthand 刄 (*qian*) as *liang* (ten times as much). In some parts of mainland China qian is written in shorthand as 刄 or as 尒. [...] Errors like these have happened but are rare, because a responsible herbalist will see that the weight of the herbs is out of the regular range and will call the prescription writers to verify them.

In Japan we know similar forms from 1692, when Nakane Genkei wrote that "久 is the same as 錢" and from 1753 when Dazai Shundai wrote that 匁 was (匁 is now read *momme* and indicates a weight of 3.75 grams).

When the yen currency was introduced in 1870, its fraction was dubbed 錢 *sen,* a name reasonably similar to the American cent and Mexican centavo which it was intended to replace. As 匁 had come to designate a weight, the need for a new short form for *sen* arose. From 1887 onwards we find recorded expenses like 壱円五拾戔 (1 yen 50 sen). The Education Ministry's 1908 *Kanji yōran* (Survey of Characters) suggested: "円–圓, 厘–釐, 丁–町 [*chō* hectare], 戔–錢. When the above characters are used as measures, there is no harm in using the variant."[248] This was the closest 戔 ever came to official recognition. The ensuing 1919, 1923, 1926, 1938 and 1942 reform schemes advocated the 錢 which finally became official in 1946.

縴 紆 纤 *qiàn* tow line

The 1955 Revised Draft proposed 牵 for 牽 and analogously 縴 for 縴, with a note that the alternative "紆 is very common in Sichuan". The 1956 Scheme plumped for the latter, shorter form, which turned out not to be common all over. Wēn Yìngshí wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "There are only the following five characters which are not much used by the masses yet and have not made their mark, which one might consider changing: [...] 縴 is shortened to 紆 in the scheme, I suggest a change to 縴." Only in 1964 did 纤 replace 縴 (and 纖 *xiān*, q.v.).

---

248 Yamaguchi Archives 戰前 A 土族 600. *Kanji yoran*, p. 26.

<div align="center">

歉 欠 *qiàn* apology

</div>

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed to replace 歉 with the homonym 欠 (*qiàn* owe). Records of this practice are scarce, a 1977 letter from Wuyang in Henan and another from Yunyang in Sichuan. The proposal was withdrawn from the 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">

槍 枪 *qiāng* gun
搶 抢 *qiǎng* rob

</div>

See 倉 *cāng*.

<div align="center">

牆 墙 *牆 *垟 *qiáng* wall
嗇 啬 *sè* stingy

</div>

The 1955 Draft proposed to simplify 墙/牆 to 牆 with 爿 (board), the 1956 Scheme to 墙 with 土 (earth). 爿 is the older component by far, appearing in Yin 𤖫 (嗇), Zhou 𤖫 (嗇) and 𤖫 (牆) and *Shuōwén*'s 牆 (牆). 土 is not even the second oldest left side; on stone steles we find 廧 with 广 (wall) from 147 CE, 癗 with 爿 and 广 from 156, 墻 with 土 and 广 from 405 but 墙 with 土 only from 668. Authorities like the Qing *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* followed *Shuōwén*, prescribing 牆. 墙 with 土 nevertheless became the more common form, outnumbering 牆 eight to one on Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* and nine to one in our 1900–1954 manuscripts. The 1955 Draft followed authority and the 1956 Scheme custom.

Puzzlingly, the right side of the now official 墙 contains one stroke more than the 龶-topped 嗇 prevalent in the Han and Later Wei and advocated in the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén*. What made writers discard 龶? Presumably *Shuōwén*'s insistence that 牆 "consists of 嗇 and the phonetic 爿 [*qiáng*]" and 嗇 "of 來 [wheat] and 向 [granary]." Yán Yuánsūn managed to squeeze at least the top of 來 into the 牆 he prescribed in *Gānlù zìshū*. Writers complied; our records of the 龶 component cease with a 廧 in a 1390 wall inscription in the Mèng zǐ temple in Zōuxiàn. 从 was hard to squeeze in, however, so Song blockprinters replaced it with ⺍ and were followed by later writers and in 1956 by Script Reform Committee.

Even 墙 was too bulky for some. In April 1956 Hubei Board of Trade reg-

istered an expediture of 3000 yuan on a new 囲垟 (*wéiqiáng* fence).[249] Four years later use of 垟 for 墙 was reported in letters to the committee from Xiamen, Songxi, Xichang and Guangzhou. Further use earned 垟 a place in the 1977 Second Scheme.

Fujian Education Bureau and Shanghai Interim Script Reform Leading Group found the 羊 *yáng* phonetic misleading. The committee split. A 1979 memo said some in its Character Group considered that "羊 expresses the sound imprecisely, so we should change to 垬 [with the phonetic *qiāng*]," others wanted to "revoke the change; the 垟 in the Zhejiang place names 南垟 and 半垟 is read *yáng* and will be mixed up with 垟 *qiáng*; whereas 垬 would be too unfamiliar."[250] In the end the 1981 Revised Draft passed 墙 over.

彊 强 強 *qiáng* strong *qiǎng* strive

In 2011 one Huáng Pèizé reported from his school's Cultured Little Scholars Summer Camp: "We prepared for our first activity: a search for irregular characters. […] Before we had walked twenty steps, I stopped. 'Hey, look here!' I stepped back and the others came. […] A close look revealed that the top 口 of 强 had become 厶."

厶 tops were outlawed by the 1955 First List of Regulated Variants, creating a split with Japanese which retained 強 with 厶. There was a case even for 厶, however. The 1610 *Súshū kānwù* argued: "強 is informally written 强. This is wrong. *Shuōwén* says the character consists of [the phonetic] 弘 [*hóng*] and 虫. This makes it clear which is correct and which is wrong." Not quite clear; the Song scholar Xú Kǎi pointed out that "in Qin stone inscriptions the character is written with 口." As it is on Han wood slips and stone steles. 強 with 厶 does not appear until 578, first on a statue by Mǎ Tiānxiáng, then in the Tang *Gānlù zìshū* and in ensuing dictionaires. Obviously 厶 writers were taking *Shuōwén* at its word, writing with a 弘.

'Strong' was initially written 彊 (彊) with the phonetic 畺 *jiāng*. On Western Han wood slips the shorter 强 (*qiáng* rice weevil) turns up in the same sense. With time this practice became universal. While we we find just eleven 强 among thirty-nine 彊 in Sano Kōichi's register of Han wood slips, the proportion on Later Wei steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* is thirty-two 强 to three 彊 and on Qing steles fifteen to nil.

249   Hubei Archives SZ81-2-1039, vol. 1, p. 1.
250   *"Cao'an di yi biao" xiuding qingkuang shuoming*, p. 7.

高 喬 乔 *qiáo* high
橋 橋 桥 *qiáo* bridge
僑 僑 侨 *qiáo* living abroad
驕 骄 *jiāo* proud
矯 矯 矫 *jiǎo* rectify

Atsuji Tetsuji writes: "I have a friend called Takahashi who writes his name 髙橋. The form 高橋 makes him uncomfortable. His forebears have written 髙橋 for generations, so it is unthinkable for his generation to change."

Variation precedes the Takahashis. The top of Warring States 喬 has been interpreted as growing grass (屮), that of 喬 as a flying dragon (九), that of 喬 as an ascending foot (止), that of 喬 as a climbing arm (力) and that of 喬 as a climbing hand (又). Han silk manuscripts and stone steles contain 驕, 橋 and 驕 with 又 (hand), 僑 with 𠂇 (hand), 僑 with 大 and 矯 (矯) with 天.

Xǔ Shèn called for order, presenting an etymology in *Shuōwén*: "喬: high and bent. The character consists of 夭 [夭 bent] and a shortened 高." By defining 喬 as 'high and bent' instead of 'high', Xǔ had created a rationale for a 夭 top.

This converted few. Umehara Seizan's registers of Later Wei and Tang inscriptions contain nine 矯 with 𠂇, one 矯 with 大, one 矯 with 犬 and one 矯 with 宀 but no 矯 with 夭. The Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* recommended 矯 with 大, the Tang *Yùpiān* 輤 with 𠂇.

Attitudes would change, however. Our oldest extant 夭 top appears in a 矯 on the 503 Prefect Yú epitaph. The Tang *Gānlù zìshū* held 喬 with 夭 as "correct", classing 高 as "informal", and was followed by the 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì*, the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* and so on. These helped oust 𠂇 tops from everyday use. 𠂇 tops were, for example, registered in Liú Fù's Song and Yuan blockprints but not in Ming and Qing ones.

By then writers had come up with the still shorter 乔, 娇 and 矫, which appear in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. These became official in China but not in Japan, where they had not taken root.

<h2 style="text-align:center">殼 壳 *qiào*</h2>

See 殼 *ké*.

<h2 style="text-align:center">竅 窍 *qiào* aperture</h2>

The 1955 Draft proposed to shorten 竅 to 窍, a proposal which was implemented in June 1956 with the Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters. Chén Guāngyáo, co-creator of the Draft, called 窍 "a character

established by custom, written with 穴 and 丂 [*qiǎo* skilful]. 丂 is also phonetic. This is analogous to 窈. 'Also phonetic' means that this [丂] is the semantic component of the character and at the same time is its phonetic. There are many examples of this in *Shuōwén*."

This promotion was needed. 窍 is not on record before the reform and was mentioned by fellow reformer Yì Xīwú among "newly created characters".

竊 窃 *qiè* steal

Liú Fù found 切 (*qiē* cut) for 竊 in Yuan and Ming blockprints. The more explicit 窃 with 穴 (void) appears in blockprints from the early Qing onwards and became official as 窃 in 1946 in Japan and ten years later in China (土 in the earlier forms is an elaboration of the original 七 phonetic).

親 亲 *qīn* parent

亲 is the left side of 親 and the left side of 新 (*xīn* new). Shorteners could have employed it as short for either, but Yuan blockprinters chose to write 亲 for 親 and set a tradition which became rule in June 1956.

禽 *夲 *介 *qín* fowl

In 1960 a Nanjing teacher wrote to the Script Reform Committee that he had seen 夲 for 禽 in his pupils' works. In 1963 a Circular Curbing the Use of Incorrect Characters in Trade issued by Beijing Non-staple Food Trade Office condemned the "widespread use of wrongly written characters like […] 家夲 […]."[251] In 1980 this author saw a 家夲 (poultry) market in Nanjing and a 苗夲供应 (*miáoqín gōngyìng* chicken supply) point in Huzhou in Zhejiang. In 1986 Wáng Mǐnxué of the Anhui Language and Script Working Committee complained of 家夲 writers.

In 1980 this author noticed a 家介 sign in Shanghai, with the phonetic 斤 *jīn*. In 1985 Fèi Jǐnchāng surveyed irregular characters and found "simplified characters current only in one area or in one trade, among them picto-phonetic characters based on dialect reading, like 朾 (楼) in Wuhan in Hubei, 辺 (遵) in Hai'an in Jiangsu and 介 (禽) in Shanghai."

Yes, 介 was typical for Shanghai, identified in 1981–1986 by informants in that city and by one in Suzhou and one in Nanjing, but not in neighbouring Jiaxing, Hangzhou, Huzhou, Nantong and so on. Even 夲 turned out to be a local form, identified in Nanjing, Yangzhou, Huaiyin, Yancheng, Suzhou,

---

251   Beijing Archives 2-21-269.

Huzhou and Shaoxing but not in surrounding areas. It is no surpruse that the 井 *jǐng* phonetic came into use just in this area, where speakers mix up the *-ing* and *-in* endings of the standard language.

Later records of both forms are lacking.

<div align="center">勤 勤 *㔀 <i>qín</i> diligent</div>

The 1956 Scheme passed 勤 over, but the public did not. A December 1955 list of assets of 勤丰煙厂 (Qinfeng Cigarette Factory) in Nanjing is followed by a January 1956 one for 㔀丰灯厰.[252] In 1957 Fán Jiāng reported in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that his Zhejiang pupils wrote either 㔀, 㔀 or 劝 for 勤. In 1958 Zhāng Sījìng from Handan complained that some textbooks contained "locally simplified characters like […] 叻 (勤)". In 1961 Wén Bīng mentioned 㔀 in *Wénzì gǎigé* among short forms "in common use all over the country". Zhāng Zhī from Linxian in Henan objected: "As for 勤, we simplify that to 㔀 here, not to 㔀. One who teaches language at a given place has no way to know whether such unofficial short forms are current in the whole country or not."

But the Script Reform Committee had a way to know. In 1960 it received letters from thirteen places reporting 㔀, from Baotou in Inner Mongolia in the north to Heyuan in Guangdong in the south, but no reports of 㔀, 劝 or 叻. So 㔀 was its obvious choice for its 1962 and 1977 simplification schemes. However, criticism of misleading phonetics like the 夫 *fū* in the proposed 宊 (富 *fù*), 令 *lìng* in 砱 (磷 *lín*) and 羊 *yáng* in 垟 (墙 *qiáng*) related even to the 井 *jǐng* in 㔀 *qín* and contributed to the exclusion of 㔀 from the 1981 Revised Draft.

The Japanese Language Council shortened 勤 to 勤 in 1949, analogously to the 謹, 勤, 漢, 難 and 嘆 described in the 難 *nán* section.

<div align="center">輕 軽 轻 <i>qīng</i> light</div>

See 經 *jīng*.

<div align="center">
青 *靑 <i>qīng</i> blue, green
清 *渍 <i>qīng</i> clear
情 *忮 <i>qíng</i> feeling
請 请 *诤 <i>qǐng</i> ask
</div>

The Script Reform Committee's 1962 and 1977 schemes proposed 靑 for 青, 渍 for 清 and so on. This 靑 is not based on the classic cursive 青 with a 乛 (月)

---

252   Nanjing Archives 5034-3-461, pp. 194, 220.

bottom, but on the further shortened ち which writers then transformed into square 专, as on a 1929 envelope addressed to "Y.M.C.A. Tientsin", clarified by the postman to 专年会 (青年會 the youth association).[253] 专 was excluded from the 1981 Revised Draft for fear of confusion with 专, according to the committee staff member Fù Yǒnghé.

慶 庆 qìng celebrate

The 心 (heart) in 慶 was reduced to 一 or removed in the 虜, 慶 or 慶 on Han wood slips and the 慶 in Yuan and Qing blockprints. Reduction accelerated in the twentieth century. Our 1909 account book registers payments to one 义合度, a 1912 entry in Lǔ Xùn's diary has a 庆 and a 1925 inventory list from the Palace Museum in Beijing registers an item from 加庆二年 (嘉慶二年 1797).[254] Introducing its 1935 List of Short Forms, the Education Ministry vowed to avoid "forms used for different characters, like 广 which stands for 廣 but also for 慶."

庆 came to outcompete the rest, appearing for 慶 in four of our 1940–1954 manuscripts compared with 度 in two and 庆 and 广 in none. In his *Jiǎntǐ zìyuán* Yì Xīwú of the Committee for Research on Script Reform advocated the common form:

Today this character is commonly written with 犬 [quǎn dog] […]. Some say 庆 is too undignified to use by celebrations. However, the form is established by custom and there is no need to be caught up on the sense of components […]. Moreover, characters with 犬 are not necessarily negative. 獻 [xiàn offer], 猷 [yóu just as], 獎, 猗 [yī how fine!], 猛 [měng fierce] and 獲, for example, are positive.

Nevertheless the Script Reform Committee opted for dignity by proposing 庆 with 大, not 犬 in its 1955 Draft. In *Zhōngguó Yǔwén* Guǎn Xièchū of the Academy of Social Sciences instead advocated 广, which was, however, earmarked for 廣. Wáng Màocái in turn defended 庆 in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "When simplifying characters, applying the established-by-custom principle alone is not sufficient, one can also introduce some new forms if suitable. Characters like 尘, 灭, 厅, 卢, 庆 […] truly demonstrate the creative wisdom of our people." Doubts nevertheless delayed the recognition of 庆 until June 1956.

、writers persisted. The 1964 General List warned that 庆 was "written with 大, not 犬", the 1998 *Xiàndài Hànyǔ guīfàn zìdiǎn* that "The bottom

---

253 Chang 1995, vol. 9, p. 562.
254 *Lu Xun shougao quanji*: *Riji* vol. 1, p. 10. Museum of Chinese History, manuscript 史 5678, p. 9.

right of 庆 is 大, not 犬." In 2006 Cuī Xǐzhōng complained of "graduates of a renowned agricultural institute" who "write 庆 with 广 and 犬."

庆 reached Taiwan, but not the canophobic warnings. This sowed discord. On 4 October 2006 one Sōng Jiānshuāng alerted web readers:

> Shameless Taiwan businessmen insult our great national day! […] I discovered this by accident two hours ago as I was having tea at the Taiwan-owned San huang san jia (3R3H) restaurant at Dayan Tower Square in Xi'an. […] Notice how 'China's National Day' is written!

A reproduced poster declared that 中国国庆三皇三家同庆 (San huang san jia celebrates China's National Day together with all), with the abominable 犬.

Japanese writers never picked up 庆, but some found another short cut. In 1975 *Yomiuri shimbun* reported that students at 慶応大学 (Keio University) wrote 庆応大学 with the phonetics K and O on leaflets and posters. The forms have not come into general use and none of our twenty-four 2014–2017 informants could identify them.

瓊 琼 *qióng* fine jade

We first find 琼 in a 1920 letter to the Bank of China from its 琼支行 (Qiong-zhou branch).[255] Chén Guāngyáo described 琼 as "a character established by custom, written with 王 and the phonetic 京."

The 1955 Draft proposed to make 琼 official. Bào Yòuwén objected in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "瓊 and 京 have different readings, so it would be better to write 挎 [with the phonetic 夸 *qióng*]."

Who got the idea of adopting the phonetic 京 *jīng* in the first place? Cáo Bóhán gave a hint in *Wénzì gǎigé*:

> Some people believe that those characters in the Draft which they do not know have been created by the editors of the Draft. This is inconsistent with the facts. The reason that they do not know them is that some characters have been used only to a limited extent. For example […] writing 琼崖 [*Qióngyá* Hainan] is common in Guangdong and Guangxi.

Yes, Guangdong people needed a short form for Hainan place names like 瓊崖, 瓊山, 瓊海 and 瓊州. They found a handy phonetic, 京 which is read *kɪŋ* in Cantonese and so rhymes with 瓊 *k'ɪŋ*, and *keŋ* in Hainanese which rhymes with 瓊 *xeŋ*.

---

255   Beijing Archives J31-1-771, p. 8.

Northern doubts delayed official status for 琼 until 1959.

窮 穷 *qióng* poor, to the utmost

The 弓 in 窮 is a shortened 呂 (which in turn is a shortened 宮 *gōng* phonetic). We can follow the character's evolution from 窡 (窮) with 呂 on Warring States wood slips from Baoshan, 窮 with 呂 in the early Han manuscripts from Mawangdui, 窮 with 㠯 on Western Han wood slips and either 窮 with 呂, 窮 with 弓 or 窮 with 弓 on Eastern Han stone steles. The 175 Xīpíng Stone Classics set the 弓 norm by prescribing 窮.

A still shorter form had existed. In the ca 300 BCE manuscripts from Guodian scribes sometimes dropped 呂 altogether to write 窡窡㐅窡 (穷𧪳以 𣩄 [窮達以時] misery and success depend on the times) and 㓁甪矛窡 (丌甪不 穷 [其用不窮] using this, one will not be lacking). Records of this, however, cease with the 134–118 BCE wood slips from Yinqueshan.

Radically shortened forms like 穷 and 穹 appeared in Yuan blockprints. 穹 was a borrowed homonym originally meaning 'vault'. 穷 was explained by Chén Guāngyáo as a 弓-less 窮 with 身 turned 为 turned 力 (which happened to give the character the logic of 'void of clout').

穷 was picked for the 1935 "handy characters" and the 1955 Draft. Chén Guāngyáo defended the choice: "There are also those who advocate 穹, but that form is not so common." Kǒng Xiángdé disagreed: "穷 is unfamiliar. We think it would be better to simplify to 穹." Zhū Qìngxià noted in 1957 that many kept writing 穹 "according to their own habit." Official status for 穷 was delayed until June 1956.

鞦 秋 *qiū* swing
韆 千 *qiān* swing

The 1956 Scheme changed 鞦韆 (swing) to 秋千. Gōng Shì wrote in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "Some of these homonymous substitutions have been used for a long time, like 才 for 纔, 千 for 韆, 秋 for 鞦 […]." Very long in fact. In *Dié liàn huā* (Butterflies Chasing Flowers) the traveller Lǐ Yù (937–978) wrote 誰在 秋千笑裏低低語 (who is there on the swing, whispering and laughing). The Song *Fùgǔpiān* explained the existence of two forms: "Gāo Wújì says in the introduction to 鞦韆賦 [*qiūqiān fù* On Swings]: 'This was a pastime in the women's part of the palace of Emperor Wǔ of Han.' It was originally called 秋千 and was used by celebrations. Later the word was distorted to 鞦韆."

<p style="text-align:center">區 区 *区 *区 qū area
鷗 鸥 ōu sea-gull
歐 欧 Ōu Europe</p>

We find 区 with 又 in Yuan blockprints, 鸥 with ㄨ in the 1496 Meiō version of the *Setsuyōshū* dictionary and 鸥 with a further contracted 区 in the ensuing Manjuya version. The latter came to dominate in Japan, where our 1900–1946 manuscripts yield fifty 区 against seventeen 区 and no 区.

The Japanese Education Ministry's 1919 Character Regulation Scheme suggested permitting the common 区. Its 1926, 1938 and 1942 schemes switched to the less radical 区, which finally became official in 1946.

Chinese habits differed somewhat; our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain thirty-nine 区, thirty-six 区, thirty-five 区, twenty-nine 尾 and eight 區. Reformers wavered, picking 区 for *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters", 区 for the Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms, 区 for the Script Reform Society's 1950 List of Common Short Forms and finally 区 for the Script Reform Committee's 1956 Scheme. Chén Guāngyáo argued: "This character is also written 区, but that is not so easy to write as 区, so that form was not adopted."

<p style="text-align:center">麴 麹 麯 曲 qū leaven, yeast</p>

Dictionaries operate with two traditional forms, 麴 with 匊 *jū* and 麯 with 曲 *qū*. 麴 is the older, seen in orders and receipts on Western Han wood slips and on Jin and Tang steles. The shorter 麯 appears in the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* as an "informal" form for the "correct" 麹. This view was upheld by later dictionaries. The Ming *Zìkǎo* spelled out: "麴 is written with 來 and 匊. 麯 is wrong."

The 1955 Draft and 1956 Scheme shortened "the hitherto generally used" 麯 to 曲 (*qū* bent). This change, wrote the *Wénzì gǎigé* editor in a comment to the debater Chéng Yí, "is based on characters customarily used in shops." The change to 曲 was not immediately implemented. In 1957 Cáo Bóhán offered on behalf of the Script Reform Committee to recall this and twenty-seven other homophonous substitutions. As we know, these revisions came to nothing and 曲 was confirmed by the 1964 General List.

In the meantime, in December 1955, the committee's First List of Regulated Variants had abolished 麴 to retain 麯, which thus came to enjoy nine years of official status.

權 権 权 *quán*
勸 勧 劝 *quàn*

See 觀 *guān.*

缺 欠 *quē* lack

In 1946 the Japanese Language Council shortened 缺 *ketsu* to 欠, a practice we can trace back to 1882, when a meeting report said one person 欠席 (*kesseki* was absent).[256] 欠 is an unlikely descendant of 缺, but a likely one of its variant 闕.

Use of 欠 for 缺 would make no sense China, where 欠 is read *qiàn* and means 'owe'. This sense of 欠 was obsolete in Japan, so users writers felt free to adopt this character for 'lack'.

確 确 *què* firmly

The 1956 Scheme changed 確 to 确. The latter is older than the former, appearing in *Shuōwén*, whereas 確 enters our records only in a 986 addition to that book: "Today this character [确] is informally written 確. This is not correct." This negative attitude had changed by 1013, when that year's version of *Yùpiān* said 確口角切堅固也 (確 is read *què* and means firm) with no such caveat.

The 1955 Draft left 確 in peace. The proofreader Zhào Xī reminded the reformers: "Replacing 審, 確, 進 [...] with 审, 确, 进 [...] is something the masses have been used to for a long time. It is necessary to add these characters to the scheme and announce them with the rest." Which was done in the 1956 Scheme.

壤埌 *圤 *rǎng* soil earth
嚷嚷*吐 *rǎng* shout yell
襄襄 *xiāng* assist
鑲*钍 *xiāng* inlay

The 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì* said 埌 was "in use in society" for 壤. The 1955 Draft, however, mooted 圤, an analogy to the proposed 註 for 讓 (*ràng* yield). 圤 turned out to be unfamiliar to the public. We saw in the *niàng* section that the reformer Yì Xīwú regarded 圤 as not customary. At a meeting of the Committee for the Promotion of Democracy some comrades feared that 圤

---

256   Yamaguchi Archives 矢田部家 2.

"will not be easy to recognise for the masses."[257] The Script Reform Committee responded by lifting 圤 out of its 1956 Scheme.

圤 had gained a foothold, however. In 1960 Qī Chángshùn of Shenyang Forestry and Pedology Institute wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that "some characters have long been in use by the masses, like 圤 (壤), 毕 (壁) […]." A teacher from Fujian Agriculture Office wrote to the committee that he in his work had encountered the character "圤 (埌)" (taking the latter to be the official form).

訨 inspired more analogies. Also in 1960, correspondents from Wanrong in Shanxi and Yangchun in Guangdong reported use of 吐 for 嚷 to the committee. In 1974 Liú Xīngēng from Wuhan wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that "in our factory and in our district there have emerged new simplified characters" like 钍 for 鑲.

So the committee renewed its 圤 proposal in its 1977 Second Scheme, this time including 吐 and 钍. Six objectors proposed a change to 埌 instead.[258] This did not sway the committee, which in its 1981 Revised Draft made a last bid for 圤, 吐 and 钍.

In Japan the 襄 component became 㐮 in 1949. This 㐮 with 𠆢 for 吅 was not the most common pre-reform short form, appearing in three of our 1900–1946 manuscripts compared with 襄 in eight. In 1926 and 1938 authorities proposed the common 襄 analogously to the proposed 単 for 單 and 器 for 器. The approval of 㐮 with 𠆢 came only with the 1949 List of Forms.

Puzzlingly the now official Japanese forms with 𠆢 were at least as common in China as in Japan; our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts contain eleven襄, 釀, 壤 or 讓 against three 醸 or 譲 with 良 and no forms with 吅.

讓 譲 *让 *ràng* yield

The Japanese Language Council shortened 讓 to 譲 in 1949. Chinese reformers were less modest. In 1935 the *Tàibái* editors adopted 訨 with the phonetic *shàng* among the "handy characters" to use in their columns. Chén Guāngyáo mooted 詶, but was criticised in 1936 by fellow reformer Ōuyáng Zhēn for promoting this "new and odd" form instead of the common 讱, an analogy to the older 娘 for 孃.

For its 1955 Draft the Script Reform Committee chose 訨. *Guāngmíng rìbào*'s "Wèntí jiědá" column explained: "讓 is read 日大 [*rang*] in Beijing speech, close to the 尸大 [*shang*] reading of 上. In addition 訨 is very current among the masses."

---

257 "Zhongguo minzhu cujin hui".
258 *Qunzhong dui "Cao'an"*, p. 6.

Others took 譲 to be more current. Qiū Chángnù of Northeast Normal University wrote: "For the character 让 (讓) it would be better to use 譲 which is established by custom." Zhào Tàimóu of Shandong University called 让 "new". Fù Cháoyáng reported in 1956: "In *Èrtóng shídài* [Childhood] the form used for 讓 is 譲, not 让." The Anhui teacher Zhōu Qǐfèng recorded 讱 in the works of middle school students. Such discord delayed the official adoption of 让 until 1959.

<h2 style="text-align:center">擾 扰 rǎo harass</h2>

See 優 *yōu*.

<h2 style="text-align:center">繞 绕 rào coil</h2>

See 堯 *yáo*.

<h2 style="text-align:center">熱 热 rè heat</h2>

See 勢 *shì*.

<h2 style="text-align:center">認 訒 认 rèn recognise</h2>

訒 was mentioned in 1950 by Huáng Ruòzhōu in the Shanghai *Wénhuì bào*. In 1952 Dīng Xīlín of the Committee for Research on Script Reform confirmed the novelty of this form:

> When advocates of short forms find a character too complex, they use the same method [of creating a picto-phonetic character] to design a new character, writing for example 擁護 as 拥护 and 認識 [*rènshi* know] as 訒訳. At first sight this way of creating characters looks ingenious, but […] later people may come to read half of the character and so pronounce it wrongly.

认 became official only in 1959, either because of these concerns or because refermers had been waiting for a verdict concerning the 言 component.

<h2 style="text-align:center">榮 荣 荣 róng glory</h2>

See 營 *yíng*.

<h1 style="text-align:center">儒 儒 *仔 *仈 *rú* Confucian</h1>

Writers early realised that this character would look much the same with 而 for the awkward 雨. In fact our oldest legible inscription is a 儒 on a 32–6 BCE wood slip from Wuwei. This 儒 proved resilient, appearing ten times in Umehara Seizan's collection of Later Wei inscriptions compared with 儒 in four.

Shuōwén, however ordained the phonetic 需 *xū* with 雨. The Tang *Gānlù zìshū* duly called 儒 "informal" and the 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* "wrong". Writers took note and restored 儒. 儒 records in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* cease with the 1329 Zhāng Liúsūn stele.

Closer to our time new stabs were made at 儒. In an 1892 manuscript by Táo Gēngzá we read that 宋儒言心 (Song Confucians spoke of morals), then below that 宋伖言心. We find no further records of this use of 伖 (which later came to be used for 價 in China and for 傳 in Japan). Instead new ideas came up. In 1936 Ōuyáng Zhēn's *Jiǎnbǐzì zhī yánjiū* said the "common short form" for 儒 was 価, Róng Gēng's *Jiǎntǐ zìdiǎn* said 仔 and Chén Guāngyáo's *Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo* 仈. Only the latter two came to wider use.

The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft proposed 仔. Duàn Dàpéng suggested a revision to 仈 in *Yǔwén zhīshí*, as did Zhào Yǒngshǎng and Tián Qíchāng in *Guangmíng rìbào*. The committee member Yè Gōngchuò pointed out that "儒 is usually written 仔 in the south and 仈 in the north, and northerners and southerners do not recognise each other's characters." Facing this stalemate, the committee left 儒 out of its 1956 Scheme.

The north-south divide was not absolute. In 1960 仈 was reported to the committee by correspondents from Baicheng in Jilin, Ürümqi in Xinjiang and Luoyang and Zhengzhou in Henan, but also from Rongjiang in Guangdong, Wugang in Hunan and Pengshan in Sichuan. 仔 was reported from Pingnan in Guangxi and Yancheng in Jiangsu, but also from from Tianjin and from Zhengzhou in Henan. It is nevertheless plausible that the phonetics 入 and 于 first came into use where reading fit best:

	Beijing	Yangzhou, Jiangsu	Wuhan, Hubei	Changsha, Hunan	Guangzhou, Guangdong
儒	*ʐu* 35	*lu* 34	*y* 213	*y* 13	*jy* 21
入	*ʐu* 51	*ləʔ* 55	*y* 213	*y* 33	*jɒp* 22
于	*y* 35	*y* 34	*y* 213	*y* 13	*jy* 53

The committee selected the most-reported 仈 for its abortive 1962 and 1977 schemes but excluded it from its 1981 Revised Draft.

灑 洒 sǎ sprinkle

Shuōwén says: "洒 [洒]: to wash. Consists of 水 and the phonetic 西. In ancient script used for 灑 [*sǎ* sprinkle] and 埽 [*sào* sweep]." Use for 'wash' ceased, at least in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*, with a 洒心 (purification of the soul) described on the 699 Revered Teacher Pān memorial tablet. Later steles in the database call this activity 洗心 with 洗 *xǐ*.

Meanwhile use of 洒 for 灑 continued, as in the phrase 洒掃之 (sprinkle and sweep it) on the 179 CE Chén Qiú stele. On subsequent steles in our database 洒掃 alternates with 灑掃. The 1956 Scheme set the standard to 洒.

賽 赛 宗 sài competition

The 1955 Draft offered no short form for 賽. Wú Jìng pointed out that "there are quite a few characters which have not been simplified, like 疑, 聚, 靜, 隸, 鼻, 傲, 儲, 塞, 賽 […]. I wish the Script Reform Committee could simplify those […] and make them easy to use for common people." In his *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ,* the always creative Chén Guāngyáo suggested the not so short 寨, 寳 or 寠. Reformers were obviously at a loss.

The public was not. The schoolteacher Luó Guāng reported in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that on 25 May 1956 *Guìzhōu tǐyù tōngxùn* had announced the results of a 竞走比宗 (競走比賽 walking competition). Lǐ Wénxiū had seen more forms:

> In Wuxi one may spot the short forms 宗, 宗, 宋 and 寠. Only from the context can one make out that they all represent 賽, like in the 在竞宗中 [in the competition] and 在竞宗中 in a theatre leaflet, or in the slogan 开展社会主义劳动竞宗 [launch the labour emulation campaign]. 競賽 is written 競宗 by Supply and Marketing Cooperative No. 1, 競宋 by Fraternal Photo Studio and 競寠 by Tíngzǐqiáo Cooperative. Here one also writes 蜜枣 as 宗枣.

The phonetics 西, 山, 三 and 水 fit 賽 poorly in northern speech but better in the east:

	Beijing	Nanjing, Jiangsu	Wuxi, Jiangsu	Shanghai	Hangzhou, Zhejiang	Xiamen, Fujian
賽	*sai* 51	*sæ* 5	*sɛ* 35	*sɛ* 334	*sɛ* 334	*sai* 11 *se* 11
西	*ɕi* 55	*si* 1	*si* 55	*ɕi* 52	*ɕi* 323	*se* 55 *sai* 55
山	*ʂan* 55	*ʂaŋ* 1	*sɛ* 55	*sɛ* 52	*sɛ* 323	*san* 55 *sũã* 55
三	*san* 55	*saŋ* 1	*sɛ* 55	*sɛ* 52	*sɛ* 323	*sam* 55 *sã* 55
水	*ʂuei* 214	*ʂuei* 3	*sɛ* 324	*suɛ* 334	*sɥer* 51	*sui* 51 *tsui* 51

An Eastern origin of 㝬, 㝥 and 宋 is thus compatible with our admittedly sparse records, and so is a Fujian origin of 宓.

㝬 was mentioned (together with 宓) in a 1957 article by Zhū Qìngxià from Suzhou and in a 1960 letter to the committee from Shanghai. In 1962 Zhāng Yǒngmián reported that Zhejiang students wrote 㝬 or 宓 for 賽 in their entrance exams. After that use of 㝬 for 賽 disappeared, as it came to be used for 密 *mì*.

㝥 records begin with a 1960 letter sent in to the committee from Nanjing and end with a 球㝥 (ball game) notice seen in Shanghai by this author in 1981. Just one 1981–1986 informant, from Shanghai, could identifiy 㝥 as 賽.

The sparsest record is that of 宋. In 1981 one Zhejiang informant spontaneously told this author that one could write 賽 for 宋. Only one 1981–1986 informant, in Changzhou next to Wuxi, identified 宋 as 賽.

Writers could manage without 㝬, 㝥 and 宋 because 宓 had taken over, even in East China. In 1957 宓 was reported from Zhejiang, the following year from Shanghai, Hebei, Henan and Anhui.[259]

This mass use qualified 宓 for inclusion in the 1977 and 1981 schemes. These failed, but 宓 survived. In 2010 the lawyer Wáng Wénhào reported that Màidíkě Medical Company had sent a handwritten litigation to Chaoyang District Court, suing Sàibótè Electronics, which answered: "The name of our company is 賽伯特电子公司, not 宓伯特电子公司. We do not know what unit 宓伯特电子公司 is." The deadline then passed and Sàibótè eluded proceedings.

傘 伞 *仐 *sǎn* umbrella

The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms envisaged a change from 傘 to 伞, based on cursive 伞. Other reformers were less modest. Chén Guāngyáo's 1931 *Jiǎnzì lùnjí* suggested 仐 with ⌄, like the Script Reform Society's 1950 List of Common Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft.

Reformers made no claim that 仐 was "established by custom". Chén Guāngyáo called it a "newly coined short form" which "those who are already literate can recognise at a glance." Jīn Míngshèng listed 仐 among "characters simply made up by the Script Reform Committee" and Zhào Tàimóu among "hitherto unseen or newly created short forms." Doubts delayed the recognition of 仐 until 1958.

In 1960 Jiǎng Yīnnán of Zhengzhou Normal School informed the committee that 仐 was commonly written 仚 with the phonetic 山 *shān*. In

259   Fan 1957. Wen 1958. Zhang 1958. Huang 1958. Zhou 1958.

1966 Jīn Huá wrote: "The character 仚 was written on a big sign above an umbrella repair shop. The sign seemed to have been there for quite a few years. I told them the character was wrong, but they insisted that 仚 was a better simplification than 伞." Perhaps so, but the committee did not want to re-simplify an already simplified character and let 'umbrella' out of the 1977 Second Scheme.

In Japan this merchandise is in turn often labelled 仐, a form registered by Suzuki Naoe in the 1882 manuscript of the novel *Agura nabe*. In 1915 Ōmachi Keigetsu warned that "writing 傘 as 仐 is wrong". 仐 appeared in the Education Ministry's 1919 Character Regulation Scheme, the Japanese Language Council's 1942 List of Standard Characters and its tentative September 1946 List of Simplified Forms. In the event 'umbrella' slipped out of the List of Characters for Current Use and so retained its 傘 shape.

Why did not Chinese writers take up the simple 仐? Because they found better use for 仐 as a replacement for the common 食 (*shí* eat).

喪 丧 *sāng* funeral

We find cursive 丧 with ⋎ for 吅 in the calligraphy of Zhāng Zhī (d. 192) and square 丧 from the 513 Lady Wáng epitaph onwards. The latter became official in China in 1956.

掃 扫 *sǎo* sweep

Liú Fù found the bottomless 扫 in blockprints from the early Qing onwards. Like 妇 for 婦, 扫 is an analogy to the older 归 for 歸.

扫, 妇 and 归 became official in China in February 1956.

澀 澁 渋 涩 *sè* astringent

The right side of 澀 comes from 歰. The top 刃刃 were upturned feet, which have no match in clerk style and so turned into either 刃刃 or 止. Dictionaries came to prefer 澀 with 刃刃, which the 1956 Scheme shortened to 涩. Chén Guāngyáo described this 涩 as a "newly created short form […]. According to *Jíyùn*, 涩 is the same as 澀. We now retain the 氵component, to make the result more similar to the original character." True, 涩 seems to have been a novelty, absent in our 1900–1954 manuscripts where we just find two 澀. Novelty may explain why its official status was delayed until 1964.

The Japanese Language Council did not need to invent a new form, adopting instead 渋, analogously to 塁 for 壘 *rui*, 摂 for 灄 *setsu* (see *shè*) and so on which had been common since the sixteenth century.

殺 殺 杀 shā kill

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council dropped a point in 殺 and set the 殺 standard. Seven years later the Script Reform Committee of China dropped the whole right side to prescribe 杀.

Chinese reformers presented ample backing for their choice. Liú Fù found 杀 in Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprints, Chén Guāngyáo called 杀 "the ancient original character" for 殺 and Lǐ Lèyì argued that "the short form 杀 has existed continuously since the bronze script and the 'ancient script' quoted by *Shuōwén* to the [241] Zhèngshǐ Stone Classics" and that "both the Tang *Wǔjīng wénzì* and the Ming *Zhèngzìtōng* recorded 杀 […]."

If 杀 was so ancient and so common, why did it not follow 児, 窓, 仏 and other common Tang forms across the sea and become common in Japan as well? Perhaps because 杀 was not common in the Tang after all. 殳-less forms had been common previously, that is true; the Warring States *Táng Yú zhī dào* (The Way of Táng and Yú) manuscript from Guodian laments the 㝢 (孝之杀 disappearance of filial piety), and on the 134–118 BCE bamboo slips from Yinqueshan 杀 is used alongside 殺 and 殺. However, the ensuing *Shuōwén*, Zhèngshǐ Stone Classics and *Wǔjīng wénzì* all called 㒸 and 杀 "ancient". Text records of 杀 do not reappear until the above-mentioned Yuan and Ming prints. Can we take it that a Yuan scribe noticed 杀 in *Shuōwén* or *Wǔjīng wénzì* and then put it to use?

曬 晒 shài be exposed to the sun

The 1610 *Súshū kānwù* said: "曬 is informally written 晒. This is wrong." This 晒 with the phonetic 西, read *sai* in parts of Guangdong and Fujian, was analogous to the older 洒 for 灑. 晒 ceased to be wrong in February 1956.

擅 *扙 shàn without permission

See 壇 *tán*.

傷 伤 *㑛 shāng wound

The right side of 傷 is a shortened 煬 (*shāng* wound), hence the top 亠. On Western Han wood slips 傷 was shortened further to 㑛 or to 伤, which became the common cursive form. In its 1935 List of Short Forms the Chinese Education Ministry proposed to write and print 伤 even in square style.

伤, 傷 minus 日一ノ丿, was registered in Liú Fù's 1930 *Sòng-Yuán yǐlai súzì pǔ* in the (disputed) Yuan blockprint *Jīngběn tōngsú xiǎoshuō*. In 1936 we find the form in Róng Gēng's *Jiǎntǐ zidiǎn* and in 1937 in a report in the

Hebei *Kàng dí bào* (Resistance News) that 日軍大批伤兵運回北平 (the Japanese army sends large numbers of wounded soldiers back to Beiping).[260] Did 伤 revivers get their idea from the much read *Sòng-Yuán yǐlai súzì pǔ*? In any case 伤 became the common short form, appearing in four of our 1935–1954 manuscripts compared with 伤 in one. Unopposed, 伤 became official for 傷 in 1956.

燒 烧 烧 *shāo* burn

See 堯 *yáo*.

舍 捨 *shě* abandon

舍 *shè* means 'lodging', as one might expect from a character with a 人 (roof) top and 口 (walls) bottom. This 舍 was early loaned for 'abandon', as in *Mèng zǐ* 舍其田而耘人之田 (*shě qí tián ér yún rén zhī tián* neglecting one's fields to chase weeds in those of other people). The sense of 'abandon' was later specified with 扌 (hand), as in the 100 CE *Shuōwén*. Ensuing dictionaries followed suit, distinguishing 舍 (*shè* shed) and 捨 (*shě* abandon). The 1956 Scheme re-merged both senses to 舍.

攝 摄 摄 *shè* absorb

See 轟 *hōng*.

身 *勺 *shēn* body

On Han wood slips from Juyan 身 appears as 勺, retaining its first, third and last strokes. Huáng Xiàng rendered this 勺 in the third century and Shěn Càn as 勺 in the Ming. The latter was adapted to square style, for example by Lǔ Xùn who wrote 设勺处 (没身處 nowhere to stay) in a 1910 letter.[261]

The 1955 Draft proposed to write 勺 but print 身. The idea was abandoned but resurfaced in 1977, when List Two of the Second Scheme included 勺 for 身. Reactions were negative. The education bureaus of Qinghai and Tibet found 勺 too ugly and those of Fujian and Yunnan too similar to 力, pushing 勺 out of the 1981 Revised Draft.

勺 has also been used for 男 *nán*.

---

260 *Beijing kangzhan tushi*, p. 140.
261 *Lu Xun shougao quanji: shuxin*, p. 12.

審 审 *shěn* examine

The 1955 Draft had no suggestion for 審. The proofreader Zhào Xī pointed out: "Replacing 審 […] with 审 […] is something the masses have been used to for a long time." The Script Reform Committee member Wéi Què was less certain, mentioning 审 among characters "which are not too widely used yet". Zhào Tàimóu of Shandong University in turn listed 审 among "characters not seen before".

The latter Zhào was wrong. 审 had been seen before. A 1954 letter in Nanjing Archives asks the Office for Local Industry to 审核 (*shěnhé* examine) one project, and a report in Beijing Archives urges to 审查 (investigate) another.[262] These records do not, however, show that had been used "for a long time." Unfamiliarity may explain why 审 was recognised only in June 1956.

瀋 沈 *shěn* Shen River

Originally 瀋 meant 'juice' and 沈 'sink'. In modern Chinese 瀋 has been used for the place name Shenyang, 沈 for the surname Shěn. The 1956 Scheme stipulated 沈 for both. That was not the first mixing up of the two. *Lǐjì* recorded Duke Āi's plans to sprinkle 榆沈 (*yúshěn* elm-juice) during his son's funeral. The 1039 *Jíyùn* said 沈 "is the same as 瀋." A 1948 register of students in Beijing Archives lists one from 沈陽.[263]

腎 肾 *shèn* kidney

See 堅 *jiān*.

聲 声 *shēng* sound

The 1212 *Sìshēng piānhǎi* passage said "声 is read 聲 and is informally used [for that character]." In Japan 声 appears in the 1496 *Setsuyōshū*'s list of the six senses 色声香味觸法 (*shoku sei kō mi kaku hō* colour, sound, smell, taste, feeling and direction). 声 became very common, appearing in all of the twelve Song to Qing blockprints surveyed by Liú Fù.

声 was included in all Chinese and Japanese simplification schemes and became official in Japan in 1946 and in China in 1956.

---

262   Nanjing Archives 5034-3-327, p. 7. Beijing Archives 38-1-90, pp. 1, 11.
263   Beijing Archives J4-2-1855, p. 20.

升 昇 *shēng* rise
升 昇 陞 *shēng* raise

𢌞 (升) depicted and meant 'measuring ladle', as on a Yin bone recording a sacrifice of �празник二𢌞一𣪊 (鬯二升一卣 *chàng èr shēng yī yǒu* two ladles and one cup of wine). At some stage the character was loaned for 'rise', as in *Shījīng*'s 如日之升 (like the rising sun).

Later writers specified the 'rise' sense by adding 日 (sun), as on the 278 CE Bìyōng stele and the 'raise' sense by adding 阝 (pile of earth) and 土 (earth), as in the 555 Gāo Jiàn epitaph.

The 1955 First List of Regulated Variants abolished 昇 and 陞 to prescribe 升 in all senses. The 2011 edition of *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn* repermitted use of 昇 and 陞 in names.

The Japanese Language Council preferred to preserve the distinction between 升 (*masu* measuring box) and 昇る (*noboru* ascend).

繩 *繩 繩 绳 *shéng* rope
黽 *黽 黾 *mǐn* toad
蠅 蠅 蝇 *yíng* fly

Simplified Chinese 绳 differs from Japanese 縄. The latter is the older, first seen on the 184 CE Guō Jiū stele. It was one of many Han variants: 繩 and 絗 in the silk manuscripts from Mawangdui, 繩, 絏 and 純 on wood slips, 繩 in *Shuōwén,* 繩 on the 165 CE Lǎo zǐ tablet and 繩 on the 170 CE Xià Chéng stele.

The obviously *Shuōwén*-based 繩 came to be standard, but not immediately. The Han Xīpíng Stone Classics and Tang *Yùpiān* advocated 繩, the Tang *Gānlù zìshū,* Liao *Lóngkān shǒujìng* and Song *Yùpiān* 繩 and only the Ming *Zìhuì* and Qing *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* 繩.

The simpler 繩 and 繩 faded away but were succeeded by the 繩-based 绳, the only short form appearing in Liú Fù's Yuan to Qing blockprints and in our 1900–1954 manuscripts.

绳 was duly proposed in *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters", the Education Ministry's ensuing List of Short Forms and the the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft. It became official as 绳 in 1959, delayed presumably by indecision over the 纟on the left. 绳 became 绳 with a prolonged 乚 in the 1962 edition of *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn*. 黾, 蝇 and other analogies were added in the 1964 General List.

In Japan 縄 stood its ground, appearing in seventeen of our 1900–1954 manuscripts, in which 縄 with 口 is absent. Accordingly the Language Council

recognised 繩 in 1981, that late because 'rope' had not been selected as a Character for Current Use in 1946.

聖 圣 *shèng* sacred

Some Warring States writers shortened 聖 by omitting the 壬 *ting* phonetic of the 呈 *chéng* phonetic. The *Táng Yú zhī dào* manuscript from Guodian compares "the first sage" (Confucius) with 邎耴 (逡耴 [後聖] later sages); the early Han *Jīngfǎ* (Eternal Laws) manuscript from Mawangdui says 至 靘者耴 (至静者聖the most peaceful are the wisest).

Later shorteners retained the bottom, assaulting instead the top. In Yuan blockprints Liú Fù found 埀, a square version of the cursive 𡈽, and 圣 with 又 for 耴. While records of 埀 cease after the Yuan, the shorter 圣 lived on to become official in China in 1959.

Japanese use of 埀 for 聖 was mentioned in the sixteenth-century *Ikyōshū* and 1705 *Dōbun tsūkō*, and of 圣 by Tanaka Dōsai in 1757 and Matsui Tadashi in 1861. The latter practice disappeared as Japanese writers began to use 圣 for the more crucial 經 and 徑.

勝 胜 *shèng* victory

War wore this character down. In 1942 Central Jiangsu Party Committee praised a 決定性肶利 (decisive victory) over enemy forces. In 1944 Huaibei Jiangsu-Anhui Border Area People's Anti-Japanese Self-Defence Force rewarded those who had helped to 打胜利仗 (wage victorius war).[264] In 1954 Liú Wényīng wrote in *Zhōngguó yǔwén* that "many characters are written in two or three ways […] like […] 勝, 胜, 肋 and 胛" and Chén Guāngyáo wrote in *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ* that "勝 is written in different ways, as 胜, 胛, 胼, 勝, 朥 or 腠, but there are also those who just write the right side 券."

胜 with the 生 *shēng* phonetic became official in June 1956, with the second batch of simplified characters. Records of competing forms cease with a 1964 complaint by the Wuzhou teacher Liú Wànxīn that "there are still people who write 胜 as 胛."

*師 師 师 *shī* army, leader, teacher
*帥 帥 帅 *shuài* general

In the Zhou 𠂤 (師) was often shortened to 𠂤 (㠯) or 于 (帀), except in the northern state of Qin, where we find only the full form 師, as in the 313 BCE

---

264 *Jiangsu kangzhan,* pp. 97, 132.

Curse on the State of Chu and on the Stone Drums from Qin. After Qin conquered China, its 𠂤/𠂤 became national standard. Records of 𠂤 cease with a 𠂤 (左𠂤 Commander Zuǒ) on an eponymous Warring States tripod, and the last 帀 is a 衛帀 (率師 *shuài shī* [Duke Huán] lead his army) in the early Han *Chūnqiū shìyǔ* (Tales of the Spring and Autumn) manuscript from Mawangdui.

𠂤 turned into clerk style 師 with 目. The more familiar 丷-topped 師 appears on the 156 CE Hán Chì stele and is obviously an attempt to revive old ways as recorded in *Shuōwén*'s 師. A misguided attempt, as the hook top in *Shuōwén*'s 師, 帥 (帥) and 𧘂 (追) was absent in Yin and Zhou forms (True, paleographic manuals routinely register 師 on the late Zhou Stone Drums from Qin, but that form has been retouched; the rubbing shows only 師 with a missing top).

Writers did not immediately take to 丷. In Umehara Seizan's collection of Later Wei inscriptions 師 outnumbers 師 thirty-six to three. 師 was snubbed even by writing models like the Han Xīpíng Stone Classics, Wei Zhèngshǐ Stone Classics, Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* and Tang *Gānlù zìshū* and *Yùpiān*, which all advocated 師 and 帥 with 目. Directives changed in the Song, when *Guǎngyùn*, *Jíyùn* and the 1013 version of *Yùpiān* prescribed 師 with 𠂤. With time, writers adjusted, producing thirty 師 in our 1900–1954 manuscripts against four 師.

Han scribes wrote 目 with the stroke order | 一一一. Contraction of the last four strokes gave Han 师 and Sui 师. The latter outcompeted the former and became official in China in February 1956. In Japan official status for 师 was never on the table, even though the form was established even in that country, appearing in six of our our 1900–1954 manuscripts against 師 in thirteen, a proportion close to the Chinese seventeen 师 to thirty 師.

濕 湿 *shī* wet

See 顯 *xiǎn.*

識 識 识 *shí* know

See 職 *zhí.*

時 时 *shí* time

On Yin bones 'time' is written 𣅱 (旹) with 日 (sun) and the 止 *zhǐ* phonetic, on the late Zhou Stone Drums from Qin � (旹) with an expanded 寺 *sì* phonetic. After that forms with 止 and 寺 coexisted.

The ensuing Qin regime imposed its own forms, including the enlarged 晹/時 with 寺. Han writers reacted to the enlargement by ejecting the original phonetic, leaving us forms like 旳 and 旴 on wood slips from Dunhuang and Juyan. This 时 was made official by the 1956 Scheme.

The Japanese Language Council never took up 时, although Japanese writing habits were similar to Chinese ones. We find a 旴 in Prince Shōtoku's 615 Commentary on the Lotus Sutra and a 1943 demand for 及时 (*kyūji* speedy) help for hurricane victims.[265] After that use of 时 seems to have decreased. In 2003 the netizen Nanashi zō (The nameless elephant) wrote: "My teacher at university shortened 時 to 日寸." Unlike himself, we take it.

食 仐 *shí* food

In 1960 eleven correspondents, from Xichang in Sichuan in the west to Yancheng in Jiangsu in the east, informed the Script Reform Committee that some used 仐 with the phonetic 十 *shí* for 食.

This practice must have been new. As late as in 1954 Chén Guāngyáo suggested using 仐 for 傘 (a practice common in Japan but unknown in China). Chén would hardly have made this suggestion if 仐 had been in use for 食 at the time.

仐 remained relatively obscure. In 1961 Lǐ Zōngxián argued in *Hēilóngjiāng rìbào* for tolerating pupils' use of common new forms like 辺 for 道 and 灬 for 煤, but admitted that "there are also some characters, like 恋 [想 *xiǎng* think] and 仐, which many do not recognise at all." One was Lù Zhìwéi, who complained in *Běijīng rìbào* in 1964: "The signboard of a food shop says 仐 品商店第×門市部 [Grocery Retail Shop No. X]. If one does not go inside to look, one cannot know what this shop is selling."

The committee did not deem 仐 fit for inclusion in its 1977 Second Scheme. Our records cease with a 主仐 (staple foods) section in a 1994 Baoding menu.

食 饣 (*shí*)

The Script Reform Committee let the character 食 remain but was determined to deal with the corresponding component 飠 in 飯 (*fàn* rice), 飲 (*yǐn* drink) and so on. The classic calligraphers rendered it 𠣻, 飠 or 𠊊 in cursive style. The latter remained common in everyday use but was not easily converted to print style. The 1955 Draft proposed writing 𠣻 while keeping 飠 in print. The decisive 1956 Scheme and 1964 General List prescribed the still shorter 饣 for all purposes.

---

265   Yamaguchi Archives 戰前 A 農業 688.

Some were even less patient with 飠. A 1947 receipt obtained at a Harbin flea-market confirms a purchase of one thousand cases of 豆并 (豆餅 *dòubǐng* bean cakes). In 1960 Guangdong Education Bureau informed the committee that some locals wrote 飯 as 反. This practice was criticised in 1962 by Wáng Yún, in 1963 by Wú Nánxīng, in 1982 by Wāng Jiāqián and in 1984 by Wáng Jiàn. As late as in 2005 teachers at Huaixi Primary School in Wuhu in Anhui complained: "Recently a number of newly created characters have appeared in society. Some people simplify wildly just to get some relief for the moment and even manufacture 'inventive creations' like 并 (饼) 干 [biscuits] […]."

實 实 実 *shí* true

实 consists of the top and bottom of 實 plus the 冫 in 为 (冊). It appears in cursive style in the Jin calligraphy of Wáng Xīzhī and in square style in Yuan blockprints.

Japanese 実 differs from Chinese 实. The split is recent. Kūkai (774–835) and Fujiwara no Teika (1162–1241) wrote 实 and the 1496 version of *Setsuyōshū* recommended writing *jippu* (accuracy) as 实否 and *jikken* (test) as 实撿. After that the two points began to grow, piercing 丿, as we see in an 1869 実二 (*jitsu ni* in fact).[266] This 実 quickly gained momentum; our 1900–1919 manuscripts contain six 実 against five 实 and four 実, our 1930–1946 ones twenty-three 実 against two 实 and one 実. The arguably more distinct 実 was included in the Education Ministry's 1919 Character Regulation Scheme, the 1923 List of Characters for Common Use and so on until it finally became a Character for Current Use in 1946. 实 fell into oblivion. Emori Kenji, born in 1915, asked rhetorically in 1965: "How does one read the following simplified Chinese characters: […] 实际, 发电 […]."

Chinese writers kept the points. Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain one hundred and ninety-two 实 against four 実 and three 実. 实 was duly included in the 1935 List of Short Forms and the 1956 Scheme.

---

266 *Enshu komonjo sen: Kindai hen*, item 3.

釋 釈 释 *shì* explain
譯 訳 译 *yì* translate
驛 駅 驿 *yì* station
澤 沢 泽 *zé* pond
擇 択 择 *zé* select

Tàibai's 1935 "handy characters" included 译 for 譯, a novelty recorded a year before in the writing of Xú Zémǐn's guinea pig students. One year before that the Beiping police discussed the 开釈 (release) of one Xíng Qìngcháng charged with illegal transport of ammunition.[267]

A letter from Hú Xíngzhī to *Xiàndài* revealed the origin of this puzzling character: "译 is a form taken over from Japanese. It would be better to change to the more common 译." True, forms with 睪 for 睪 were common, appearing in Jiǎng and Shào's Ming military documents, in Liú Fù's Ming and Qing blockprints, in Guō Ruòyú's Taiping Rebellion documents and in twelve of our 1900–1939 manuscripts, in which we find just two 釈 with 尺.

Nevertheless, 譯 contained four strokes more than 訳, so a shorter form was in demand. Róng Gēng's 1936 *Jiǎntǐ zìdiǎn* suggested the cursive-based 译, 择 and 泽. These forms did not outcompete those with 睪; our 1940–1954 manuscripts turn up three 释, two 译, five 泽 and one 择 but no forms with 睪 or 尺. In 1954 Xú Huàwén proposed in *Zhōngguó yǔwén* to simplify to 釈 and 訳. For its 1955 Draft, however, the Script Reform Committee chose 释, rare but shorter than 釋 and more Chinese than 釈, together with 译, 择 and 泽. The last 尺 advocate on record is Jì Dá who argued in *Wénzì gǎigé* for 訳 in 1958. This did not sway the committee, which changed all 睪 to 睪 in 1964.

Records of 尺 forms petered out, ceasing with a 1972 letter from a miner in Benxi in Liaoning asking *Hóngqí* "how to deal with the new simplified characters common among the masses". The editors let China's top philologist Guō Mòruò answer: "Some of the simplified characters mentioned in the letter have spread from Japan, like 沢 for 泽, 伝 for 传 and 転 for 转. I presume these are used in the [formerly Japanese-run] Northeast and certainly not all over."

The 尺 *chǐ* phonetic does not fit Chinese 譯 *yì* and 釋 *shì*, nor does Japanese 尺 *shaku* fit 譯 *yaku*, 驛 *eki*, 澤 *taku* or 擇 *taku*. 尺 does, however, fit 釋 *shaku*. It is therefore not too surprising that Yamauchi Yōichirō found 尺尊 for 釋尊 (*Shakuson* veneration of Buddha) and 釈云 for 釋言 (*shakugen* excuse) in Buddhist tales copied in 1140. The analogous 択, 訳, 駅 and 沢 turn up later.

Japanese scholars were aware that these forms were home-grown. In 1750 Kondō Saigai wrote that "訳 for 譯 and 釈 for 釋 are habitual but erroneous

267   Beijing Archives J181-21-17389, p. 6.

Japanese characters" and Tanaka Dōsai wrote in 1757 that "there are informal Japanese short forms which should absolutely not be used: [...] 釈釋, 沢澤." The Japanese Language Council nevertheless proposed permitting 釈, 訳, 駅, 沢 and 択 in 1926, 1938, 1942 and, decisively, in 1946.

事 亊 *叓 *𠃓 *shì* matter

Tàibái adopted 亊 among the "handy characters" intended for use in its columns from 1935 onwards. Forms with 丷 or 丷 for 口 had been common since they appeared on Western Han wood slips.

Other writers opted for 𠃓, another form traceable to Western Han slips. Modern reformers saw no way of rendering 𠃓 in square style and left 事 out of their 1956 Scheme. Then a way turned up in 1959 when 𡙧 (專) became 专. This opened a precedent for the analogous 𠃓 which turned up for 事 in List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme. Like 𠃓 for 高, 𠃓 was called "unfamiliar", "ugly" and "unbalanced, lopsided and hard to define" and was excluded from the 1981 Revised Draft.

Ambitious Japanese dictionaries list the somewhat shorter variant 叓. This deviation is less drastic than it looks. Both 又 and 彐 stem from 彐 (hand), so both 事 and 叓 depict an implement in a hand. Tracks of 叓 lead to *Shuōwén*, which to its 𠁽 (事) entry added "𰯼: ancient form of 事." The Song *Yùpiān* rendered this as "叓: ancient form." The hereby created square form 叓 had less impact in China than in Japan. The 1496 Meiō version of *Setsuyōshū* recommended writing 主叓 for 主事 (*shuji* man in charge), the Manjuya version 叓闕 for 事缺き (*kotokaki* lack). As late as in 1846 we find 何叓 (*nanigoto* what) in the blockprint *Shaka goichidaiki zue*. Thereafterr the form fell out of use. The 1917 *Kan-Wa daijirin* called 叓 an "ancient character for 事". None of our 2014–2017 Japanese informants could identify 叓.

勢 势 *埶 *shì* power
熱 热 *rè* heat

The 埶 *yì* phonetic in 勢, 熱 and 藝 (*yì* arts) depicts a person (𠂇) on the right planting a tree (木) into the ground (土). The enlargement of 木 to 夫 came with Han clerk style. Shortening of 埊 ensued, to 圭 beginning with a 藝 in the 169 CE Shǐ Chén stele, to 坴 beginning with a 勢 on a 483 statue by Fǎ Zōng and to扌beginning with 势 in Song blockprints.

The latter became the common form in China, appearing in six of our 1900–1954 manuscripts compared with 勢 in none. 势 and 热 were duly included in the 1935 List of Short Forms and the decisive 1956 Scheme.

If one draws the first 一 in 圭 from right to left as 丿 the character be-

comes 勢, as in a 743 stone inscription by Chén Dàngyì. This form became popular in Japan, appearing in phrases like 势賦 (*seikubari* empower) and 势遣 (*seizukui* transfer of power) in the sixteenth-century dictionary *Setsuyōshū* and in sixteen of our 1900–1946 manuscripts, compared with 勢 in none. The Education Ministry proposed to permit 势 in 1919, 1926 and 1938 but abandoned the idea in 1946.

適 适 *shì* suitable

Records of 适 for 適 begin with a 1944 document from Northern Jiangsu Party Committee specifying policies to 适应 (adapt to) the needs of the war against Japan.[268] The Script Reform Committee included this form in its 1955 Draft. Chén Guāngyáo promoted the change in his *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ*:

> 适 (適) is a character established by custom, analogous to [the somewhat older] 敌 [for 敵]. It is written with 辶 and the phonetic 舌 [*shé*], as 舌 also begins with *ş*. True, 适 is also the personal name of [the Zhou statesman] 南宫适 [Nángōng Kuò], but the character has always had very little use and may therefore replace 適.

Wáng Màocái objected:

> 适 can be used for 適 only in words like 适合 [*shìhé* suit] and 适宜 [*shìyí* fit]. Writing 胡適 [Hú Shì 1891–1962] and 高適 [Gāo Shì c. 700–765] as 胡适 and 高适 is not suitable, as that makes their names identical with those of 南宫适 and 洪适 [Hóng Kuò 1117–1184]. […]. How about changing 適 to 逎?

Also in *Wénzì gǎigé*, Yuē Qiáo referred to another proposal: "Some advocate a change to 迣 with the phonetic 土. I am afraid this would make things worse. 土 is easily mixed up with 士, and we already have a 迣 with the phonetic 土 [in *Shuōwén*], namely the ancient form of 徒 [*tú* apprentice]."

So the 1956 Scheme retained 适. The 1964 General List added a caveat: "The 适 in the names of the ancient personages 南宫适 and 洪适 (an ancient and rare character) is read *kuò*. This 适 was [in *Shuōwén*] originally written 逎. To avoid mixing up, one can revive this original 逎."

Xīnhuá zìdiǎn duly introduced a 逎 *kuò* entry, reducing 适 *kuò* to a variant in brackets. This ruling was not followed. The 1979 edition of *Cíhǎi* said 隶释: 书名. 宋洪适撰 (*Lì shì* is the title of a book compiled by Hóng Kuò in the

---

268   *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 116.

Song). The 1998 edition of *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn* caved in to practice, restoring the 适 *kuò* entry alongside the promoted 遁. Promotion remained ineffective. The makers of the font used in the present text, for example, did not deem 遁 common enough to be included; the 遁 used here was made up for this occasion.

收 収 *shōu* receive

The official Japanese 収 differs from Chinese 收. The idea of writing 又 (hand) for 攵 (hand with club) is nevertheless Chinese; forms like 収, 故 (故 *gù* cause) and 敦 (敦 *dūn* honest) appear already on Western Han wood slips. In cursive style 又 for 攵 became mainstream, in square style just in 収. The Yuan *Zìjiàn* and Ming *Súshū kānwù* and *Zìkǎo* dubbed 収 "wrong" but failed to eradicate the form, which appears in thirty-eight of our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts, compared with 收 in sixty-six.

The 1955 Draft ignored 収. Dài Tiānjiàn protested in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "As for selecting and discarding variants, I think one should look to shortness rather than to custom. It would be better to change 同 to 仝, 收 to 収 […]." The 1956 Scheme nevertheless left 收 alone.

収 was more welcome in Japan. The 1496 Meiō version of *Setsuyōshū* recommended writing *osamu* (receive) as 納, 収 or 治. In our 1900–1954 manuscripts we find ten 収 against nine 收, proportionally more than in China. Accordingly the Education Ministry and then the Language Council proposed in 1919, 1926 and 1938 to give 収 legal status, which it finally obtained in 1949.

獸 獣 兽 *shòu* beast

The 1956 Scheme shortened 獸 to 兽, a form absent in our 1950–1954 manuscripts which instead contain four 獣, two 獸, one 狀 and one 獻.[269] The reformer Chén Guāngyáo called 兽 "established by custom" in 1956, implausibly, as he had been at a loss for a short form for 獸 in his 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ*.

The Qing philologist Duàn Yùcái has been called as a witness to pre-re-form use of 兽: "*Shǐjì* says 武成歸嘼 [when the war was over, the beasts of burden returned to the fields]. Today one writes 歸獸. Since long the two characters have not been distinguished." This may confirm use of 嘼 for 'beast' in the Han, but not not in the years preceding the reform, evidence for which remains lacking.

---

269   The latter in Hubei Archives SZ107-3-1216, pp. 7, 33.

The common short form for 獸 may instead have been the above-mentioned 狩, which was mentioned as late as 1961 in a *Hā'ěrbīn wǎnbào* article signed Dà Guāng: "Recently I have seen people write [...] 养兽場 [livestock farm] as 养狩場 [...]." After that tracks even of 狩 disappear.

The Japanese Language Council changed 獸 to 獣 analogously to 単 for 單.

壽 寿 *shòu* longevity

At the 1955 script reform conference the delegate Zhāng Zhōngjié lamented: "There are some characters, like 獻 [*xiàn* offer], 壽 [...], which teachers never write in complex form. Sometimes, to show the pupils, they rehearse them stroke by stroke from the text-book or dictionary before class."

Uncertainty was nothing new. Han scribes wrote 壽, 壽, 寿, 寿 or 壽 on wood slips and 壽 or 壽 on stone steles. Tang scribes kept the 口 or 吅 centres, defying *Shuōwén* which prescribed a 工 centre. The 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì*, 1008 *Guǎngyùn* and 1013 *Yùpiān* then propagated the more *Shuōwén*-like 壽 with 工, with some success: 壽 appeared in nineteen Song inscriptions in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* among twenty-five 壽 with 口.

Song and Yuan blockprinters avoided the quandary by writing 夀 or 寿. The latter lived on to be recognised in Japan in 1949 and in China in 1956.

書 书 *shū* write

Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain six 𢎑 and six 书 for 書. The former was the older form. In early clerk style the bottom of 書 was written 𦥑 with the stroke order ∟一一. Contraction of the bottom gave 晝 and removal of the top 𡈼, a form seen already on Western Han wood slips. Later the bottom came to be written 日 with the stroke order ｜丁一, which gave us forms like 书 first in cursive and then in square style.

The 1955 Draft left 書 alone. Wáng Xiǎn then pointed out in *Zhōngguó yǔwén* that "in [the Yuan blockprint] *Jīngběn tōngsú xiǎoshuō* 書 is written 书." Or almost; in Liú Fù's *Sōng-Yuán yǐlái súzì pǔ*, which Wáng like everybody else was referring to, the form was rendered 𢎑, not 书.

Why would Wáng, or the *Zhōngguó yǔwén* editors, modify the 𢎑 registered by Liú? Perhaps to increase its prospects. 𢎑 was handicapped by containing 乙, a stroke not in the list of standard square-style strokes. So friends of reform began to promote 书 with the more current 乛, like Jīn Wén in *Yǔwén zhīshí* and Guǎn Xièchū in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*. The 1956 Scheme adjusted 书 to 书 with the even more current 乛 and 乛.

The resulting compound seems to have been less current, however. We saw in the 卢 *lú* section that the teacher Yǐn Bīnyōng called 书 "unfamiliar".

<h1 style="text-align:center">輸 输 *轵 *shū* transport</h1>

Beijing Archives holds a 1959 report from Beijing's 交通运轵局 (Communications and Transport Office).[270] The following year use of 轵 for 输 was reported to the Script Reform Committee by correspondents from Baotou in the north to Xichang in the southwest.

The phonetic 入 *rù* was unsuitable in the southeast where it is read with an entering tone. A 1975 article by the staff of Huzhou Middle School in northern Zhejiang reported an alternative: "In [our] Wu dialect 输 *shū* and 四 *sì* are both read *si*, so forms like 牰 (or 牫) for 输 have emerged […]."[271] 牰 was identified by informants in Hangzhou and Shaoxing but not further south.

Not surprisingly, the committee chose the more widespread 轵 for its 1977 Second Scheme. Jiǎng Chuányī from Liánshān Brigade near Huzhou objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Some commune members say: '[…] we have already taken up 芢 for 蔡 and 牰 for 输. Why must these characters now be simplified to 芧 and 轵?'"

Other criticism hurt 轵 more. Yunnan Script Reform Leading Group wrote: "输, 儒, 蠕 [*rú* wriggle], 孺 [*rú* child] and 辱 [*rǔ* disgrace] originally contained different components but now all use 入. This makes them impossible to analogise and hard to grasp." Jilin Education Bureau found it confusing to change 输 to 轵 but 愉 (*yú* happy) to 忏. 轵 was duly barred from the 1981 Revised Draft.

<h1 style="text-align:center">屬 属 屌 屌 *shǔ* belong</h1>

Our 1940–1954 manuscripts contain twenty-nine 属, sixteen 屌, six 屌, three 屌 and one 屌. 屌 looks like a shortened 屌 but is unlikely to be so, appearing on Western Han wood slips from Juyan and preceding 屌 which turns up in the handwritten Principles of Administration of Southern Jiangsu, which in 1943 defined benefits to 抗日軍人家屌 (*kàng Rì jūnrén jiāshǔ* families of soldiers fighting Japan). More likely 屌 is a 屌 converted to square style. 屌 in turn seems to be a contracted 属, another form seen on Western Han slips.[272]

屌 and 屌 were hard to render in square style and 屌, wrote Chén Guāngyáo, "has not been common for so long as 属." This left 属 for the 1955 Draft. Yú Xīnbó objected in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that "some characters have not been subjected to true simplification […] like […] 属 (屬) which ought to be simplified further to 屌." A comment attached to the October 1955

---

270   Beijing Archives 117-1-1128, p. 1.
271   Zhejiang sheng Huzhou zhongxue 1975.
272   Juyan slips 35.20B and 19.21. *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 110.

Revised Draft noted that there were also those who advocated 㞴 with the phonetic 术, the new official form for 術 (*shù* art). Such objections delayed the recognition of 属 until 1964.

The public soon came up with something still shorter. Jīn Huá found in 1966 that his students "shortened already simplified characters further, like 面 to 百, 点 to 点 and 属 to 尿." 尿 is a square version of the above-mentioned 㞴, analogous to the by then official 专 for 专.

The 1977 Second Scheme promoted this 尿. While no one denied that 尿 was common, Fujian Education Bureau and others objected to "creating problems by simplifying and then simplifying again". Such arguments excluded 尿 from the 1981 Revised Draft.

In Japan too, 属 was the more common short form, appearing in thirty-two of our 1900–1946 manuscripts compared with 尿 in two and 屚, the beginning and end of 屬, in six. The Education Ministry's 1919 Character Regulation Scheme advocated the shorter 屚 and subsequent schemes the more common 属, which finally became official in 1946.

屚 was not completely forgotten. In 2001, the editors of the Japanese journal *Sinica* marveled at a 貴金屚 (*kikinzoku* precious metals) sign photographed in Tokyo. In 2014–2017 three out of our twenty-four Japanese informants could identify 屚 without a context.

屚 has fared somewhat better in former Japanese territory, being identified by four out of six informants from Taiwan. In 1969 the Revolutionary Committee of Jixi Grain Depot in Heilongjiang registered that one employee had been sentenced twenty years before to one year of reform for 与军屚搞男女关係 (having a relationship with a dependent of a serviceman).[273]

The ousted 屬 had not always been the norm. The 口 in 虫 was absent in the 属 in the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts, the 属, 属 and 屚 on the Western Han wood slips and the 屚 on the 50 BCE Chǐyáng Temple stirrup. The 100 CE *Shuōwén* reminded writers that 屬 "consists of 尾 [tail] and the phonetic 蜀 [*shǔ*]." The Sui model text *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* nevertheless advocated the common 属, whereas the first authorities to champion the etymologically correct 屬 were the Tang *Gānlù zìshū* and the Liao *Lóngkān shǒujìng*.

数 數 数 敗 *shǔ* count *shù* number

See 婁 *Lóu*.

---

273   Document of Jixi liangku gewei, p. 2.

竪 竖 *shù* vertical

See 堅 *jiān*.

術 术 *shù* art

The 1617 *Zìkǎo* admoished: "術 is written with 朮 and a point. 術 is wrong." But common it was. Umehara Seizan's collection of Tang inscriptions, for one, contains eleven 術 with 木 against two 術 with 朮. Our earliest pointless form is a 術 on the 168 CE Héng Fāng stele.

Shuōwén called 朮 a variant of 秫 (*shù* sorghum), though we regard it as the original form. Later dictionaries define 朮 as *zhú*, 'the rhizome of *Atractylodes macrocephala* or *chinensis*'.

Non-medics had little use for the rhizome and put 朮 to more urgent use, as in a 1944 directive from Central China Office concerning 战术 (戰術 tactics) against the Japanese invaders.[274] The 1955 Draft proposed to make such use of 术 official. Reformers were aware that 朮 was unfamiliar to many. Wèi Jiàngōng called 朮 a "newly coined form" and Yì Xīwǔ thought the scheme contained "too many newly created characters" so that phrases like 辽远射击艺朮 (*liáoyuǎn shèjī jìshù* the art of shooting from a distance) might be hard to comprehend. These worries delayed 术's official status until June 1956.

樹 樹 树 *shù* tree
廚 厨 *chú* kitchen
櫥 櫉 櫥 *chú* cabinet

The phonetic 尌 (*shù* raise) depicts a hand (寸) supporting an adorned (十) drum (日) on a tablet (丷). Some dropped the adornment to write 廚 as in the 528 Yuán Tì epitaph and 樹 as in the 529 Yuán Wéi epitaph. This annoyed friends of order. The 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* said: "廚 is informally written厨. This is wrong." The 1617 *Zìkǎo*: "樹 is written with 壴. 樹 is wrong." The 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*: "樹 […] is informally written 樹. This is wrong."

Worse was to come. Our 1925 Palace Museum inventory mentions an 二树 叁 (二樹齋 *Èr shù zhāi* Two Trees Mansion).[275] The Script Reform Committee authorised this 树 in its second, June 1956 batch of simplified characters.

There was no analogous habit of writing 廚 and 櫥 with 又 for 壴. Instead the committee pardoned the outlawed 厨 and 櫉. Since these were mentioned in *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*, they were classed not as simplified forms but

---

274   *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 130.
275   Museum of Chinese History, manuscript 史 5678, p. 23.

as variants, and so became official in December 1955 with the First List of Regulated Variants.

Variation between 广 and 厂 is described in the 厠 *cè* section.

雙 双 *shuāng* double

The 1610 *Súshū kānwù* warned: "雙 is informally written 双. This is wrong." This did not stop the form, which appears in all of the twelve Yuan to Qing blockprints investigated by Liú Fù as well as in Ming typeprints. In Japan the 1496 Meiō version of *Setsuyōshū* recommended writing *sugorokuban* (dice tray) as 双六盤.

Unopposed, 双 became official in Japan in 1946 and in China in 1956.

絲 糸 丝 *sī* silk

Modern Japanese 糸 corresponds to Chinese 丝. *Shuōwén* distinguished the two, calling 絲 "what the silkworm spits out" and 糸 "fine silk. Depicts a bundle of silk. All characters connected with silk are written with 糸. Read like 覛 [*mì*]." This distinction was already blurred: Western Han wood slip 262.28A from Juyan registers a purchase of 綃糸二斤 (*xiāosī* two pounds of raw silk) with 糸 for 絲. The 1039 *Jíyùn* regarded this as normal: "絲糸: *Shuōwén* says 'what the silkworm spits out'. It may also be written with the shorter form."

Others preferred to shorten 絲 from the bottom. The 525 Gāo Guǎng epitaph has a 𢇁, which in Yuan blockprints became 丝 or 𢆶.

Japanese writers came to prefer the former way out, Chinese ones the latter. Our Japanese 1900–1946 manuscripts contain six 糸 but no 𢇁 or 丝, Chinese 1900–1954 manuscripts three 𢇁 and four 丝 but no 糸.

Accordingly, the Japanese Language Council proposed to replace 絲 with 糸 in its 1926, 1938 and 1942 schemes and in the decisive 1946 List of Characters for Current Use. The Chinese reformers at *Tàibai* in turn advocated a change from 絲 to 𢇁 in 1935, followed by their *Lúnyǔ* colleagues. The Script Reform Committee did not find this worthwhile, dodging 絲 in its 1955 Draft and 1956 Scheme. The latter, however, did envisage a change of the 糸 component to 纟. The 1964 General List applied this to both sides of 絲, turning out the now official 丝.

糸 * 纟 纟 (*sī*)

The choice of a short form for the 'silk' component was wider than for the 'silk' character. Our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain, for example, ten 总

(總) with 纟, twenty-eight with 纟, fifteen with 纟, twenty-one with 纟 and four with 纟.

The 1955 Draft proposed to normalise handwriting to 纟 but keep 糸 in print, the 1956 Scheme to use 纟 in all cases. That proposal was invalidated by the 1959 Fourth Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters, which prescribed 继, 练, 绳 and 纵 (縱 *zòng* vertical) with the perhaps unfamiliar but definitely shorter 纟. Analogies like 给, 红 and so on followed in 1964.

私 *厶 sī

The 1955 Draft proposed to shorten 私 to 厶. Huáng Bóróng called the proposed 厶 "an ancient character". How ancient? Very, said *Shuōwén*: "Hán Fēi says that when Cāng Jié created characters, he let 厶 mean 'selfish'." The 1013 *Yùpiān* identified this 厶 with 私: "厶 is read 相咨切 [*sī*] and means 'cunning'. Today it is written 私. Also read 亡后切 [*mòu*] in the sense of 'someone'." (See 某 *mǒu* section.) Even the Qing commentator Duàn Yùcái described 厶 as obsolete: "This is the original form of the character in 公私 [public and private]. Today 私 is used and 厶 discarded. 私 was [originally] the name of a cereal." In 1950, however, Huáng Ruòzhōu listed 厶 among "common short forms".

厶 turned out to be unfamiliar to the public. 1955 debaters called it ugly, too close to 么 or unnecessary as 私 was not very complex in the first place.[276] Liú Shàofǎng was the least negative, writing in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "One might open a discussion about the benefit or no benefit of simplifying 私 to 厶, to let everybody know there is a character 厶, then no one can call it 'hard to make out' or 'troublesome' any more." In the event 厶 was removed from the 1956 Scheme.

Some nevertheless picked up the form. In 1960 a proofreader from Shanghai and a teacher from Siping in Jilin wrote to the committee that they had seen 厶 for 私. So 厶 earned a place in the 1977 Second Scheme. Comments were effectively summed up by Wú Jiǎfēng in *Shèhuì kèxué zhànxiàn*: "厶 was originally an ancient form for 私, but in square style it is ugly. Besides it is identical with the Japanese sign 厶 *mu*, something to avoid. 私 does not contain too many strokes and need not be simplified."

---

276   Dong 1955. Zheng Yun 1955. Yun and Jun 1955. Zhang Decun 1955. "Ge di renshi", p. 39.

<div align="center">鬆 松 sōng loose</div>

The 1956 Scheme replaced 鬆 with the shorter homonym 松 (pine). The practice can be traced back to 1666, when Zìhuìbǔ said "松: same as 鬆."

<div align="center">叟 叟 sǒu old man</div>
<div align="center">搜 搜 sōu search</div>
<div align="center">瘦 瘦 shòu thin</div>
<div align="center">嫂 *嫂 sǎo sister-in-law</div>

The 1949 List of Forms changed Japanese 搜 to 搜. 搜 was the shorter of at least two short forms in use, appearing in one of our 1900–1946 manuscripts against 搜 in four. Both right sides were first recorded in China, 叟 in a 1212 inscription by Guǎn Zhàn and 叟 in blockprints from the Yuan and Qing. 叟 is an analogy to the older 児 for 兒.

 Forms with 叟 lived on even in China. Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain three 搜 but also five 搜. The 1955 Draft proposed to standardise the handwritten component to the cursive-based 乄 but retain 叟 in print, a plan soon abandoned. In Zhōngguó yǔwén Guǎn Xièchū in vain promoted a change to 嫂 and 瘦 with 叟. List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme promoted 叟 and 搜, a proposal repeated in the 1981 Revised Draft with the comment: "叟 is easily miswritten. Simplified to 叟 it will be easy to learn and easy to write. This form originated in the Song or Yuan."

<div align="center">蘇 苏 *茆 sū revive, Soviet, Jiangsu</div>

Our earliest shortened 蘇 appears in a 1928 leaflet urging the people of Fujian to 建設工農兵苏维埃政权 (jiànshè gōngnóngbīng Sūwéi'āi zhèngquán develop a Soviet regime of workers, peasants and soldiers). Four years later postage stamps inscribed 蘇維埃郵政 (Soviet Post), 苏維埃郵政 or 茆維埃郵政 were issued in Ruijin in southern Jiangxi.[277] 茆 in the latter inscription is 蘇 minus 魚, 苏 in the former is, perhaps, 蘇 minus 禾 minus 田 minus 、、.

 茆 never took root, outnumbered twelve to nil by the irrational but shorter 苏 in our 1930–1954 manuscripts. 苏 was duly included in Tàibái's 1935 "handy characters", the Education Ministry's ensuing List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committe's 1956 Scheme.

---

277 *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 40. Yang 1982, p. 3.

肅 蕭 肃 *sù* solemn, respectful
蕭 蕭 萧 *xiāo* desolate
簫 簫 箫 *xiāo* bamboo flute
嘯 嘯 啸 *xiào* whistle

Before 1955 the more common short forms were 肃 and 萧, which appear in eighteen of our Chinese 1900–1954 manuscripts against six 肅 or 蕭. The former were advocated in *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters", the Education Ministry's ensuing List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft. Bào Yòuwén objected in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "Some characters have not been simplified sufficiently. It is better to adopt 肃 than 肅. All characters with 肅, like 蕭, 簫 and 嘯, can be written with 肃." The committee complied, legalising 肃 in June 1956 with its second batch of simplified characters. Not everybody was converted. As late as in 1998 *Xiàndài Hànyǔ guīfàn zìdiǎn* warned: "The centre of the bottom of 肃 is ⺊, not 米."

In Japan only 粛 was current, appearing in seven of our 1900–1946 manuscripts against 肃 in none. 粛 duly became official in 1946.

肅 is not a shortened version of 肅 or 蕭, but of an older 肅. The character appears as 𢞤 on the Spring and Autumn Wáng Sūn bell, as 肅 in the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts and the 118 CE Sōngshān inscription and contracted as 蕭 or 萧 on Western Han wood slips.

肅 descends from the younger 肅 with 一, a form first seen on the 165 Xīyuèhuáshān Temple stele. Why would someone add 一 to the already overloaded 肅? Perhaps to match *Shuōwén*'s claim that 肅 "consists of 聿 [pen] over 𣶒 [abyss], expressing 'caution'." Writers swallowed this logic and began to write 肅 even in clerk style. 龸 was hard to squeeze in and quickly became 龸; our first 粛 with 米 appears in the 188 Zhāng Nà inscription, only twenty-three years after our first 肅 with 一.

The surname 蕭 or 肖 is dealt with in a separate *Xiāo* section.

算 筭 祘 *suàn* count

Shuōwén distinguished 算 (count), 祘 (look closely so as to count) and 筭 (a six-inch device for calculating the calendar) but its 997 re-editors gave all three the same reading. The six-inch device was rarely mentioned, so writers felt free to adopt 筭 for 'count'. Even *Shuōwén* ignored its own rule, writing 明視以筭之 (look closely so as to count). 筭 outnumbers 算 on Tang steles and was held to be correct by the Tang *Gānlù zìshū*.

By then writers had contrived a still shorter alternative. The 91 BCE *Shǐjì* said Cháo Cuò 筭軍食 (assessed the army's provisions) and the 520 CE Lǐ Bì epitaph 猋筭戎旅 (參算戎旅 *sānsuàn rónglǚ* he assessed the army). Writing authorities were negative. The 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* called 筭 "wrong". The 1610

Súshū kānwù elaborated: "算 is also written 笇. Informally it is written 筭. This is wrong." Condemnations proved effective; on Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* 筭 is absent.

Knowing no current short form for 算, the *Tàibái* reformers picked *Shuōwén*'s 祘 for their 1935 "handy characters", calling it the "ancient form" for 算. The Education Ministry's ensuing List of Short Forms followed suit. These schemes failed but did remind the public of 祘, which we next find in a handwritten 1942 instruction by the Administrative Office of Central Jiangsu concerning 折祘 (converting) land rents.[278]

By the 1950s 祘 had become common, appearing in fourteen of our 1950–1954 manuscripts compared with 筭 in eight. The 祘 bid was renewed in the 1955 Draft, withdrawn in the 1956 Scheme but revived in the 1962, 1977 and 1981 schemes. 祘 was thus part of all reform schemes except the one that was realised.

Japanese reformers and writers never revived 祘. Instead the less short 筭 was proposed for official use by the Interim Committee on the Japanese Language in 1926 and by the Japanese Language Council in 1938, but in the end the council left 算 alone.

<div align="center">

雖 錐 虽 *suī* although

</div>

雖 consists of 虫 (creep) and the phonetic 唯 *wěi,* which in turn consists of 口 (mouth) and the phonetic 隹 *zhuī*. *Shuōwén* said 雖 designated a creature "like a lizard, but bigger." Luckily this beast does not reappear in other texts. Instead 雖 has come to good use as a loan for 'although'.

Blockprinters began to drop 隹 in the Song, writing 虽, then 虽 or 鱼. 鱼 for 虽 was analogous to 舩 for 船, 単 for 單 and 貟 for 員; 虽 to 亊 for 事, 丧 for 喪 and 襄 for 襄. The 1956 Scheme opted for 虽.

<div align="center">

隨 随 *suí* follow
隋 陏 *Suí*
髓 髄 *suǐ* marrow
墮 堕 *duò* fall
橢 椭 *tuǒ* oval

</div>

隨 contains the phonetic 隋 which contains the phonetic 左 *zuǒ*. Simplifiers took aim at the latter component. A 工-less 隋 appears on a Western Han wood slip 517.17 from Juyan, 堕 in the Jin calligraphy of Wáng Xīzhī, 髄 in

---

278   Guo (1935) 1936, p. 45. *Jiangsu kangzhan,* p. 108.

the 471 Golden Light Sutra and 陏 in the 493 Lǚ Chāo epitaph. 工-less forms were long mainstream, promoted by the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* and by model writers like Wáng Xīzhī, Yù Shìnán, Ōuyáng Xún and Chǔ Suìliáng.

The Tang *Zìyàng* and *Gānlù zìshū* prescribed 隨 with the etymologically correct 工. The immediate effect was small. *Zìyàng*'s presumed author Yán Shīgǔ, for one, left us a 随 on the Děngcí Temple stele. In 851 the above-mentioned Dunhuang teacher Ān Wéndé wrote down a 随 for his pupil to copy correctly. Dictionaries, however, continued to propagate 隨 with 工.

The Japanese Education Ministry and Language Council proposed legalising 随, 髄 and 堕 in 1919, 1923, 1926, 1938 and, finally, in 1946. Chinese reformers were less decided, bypassing the group in their 1935 List of Short Forms and and 1955 Draft, but accepting 随 in 1956, 堕 in 1959 and 椭 in 1964.

Alternatives existed. Use of the shorter 阹 for 隨 was registered in 1934 by Xú Zémǐn and in 1960 in a letter to the Script Reform Committee from Guangzhou. The still shorter 阣 was mentioned in a 1975 letter from Shaoxing. In 1981 a sign at Hangzhou railway station urged travellers to carry their luggage 阹身 or 阣身 (close to them) and signs in Huzhou and Shanghai warned not to spit 阹地 (all over the place).

阹 and 阣 records cluster in East China. Readings explain why:

	Beijing	Shanghai	Suzhou, Jiangsu	Huzhou, Zhejiang	Hangzhou, Zhejiang	Shaoxing, Zhejiang	Guangzhou, Guangdong
随	*suei* 35	*zø* 113	*zɛ* 223	*dze* 11	*dzɣei* 212	*ze* 231	*ʃœy* 53
才	*ts'ai* 35	*zɛ* 113	*zɛ* 223	*dze* 11	*dzɛ* 212	*dze* 231	*tʃ'ɔi* 21

We must presume that 阹 and 阣 were invented in Jiangsu or Zhejiang.

歲 崴 歩 *岁 *才 *suì* year

In 2010 the head of Jiangsu Painting and Calligraphy Valuation Committee doubted the authenticity of the newly unearthed 345 CE Lǚ Qián epitaph. *Yángzǐ wǎnbào* (Yangtze Evening News) reported:

> The *suì* form in that epitaph makes Lǐ Lùpíng suspicious. He says that when Northern Dynasties writers wrote *suì*, the upper half of the character should be 止, not 山. But the top in the Lǚ Qián epitaph is 山, which is inconsistent with the correct way of writing at the time.

Inconsistent with the correct way, perhaps, but not with the common way. Umehara Seizan's register of Later Wei inscriptions contains forty-nine 崴

with 山 against one 歲 with 止. In a reply Huáng Zhēng of Nanjing Normal University gave examples of (somewhat more recent) 山 tops from his *Dūn-huáng súzìdiǎn* (Dictionary of Informal Characters from Dunhuang).

'Foot' is the older top, appearing as 㞢 in the Zhou and then as 止, 业, 㞢, 㞢 and 山 as in a 歲 on the 172 Língtái stele. 山 came to dominate and was recommended in the Sui model text *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén*.

The top 山 saved one stroke, but more was to be saved below. A 岇 with 二 appears in the 1212 *Sìshēng piānhǎi*, 岁 with 夕 in the Yuan blockprint *Jīngběn tōngsú xiǎoshuō*, 岌 with 戈 in the Early Qing *Mùliánjì* and 岽 with 不 in the 1796–1820 *Jīn Píng Méi*. 不 is the bottom centre of 歲, 戈 the bottom right, ㇇ a contraction of all and 夕 an enigma.

Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain eighteen 岁 or 岌, four 步 or 岌, two 岁 or 岌, two 岝, one 凷 and one 岽. In 1935 the *Tàibái* editors chose the more etymological 步 for their "handy characters" and were followed by their *Lúnyǔ* colleagues, but not by the Education Ministry which selected the more common 岁 for its List of Short Forms. The 1956 Scheme followed the latter.

None of the above forms were current in Japan, where writers have replaced 歲 *sai* with the still shorter 才 *sai* at least since 1529, when we find 次才 (次歲 *tsugi no toshi* the following year) in a transcript of *Jinnō shōtōki* (A Chronicle of the Authentic Divine Emperors).[279] The Education Ministry's 1919 Character Regulation Scheme recommended permitting 才 for 歳, whereas later schemes made do with a change from 歲 with 步, a reverse 止, to the unetymological but common 歲 with 不. The shorter form remains common. For *jussai* (ten years old) the writing program used for this text proposes 十才 and nothing else.

The common 才 even spread outside the Japanese mainland. In 1954 Wáng Zhèng complained in a *Zhōngguó yǔwén* article, titled "Root out remnants of the 'Manchukuo idiom' ", that "in the 'age' column of surveys and forms there are still those who write ××才 (for ××歲)." In likewise ex-Japanese Taiwan, 才 survived longer: in 1986 this author noticed street advertisements calling for apprentices aged 15–25 才 to work in a kiln in Yingge, and for workers aged 30–45 才 for a factory in Lugang.

孫 孙 *sūn* grandson

孙, the beginning and the end of 孫, appears on Western Han wood slips from Juyan. Use by Wáng Xīzhī made 孙 respectable and paved its way to 1935 List of Short Forms and the 1956 Scheme.

---

279   *Jinno shotoki,* vol. 1, p. 6b.

擡 抬 *tái* lift

Liú Fù found 抬, an analogy to the older 台 for 臺, for 擡 in Yuan and Qing blockprints. By 1952 抬 had become established enough to enter *Rénmín xīn zìdiǎn*. The 1956 Scheme passed 擡 over, but dictionaries nevertheless kept the 抬 entry.

檯 枱 台 *tái* desk

Use of 檯 for 'desk' is a novelty, absent in *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* which defined 檯 as 'the name of a tree'. Already in the 1862–1874 blockprint *Lǐngnán yìshǐ* Liú Fù found the character shortened to 枱.

The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft proposed 枱 for 檯. The 1956 Scheme, however, shortened 枱 further to 台, merging it with 臺. In 1957 Cáo Bóhán proposed on behalf of the committee to preserve the distinction by reverting to 枱. As we know, no changes were made and 'desk' remained 台.

颱 台 *tái* typhoon

颱 was a novelty absent in *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*. The 1956 Scheme abolished the form by merging it with 台.

態 态 *tài* form

Yuan blockprinters shortened 能 to 㠯 and 態 to 㤅. Modern writers revived the former but not the latter, which they instead equipped with the phonetic 太 *tài*. Chén Guāngyáo recalled: "Many years ago, in the Liberated Areas, some tried out characters like 㐅 [艺], 态, 拥 and 护, which people came to like and use. After liberation they spread all over the country." For example to Beijing, where we find a 1949 memo criticising 贺同学的态度 (賀同學的態度 the attitude of student Hè).[280]

Even the Script Reform Committee liked 态 and included the form in its 1955 Draft. Professor Yuè Sìbǐng cautioned in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Older persons find 艺, 疗, 床, 态 and 卫 unfamiliar." This did not prevent the committee from recognising 态 with its first batch of simplified characters in February 1956.

---

280   Chen Guangyao 1956, p. 28. Beijing Archives 153-1-803, p. 7.

<h1 style="text-align:center">泰 *太 tài peaceful</h1>

Shuōwén said 泰 "consists of 廾 [hands], 水 [water] and the phonetic 大." Seeing no logic to preserve, writers saved effort by turning 水 into 小 (heart) or 小 (small). *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains thirty-seven 泰山 (Mount Taishan), eighteen 泰山 and five 泰山 on Later Wei to Qing steles, but also twenty-one 太山 with the shorter homonym 太, the oldest on the 508 Gāo Qìng stele. The latter, shorter option remained in use, as in a 1960 letter to the Script Reform Committee from 长太实小 (长泰实小 Changtai Experimental Primary School) in Fujian.

So the committee proposed in 1962 and 1977 to make this use of 太 official. It then concluded, however, that "the counties 太和 in Jiangxi and 泰和 in Anhui would after simplification both be 太和 and become confused" and excluded the change from its 1981 Revised Draft.[281]

<h1 style="text-align:center">攤 摊 *扙 tān stall</h1>

The 1956 Scheme shortened 攤 to 摊 analogously to 难 for 難. Some found even this too complex. In 1957 Huī Zhī reported in *Yǔwén zhīshí*:

> These days one often sees a handwritten character in the streets of Shanghai: 扙. This character frequently forms a word with 販 [*fàn* trader]. It appears to be short for 攤. […]. It is no accident that 扙 has appeared in Shanghai. […]. In Shanghai 攤 is read *t'ɛ*. 太 has two readings: in speech *t'a*, in reading *t'ɛ*. The creators of 扙 have exploited this similarity of 太 to 攤 and used 太 as a phonetic.

Others may lay claim to this invention. In late 1954 or early 1955 Hangzhou Trade Bureau registered 摊販户数色括流劲扙販左内 (*tānfàn hù shù bāokuò liúdòng tānfàn zài nèi* the number of pedlar families including itinerant pedlars).[282] Readings hint at a Hangzhou origin of 扙:

	Shanghai	Hangzhou	Wenzhou	Nanjing	Guangzhou	Nanning	Chaozhou
摊	*t'ɛ* 53	*t'ɛ* 323	*t'a* 33	*t'ã* 31	*t'a:n* 55	*t'an* 55	*t'ũã* 33
太	*t'a* 34	*t'ɛ* 334	*t'ai* 42	*t'ʋe* 44	*t'a:i* 33	*t'ai* 33	*t'ai* 213

The character soon turned up in areas where the phonetic did not fit. In 1960 Guangdong Education Bureau informed the Script Reform Committee that

---

281 'Cao'an' di yi biao xiuding qingkuang shuoming, 1979, p. 7.
282 Hangzhou Archives 81-4-21, p. 64.

�298 was "used in parts of Guangdong." In 1965 Huáng Shìzhōng of Wenzhou Middle School No. 6 in southern Zhejiang wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "In market-places 韭菜 is written 芁芽 and 摊販 is written 扻販." In 1982 this author saw 不准出扻 (setting up stalls is not permitted) signs not only in Shanghai but also in Wuzhou in Guangxi, in 1988 a 严禁設扻 sign in Wenzhou and a 不准摆扻 sign near Chaozhou in Guangdong. The form did not spread all over, however, being recognised in 1981–1986 by informants in Shanghai and parts of Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Guangdong and Guangxi but not in sixteen other provinces.

<div style="text-align:center">

壇 坛 *tán* altar, elevated field
檀 *枟 *tán* sandalwood
擅 *扝 *shàn* without permission

</div>

The puzzling change from 亶 to 云 may be illuminated by a 挋 for 擅 in the early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì* and a 稷坛 (*jìtán* millet field) on a map in the 1824 *Nánxióngzhōu zhì* (History of Nanxiongzhou). 云 is obviously a reduced 玄, appearing in a 扝 in the "selected mistakes" section of the 1839 *Zìxué jǔyú* and in the 坛 and 枟 in the 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn*.

Reformers favoured the latter, including 坛, 枟 and 扝 in *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters", 坛 and 枟 in the Education Ministry's List of Short Forms and 坛, 枟 and 扝 in the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft.

Bào Yòuwén objected in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "云 replaces too many compo-nents, as in 扝 for 擅, 坛 for 壇 and 壜 [*tán* jar], 层 for 層, 运 for 運, 酝 for 醞 [*yùn* brew] and 动 for 動. With the exception of 運 and 醞, all these are read differently from 云. This is confusing." Xú Chuánxíng had an idea where to make cuts: "As I see it, characters like 会, 尝 and 动 have been common for a long time. If we on the other hand simplify 壇, 擅 and 檀 by replacing 亶 with 云, I am afraid the result will be easy to misread."

The committee responded by excluding 檀 and 擅 from its decisive 1956 Scheme, changing only 壇 to 坛. The change was not implemented until 1959. One delaying factor may have been the informal use of 坛 even for 增 (*zēng* increase), another hesitation whether to merge 壇 and 罎 (see below).

The committee proposed 枟 again in its abortive 1977 and 1981 schemes. 枟 had thus been part of all official simplification schemes except the one that was realised. On 擅 the committee tried a new approach, proposing 扯 with the phonetic 山 *shān* in List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme. This is our only record of this form.

Our records of shortened 擅 cease with 1982 signs forbidding 扝自进入 (entering without permission) in Yueyang and 扝离职守 (leaving one's post without permission) in Shanhaiguan.

罎 坛 *tán* jar

As 坛 came into use for 壇, writers took up this form even for the homonymous 罎, as mentioned in Róng Gēng's 1936 *Jiǎntǐ zìdiǎn* and in the 1950 *Jiǎnbǐzì*.

The 1956 Scheme proposed to simplify 罎 to 坛, merging it with 壇. This was not the last word on the matter. In 1957 Cáo Bóhán on behalf of the Script Reform Committee proposed to revoke the simplification of 罎, while the *Guāngmíng rìbào* reader Wēn Yìngshí suggested changing 罎 to 坛. However, no amendments were made and 罎 became 坛 in 1959.

潭 *沄 *tán* pond

The unusual character 沄 (*yún* torrent) has been used for 潭 analogously to the older 坛 for 壇 *tán*. In 1960 a correspondent from Songxi and Zhenghe Middle School No. 1 in Fujian informed the Script Reform Committee that people wrote 沄 for 潭. A 1970 decision to build a bridge at 隔卜沄 (隔铺潭 Geputan) is recorded in Hubei Archives, and an envelope in this author's collection was sent that year from 刜沄、沄家山炅矿 (*Xiāngtán, Tánjiāshān méikuàng* Tanjiashan Coal Mine, Xiangtan).[283] A 2017 web search yielded fourteen 湘沄市.

嘆 叹 *tàn* sigh

We saw in the 汉 *hàn* section that 叹 appeared in 1934 but was excluded from the Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms as a character which had "not yet become common". It was also excluded from the 1955 Draft. Some wanted it in, analogously to the proposed 难, 艰 and 汉 for 漢, 難 and 艱. Wáng Tónghàn argued in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that 叹 already had "a broad basis of use among the masses", while Yùn Huī and Jùn Tāo noted that the form was "nowadays used by broad layers of the people."

So 叹 was included in the 1956 Scheme. It became clear that not everybody was familiar with the form. Chén Mèngjiā wrote: "Whole groups have been changed, like 观, 欢, 仅, 汉 and 叹. The latter are forms I do not recognise. They seem to be read *yòu*, since the phonetic is 又." Zuǒ Huànrén filled in: "Frankly, when the scheme was published and I saw forms like 尘, 仅, 汉 and 叹, even I could not make them out […]." 叹 became official in 1959, three years after the analogous 汉, 难 and 艰.

---

283   Hubei Archives SZ139-1-201, p. 3. Envelope provided by Wang Jialin.

<div align="center">堂 *坣 táng hall</div>

A chart from the pre-309 BCE tomb of the king of Zhongshan demarcates 王后坣 (王后堂 the queen's palace), 王坣 (the king's palace) and 夫1坣 (夫人坣 ladies' premises). Already the 100 CE *Shuōwén* regarded the shorter 坣 (坣) as obsolete: "堂 […] consists of 土 and the phonetic 尚. 坣 [坣]: ancient form of堂." Even though the 1008 *Guǎngyùn*, 1013 *Yùpiān* and their successors persisted in calling 坣 "ancient", 坣 did see some use, for example by Lǔ Xùn who wrote 坣 in his diary on 29 June 1912. In 1952 Dīng Xīlín mentioned 坣 among "short forms commonly used by the masses."

So 坣 was included in the 1955 Draft. Professor Yuè Sìbǐng objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Characters with simple strokes, like 豈, 長, 私, 堂, 啟 need not be simplified immediately." 坣 was withdrawn but reintroduced in the 1977 Second Scheme. Tianjin Culture and Education Section repeated: "There is no need to simplify characters which do not have too many strokes to begin with and which after simplification will not be much shorter, like 雨 (雨), 修 (俢) and 堂 (坣)." All were duly ousted from the 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">塘 *圹 táng dike, pond
糖 *糖 táng sugar, sweets</div>

We saw in the *guǎng* section that by the 1930s, 广 was in use for 廣, 房, 庵, 廖, 慶 and 廠. As a component it came to fill yet another function. A map in the 1931 *Tāngxī xiàn zhì* (Chronicle of Tangxi County) shows a 上官圹 (Shangguan Lake) and a 下官圹. The 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì* called 圹 short for 塘 and 糖 for 糖.

Neither was included in the 1956 Scheme. Some assumed that they had been; in 1958 Zhāng Sìjìng found 糖 for 糖 in a textbook printed in Handan. From 1960 to 1977 ten correspondents reported 圹 or 糖 to the Script Reform Committee, which proposed the latter in its 1977 Second Scheme but withdrew it from its 1981 Revised Draft.[284]

糖 has had a competitor. In 1981 this author saw an advertisement for a cure for 耘尿病 (*tángniàobìng* diabetes) in Chengdu in Sichuan and the following year sweets sold as either 糖, 糖 or 耘 in Kunming in Yunnan. Informants from Yunnan identified this 耘 as 糖, those further east as 糯 *nuò*. Kunming writers must have reasoned that if 云 could serve as a phonetic in 坛 for 壇 which they read *t'ã* 31, it could also in 塘 *t'ã* 31.

---

284   糖 in letters from Yichang, Wugang, Rongjiang, Wuzhou, Songxi, Shaoguan and Yunyang, 圹 in letters from Wuzhou, Songxi, Qingjiang, Hui'an and Mengcheng.

套 *套 *奁 *套 *套 *套 *套 *套 *套 tào set

套 depicts a bundle (大) of long hair (镸), 镸 being short for 長. The 1955 Draft envisaged a change from 長 to 圡, 張 to 张, 賬 to 账 and 套 to 奁. The decisive 1956 Scheme switched to 长, 张 and 账 but passed 套 over. The 1977 Second Scheme and 1981 Revised Draft proposed to include even 奁 for 套.

謄 眷 téng copy out

We have no records of 眷 prior to the 1956 Scheme. Chén Guāngyáo called 眷 a "newly coined picto-phonetic character", which may explain why its official status was delayed until 1957.

藤 *苞 *荇 téng rattan

Reformers have struggled with 藤. Chén Guāngyáo suggested 苳 "analogously to疼 [téng hurt]" in his 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ*, and the Script Reform Committee proposed 桼 in its 1962 List of Simplified Characters and 𣗥 in List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme. Neither form took root among the public, which had other ideas.

In 1959 Qín Bówèi wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that in Chinese-style pharmacies "鷄血藤 [*Millettia retilucata*] is written 鸡血苞." In 1975 staff of Huzhou Middle School in Zhejiang reported in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that locals wrote 藤 as 苞.[285] In 1988 this author saw buses in Wenzhou in Zhejiang bound for 笔桥 or 藤桥.

In 1960 a correspondent from Guangdong informed the committee that writers in Zhongshan shortened 藤 to 荇. In 1982 this author saw 荇席 (rattan mats) and 荇制品 (rattan products) on offer in Guangzhou, rates for telephone calls to 荇县 (藤县 Tengxian) in Jiangmen in Guangdong and, in 1986, price tags on 荇椅 (*téngyǐ* rattan chairs) and 全荇婴車 (*quán téng yīngchē* rattan baby prams) in Zhongshan.

In 1982 this traveller noticed timetables to 艼县 at the Wuzhou bus station in Guangxi. The relatively low fare indicated that 艼县 must be the nearby 藤县.

Neither form spread. 苞 was recognised only by informants in parts of Zhejiang, 荇 near Guangzhou and 艼 in Wuzhou. This distribution was not accidental. In Huzhou and Hangzhou the phonetic 屯 is read dən like 藤. In Cantonese 行 *haŋ* rhymes with 藤 *t'aŋ*. The short 艼 came to be used where it was most needed, namely in the vicinity of Tengxian.

---

285   Zhejiang sheng Huzhou zhongxue 1975.

踢 踢 *tī* kick
惕 惕 *tì* cautious

See 易 *yì*.

題 题 丁 赶 *tí* topic

In March 1955 Jīn Míngshèng asked in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Take 警, 题, 鬆, 翻 […], is there absolutely no way of simplifying these characters?"

There was. Professor Jīn Lúnhǎi of Jiangsu Normal Institute reported that many "write 問題 as 问丁". Yùn Huī and Jùn Tāo wrote that 赶 was "in common use" for 题, Wáng Tónghàn that this form had "a broad basis of use among the masses" and suggested adding it to the 1956 Scheme. In 1957 Fán Jiāng reported that Zhejiang students wrote 题 not only as 赶 but also as 赴.

丁 is the Latin letter T, 赶 a compound of the phonetics 是 *shì* and 丁 *tí*, but 赴? A 赴 observed by this author may give a clue. Readers may have taken a sloppily written 丁 on top right for a sloppy 卜, a more familiar and perhaps handier component than 丁.

Neither form survived. Our records of 丁 cease with a warning against that form in Xiāo Tiānzhù's 1962 writing guide. The last sighting of 赴 is a 1981 notice at Nanjing University and of 赶 the above-mentioned 赴 from 1986.

Why were writers so lukewarm about shortening the fifteen-stroke 题? Because they found a still simpler way out, contracting the most common combination 问题 to 忊, 冏 or 㳮.

體 体 *tǐ* body

體 consists of ten strokes of 骨 (bones) and thirteen strokes of the phonetic 豊 (*lǐ* ritual vessel). Unsurprisingly, simplification started early. On Wuwei wood slips from 32–6 BCE we find 膃 with 'meat' and 軆 with 'body' for 'bones'.

軆 outcompeted 膃 and became the basis for still shorter forms, 躰 with 本 for 豊 on a 553 statue by Zhāng Tǎn and 体 with 'man' for 'body' on a 547 Buddha statue by Dù Zhàoxián. In spite of these dates we presume that 躰 preceded 体.

Not surprisingly, the shorter form outcompeted the rest. Liú Fù found both 体 and 躰 in Ming blockprints but only 体 in those from the Qing. 体 appears in seventy-nine of our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts, 躰 in none. The 1956 Scheme duly prescribed 体.

In Japan 躰 held out longer, appearing in four of our 1860–1899 manuscripts against 体 in three, and in one of our 1900–1946 ones against 体 in forty-seven. The shorter form appeared in all Japanese reform schemes

including the decisive 1946 one. The last non-体 short form on our record is a 躰 in a 1959 manuscript by Ōe Kenzaburō.[286]

條 条 *tiáo* twig

條 appears as 条 in the Tang, indistinctly on a 699 statue in Wáng Dàzhēn Temple, clearly on the 742 Chén Lìngwàng stele and frequently in blockprints from the Yuan onwards.

In Japan 条 was promoted by religious leaders like Saichō (767–822) and Kūkai (774–835), secular authorities like emperors Gouda (1267–1324) and Godaigo (1288–1339) and the sixteenth-century Manjuya version of the *Setsuyōshū* dictionary

条 became official in Japan in 1949 and in China in 1956.

糶 粜 *tiào* sell grain

The Tang *Gānlù zìshū* called 粜 "informal" for 糶. In 1959 the Script Reform Committee made the shorter form formal.

鐵 鉄 铁 *tiě* iron

铁 records begin with a 铁匠徐 (*tiějiāng Xú* Xú the smith) named on an incense burner by Tián Bīn in 1328 and continue in Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprints. 鐵 officially became 鉄 in 1946 in Japan and in 1956 in China, where it then became 铁 in 1964.

In Japan not everybody welcomed 鉄. The logo of 東日本旅客鉄道株式会社 (*Higashi Nihon ryokaku tetsudō kabushiki gaisha* East Japan Rail Company Ltd.) is written with 矢 not 失 on the right of 鉄 since, informs Sugiyama Junichi, the railwaymen shun the juxtaposition of 金 (*kane* 'money) and 失う (*ushinau* lose) and prefer to replace the latter with the more befitting 矢 (*ya* arrow). Even the Osaka 近鉄 (Kintetsu Railway) called itself 近鉄 until 1967, when it bowed to complaints that schoolchildren along its line tended to miswrite 鉄 as 鉃.

鉄 was not a complete novelty, appearing in twelve of our 1900–1946 Japanese manuscripts compared with 鐵 in twenty. The original component was 失, however, an analogy to 跌 (*diē* fall) and 迭 (*dié* alternate).

---

286 Manuscript of *Hato* (Doves). Facsimile in Aoki 2001, p. 187.

聽 聴 听 *tīng* listen

Chén Guāngyáo presented a provenance for the puzzling 听: "In ancient script 聽 was also written 咡. The cursive form of 耳 is 𠃌. Since common people did not cope with cursive style, they turned 咡 into the square form 听."[287] Not likely, as forms like 𦔫 (咡) had been replaced by the enlarged 聽 long before cursive style emerged in the Han.

Lǐ Róng provided a more plausible etymology: "廳 [*tīng* hall] was shortened to 庁 or 厅 [with the 丁 *dīng* phonetic]. The short form 听 for 聽 may have originated as 听, a mouth plus a 厅 (廳) phonetic. The short form 厛 for 廳 must have emerged after 聽 had become 听."

This fits our records. 厅 appears in the 1058 Liáoyúnjū Temple inscription, 听 in the 1108 Chóngxīngqiáo inscription and 厛 in Yuan blockprints. The 1058 厅 was used for 聽, in phrases like 厅经 (listen to sutras) and 厅佛説 (listen to the words of Buddha).

In Japan 听 was mentioned by Dazai Shundai in 1753 and Matsumoto Guzan in 1803 but then disappears. So the Japanese Language Council confined itself to shortening 聽 to 聴 without 壬 on the left and 一 on the right, a form seen already in the early Han Lǎo zǐ B manuscript from Mawangdui. The coming and going of 一 is analogous to that in 德.

廳 厛 庁 厅 *tīng* hall, office

We saw above that 厅 was in use by 1058 and 厛 by the Yuan. The latter became the more common, appearing in three of the Qing blockprints surveyed by Liú Fù against 厅 and 庁 in none. Later still shorter forms appeared. Our 1925 Palace Museum inventory list mentions the 警察厂 (police department) and 检察厂 (prosecutor's office). A 1926 letter was sent from 怇北财敀广 (湖北財政廳 Hubei Finance Office).[288]

The Education Ministry chose the more traditional 厛 for its 1935 List of Short Forms. This list failed, but 厛 remained in use, appearing in two of our 1950–1954 manuscripts, alongside four 厛, two 厛, two 厅 and three 庁 but, notably, no 厂 or 广 which writers had by then made up their minds to use for 廠 and 廣.

The 1955 Draft repeated the 厛 proposal. Yáo Jiāzhēn of Jiangsu Industry Bureau objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Some comrades point out that one could simplify more thouroughly. For example, we all write 工業廳 as 工叶

---

287 Ai 1949, p. 147.
288 Museum of Chinese History, manuscript 史 5678, p. 1. Hubei Archives LS10-5-1294, p. 111.

厅." In *Zhōngguó yǔwén* the proofreader Zhào Xī praised 厅 for its shortness. The 1956 Scheme accordingly changed 厠 to 厅.

In Japan 广 appeared for 廳 at least as early as in China. A 1914 letter from 山口縣广土木课 (*Yamaguchi kenchō doboku ka* Engineering Section of Yamaguchi Prefectural Office.[289] Such use of 广 for 廳 clashed with its traditional Japanese use for 摩 and upcoming use for 廢, as described in the *mó* and *fèi* sections. So the Education Ministry and the Japanese Language Council avoided the graph 广 in their 1919, 1923, 1926 and 1938 reform schemes, suggesting instead a change of 廳 to 廰 or 廰 analogously to 聴 above.

Then another option turned up. A document from 1941 registers police expenditure on 庁舍修繕 (*chōsha shūzen* office repairs).[290] This 庁 did not immediately outcompete the shorter 广, which outnumbers 庁 five to two in our 1940–1946 manuscripts. The Language Council nevertheless found 庁 with its distinctive 丁 *chō* phonetic more acceptable than the ambiguous 广 and included this novelty in its 1949 List of Forms.

停 *仃 *tíng* stop

厅's official status helped to promote the 丁 *dīng* phonetic. In 1958 Rén Shuāngyàn from Beijing mentioned "some now very common short forms, like the 氵 in 演員, the 艹 in 蒙古, the 仃 in 停止 […]." In 1960 this use of 仃 was reported to the Script Reform Committee by correspondents from Gaozhou in Guangdong in the south to Baotou in Inner Mongolia in the north.

The committee found 仃 common enough to include in its 1977 Second Scheme. Yú Xiàlóng and others reminded reformers that 仃 *tíng* clashed with the 仃 in 伶仃 (*língdīng* lonely), effectively ousting 仃 from the 1981 Revised Draft.

But not from use. 严禁仃车 (parking forbidden) messages appear wherever there is an open space.

通 *迀 *tōng* open

In 1964 Shĕn Chángchūn and Wáng Hóngzhēn from Hefei Middle School No. 1 wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé*:

> In students' compositions and excercises we often come across irregular short forms like 厃, 忈, 迣, 迀 […]. Remarks and corrections have no effect. The students often ask back: 'Aren't these simplifications all

---

289   Yamaguchi Archives 戰前 A 土木 436, letter dated 3.2.25 (25 February 1914).
290   National Archives 1941.2.26, p. 10.

right? Why shouldn't we shorten these characters?' In fact we are not innocent of using these forms ourselves in our notes. It is only when we correct papers and write on the blackboard that we write the full forms.

Shěn and Wáng did not bother to give the sense of each character, expecting readers to recognise 厉 as 原, 忎 as 愚, 迖 as 建 and 迍 as 通. Readers most probably recognised 厉, 忎 and 迖, which had been mentioned many times in that publication, but hardly 迍 with the phonetic 中 *zhōng*, which had not. It had, however, been reported in 1960 letters to the Script Reform Committee from Hefei, Anqing and Zongyang in Anhui, Macheng and Yichang in Hubei, Wugang and Shaoyang in Hunan, Rongjiang and Modong in Guizhou, Dehong in Yunnan, Xichang in Sichuan and Hangzhou in Zhejiang.

Geography explains the absence of 迍 in the media; the above records are all from the central and southwestern parts of the country. Later, in 1981–1986, 迍 was identified as 通 by informants in Anhui, Guizhou, Yunnan and parts of Hunan, but not elsewhere.[291] Since then the form has been forgotten. Our youngest informant to recognise 迍 as 通 was a shopkeeper in Xuancheng in Anhui born in 1956.

In Shanxi 迍 has been used for 遵 *zūn*, as we shall see in that section.

同 仝 *冂 *冈 *tóng* same

We mentioned in the 岡 *gāng* section that 同 used to be shortened 冈. Our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain eleven 冈 for 同, alongside forty-three 冂 and thirteen 仝.

冈 records begin with a letter reproduced in N. C. Yang's postage stamp catalogue, forwarded in 1932–1934 by Jiangxi Soviet Post and adressed to one 戈莐記冈志 (戈發記同志 Comrade Gē Fājì). Thirty years after the 1956 Scheme adopted 冈 for 岡 one could still see letters addressed to 冈志 so-and-so. Our youngest informant to identify 冈样 as 同样 (*tóngyàng* identical) was a person from Shanghai born in 1983.

仝 was originally the surname *Tóng* but came to be used even for 同. *Cíyuán* records begin with 大仝而小異 (very similar and not too different) in a poem by Lú Tóng (盧仝 795–834), who was of course familiar with the otherwise unusual 仝. Today dictionaries register 仝 as a variant of 同.

---

291 迍 identified as 通 in Huaibei, Sùzhou, Hefei, Ma'anshan, Anqing and Huangshan but not Jingxian in Anhui, in Guiyang and Xingyi in Guizhou, in Kunming and Qujing in Yunnan, in Lianyuan and Hengyang but not Yueyang, Changsha, Zhuzhou and Chenzhou in Hunan, identified as 遵 in Taiyuan, Yongquan, Changzhi and Yuncheng in Shanxi, in Baotou in Inner Mongolia and in Luoyang but not Sanmenxia and Xinyang in Henan, unknown in forty-two localities in other provinces.

冋 appears in a letter from Lǔ Xùn dated 21 September 1934. He may have picked up this habit in Japan, where 冋 is found already in the calligraphy of Emperor Uda (966–1028), and even made its way into fifteenth- and sixteenth-century versions of the *Setsuyōshū* dictionary, which repeatedly define characters as 冋 (same [as above]). Our youngest Japanese informant to identify 冋 as 同 was born in 1995, our youngest Chinese one in 1969.

頭 头 *tóu* head

Writing 头 for 頭 is not so far-fetched as it looks. Cursive for 豆 is 𠮷, for 貝 its bottom 大 , as in 卖 and 买 above. 头 is thus the beginning and the end of 頭. In square style we find 头 in our 1909 account book, which registered a purchase by one 胡芦头 (葫蘆頭 *Húlutóur* The Baldhead). 头 became official in 1956 without controversy.

One may wonder how writers could put up with the sixteen stroke 頭 for so long. In fact they did not; Liú Fù found that Qing blockprinters beat 頭 down to seven strokes by writing the phonetic 豆 only.

塗 涂 *tú* smear

Kāngxī zìdiǎn calls 涂 "a river name" but also "the same as 塗". The 1956 Scheme duly included a change from 塗 to 涂. This was one of the changes the committee offered to withdraw in 1957. Although no withdrawals came about, doubts nevertheless delayed official status for 涂 until 1964.

圖 图 図 *啚 *図 *tú* drawing

In 1990 no one could miss the Beijing Library New Culture, Art and Film Hall under its huge 北圖新文化藝術影院 sign. The second character is not in the dictionary but obviously represented the 图 of 图书馆 (library). Four years later the sign had been replaced.

啚 (啚) meant 鄙 (*bǐ* outskirts) but came into use for 圖, as in the phrase 改畫聖象如古啚 (redrawn, the venerable portrait was like the old one) on the 157 CE Hán Chì stele. Use of 啚 for 圖 became very common and was even recommended by the Sui model text *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén*. Later authorities were less permissive, like the Tang *Zìyàng*: "啚 is read 鄙. This form is informally used for 圖. This is wrong."

Other writers shortened 圖 from the inside. Cursive 图 turns up in the Jin calligraphy of Wáng Xiànzhī and square 図 in a sixteenth-century transcript of the Japanese songbook *Wa-Kan rōeishū shichū* and then in the Chinese 1862–1874 blockprint *Lǐngnán yìshǐ*. Some writers shed one point, like Lǔ

Xùn who wrote 图 in a 1911 letter. Others shed the top 冂, like Nanjing Health Office in a 1953 草刕 (draft).[292] Our 1900–1954 manuscripts turn up forty-five 啚 or 畲, thirty-three 图, twelve 图, five 图, three 图 and two 刕.

The *Tàibái* editors opted for 啚 for their 1935 "handy characters", the Education Ministry for 图 in its ensuing List of Short Forms, and the Script Reform Committee for 啚 in its 1955 Draft.

Pān Yǔnzhōng objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "The masses habitually shorten 圖 to 图 with nine strokes only. The present proposal has 啚 with eleven strokes." Yú Xīnbó maintained that "the habitual short form is 图," Zhāng Décún that "everybody writes 图" and Yùn Huī and Jùn Tāo that "the form in common use today is 图."

The October 1955 Revised Draft proposed either 刕 or 图, which the 1956 Scheme changed to 图 with 冬 since, wrote Chén Guāngyáo, "the 刕 component is not a character by itself and is not so easy to write as 冬." Still hesitant, the committee delayed 图's official status until 1959.

Japanese 図 stems from cursive 圗, which locals turned into 図 and then 図. With time, this form came to dominate. While we in our 1900–1919 Japanese manuscripts find only three 図 among seven 啚 and three 图, 1940–1946 ones give us nine 図 against two 啚 and no 图. The Language Council duly selected 図.

兔 *兎 *tù* hare

兎 forms with a flattened head are known since the 586 Lóngcáng Temple stele. The 1610 *Súshū kānwù* felt called upon to warn: "兔 is informally written 兎. This is wrong."

The 1955 Draft proposed to make 兎 correct. Liú Nǎizhōng argued in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that saving just one stroke was not worthwhile. The committee agreed and retained 兔.

團 団 团 *tuán* group

The Japanese Language Council changed 團 to 団, the Script Reform Committee of China to 团. The deviation was based on usage; our Japanese 1940–1946 manuscripts contain five 団 and four 团, Chinese 1940–1954 ones seventy-three 团 but no 団.

Our records of 団 begin with a postcard sent from Sakhalin during the Russo- Japanese war by a medical officer of the 第十三師団 (Thirteenth Di-

---

292   Yamada 1958, p. 32. Liu 1930, p. 14. *Lu Xun shougao*: *shuxin*, p. 28. Nanjing Archives 5065-2-525, p. 11.

vision), those of 団 with a 青年团 (*seinendan* youth association) mentioned in a 1923 survey by Yamaguchi Prefecture. In China 团 appears in a 1929 rule prohibiting members of Qianshan Peasants' Association in Anhui from 破坏团体 (*pòhuài tuántǐ* disrupting unity).[293] 団 with 寸 is absent in our extensive Chinese records of this character.

So 團 first lost 叀 to become 団. Some but far from all then slipped into writing 团. By accident Chinese writers picked up the latter.

Early Japanese reform schemes ignored the newish 団, which became official as late as in 1949. Even the Script Reform Committee of China hesitated, authorising 团 only in 1959, presumably after pondering the fate of 糰 below.

<div style="text-align: center;">

糰 团 *tuán* dumpling

</div>

In 1959 the Script Reform Committee merged 糰 with 团. Chén Guāngyáo argued that use of 团 for 糰 was "established by custom" and that the original sense of 团 was 'round' and thus identical with 糰.

<div style="text-align: center;">

楕 椭 *tuǒ* oval

</div>

See 隨 *suí*.

<div style="text-align: center;">

窪 洼 *wā* hollow

</div>

Quoting earlier dictionaries, *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* said that 窪 means "deep" and 洼 "Wowa River in Shaanxi", but also that according to *Guǎngyùn, Jíyùn, Yùnhuì* and *Zhèngyùn* 洼 is the "same as 窪." 洼 was used in the sense of 窪 even before, as in the early Han *Lǎo zǐ* manuscripts from Mawangdui which say 洼則� for later versions' 窪則盈 (*wā zé yíng* [experience of] want leads to [enjoyment of] surplus).

洼 replaced all 窪 in 1958.

<div style="text-align: center;">

襪 袜 *wà* sock

</div>

The 1956 Scheme replaced 襪 with 袜. It is far from certain that the former is the older form. Dù Zhāohuī made a thorough survey of early records and found 脚袜 (foot socks) and 帛練袜 (white silk socks) in Turfan manuscripts from 384–488 and 細絲襪 (fine silk socks) only in one from 672.

These are not the oldest records of 'socks', which appear earlier (and later)

---

293   Clark 2004, vol. 1, item C103. Yamaguchi Archives 戦前 B 89. *Anhui geming shi*, p. 58.

with the sense indicated not by 衤 (cloth), but by 糸 (silk), 韋 (feet) or 革 (leather). Even in these cases the 末 *mò* phonetic precedes 蔑 *miè*. Dù found 布袜一兩 (布襪一兩 one pair of cloth socks) and 幣袜裏 (silk lining socks) with 末 on Western Han wood slips from Juyan and Dunhuang, and 韤 with 蔑 only in the 100 CE *Shuōwén*.

<div align="center">

彎 弯 *wān* bent
灣 湾 *wān* bay

</div>

See 變 *biàn*.

<div align="center">

萬 万 *wàn* ten thousand

</div>

萬 became 万 in 1946 in Japan and in 1956 in China. The shorter form was registered by Hóng Kuò in the phrase 賈二万五千 (a price of twenty-five thousand) on the now lost 2 BCE Pí xiàn stele. Qiú Xīguī took 万 to be a descendant of the 丂 used for 'dancer' on Yin bones, Yú Xīn for a Warring States fusion of 一 (many) and 八 (人 men) and Lǐ Lèyì for a derivate of the cursive 㸒 and 㸒 seen for 萬 on Han wood slips.

<div align="center">

网 罔 網 綱 纲 *wǎng* net

</div>

On Yin bones 'net' is written 网 (网) or 网 (冈). By the Western Han the reading had been spelled out by addition of the phonetic 亡 *wáng*, as in the 天罔 (天罔 Heaven's justice) in the Lǎo zǐ B manuscript from Mawangdui. By the Eastern Han the sense had been further clarified by the addition of 糸 (thread), as in *Shuōwén*: "网 is also written with 糸." With time, enlarged forms took over. Our last threadless 网 is a 天网 on the 732 Kül-Tegin stele.

Enlarged forms were made less large by squashing the 罔 component to 冈. The 185 CE Cáo Quán stele said the protagonist of that text at one stage 遇禁冈 (became associated with a banned network) and the Jin calligrapher Wáng Xīzhī wrote 法纲 for 法網 (the net of the law). The career of this 網 peaked when the Tang version of *Yùpiān* advocated that form for 'net'.

Pre-reform writers used 網 for both 網 and 綱. Our 1940–1954 manuscripts contain a 零售網 (*língshòuwǎng* retail network) and 漏網 (*lòuwǎng* slip through the net) but, confusingly, also a 網伶 (綱領 *gānglǐng* programme), 提網 (*tígāng* outline) and 纲要 (*gāngyào* outline).[294]

The 1955 Draft opted to use 網 for 綱 *gāng*, dealing with 網 by reviving

294　Beijing Archives 88-1-369, p. 2. *Anhui geming shi*, p. 277. *Jinjiang geming shi*, p. 97. Beijing Archives 135-1-40, p. 146; 117-1-672, p. 43.

网. No one claimed that 网 was established by custom. The script reform conference delegate Chén Zhōngfán admitted: "There are only a few characters, like 尘 and 网, which are a little unfamiliar, but after explanation it will be easy for the masses to recognise and accept them." 网 became official only in 1959, with the fourth batch of simplified characters.

In Japanese records 綱 never represents 網. Kitagawa Hirokuni's compilation of Japanese calligraphy contains seven 綱 and nine 綱, all for 網. In a 1943 application for compensation, Yamaguchi fishermen list their damaged 狩込網 (*karikomiami* dragnets) and 壷網 (*tsuboami* stationary nets).[295]

The Education Ministry's 1919 Character Regulation Scheme suggested permitting 綱 for 網, later schemes did not. Why not, if there was no risk of mixing up with 綱, as in China? Because of another risk, apparent in a 1934 letter addressed to 西網江町, which may look like Nishi-Amie chō, but is in fact addressed to Nishi-Hosoe chō in Shimonoseki, with 網 for 細 (*hosoi* thin).[296] Why were 網 and 細 mixed up in Japan but not in China? Because Japanese write 田 with the stroke order 丨コ丨一一, unlike Chinese 丨コ一丨一. In Japan the centre 十 therefore easily comes out as 乄, 田 as 囟 and 細 as 網.

So Language Council chairman Andō Masatsugu mooted another idea in 1948: "網 and 綱 are easy to mix up. It would be better to write 'net' without 糸." Such a practice is not on record and the proposal was not implemented.

<p align="center">爲 為 为 wéi act as wèi for</p>

爲 was simplified to 為 in Japan and to 为 in China. Both forms have long traditions. Topless 𢍿 appear in the early Han *Yìjīng* manuscript from Mawangdui and contracted 为, 㐓 and 为 on first century BCE wood slips from Juyan.

Wáng Xīzhī wrote 為 and was imitated by admirers, provoking traditionalists. The 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* said "writing 為 is wrong", the 1610 *Súshū kānwù* "爲 is informally written 為, this is wrong" and the 1617 *Zìkǎo* "為 is wrong." 為 nevertheless lived on, even in print, and gained official status in Japan in 1949.

Chinese reformers never considered this trifling adjustment. Both *Lúnyǔ*'s 1935 "plain stroke characters", the Education Ministry's ensuing List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft and 1956 Scheme included 为.

---

295   Yamaguchi Archives 戦前 A 農業 688, letters dated 1943.4.27 and 1943.3.27.
296   *Nihon kitte meikan*, vol. 6, fig. 160.

韋 韦 *wéi* leather
違 违 *wéi* disobey
偉 伟 *wěi* great

韋 appears as 韦 in a 衛 (衛 *wèi* guard) on a Western Han wood slip from Juyan. 衞, 违 and 韦 became common in cursive style and by the twentieth century even in square style. In 1964 the Script Reform Committee changed all 韋 to 韦, except in 衛 for which it had other plans.

圍 囲 围 *wéi* surround

The 1955 Draft proposed to shorten 圍 to 围 analogously to 违 and 伟. Zhào Xī instead suggested 囲 "in accordance with the masses' longstanding habits", while Xú Yīhuī argued for "囲 which is in common use today." 囲 was certainly in common use, appearing in twenty-two of our 1940–1954 manuscripts against 围 in four, but hardly longstanding; we do not find 囲 in China until 1931, when a leaflet by the communist party committee in Beiping warned for a 第四次囲剿 (*dì sì cì wéijiǎo* fourth encirclement campaign) by the Kuomintang.[297] The Script Reform Committee chose to keep the analogy to 韦, 违 and 伟, recognising 围 together with these forms in 1964.

Why would Chinese writers invent a seven-stroke 囲 if they already had access to a seven-stroke 围 ? In fact they did not invent 囲 but imported it from Japan, where it is known since 1496, when the Meiō version of *Setsuyōshū* recommended writing *irori* (fireplace) as 囲炉裡. The 1919, 1923, 1926, 1938 and 1942 Japanese reform schemes all included 囲, which finally became official in 1946.

衛 卫 *卩 *wèi* guard

Short forms of 衛 varied. In 1934 the People's Committee of Fujian Military District urged people to 加入赤卫軍 (join the red guards) and 保卫苏区 (defend the soviet area). In 1944 the Central China Office sanctioned a 自卩軍 (self-defence corps). A 1951 document in Beijing Archives is signed by the 仦健科 (Sanitation and Health Section), another by the �위建科. Chén Guāngyáo wrote in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "Many write 卫 or 卩 for 衛. Reportedly this is a loaned Japanese katakana [ヱ *we*]."[298] Our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain seven 衛, eight 卫, three 卩, six 卩, five 卩, three 仦, two 衞 and one 衛.

The Script Reform Society selected 卩 for its 1950 List of Common Short

---

297   *Beijing renmin geming douzheng*, p. 67.
298   *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 174. *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 110. Beijing Archives 45-5-40, pp. 13, 33. Chen 1953, p. 6.

Forms and the Script Reform Committee 卫 for its 1955 Draft. The People's Political Consultative Conference member Lín Zhōngyì objected: "卫 comes from a foreign script. It would look better if one could find a form based on our own script." Professor Yuè Sìbǐng took him to task in *Guāngmíng rìbào*:

> As for adopting 卫, one older gentleman has published an impassioned article, claiming that this amounts to a national shame. [...] 衞 is simplified to 卫 because the broad masses are already used to this character. The gentleman behind the article says he has studied in Japan. Then he is of course aware that Japan at first had no script and so had to borrow Chinese characters, and specific Chinese characters to create its syllabary. Taking 卫 back from Japan is like a married daughter returning to her parents' home, is that a national shame?

Chén Guāngyáo provided another defence for 卫:

> This character is probably a distortion of the top of the 韋 phonetic in 衞. Some say this is a Japanese letter. That is not credible, and even if it were true, it still involves using our Chinese characters, since the Japanese letters were originally taken from Chinese characters.

Official status for 卫 was nevertheless delayed until 1959.

Not surprisingly, Japanese 卫 records precede Chinese ones. In 1910 the teacher Kuroyanagi Isao called 卫 "common" for 衞. In 1962 Fujikawa Sukezō hinted why a short form for 衞 turned up just in Japan: "In the past, personal names in – 衛門 [-*emon*] were shortened – 卫門." Our last Japanese record is a note in the diary of Kido Kōichi, registering a call to 近卫公 (近衞公 *Konoe kō* Prince Konoe) during the 26 February coup.[299]

Japanese 衞 records in turn trail Chinese ones. Fujikawa continued: "The other year I visited the Self-Defence Force in Aebano in Shiga Prefecture. A big sign at the gate said 自衞隊 [*jieitai*]. Even in official documents one often sees 衞生 [*eisei* hygiene]." Our last record of this is a street notice from □□町環境衞生部 (-*chō kankyō eisei bu* X-town Environment and Sanitation Office) photographed by Ono Shigehiko in 2006.

The writer belonged to a dwindling minority. 衞 was recognised only by three of our twenty-four Japanese informants, all born in 1950 or before. 卫 is even less known, identified as 衞 only by a professional translator born in 1942.

---

299   *Enshū komonjo sen: Kindai hen*, item 56.

穩 穩 稳 *秎 *wěn* steady
隱 隱 隐 *yǐn* hidden

Shuōwén says the top right is consists of two hands (爫彐) holding an implement (工) which is, however, lost already in our oldest records, a 隂 on a pre-217 BCE Shuihudi wood slip, a 隂 in the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts, a 隐 on a Dingxian wood slip and the 隐 on Wuwei and Juyan slips.

Even standardisers did without *Shuōwén*'s 工. The 175 CE Xīpíng Stone Classics prescribed 隱 with 爫 and the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* 隱 with 下. The Tang *Gānlù zìshū*, however, prescribed the etymologically correct 隱 and was followed by later dictionaries.

But not by writers. Sixteen 隱 with 工 on Song to Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* are heavily outnumbered by forty-one 隱, thirty-eight 隱, forty-two 隱, sixteen 隐 and sixteen 隐.

The Japanese Language Council selected the more common 穩 and 隱 and the Script Reform Committee of China the shorter 隐 and 稳. Bào Yòuwén objected in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "Writing 稳 for 穩 turns the phonetic into the 急 in 緩急 [*huǎnjí* urgency]. The reading is different and the sense opposite. It is better to use the ancient 㒥." The committee stuck to practice, authorising 稳 and 隐 in 1956.

In its 1977 Second Scheme the committee nevertheless strayed away from practice, proposing 秎 with the phonetic 文 *wén* for 稳. Preceding records of this 秎 are lacking and the form was ousted from the 1981 Revised Draft.

烏 乌 *wū* crow, black

As we saw in the 鳥 *niǎo* section, the cursive-based 乌 was added to the Character Simplification Scheme after 1957 and became official in 1964.

無 无 *�无 *wú* there is no

無 descends from 秳, a dancer with something in his hands, sometimes under a 𠕒 (雨) top, implying a prayer for rain. With time the man faded away, Yin 秳 becoming Zhou 秳, Spring and Autumn 㒇, Warring States 㒇, Qin 無 and Han 無. As Zhou writers borrowed 秳 (無) for 'not have', its original sense of 'dance' was specified with 舛 (feet), turning the character for 'dance' into 舞.

The short form 无 is less transparent. Kǒng Guǎngjū took it to be a man (儿) buried under earth (二), while Tōdō Akiyasu held it to be a man (大) under a cover (一). Today many regard both 無 and 无 as another offshoot of 㒇, some Warring States scribes dropping not the shaman to write 㒇 but the objects in his hands to write 夭, as in the 夭氣 (breathless), 夭後 (without

descendants) and 无非 (無非 nothing but) in the pre-168 BCE Mawangdui manuscripts.

Liú Fù found 无 for 無 in blockprints from the Song onwards and 无 and 旡 from the Yuan. The latter, a contracted 無, came to outcompete the rest. Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain twenty-two 旡, fifteen 旡, two 旡 and three 旡 but no 無 or 无.

Reformers nevertheless preferred 无, which they knew from *Shuōwén* and from Liú's book. In 1935 无 was selected for *Lúnyǔ*'s "plain stroke characters" and for the Education Ministry's List of Short Forms, which specified that it contained some "ancient characters like 气, 无, 处 and 广 [for 庵]." In 1943 the reformer Cáo Bóhán argued in the Guilin *Guówén zázhì* (National Literature Journal): "There are some short forms which are not in common use today but have ancient roots; promoting these should not be too hard. […]. 無 can be shortened to 无, a form seen in *Shuōwén* […]."

Then the scales tilted towards common forms. The Script Reform Society's 1950 List of Common Short Forms mooted 旡; a 1952 *Guāngmíng rìbào* article by Dīng Xīlín of the Committee for Research on Script Reform promoted "cursive forms like 为, 头, 东, 旡, 门 […]"; and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft proposed 旡 for handwriting but left the printed form at 無.

Predictably some demanded a shorter printed form. In *Yǔwén zhīshí* Wáng Tónghàn suggested 无 which already had "a broad basis of use among the masses". Luó Jiè of the Guangdong Committee of the People's Political Consultative Conference disagreed:

> Some experts concentrate too much on looking for roots in ancient script. This can cause problems. If we for example simplify 無 to 旡, that will be very easy to carry out because this form is already common among the people. If we on the other hand change to the ancient form 无, a large majority will have to learn it from scratch.[300]

The 1956 Scheme stuck to 无. As we saw in our 书 *shū* section Yǐn Bīnyōng, for one, chose to add the complex form below whenever he wrote 无 for his students. The committee then had second thoughts. In 1957 Cáo Bóhán wrote in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "In the Scheme the short form for 無 is 无. We now propose to change this to 旡 and apply that to analogous components." Amendments came to nothing, however, and 无 became official in 1958.

Even the Singapore Ministry of Education didtrusted无, selecting instead 旡 for its shortlived 1969 List of Simplified Forms.

---

300   Renmin zhengxie 1955.

舞 *午 *wǔ* dance

In Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprints 舞 was shortened analogously to 無 to 舛 or 舜. After that records cease. The 1956 Scheme left 舞 alone.

The public did not. In March 1957 Zuǒ Zhìhuá wrote in *Yǔwén zhīshí*:

> On 7 November last year the Geological Exploration Department of our institute advertised a weekend social evening including a 青年午. What did this 青年午 mean? Guessing is not too hard. 午 [*wǔ* noon] stands for 舞. Writing 舞 as 午 looks like a way to simplify things, but in practice one has to guess a while before grasping the sense.

People would soon get used to the practice. In May 1957 the archaelogist Chén Mèngjiā wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "In many public places writers create short forms at will, like 午会 for 舞会 [dance]. This must be stopped."

That proved hard. In 1958 Cáo Bóhán of the Script Reform Committee wrote:

> When adopting simplified characters one cannot follow the masses blindly. It is for example already common among the masses to write 午 for the 舞 in 跳舞 [*tiàowǔ* dance], but intellectuals are not satisfied with this. To be sure, writing 舞会 as 午会 is a bit awkward, there is no need for the Script Reform Committee to adopt forms like that. However, the 舛 in [Liú Fù's] *Sòng-Yuán yǐlái súzì pǔ* is no longer in common use and is disliked by many intellectuals. At the same time 舞 remains complicated. Should we perhaps add a component to the common 午 and let the character become something like 跰 or 飞? (There are already some comrades who use these two forms.)

In its 1962, 1973 and 1977 simplification schemes, however, the committee chose to follow the masses, proposing 午 for 舞. The proposal was revoked in the 1981 Revised Draft.

務 务 *wù* affair
霧 雾 *wù* fog

Liú Fù found 务 for 務 in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. In China 务 become official in 1956 and the analogous 雾 three years later.

Japanese writers found a still shorter way out by replacing 務 with the

katakana ム *mu*. We find our first 事ム室 (事務室 *jimushitsu* office) on a 1921 chart of Shimonoseki Weather Station.[301]

惡 噁 悪 恶 *wù* loathe

See 亞 *yà*.

犧 牺 *xī* sacrifice

The 1955 Draft advocated 牺 with the phonetic 西 *xī*. Ǎi Qū commented in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "The phonetic in […] 牺 fits only in areas where tongue-tip and back-tongue consonants merge […]. However, these short forms have long been current all over the country."

True, the phonetic 西 does not fit in places like Guangdong, where 西 may read ʃɐi 53 and 犧 *hei* 53, or Fujian with *sɛ* 44 and *hi* 44. Also true, 牺 was current even in these areas. In fact our oldest 牺 record is a 1933 letter from Fujian Workers and Peasants Guerrilla Detachment No. 1 stating that the well-being of the many is attained through 牺牲 (sacrifices) by the few.[302] Thus uncontroversial, 牺 was included in the February 1956 first batch of simplified characters.

稀 希 *xī* scarce

稀 (rare, scarce) and 希 (rare, hope) are obviously related and have long been mixed up, as in a 稀望 (hope) in a Sui carving of the Bǎoliáng Sutra and in remedies against 希疏的头发 (thin hair) advertised on ten web sites in 2017.

The People's Political Consultative Conference member Zēng Zhāolún proposed to simplify 稀 to 希 in 1955 and the Script Reform Committee in 1977 and 1981.

錫 锡 *xī* tin

See 易 *yì*.

溪 溪 汗 *汐 *xī* stream

溪 is common in place names and so has been shortened by many.

汐with the phonetic 夕 *xī* was reported to the Script Reform Committee

---

301   Yamaguchi Archives 戰前 B2996.
302   Guangzhou and Fuzhou readings. Letter in *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 164.

in a letter sent in 1976 from Taihe in Anhui and in one sent 1977 from Shenyang in Liaoning. In 1981 this author saw a shop in Hefei in Anhui advertising merchandise from 屯汐 (屯溪 Tunxi). It is not surprising that a short form for would appear in these two provinces, with their prominent cities Tunxi and Benxi (本溪).

汗 was mentioned in 1960 letters to the committee from Hangzhou, Pingyang and Taishun, all in Zhejiang. In 1982 the Hangzhou bus station displayed timetables not to 屯汐 but to 屯汗, as well as to 顺汗 (Shunxi), 梅汗 (Meixi) and 双汗 (Shuangxi). From Wenzhou bus station in southern Zhejiang one could travel to 珊汗 (Shanxi) and 温汗 (Wenxi). 千 in 汗 is phonetic, as the *-n* ending in 千 disappears in Wu dialects, and 溪 has a *tɕʻ-* initial, like 千.

洒 with the phonetic 西 *xī* was used in 松溪 (Songxi) in the northernmost corner of neighbouring Fujian, according to a 1960 letter from a teacher at Songxi and Zhenghe Middle School No. 1.

In Xiamen further south this author stayed at 霞溪旅馆 (*Xiáxī lǚguǎn* Misty River Hotel) in 1982, with slippers on the house, marked 下 and K (溪), ensuring that neither left the premises. In 1986 the bus station in Dehua, also in southern Fujian, offered tickets to 龙 K (龙溪) and 安 K (安溪), and that in Longyan to 兰 K (兰溪) and K口 (溪口). These K were comprehensible to locals, who read 溪 as *kʻe*.

沙 was used for 溪 "in parts of Guangdong", according to a 1960 letter from Guangdong Education Bureau.

氿 for 溪 was mentioned between 1960 and 1977 by correspondents from Wugang in Hunan, Gejiu in Yunnan and Xichang, Shaojue, Yunyang, Pengxi and Santai in Sichuan. Locals in Sichuan and Hunan read 溪 as *tɕʻi* and so find the 七 phonetic helpful.

None of the above forms was fit for official use. 汐 clashed with 汐 (*xī* night tide), 汗 with the river name 汗 *Qiān*, 洒 with 洒 (*sǎ* sprinkle), 氿 with the popular short form for 漆 and K with the letter K, and 沙 had been mentioned just once. So the 1977 Second Scheme passed 溪 over, adopting 氿 for 漆. Unsurprisingly, Hunan Script Reform Committee objected: "The masses in places like Chenxi [辰溪] and Luxi [泸溪] in Hunan write 氿 for 溪. This is easy to mix up with the [proposed] simplified form of 漆 and 柒".

In Japan 溪 became 渓 in 1980 analogously to 鶏 for 鷄.

習 习 *xí* practise, habit

On Western Han wood slips 'practise' is written 習 with 日 below. *Shuōwén* took the bottom to be a shortened 自, rendering the character 習 with 白 in square style. Writers ignored it and continued to write with 日, as we see on Han, Tang, Song and Yuan steles. Even the Song dictionaries *Guǎngyùn*,

Yùpiān and *Jíyùn* prescribed 習 with 日, a standard overturned by the Ming *Súshū kānwù* and *Zìhuì*, which took *Shuōwén* at its word and declared 習 standard. With time writers followed. Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain 白 bottoms but no 日.

By then archaeologists had unearthed Yin bones with 習, with a bottom representing a sun under which birds practise flying, according to Guō Mòruò, or a tray habitually filled with prayer chips, according to Shirakawa Shizuka. In either case the insertion of 丿 would be misguided.

This became irrelevant as writers did away with the bottom altogether. We first see 习 in the 1942 Central Jiangsu Regulations on Land Rent, which compared 习慣上 (習慣上 habitual) rents with rents based on voluntary contracts.[303]

This 习 was included in the 1955 Draft. It turned out that not everybody was at home with this form. Zhào Tàimóu mentioned 习 among "hitherto unseen or newly created short forms" with "an unfamiliar appearance". The People's Political Consultative Conference member Wēng Wénhào said: "Another method is making up simplified characters, like […] 习 for 習. When I saw these forms, I felt like opposing them as senseless fabrications, but after some consideration I found them acceptable." These gripes may explain why 习 did not become official until 1959.

<p align="center">喜 *㐂 *𠮖 xǐ happy</p>

On a 1982 stopover in Hangzhou, my landlady said: "So you are into short forms? The latest is three sevens for *xǐ*! A guest signed in with three sevens and said it meant *xǐ*." Where did the guest come from? "I don't know, but he was a northerner." Judging by his accent, of course.

Informants in Henan, Shanxi and Beijing were blank. Among the names illegally chiseled into the Great Wall at Beidaihe, however, one could find one 四平𱐈㐂臣 (Zhào Xǐchén from Siping). Siping is in Jilin in the Northeast. It turned out that informants in ten places out of ten in the Northeast identified 㐂 as 喜.

Like the Northeastern 荮 (薄) and 転 (转 *zhuàn*), 㐂 is imported from Japan, where forms like 㐂 and 㐂 were promoted already by the Buddhist sect founder Kūkai (774–835) and the poet Sugiwara no Michizane (845–903). Today 㐂 is little used in Japan, where it was identified only by eight out of twenty-four informants, unlike in Northeast China where 㐂 was recognised by three out of four Jiamusi informants born as late as in 1994.

An alternative has existed. Liú Fù found 𠮖 for 喜 in the Yuan blockprint

---

303   *Jiangsu kangzhan,* p. 108.

Jīngběn tōngsú xiǎoshuō. The authenticity of this print is disputed, but at any rate Chén Guāngyáo read Liú's *Sòng-Yuán yǐlái súzì pǔ* and promoted 苦 in his 1936 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo* and then in his 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ*.

Promotion worked. On 14 July 1958 a headline in the Hubei *Máchéng bào* announced: 全縣普降苦雨 (Welcome rain falls over the county). In 1960 use of 苦 for 喜 was reported to the Script Reform Committee by correspondents from Henan, Hubei and Hunan. In 1981 and 1982 this author recorded 苦 in Henan, Hubei, Hunan, Jiangxi and eastern Sichuan. These records are conspicuously concentrated. Interviews in 1981–1986 confirmed that 苦 was known in the central provinces Henan, Hubei, Hunan and Jiangxi and in a few areas bordering these.[304]

The Beijing-based reformers encountered neither 𡴆 nor 苦. Instead List Two of their 1977 Second Scheme came up with 喜, a form not on earlier record. Hubei Script Reform Leading Group objected that "喜 is habitually shortened to 苦" and Hunan Script Reform Committee that "It is better to shorten 喜 to 苦 than to 喜. 苦 has been used by the masses for a long time. Not only has the form a basis among the masses, it is also short, easy to learn and easy to remember." The 1981 Revised Draft passed 喜 over.

<div align="center">係系 xì be connected
繫系 xì be connected, fasten jì tie</div>

Shuōwén defined 係 as "bind around", 繫 as "bind" and 系 as 繫. Its 986 editors gave 係, 繫 and 系 identical readings. The Qing commentator Duàn Yùcái wrote that "系 and 係 can be used interchangeably" and that 係 "is informally used for 繫." No objections were heard when the 1956 Scheme merged 係 and 繫 to 系.

<div align="center">戲 戲 戏 xì play, drama</div>

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council shortened 戲 to 戯 with 业 for 豆. We can follow the evolution of 戲 through a 戠 with 亜 in the early Han manuscripts from Mawangdui, a 𢧐 with 工 on the 156 CE Hán Chì stele and 戲 with 业 in the Jin calligraphy of Wáng Xīzhī. Authorities were unenthusiastic. The Tang *Gānlù zìshū* called 戲 "common", the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* "modern", the 1617 *Zìkǎo* "wrong" and the 1627 *Zhèngzìtōng* "informal".

---

304 苦 reported in letters from Zhengzhou, Wuhan, Yichang, Changsha, Wugang and Liuxiang; seen by this author in Xinyang, Wuhan, Huangshi, Wanxian, Jiujiang, Yueyang and Hengyang; identified by informants in twenty-two places in Henan, Hubei, Hunan and Jiangxi and in nearby Baoding, Xi'an, Wanxian, Guilin and Huangshan.

Later Chinese writers contracted the whole left side, as in the 1921 police report mentioned in the 萄 *bo* section, where the kidnapped girl was promised to be taken to a 学戏的地方 (place to learn opera). 戏 was included in *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters", the Education Ministry's ensuing List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft.

Zhèng Yīnghàn objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that the Draft had too many forms with 又, proposing a more modest change to 戲 with 业. Zhāng Yuàntí suggested instead 戯 with the phonetic 西 *xī*. Zhù Jūxiān in turn argued for keeping the masses' customary 戏. This discussion delayed the reognition of 戏 until June 1956.

The rejected 戯 survived for a time. In 1957 the form was recorded by the teacher Fán Jiāng, then by Zhū Qìngxià, Xióng Kāiyín, Zhōu Qǐfèng, Lǐ Zǐxīn and, lastly, by Huáng Shìzhōng in 1965.

蝦 虾 *xiā* shrimp

We first meet 虾 with the phonetic 下 *xià* in the Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms. In June 1956 it became official in the People's Republic.

虾 made it to Taiwan, where. the short form advocate Luó Jiālún mentioned the form in 1954 among "short forms commonly used among people and in trade". The non-advocate Pān Zhòngguī wrote that "short forms like 猪'干' [猪肝 *zhūgān* pig liver] and '虾'子 [shrimp eggs] occur in restaurants." In 1979 the writing manual *Biāozhǔn xíngshū fànběn* recommended 虾.

Writers followed the recommendation but sliced off even more of 下's top. In 1986 this author was offered 虾仁 (*xiārén* shelled shrimps) in a Beigang restaurant, 鲜虾 (*xiānxiā* fresh shrimps) in a Tainan market and 虾排飯 (*xiāpáifàn* shrimps with rice) in a nearby restaurant, but no 虾 products.

霞 *雫 *xiá* rosy clouds

In 1956 Nanjing City planned to increase agricultural production in 栖雫镇 (棲霞鎮 Qixia Township).[305] This 雫 was obviously inspired by the 虾 for 蝦 in the 1955 Draft. In 1964 Zhāng Sānwèi criticised this character in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "If someone writes 雫 for 霞, we advise some deliberation, because this form is topheavy and lopsided and makes one fear it might tumble." The Script Reform Committee nevertheless included 雫 in List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme, then deliberated and excluded the form from its 1981 Revised Draft.

雫 remained useful for writing names. On a 1989 parcel dispatch note

---

305   Nanjing Archives 8003-3-55, p. 36.

in my collection, the sender has filled in the name 刘玉雫雫, writing first 雫, finding that imprecise crossed it out, begun to write 霞, given up and written 雫 again.

嚇 吓 *xià* scare *hè* threaten

According to the 1932 *Guóyīn chángyòng zìhuì* 吓 was short for 嚇, and according to *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters" short for 呀 (*yā* oh!). The Script Reform Committee sanctioned the former, changing 嚇 to 吓 in June 1956.

廈 厦 *厈 *Xià* Xiamen *shà* tower

We saw in the 厠 *cè* section above that the 1955 First List of Regulated Variants abolished 廈 with 广 to retain the shorter 厦 with 厂.

The public was more radical. In 1958 Rén Shuāngyàn mentioned "some now very common short forms, like the […] 厈 in 厦門, 狙 in 彈克 and so on" in *Guāngmíng rìbào*. In 1960 厈 was reported in letters to the Script Reform Committee from Guangzhou and Chaozhou in Guangdong, Longchang in Jiangxi and Anqing in Anhui, as well as in several letters from Fujian, the province where the city of Xiamen is situated. In 1964 Lǐ Zhúchén wrote that "in documents from official institutions […] 厦門 is written '厈'門".

厈 was not without competition; in 1960 a teacher in Changtai near Xiamen reported 厌. In 1981 this author saw a 厌门 sign in nearby Zhangzhou. This 厌 turned out to be known by all informants in Fujian but by none in neighbouring provinces.[306] The form is not as arbitrary as it looks. Cursive for 夏 is 夊, so 厦 became 厊 and then 厌.

For List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme the committee chose the more widely known 厈. Authorities in Shanghai, Hebei, Yunnan, Hubei and Sichuan as well as individuals like Yú Xiàlóng and Lǐ Jīngyuǎn pointed to 厈's similarity to 斥 (*chì* scold), prompting its exclusion from the 1981 Revised Draft.

纖 繊 纤 *xiān* slender
殲 殱 歼 *jiān* annihilate
懺 懴 忏 *chàn* repent

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council changed 纖 to 繊 with 十 for 从 and 业 for 韭. Records of 十 begin with a 殱 on the 168 CE Zhāng Biǎo stele, of 业 with a 殲 in the 750 Lǐ Xì epitaph. 从 tops were a restoration of ancient

---

306 厌 identified as 厦 in Fuzhou, Dehua, Longyan, Xiamen, Yong'an and Zhangzhou in Fujian. Unknown in ten places in adjacent Zhejiang, Jiangxi and Guangdong.

ways as related in *Shuōwén,* which said the 韱 phonetic meant 'wild onion' and consisted of 韭 (*jiǔ* onion) and 𢦎 (destroy), which in turn consisted of 从 (men) wielding 戈 (halberds).

Standardisers were in no hurry to restore the belligerent men. The 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* and 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* upheld 韱 with 十. Song and Ming steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contain ten 纖 with 十 but no 纖 with 从. Only in the Ming did etymologisers wake up. The 1610 *Súshū kānwù* spelled out: "By bad custom 纖 is written 纖. This is wrong." The 1617 *Zìkǎo* joined in: "纖 is written with 从. 纖 is wrong." The 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* prescribed 纖 with 从 with no alternatives. Even so our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts hold five 十 tops against one 从, Japanese ones twenty 十 to five 从. The Japanese change to 纖 with 十 was no great upheaval.

At least not compared to what the Script Reform Committee of China was preparing. Its 1955 Draft suggested not only a change of 懺 to 懴 but also of 纖 to 纤 and 殲 to 歼. At least the latter was already in use. A 1948 pamphlet said Southern Fujian forces had 歼閩保二团二大隊 (annihilated the Second Brigade of the Second Regiment of [Kuomintang's] Fujian Defence Force).[307] In 1955 Wáng Tónghàn reported even 忏: "If the masses have already created a short form, like 覀 for 霸, 丆 for 卿 [*qīng* minister], 忏 for 懺 or 秌 for 糯, we should not retain the original character." So the committee added 忏 to its 1956 Scheme. Qiū Chángnù of Northeast Normal University then complained in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that 忏 could easily be misread *qiān.* Doubts delayed official status for 忏 and 纤 until 1964.

鹹 咸 *xián* salty

The 1956 Scheme changed 鹹 to 咸, a homonym meaning 'all'. At the earliest we find 咸 for 'salty' on a receipt for 咸㕕皮 reproduced in a 1908 manual for China traders, deciphered by the Japanese editor as 鹹水皮 (hides soaked in salt-water).[308]

賢 贤 *𫞕 xián* virtuous

賢 has been shortened to 贤 analogously to 坚 for 堅 at least since the Song and further to 𫞕 at least since the Taiping Rebellion, as in an administrative letter reproduced by Guō Ruòyú. The still shorter 㑵 appears in vernacular blockprints from the early Qing onwards. Quán Xuántóng explained this

---

307 *Fujian geming shi huaji,* p. 317.
308 *Shina keizai zensho,* vol. 9, p. 237.

puzzling form in 1922: "Cursive for 賢 is 癸, which then becomes 吴." 癸 in turn consists of the 匸 of 臣, the 乛 of 又 and the bottom of 貝.

In 1935 the *Tàibái* editors chose 贠 for their "handy characters". Hú Xíng-zhī objected: "吴 is often used for 賢, unlike 贠 which looks unfamiliar." The Education Ministry nevertheless chose 贠 for its List of Short Forms later that year.

The 1955 Draft less radically recommended 贤 with 収, analogously to the proposed 坚, 紧, 肾 and 竖 for 堅, 緊, 腎 and 豎. In *Yǔwén zhīshí* Wú Jìng criticised "characters which have been simplified but not enough, like [...] 賢 to 贤, although the custom of writing [...] 賢 as 贠 is already established in society." The People's Political Consultative Conference member Lín Zhōngyì in turn found it "better to shorten to the already existing 吴." Even so the 1964 General List confirmed the choice of 贤.

<p style="text-align:center">險 险 険 xiǎn danger</p>

See 檢 *jiǎn*.

<p style="text-align:center">顯 顯 顕 显 xiǎn apparent
濕 濕 湿 shī wet</p>

In the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts these characters are written 㬎 and 㬎 with 絲. The bottoms were later compressed to 㡀 as in a 顯 on Han wood slips, to 亚 as in a 顕 on the 1206 Húliùbā Stone and to 业 as in a 顕 in the 1312 Chart of Sects of the Fourth Year of Zhìdá.

The 986 edition of *Shuōwén* included the addition "In ancient times 㬎 was used for 顯." Writers took this as a permission to drop 頁. 显 appears on the 1312 Běisì Temple Sect Founding Stele and 显 on the 1469 Stele Recording Virtues of Teachers and Disciples.

In 1949 顕 and 湿 became official in Japan. The Chinese 1955 Draft proposed the same change, but the 1956 Scheme discarded 顕 for 显.

<p style="text-align:center">綫 綫 线 xiàn thread</p>

See 殘 *cán*.

<p style="text-align:center">獻 献 xiàn offer</p>

獻 consists of 虍 (tiger), 鬲 (cauldron) and 犬 (dog) and may depict a shaman in a tiger skin or mask sacrificing dog's meat on an altar. Shortened forms appear already in the Han: 献 and 𤞓 without the cauldron on wood slips

from Wuwei, and 献 and 献 without the centre on slips from Liushaduo. Later writers preferred the latter type and ended up writing the left side as 南, a component already familiar as the character for *nán* (south). The resulting 献 established itself both in China and Japan, and dictionaries like the 1212 *Sìshēng piānhǎi*, the 1597 version of *Setsuyōshū* and the 1952 *Rénmín xīn zìdiǎn* said 献 was the same as 獻. We saw in the 寿 *shòu* section that even teachers were unaccustomed or unable to write the complete 獻. Without controversy 献 became official in 1946 in Japan and 1956 in China.

憲 宪 *xiàn* statute

The 1955 Draft offered no remedy for 憲. Professor Jīn Lúnhǎi of Jiangsu Normal Institute then presented one in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "When we encounter complicated characters, we must be bold and create forms. The 憲 in 憲法 [constitution] may for example be simplified to 宪." The committee embraced the idea and recognised 宪 in June 1956 with its Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters.

現 现 *玑 *xiàn* current

玑 was a southwestern form, reported in 1960 by correspondents from Nanchong and Pengshan in Sichuan, Ankang and Hanzhong in southern Shaanxi, Yichang in western Hubei and Shaoyang in western Hunan and seen in 1981 by this author in Sichuan, Guizhou and Yunnan. In 1981–1986 玑 was identified as 现 by informants in Sichuan, Yunnan, Guizhou, western Hunan and western Hubei but not farther east and north.[309] Today the form is forgotten; our youngest informant to identify it was a man from Chongqing born in 1965.

縣 縣 県 县 *xiàn* county

Shortened 県, 县, 県 and 县 appear in Jiǎng and Shào's late Ming military documents and Liú Fù's Qing blockprints. 県 is now official in Japan and 县 in China.

The 丨 on the left of 県, 縣, and 县 is a novelty. Throughout the Han, Jin, Tang and Song 縣 was written without 丨. The first 縣 with 丨 appears on the 1316 Èrxián Temple stele, after which 縣 and 縣 compete. 丨 was

---

309 玑 seen for 现 in Chengdu, Chongqing, Wanxian, Guiyang, Kunming and Qujing. Identified as 现 by informants in Chengdu, Yajiang, Chongqing, Wanxian, Kunming, Qujing, Xingyi, Guiyang, Lianyuan, Yichang and Shashi.

obviously an attempt to conform to *Shuōwén*'s seal form 縣 which has a small twist on its ⼓.

The contracted 厶 bottom came to dominate in China, where our 1900–1954 manuscripts turn up nineteen 县 and nineteen 县, 县 or 县 against four 県, one 景 and one 県. Reformers wavered. In 1935 *Tàibái* chose 県 for its "handy characters" and the Education Ministry 県 for its List of Short Forms. The Script Reform Committee opted for the shorter and more common 县 and made that form official in June 1956.

In Japan the ⼁ left side and 小 bottom remained popular, appearing in nineteen 県, 県 or 県 in our 1900–1946 manuscripts against two ⼁-less 県 and one 厶 bottomed 县. The Language Council nevertheless hesitated, sparing 縣 in its 1938, 1942 and 1946 schemes. Then in 1948 its chairman Andō Masatsugu announced that there "is no shortage of characters to take into consideration as short forms, like the ⼚ (歴), 斗 (鬥), 云 (言), 県 (縣) and 庁 (廳) now used in society", paving the way for 県 in the council's 1949 List of Forms.

<p align="center">襄 襄 xiāng assist
鑲 *钲 xiāng inlay</p>

See 壤 *rǎng.*

<p align="center">鄉 鄉 乡 xiāng countryside</p>

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council changed 鄉 with 白 to 鄉 with 日. This was no innovation; Han and Jin inscriptions all have 鄉 with 日, and 鄉 with 白 does not appear until the 505 Yuán Shǐhé epitaph. The first diction- ary to recognise 鄉 with 白 was the 1013 *Yùpiān* which, however, conceded that 鄉 "is also written 鄉." This tolerance did not last. The Yuan *Zìjiàn* said "鄉 [...] is informally written 鄉", the 1617 *Zìkǎo* "鄉 is written with 皀 [...]. 鄉 and 鄉 are both wrong." Wrong because *Shuōwén* had specified that 鄉 contained the phonetic 皀. The wrong 鄉 nevertheless outnumbers 鄉 ten to six in our 1900–1946 Japanese manuscripts.

The question became irrelevant in China as writers did away with both 皀 and ⻏. We first find the solitary 乡 for 鄉 in a 1935 order from the Head- quarters of the Sidu Guerrillas in Fujian, signed by 各乡政府 (the leadership of each township).[310] This 乡 became official for 鄉 in June 1956. It was un- familiar to Zhào Tàimóu of Shandong University, who mentioned 乡 among "hitherto unseen or newly created short forms" in 1957.

---

310   *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 228.

響 响 *xiǎng* sound

The now official 响 for 響 was a gradual development. We find 響 with 口 (mouth) for 音 (sound) in the 1039 *Jíyùn* and Lǐ Lèyì found 响 with the phonetic 向 *xiàng* for 鄉 *xiāng* in the Ming blockprint *Qīngpíngshān táng huàběn*. This 响 became common, appearing eighty-four times in Taiping Rebellion prints examined by Wú Liángzuò.

嚮 向 *xiàng* to face, direction

The above-mentioned 鄉 depicts two squatting men facing a food vessel and originally meant 'to face', as in the 卿北 (鄉北 facing north) on the Western Zhou Dà Kè tripod. The sense of 'to face' could also be expressed by 向, a 口 (window) of a 宀 (house), as in *Zhànguó cè*'s 必舉甲而向趙 (we must pick up our armour and confront [the state of] Zhao). Later both could be thrown in, as in the Han *Shǐjì* where *Zhànguó cè*'s 向趙 became 嚮趙.

向 and 嚮 competed until the former became official in Japan in 1946 and in China in 1956.

象 *兔 *xiàng* elephant, appearance

兔 was proposed in List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme but not in the 1981 Revised Draft. 兔 had been known since 1960, when it was reported in letters to the committee from Ankang in Anhui, Nanjing in Jiangsu and Wuhua in Guangdong.

像 象 *xiàng* portrait

Dictionaries distinguish 像 (portrait, resemble, seem, like, image) from 象 (elephant, appearance, image). Compliance has not been complete. Records of 'portrait' begin with the pre-168 BCE Lǎo zǐ B manuscript from Mawangdui which says the ruler 作自临象 (作自為像 made portraits representing himself) for everybody to see. On Tang to Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* we find twenty-four regular 佛像 (Buddha portraits) but also two 佛象 and six 佛相.

Reformers wanted an end to wavering. *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters" and the Script Reform Committee's 1956 Scheme aimed to replace 像 with 象. The 1964 General List confirmed the change, but with a caveat: "In cases when 象 and 像 may be confused 像 should still be written 像."

List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme proposed to shorten 像 to 佝 with the phonetic 向 *xiàng*. This 佝 was obviously a fresh invention. Heilongjiang Leading Group for Organising Discussions on the Draft of the Second Character Simplification Scheme wrote: "The masses often replace 像 with 相;

that is better than creating a new character like 俍." Yunnan Script Reform Leading Group, Guangdong Script Reform Committee and the education bureaus of Fujian, Qinghai and Shanxi found it inconsistent to simplify 像 to 俍 but 象 to 刍. Unsurprisingly, 俍 was withdrawn from the 1981 Revised Draft.

The revised 1984 version of the General List restored 像 in all its functions. The restoration has been followed by a steady stream of articles titled "More about 象 and 像", "How to distinguish 像 and 象", "How to separate 象，像 and 相" and the like.[311]

橡 栙 *xiàng* oak, rubber tree

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed a change from 橡 to 栙, a form we know from a 1954 survey of private rubber producers in Beijing and later from articles by Huáng Shìzhōng from Wenzhou, Hán Róngshí from Shenyang and others.[312] Guangdong Script Reform Committee and Yunnan Script Reform Leading Group objected that 栙, like 俍, was inconsistent with the proposed 刍 for 象. 栙 was duly excluded from the 1981 Revised Draft.

蕭 蕭 萧 肖 *xiāo* desolate, Xiao

In 1954 one Xiāo Zhìqiān wrote in *Yǔwén zhīshí*:

> My surname is 蕭, so I have had to write it every day ever since beginning school. Since this character contains numerous and complicated strokes, many write 萧 or 肖. When I wrote my name then, even I wrote 肖. My teacher said: 'Both the meaning [resemble] and reading [*xiào*] of this 肖 is different from your name. From now on you may not shorten it but must write 蕭.' For a beginner, a character looking like an ink stain is hard to remember. In the beginning I wrote 蕭, 蕭 or 蕭 and was scolded by my teacher, but no matter how I wrote I did not get it right. How I detested bearing the name 蕭!

The 1955 Draft offered relief through a change of 蕭 to 肖. The decisive 1956 Scheme, however, prescribed the less simple 萧, analogously to 肅 for 蕭. The 1962 edition of *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn* nevertheless gave name bearers a choice: "肖 *xiāo* […] a surname. Identical with 萧." The 1977 Second Scheme prescribed 肖 for all 萧. During this scheme's validity in early 1978 some Xiāos got documents confirming their surname 肖. In 1997 Jīn Guótài pointed out:

311　"Zai tan 'xiang' yu 'xiang'", 1991. "Ruhe qubie 'xiang' yu 'xiang'", 2006. Du 2009.
312　Beijing Archives 22-10-1369, pp. 5, 6, 14.

Hànyǔ dà cídiǎn lists one 肖霖 [Xiāo Lín] among its editors and one 肖碧云 [Xiāo Bìyún] in its staff. This writer is of the firm opinion that these persons now bear the name 肖, even though they may originally have been 萧. This because, firstly, they were conscious that this book stressed correctness […]; secondly, they were personally in charge of editing and would have changed the character if they had disagreed with using 肖; thirdly, there was also an editor named 萧亚辉 [Xiāo Yàhuī] who [it seems] refused to be surnamed 肖.

The existence of two names is recognised in the 2011 edition of *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn*, where 肖 is no longer a variant of 萧, but a separate name: "萧 *xiāo* a surname. […] 肖 *xiāo* […] a surname." All who now go by the name 肖 are descendants of 萧: among fifty-one thousand graduates of the imperial Ming and Qing examinations, Zēng Shǐ found two hundred and forty-five 萧 but no 肖.

<p align="center">曉 暁 晓 xiǎo dawn</p>

See 堯 *yáo*.

<p align="center">效 効 xiào effect, imitate</p>

The Japanese Language Council chose the shorter variant 効 in its 1946 List of Characters for Current Use, while the Script Reform Committee's 1955 First List of Regulated Variants stuck to 效.

效 is the younger form, first described in the Tang *Gānlù zìshū*: "効效: the former means 'effort', the latter 'imitate'." This reminder led nowhere; the two soon merged even in dictionaries, like the 1013 *Yùpiān* which called 効 "informal for 效."

<p align="center">鞋 *鞋 xié shoes</p>

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed to change 鞋 to 鞋, a form we first find on a letter sent in 1949 from Shijiazhuang to 北平前外观音寺94号復兴皮鞋店 (Fuxing Shoe Shop, Qianwai Guanyin Temple 94, Beiping).[313] This 鞋 was withdrawn from the 1981 Revised Draft.

---

313   *A Rare Collection of Chinese Stamps*, p. 138.

<div align="center">

協 *叶恊 协 *xié* joint

脅 脇 脇 胁 *xié* coerce

</div>

Shuōwén recorded an early short form for 協: "꿔 [叶]: in ancient script 協 has been written with 曰 [speak] and 十 [many]; or 叶 [叶] with 口." Gāo Hēng mentions examples like *Shūjīng*'s 協和萬邦 (all the states were brought into harmony) which was quoted in the Han *Lùnhéng* as 叶和萬邦.

An alternative short form turned up in late Ming military notes, where Jiǎng and Shào found forty-two 协 with 丷 for 力力. The 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn* called both 叶 and 协 "informal for 協"; By then 协 was outcompeting 叶; our 1930–1954 manuscripts mention five 协会 (societies) but no 叶会.

协 was proposed in the Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft and 1956 Scheme and became official with the first batch of simplified characters in February 1956.

Reformers were less resolute with the analogous 胁, which was not on record before 1955 and was not part of the 1955 Draft but was added to the 1956 Scheme, and was recognised only in June 1956 with the second batch of characters.

Japanese writers took up neither 协 nor 胁 but shortened the characters to 恊 and 脇 analogously to the 摂 for 攝 and 裏 for 轟 described in the 轟 *hōng* section. 恊 and 脇 were part of the 1919, 1926 and 1938 reform schemes but were excluded from the decisive 1949 List of Forms. At least the former has lived on, however; in 1999 Yoshida Yoshio photographed a 近畿官公需被服 恊同組合 (*Kinki kankōju hifuku kyōdō kumiai* Kinki Uniforms Cooperative) sign in Osaka.

<div align="center">

寫 写 写 *xiě* write

</div>

Japanese 写 and Chinese 写 stem from cursive 冩, which turns up as 写 in the 1505 writing guide *Unshū ōrai* and as 寽 in the early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjí*.

In 1923 the Interim Committee on the Japanese Language suggested permitting 写. The ensuing 1926, 1938 and 1942 reform schemes opted for 写 with a longer, piercing 一 which then became official in 1946.

Chinese reformers were less decisive. The *Tàibái* editors chose 寫 for their 1935 "handy characters", Róng Gēng 写 for his 1936 *Jiǎntǐ zìdiǎn,* the 1952 *Xué wénhuà zìdiǎn* 写 for its "short form" and the Script Reform Committee 写 for its 1955 Draft.

Liú Kuímín objected in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "Character simplification should as far as possible follow people's habits. For example, everybody writes [...] 写 as 写." Some, perhaps, but not everybody; our 1940–1954 manuscripts con-

tain six 写, three 冩, three 写 , two 冩 and one 冩 but no 冩. The committee abandoned both 冩 and 冩 for the shorter and apparently more common 写 and made that form official in June 1956.

The 写/冩 split had a basis in usage. While our Japanese 1900–1946 manuscripts turn up six 冩 and one 写 against three non-piercing 写, our Chinese ones contain neither 写 nor 写.

褻 亵 *xiè* indecent

See 勢 *shì*.

釁 衅 *xìn* quarrel

衅 consists of 'blood' and 'split'. In *Lǐjì*'s 車甲衅而藏之府庫而弗復用 (chariots and armour were smeared with sacrificial blood, put away and never used again) it is used in the sense of 釁, which according to *Shuōwén* meant 'blood sacrifice'. Dictionaries have treated the two characters as identical. *Jíyùn*, for one, said 釁 "is also written 衅."

釁 was high on the Script Reform Committee's hit list. We have seen the conference delegate Zhāng Zhōngjié's frustration with "characters like 獻, 壽 […] and 釁, which teachers never write in complex form. Sometimes, to show the pupils, they rehearse the character stroke by stroke from the textbook or dictionary before class." Chén Wénbīn wrote: "Because the word 挑釁 [*tiǎoxìn* provocation] often appears in the newspapers and the character 釁 is very complicated, representatives of the press demanded an early trial use of 衅." Trial use never came about, as the committee recognised 衅 as the sole form in February 1956 with its first batch of simplified characters.

信 *仾 *xìn* faith, letter

Shuōwén's 信 entry recorded a short form: "𠄢 [伩]: in [some forms of] ancient script this character had a shortened 言." And yes, we find a person named 𠄢姬 (伩姬 Xìn Jī) on the tenth-century BCE Third Brother Hú tripod. But none later.

It took writers until the twentieth century to take up another short form. The 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì* mentioned 仾, an analogy to the older 这 for 這, among characters "in use in society". Four years later Wáng Tónghàn mentioned 仾 in *Yǔwén zhīshí* among "characters which already have a broad basis of use among the masses, I think they could be added." The Script Reform Committee ignored the proposal then but included 仾 in its 1977 Second Scheme and 1981 Revised Draft.

興 兴 *奥 *囟 *xīng* prosper *xìng* excitement

Alongside sixteen 兴, our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain forty-one 奥 or 囟 and five 奥 for 興. 兴 is a slow version of the cursive 嬰 and 奥 the frame of 興. 兴 and 囟 appear on Tang scrolls from Dunhuang, 奥 on a 1566 map of 龍奥府 (Longxing Prefecture).[314] Are these dates really correct? Who would add 丿 to 囟? Ming writers, who like modern writers started 興 with 丿, unlike their Han, Jin and Tang predecessors who wrote 丨 followed by 一.

Reformers wavered. *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters" included 囟, *Lúnyǔ*'s "plain stroke characters" and the Education Ministry's List of Short Forms 奥, the Script Reform Society's 1950 List of Common Short Forms 奥 and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft 兴. Finally the 1956 Scheme authorised the short 兴, at the expense of the common 囟.

Zhejiang has had a form of its own. In a Hangzhou Employment Office file we find a 1957 letter introducing one 孙玙华 (Sūn Xīnghuá).[315] This modified 囟 should be older that that, as it would not make sense in 1957 to invent a form less simple than the by then official 兴. In 1982 one could see bus timetables to 宜玙 (宜兴 Yixing) in Huzhou and to 绍玙 (绍兴 Shaoxing) and 加玙 (嘉兴 Jiaxing) in Hangzhou. As late as in 1988 this author saw advertisements for 長玙饭店 (Changxing Hotel) in Qiaotou and for 绍玙加饭泛 (绍兴加饭酒 Shaoxing rice wine) in Wenzhou. In 1981–1986 informants from Zhejiang and adjacent Fujian identified 玙 as 兴, while outsiders did not.[316] Today even Zhejiang people are puzzled by 玙; the youngest informant to identify 玙 was a man from Hangzhou born in 1972.

雄 *厷 *xióng* grand

In his 1955 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ* Chén Guāngyáo said 厷 was "in common use" for 雄. Five years later 厷 was reported to the Script Reform Committee by correspondents from from Baicheng in Jilin in the north to Rongjiang in Guizhou in the south.

So the committee included 厷 in its 1977 Second Scheme. It turned out that not everybody was familiar with the form. Two respondents felt that

---

314   Pan 1978, p. 269. *Xuzhou zhi*, p. 18.
315   Hangzhou Archives 94-1-104, p. 211.
316   玙 identified as 兴 in Hangzhou, Jiaxing, Shaoxing and Ningbo in Zhejiang, Fuzhou and Xiamen in Fujian and, unexpectedly, by one informant in Luoyang in Henan. Not identified in twelve places in surrounding Guangdong, Jiangxi, Anhui, Jiangsu and Shanghai.

"厷 is hard to understand and easy to mix up."[317] 厷 was duly excluded from the 1981 Revised Draft.

修 *参 *xiū* repair

参 appeared in Chén Guāngyáo's 1936 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo*, the 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì* and the 1977 Second Scheme. Critics pointed to its similarity to 冬 (*dōng* winter), effectively excluding it from the 1981 Revised Draft.[318]

鬚 須 须 *xū* beard

'Beard' was originally written without the top 髟 (hair). A Western Han bamboo slip from Wuwei describes 六十日須麋生 (六十日須眉生 sixty days' growth of beard and eyebrows).[319] *Shuōwén* said 須 means "facial hair", mentioning no 鬚.

By then 須 had been loaned for the homonym 'must'. To distinguish 'beard' from 'must', writers added 髟 to the former. This practice was criticised by the Yuan *Yùnhuì*: "須 is already written with 彡[hair]. The habitual addition of 髟 is erroneous." The habit stuck, however. Tang to Qing inscriptions in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contain one 鬚眉 (beard and eyebrows), two 鬚眉, two 鬚眉, two 鬚眉 and one 鬚眉 but no 須眉. In 1943 the reformer Cáo Bóhán wrote in the Guilin *Guówén zázhì*: "There are short forms which are not in common use today but have an ancient basis. Promoting these should not be too hard. […]. 鬚 can be shortened to 須."

The 1956 Scheme prescribed a return to 須 in both senses. The change was not implemented until 1964.

續 续 続 *xù* continue

See 賣 *mài*.

宣 *宀 *xuān* declare proclaim announce

An Urgent Directive on the Currency Struggle issued by the Administrative Office of Henan, Anhui and Jiangsu in 1948 declared that 宀传蒋币车我区完全非法 (宣傳蔣幣在我區完全非法 promoting Chiang [Kai-shek] currency

---

317 *Qunzhong dui 'Cao'an'*, p. 9.
318 *Qunzhong dui 'Cao'an'*, p. 25.
319 Wuwei medical slip 68. Sano 1991, p. 779.

is absolutely illegal in our area). In 1953 Hangzhou Public Health Bureau prepared a plan for 宀教工作 (Work on Propaganda and Education).[320]

Apparently the 1955 reformers were unaware of this 宀. Instead Dù Dìngyǒu proposed 亘 in *Zhōngguó yǔwén* and Chén Guāngyáo 㝉 in *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ*. In the event 宣 was left unchanged.

But soon no one could miss 宀. In 1957 the calligrapher Mǎ Gōngyú wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "In letters and documents I have received recently there are many newly created short forms. Some I have made out, like 宀 (宣), 衶 (街) […]." In 1958 宀 was mentioned by Zhū Ěrchóu in *Yǔwén zhīshí* and by Hǎo Wànquán in *Wénzì gǎigé*. On 11 June a headline in *Máchéng bào* urged readers to 宀傳总路線 (propagate the general line). In 1960 use of 宀 was reported to the Script Reform Committee from Maicheng in Jilin in the north to Pingnan in Guangxi in the south.

So the committee included 宀 in its 1977 Second Scheme. Yunnan Script Reform Leading Group, Zhejiang Education Bureau and the Education Bureau of the Revolutionary Committee of Jiangsu Province found 宀 confusing and inconsistent with the proposed 氵 for 演. In consequence both forms were excluded from the 1981 Revised Draft.

癬 癣 疢 *xuǎn* ringworm

In 1964 Zēng Xiàndá wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "There are many common medical characters not yet officially simplified by the Cabinet which the medical profession has shortened and put to use. The most common ones like 菌, 癬 […] are now written 苩, 疢 […]." Ten years later Xiàng Huī wrote that characters like 疢 "are often seen in the field of medicine and health." On this basis the Script Reform Committee included 疢 in its 1977 and 1981 schemes.

選 选 *選 *xuǎn* select

Shorteners have had many shots at 選. We find 遟 with 井 for 共 on Western Han bamboo slips from Wuwei, 選 without 艹 in the Tang calligraphy of Chǔ Suíliáng, 逻 with 巳 for 㠶 in Yuan blockprints and 遂 with 又 for 弜 in the late Ming military notes surveyed by Jiǎng and Shào. The latter survived till the twentieth century, when it faced competition from a novelty we first register in a 1924 选報㕷陵鋪枒草皮冈费计筭 (選報明陵鋪植草皮用費計算

320 *Anhui geming shi huace*, p. 236. Hangzhou Archives 87-1-15, p. 33.

compiled and reported estimate of the cost of preparing lawns by the Ming tombs) by Jiangsu Forestry Centre No. 1.[321]

The Education Ministry chose this 选 for its 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee for its 1956 Scheme. The committee member Lù Zhìwéi had doubts: "选 [with its phonetic 先 *xiàn*] violates the principle of separate phonetics for rounded and unrounded vowels. I approve of this kind of 'substitution of homonyms' in this one case, but we cannot let this spread out of bounds."

The above forms are not known from Japan, where writers found another way. The minutes of the 1875 Osaka Conference say 気脈之相通スル人ヲ選ンデ (*kimyaku no aitsūzuru hito o erande* persons of matching veins of thought were selected).[322] This 選 with ⺍ for 㠯 could still be seen in 2000, when Yoshida Yoshio photographed an 味選市場 (*Ajisen Ichiba* Selected Tastes Market) sign, a matter he found unusual enough to mention on his homepage.

The Japanese Language Council never formally proposed 選, although council chairman Abe Shinnosuke did mention in 1963 that "we need to consider the adoption of suitable short forms used to some extent in society today but not included in the List of Forms […] like […] 選 (選) […]."

鏇 旋 *xuàn* turn on a lathe, container for warming wine

Traditionally 鏇 *xuàn* has been used for 'lathe' and 'wine vessel', 旋 for *xuán* 'revolve' and *xuàn* 'whirl', senses which are obviously cognate.

The 1955 Draft shortened 鏇 not to 旋 but to 铣, a character already read *xǐ* in the sense of 'mill' and *xiǎn* in that of 'cast iron'. Guǎn Xièchū and Zēng Zhāolún warned against merging 鏇床 (*xuànchuáng* lathe) with 铣床 (*xǐchuáng* milling machine). At the October script reform conference Yè Gōngchuò duly declared this change cancelled.

Zēng Zhāolún continued his *Guāngmíng rìbào* article: "I see two ways of changing 鏇. The first is to dispose of the 金 component, change to 旋 and read that in the fourth tone. The other way is to abolish the word 鏇床 and use the more common term 車床." The Script Reform Committee had a mandate to abolish characters, not words, and so abolished 鏇.

In June 1957 Qiū Chángnù of Northeast Normal University opined that "鏇 is essential for lathe workers but otherwise little used. There is no harm in leaving 鏇 as it is." In August the committee offered to cancel this and forty-one more substitutions but, as we know, it did not.

---

321 Nanjing Archives 1005-1-289, p. 65.
322 *Enshū komonjo sen: Kindai hen*, item 10.

<div align="center">靴 *靯 *xuē* boots</div>

See 鞋 *xié*.

<div align="center">學 学 *孝 *xué* study
覺 觉 *竟 *jué* sense *jiào* sleep</div>

There were alternatives to 学 and 觉. Besides seventy-two 学, our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain fifty-two 斈, twenty-eight 壆, eight 學 and three 孝.

学 is the contour of 學, turning up as cursive 学 in the third century calligraphy of Huáng Xiàng. In square style we find a 觉 in the 1124 Qí Gǔshī inscription.

壆 and 學 are analogous to the *jǔ* section's 挙 and 擧.

孝 is less transparent. The Zhōngguó wénmíng wǎng site provides an explanation: "The variant 孝 consists of 文 and 子. 文 stands for 文字 (writing), 文章 (literature) and 文化 (culture). Here it indicates the knowledge one needs to obtain. 子 represents 'child' and 'posterity'. The 文 and 子 in 孝 stress that the acquisition of culture begins in childhood."[323] One regrets to present a more prosaic etymology. 斅 (學) consists of two hands (臼) holding an object (爻) over a child (子) in a house (宀). 斅 with 爻 became 學 with 父 as in the early Han Lǎo zǐ B manuscript. 父 looked like the then current form for 文. Later some took 父 for 文 and wrote 斈, like the authors of the 143 CE Jǐng jūn stele and 156 Hán Chì stele. Shedding 臼 and 宀 gave 孝 as in the 529 Lǐ Chāo epitaph. The Tang scholar Sū È confirmed: "Characters like 囗 plus 王 for 國 and 文 plus 字 for 學 were made up and became popular in the Later Wei. They are not used in educated circles."

The reformers at *Tàibái* chose 孝 and 竟 for their 1935 "handy characters" while the Education Ministry picked the less short but more common 学 and 觉 for its ensuing List of Short Forms, as did the Script Reform Committee for its 1955 Draft.

Zhào Xī objected in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "Some characters have been simplified but not enough. It is for example better to simplify 學 to 斈 rather than to 学 […]." Wáng Tónghàn in turn promoted 斈, asserting that this was "the short form in common use today" (unconvincingly, as our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain eleven 斈 against thirty-two 学). The committee stood by 学 and recognised that form in February 1956 together with 觉, as the Japanese Language Council had done ten years earlier.

---

323 www.wenming.cn/gxtpd/yryz/201101/t2011011049171.shtml. 2012-09-14.

<h1 style="text-align:center">雪 *彐 <i>xuě</i> snow</h1>

The 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn* said "彐 is the informal form for 雪." The 1955 Draft did not include this form. Wáng Zhìpéi objected in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "For some time one has seen use of a short form for 雪, namely 彐. Just like [声 for] 聲 and [医 for] 醫 this character has become a variant of 雪. I therefore propose to replace 雪 with 彐."

The 1956 Scheme did not adopt 彐, but the public did. In 1957 the Zhe-jiang teacher Fán Jiāng found 彐 in seventeen of his middle school students' compositions. The Script Reform Committee advanced 彐 in its 1962 and 1977 schemes but excluded it from its 1981 Revised Draft.

<h1 style="text-align:center">尋 寻 *寻 <i>xún</i> search</h1>

Views differ on the origin of 寻. Wèi Jiàngōng called it a "newly coined form" while Chén Guāngyáo described it as "a character established by custom, analogous to 夺 [奪] and 奋 [奮]". Records, or the lack of them, back Wèi. We find 寻 with ⺍ for 工口 from the 528 Yuán Qīn epitaph onwards and 寻 with 一 from the 510 Shíkū Temple inscription onwards but 寻 only once, on a 530 statue by the monk Dàochàng. Unfamiliarity to the public may explain why recognition of 寻 was delayed until June 1956.

<h1 style="text-align:center">壓 压 圧 <i>yā</i> press</h1>

The Chinese 压 has a 、 absent in the Japanese 圧. The split is old. Our Japanese records begin with a 圧 in Ōnishi Katsutomo's 1897 article on shortsightedness, Chinese ones with a 1925 essay on 被压迫民族 (oppressed peoples) by the Fujian political activist Zhū Jīlěi.[324] Both forms are repre-sented in our Japanese pre-reform manuscripts, which contain four 圧, seven 压 and one 压. The shorter form never made it to China, however, where we find thirty-nine 压 and three 圧 but no pointless 压.

Neither the Japanese nor the Chinese choice of form was undisputed. In August 1946 the Textbook Office of the Japanese Education Ministry sug-gested 压, a proposal which was changed to the shorter 圧 in the decisive November List of Characters for Current Use.[325]

In China the *Tàibái* editors selected the common 压 for their 1935 "handy characters", like the Education Ministry for its List of Short Forms later that year. In 1954 Yì Xīwú of the Committee for Research on Script Reform wanted to go further: "The form in common use is 压 with 、. The point has

---

324 *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 19.
325 National Archives 1946.6.4–1946.12.19, p. 75.

326 · LONG STORY OF SHORT FORMS

no function and may be omitted. The short form 庄 for 莊 [*zhuāng* village] has a point on top and will not be mixed up [with 压]."[326] Unconvinced, the Script Reform Committee followed habit and chose 压 with 、 for its 1955 Draft and 1956 Scheme.

亞 亜 亚 *yà* inferior, Asia
惡 悪 恶 *è* evil *wù* loathe

亞 ended up as 亜 in Japan and 亚 in China. Both forms originated in China. 惡 with 亜 appears in Song blockprints and 亚, a square version of the cursive 𢆥, in the 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn*. 亚 and 恶 did not outcompete the older forms, being outnumbered seventeen to one by 亜 and 悪 in our 1940–1954 Chinese manuscripts and ten to two in 1940–1946 Japanese ones.

Japanese reformers made the common 亜 and 悪 official in 1949. Their Chinese colleagues were heading in the same direction, proposing 悪 for *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters", 亜 and 悪 for the Education Ministry's ensuing List of Short Forms and 亜 for the Script Reform Society's 1950 List of Common Short Forms. Then the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft suggested 亚 for handwriting but 亞 as before in print. The 1956 Scheme abandoned the separate handwritten norm but retained 亚, less common but shorter than 亜. Lingering doubts delayed the recognition of 亚 and 恶 until 1959.

煙 烟 *yān* smoke

Shuōwén said 'smoke' was written with the phonetic 垔 (*yīn* dam up) or 因 (*yīn* reason). For years both 煙 and 烟 were listed in Chinese and Japanese dictionaries, until the Japanese Language Council laid down 煙 in 1946 and the Script Reform Committee of China 烟 in 1955. Both followed custom; our Chinese 1900–1954 manuscripts contain thirteen 烟 and two 炮 against eight 煙, Japanese ones from 1900–1946 nineteen 煙 against three 烟.

言 讠 (*yán* speech)

The 1964 General List replaced the 言 component with 讠, a form appearing in the Jin calligraphy of Wáng Xīzhī and gradually outcompeting the 乚 seen on Han wood slips. In our 1950–1954 manuscripts we find 讠 for 言 but never 乚, which had by then come to represent 氵 or 彳.

---

326   Yi (1954) 1955, p. 9.

嚴 严 嚴 *yán* severe

Three tops appear in dictionaries: 川 in the traditional 嚴, 〤 in the now official Japanese 嚴 and ㅍ in the now official Chinese 严. Other tops have appeared elsewhere: two or three mouths on Zhou bronzes, 川 or 吅 in the early Han manuscripts from Mawangdui, 厸, 屮 or 丷 on Han steles, 〤 on Tang steles, ㅍ on Song steles and ㅍ in Yuan blockprints. The latter became popular enough to annoy the editor of the 1617 *Zìkǎo*: "嚴 is written with two 口. 嚴 is wrong."

Worse was to come. In blockprints from the Ming onwards Liú Fù found 厌 with a short but expressive 火 (fire) bottom. Later writers discarded the whole bottom. The 1943 Principles of Administration of Southern Jiangsu vowed to 严惩含污浪费 (*yánchéng hánwū làngfèi* severely punish corruption and waste). 1948 declarations by Beiping and Tianjin students said the government had 㠪重损害宪法之尊㠪 (*yánzhòng sǔnhài xiànfǎ zhī zūnyán* seriously violated the constitution), announcing 㟘重的抗议 (*yánzhòng de kàngyì* serious protests).[327] 严 came to dominate, appearing in four of our 1950–1954 manuscripts compared with 㠪 and 㟘 in none.

The 1955 Draft recommended 㠪. Zhào Xī instead advocated 严 "in accordance with the masses' longstanding habits" and Liú Kuímín on the grounds that "everybody writes […] 㠪 as 严". The committee complied and changed 㠪 to 严 in its October Revised Draft.

Other criticism was rejected. At the October script reform conference the reformer Yè Gōngchuò admitted that some thought that "厂, 产 and 严 do not stand straight and look like falling over", but maintained that "there will be no problem as one gets used to them." Doubts nevertheless delayed official status for 严 until June 1956.

巖 岩 嵒 *yán* cliff

All three variants are known from the Han, 巖 and 嵒 from the 100 CE *Shuōwén* and 岩 from the Wáng jūn Stone Road stele.

The 1955 Draft proposed to simplify 巖 to 岩. Wú Jìng urged in *Yǔwén zhīshí* to do away even with 嵒. Reformers then recalled that 岩 was mentioned in *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* and so should not enter the list of simplified characters. The task of abolishing 巖 and 嵒 was therefore instead left to the December 1955 First List of Regulated Variants.

---

327 *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 110. *Jiefang zhanzheng shiqi Beiping*, p. 111.

<h1 style="text-align:center">閭 閆 闫 Yán</h1>

In 1999 Sūn Zhōngyùn quoted his friend Yán: "I sometimes write 阎, sometimes 闫. On receipts and bills I always sign 闫. But I get problems at the bank. They say your name is 阎, you cannot draw money for someone called 闫. I have used the simplified form for so many years so what has changed?"

One thing which had changed was *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn*. Whereas the 1987 edition said "阎 (閆) *yán* (1) the gate of a township alley (2) a surname" and so held 閆 for a variant of 阎, the 1998 and later editions have two entries, "閆 *yán* a surname" and "阎 *yán* (1) the gate of a township alley (2) a surname." This gives us two Yán surnames from 1998 on.

The characters started as one. *Shuōwén* said: "閭: village gate. Consists of 門 and the phonetic 臽 [*xiàn*]." The form with three bars appear in a 城閆 (城 閆 city gate) mentioned on the 414 Hǎo tàiwáng stone, where it is obviously a variant of 閭. The 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* said 閆 "is read 鹽 [*yán*]. It has the sense of 閭, [for which] it is used informally."

Abolishing 閭 was proposed in the 1955 Draft, rejected in the 1956 Scheme and mooted again the 1977 Second Scheme and 1981 Revised Draft. Instead one ended up with two official characters.

<h1 style="text-align:center">鹽 塩 盐 盐 yán salt</h1>

鹽 consists of 鹵 (*lǔ* salt) and the phonetic 監 *jiān*. 鹵 depicts a bag of salt crystals, which had turned into 田 already in the 鹽 and 鹽 seen in the early Han manuscripts from Mawangdui. As late as in 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* warned that "writing 鹽 for 鹽 is wrong."

This warning became obsolete as 鹽 was outcompeted by still shorter forms. We find 塩 with 土 for 臣 in the 528 Yuán Qīn epitaph and 塩 with 口 for 鹵 in the 671 Wáng Xuán epitaph. The latter came to replace 鹽 completely. Liú Fù registered 盐 with 口 in six Song to Qing blockprints, forms with田in none. Sticklers for rules then turned on 盐. The 1610 *Súshū kānwù*: "鹽 is informally written 盐. This is wrong." The 1617 *Zìkǎo*: "鹽 is [properly] written with 鹵. 盐 is wrong."

In Japan 塩 was treated with more respect. The 1597 Ekirin version of *Setsuyōshū* recommended writing 塩梅 for *anbai* (seasoning) and the ensuing *Ikyōshū* 塩酢 for *enso* (salt and sour). The Education Ministry and the Language Council advocated 塩 in their 1919, 1923, 1926, 1938 and 1942 reform schemes and finally in the 1946 List of Characters for Current Use.

Chinese writers made further cuts. An 1892 manuscript from Sichuan explains how to 煮沟卟 (*zhū hǎiyán* boil sea salt). In 1930 Yongli Soda Factory in Nanjing tallied its 工業用卟 (industrial salt). In 1936 the Jiangxi teacher

Ōuyáng Zhēn called 卟 "the common short form for 鹽". A 1947 letter from 襄樊卟務局 (Xiangfan Salt Agency) in Hubei described how seven people died as hundreds 爭購食卟 (were fighting to buy salt).[328]

Use of 卟 for 鹽 clashed with the northern habit of using 卟 for 塊. So northerners thought of something else. In Beijing Archives we find a 1946 survey of firms dealing in 油盁 (oil and salt) and a 1947 letter concerning transport of 盐痠 (鹽酸 *yánsuān* hydrochloric acid).[329]

The shorter forms did not outcompete 鹽; our 1940–1954 northern manuscripts contain fourteen 鹽, one 盁 and one 盐, southern ones seven 鹽, two 盁 and one 卟.[330] Following custom, reformers included 鹽 in *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters", the Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms, the Script Reform Society's 1950 List of Common Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft.

Zēng Zhāolún objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that "the character 鹽 is much used both in science and in daily life. Would it be possible to follow custom and simplify it further to 卟?" Guǎn Xièchū mooted the same idea in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*.

Unlike the Hunan-born Zēng and the Jiangsu-born Guǎn, the Beijing reformers were aware of the ambiguity of 卟 and chose instead 盐 for their 1956 Scheme. Chén Guāngyáo explained: "In the south this character [鹽] is also written 卟. Northerners, however, use 卟 for 塊. To avoid arguments 盐 was adopted." Even so, the relative rarity of 盐 delayed its official status until 1958.

Arguments were not entirely avoided. In 1958 the Jiangsu-born Jì Dá wrote "it is better to simplify to 卟." In 1959 Lǐ Cuìhé wrote "if one discovers a better way to shorten a character, it should be simplified again. 盐, for example, can be simplified further to 卟 (actually this 卟 has long been in use in the countryside and marketplaces in Hunan)."

In 1981 this author saw 卟 for 盐 in Nanjing in Jiangsu, Jinhua in Zhejiang, Chongqing and Wanxian in Sichuan, Yueyang and Hengyang in Hunan and Wuhan in Hubei. Since then the form has disappeared from sight. The youngest informant to identify 卟 as 盐 was a student from Zhoukou in southern Henan born in 1982. Farther off the beaten track the practice may have survived longer; Huáng Xuětíng from Baise in Guangxi complained as late as in 2006 that some "write the top only" of 盐.

---

328   Manuscript of Tao Gengza, p. 52b. Nanjing Archives 1048-1-24, p. 5. Hubei Archives LS19-5-7726, p. 18.
329   Beijing Archives 87-31-8, p. 46; J6-1-214, p. 226.
330   North: Beijing, Jilin, Hebei. South: Anhui, Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Hubei, Sichuan, Guangdong.

演 *氵寅 yǎn act

In 1957 the Zhejiang teacher Fán Jiāng noticed that three of his students wrote 氵寅 for 演 in their compositions. The following year the form was reported from Beijing by Rén Shuāngyàn, from Shanghai by Wēn Yìngshí and from Changre in Jiangsu by Zhū Ěrchóu.

The 1977 Second Scheme included 氵寅. As we saw in the 宣 *xuān* section, educators found 氵寅 for 演 inconsistent with 宀 for 宣, effectively ousting both from the 1981 Revised Draft.

厭 厌 yàn detest

厌 was launched in 1931 in Chén Guāngyáo's *Jiǎnzì lùnjí* and listed in Huáng Ruòzhōu's 1950 index of "now common short forms with a relatively broad basis among the masses".

When the committee included 厌 in its 1956 Scheme, Chén described it as "established by custom". Liáng Dōnghàn did not: "The overwhelming part of the announced characters are 'established by custom' and have long been common in society […]. There is just a small number still worth discussing, like 症 for 癥, 余 for 餘, 忧 for 憂, 厌 for 厭 […]." Doubts delayed official status for 厌 until 1959.

驗 験 验 yàn test

See 檢 *jiǎn*.

雁 *厂 yàn wild goose

Kono Masahiro found 厂 for 雁 in a 1613 edition of *Tsurezuregusa* (Essays in Idleness). Arai Hakuseki explained in 1705: "In the local [Japanese] reading 厂 [*kan*] is close to 雁 [*gan*], so 厂 is used for 雁." We find the practice in an 1894 manuscript titled 厂のゆきかひ (*Gan no yukikai* Coming and Going of the Wild Geese).[331] The Education Ministry's 1919 Character Regulation Scheme suggested permitting use of 厂 for 雁.

The proposal was not repeated, as writers had found other uses for 厂. In 1803 Matsumoto Guzan observed: "Informally 雁 is shortened to 厂 here [in Japan]. In addition other characters with 厂 like 歷 and 曆 are also written 厂." With time the latter use would take over. In our 1920–1946 Japanese manuscripts we find five 厂史 (歷史 *rekishi* history), while our records of 厂 for

---

331 Yamaguchi Archives 高津家 129.

雁 end with a 1923 plan to build a bridge at 厂島 (雁島 Ganjima) in Hagi.[332] In 1946 the Japanese Language Council chose to give 厂 no official role.

In China 厂 has been used for 庵, then 廳, then 歷, then 廠 but never to our knowledge for 雁.

陽 阳 *yáng* sunny side

The 昜 and 昜 (昜) seen in Yin and Zhou geographical and personal names are regarded as the original forms of 陽 and 揚 [*yáng* raise]. Many have shed light on the etymology of 昜. Lín Yìguāng saw a sun (日) emerging as the clouds (一) blow away (勿), Léon Wieger a sun (日) rising over the horizon (一) emitting rays (勿), Xú Zhōngshū a sun (日) rising over a branch (丁) emitting rays (彡), Kanō Yoshimitsu a sun (日) rising (丁) and shining (彡), Zhū Fāngpǔ a shining (彡) bronze vessel (日) on a table (丁), Shirakawa Shizuka a shining (彡) piece of jade (日) on a table (丁), Kāng Yīn rice (白) offered on an altar (示) and Katō Jōken a sun (日) and the phonetic 丁 *dīng*.

The 阝 (阝 hillside) basking in the sun was introduced in the Zhou and became universal in the Han. Yuan blockprinters shed 勿 of this enlarged form, keeping 阳, the form later included in *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters" and the Education Ministry's ensuing List of Short Forms.

After the failure of these schemes, Cáo Bóhán came up with another idea in a 1943 issue of the Guilin *Guówén zázhì*: "There are some short forms which are not in common use today but have ancient roots; promoting these should not be too hard. [...] 陽 can be shortened to 昜, which depicts a fluttering flag under the sun. 昜 is the original form of the 陽 in 陰陽 [*yīnyáng* yin and yang], says Duàn Yùcái in his commentary to *Shuōwén*."

Ancient roots, yes, but no recent ones. *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* registers three thousand four hundred Han to Qing 陽 but no 昜, and our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain five 阳 but no 昜. The Script Reform Committee included 阳 in its 1956 Scheme, but delayed its official status until 1958. Was the committee staff member Cáo Bóhán making a last stand for 昜?

揚 扬 *yáng* raise
楊 杨 *yáng* poplar, Yáng
湯 汤 *tāng* soup

A 1944 document titled Instructions Concerning Training and Consolidation of the Army, issued by the communist Central China Office, urged combatants

---

332   Yamaguchi Archives 戰前 A 土木 325.

to 蒾㧕 (發揚 develop) work on military technique.[333] This 㧕 is analogous to the older 阳 for 陽. Subsequent examples of 㧕 are scarce, however, and the Script Reform Committee did not take this form into account in 1956, proposing instead to replace the 昜 component with the cursive-based 㫃. That decision was implemented in 1964, when 揚 became 扬, 楊 became 杨 and so on.

By then use of 㧕 and 梍 had surged. In 1959 the Planning Committee of Nanjing City prepared statistics of forests in 㧕州专区 (揚州专区Yangzhou District).[334] In 1960 梍 and 㧕 were reported to the Script Reform Committee by teachers in Rongjiang in Guizhou and Xiamen in Fujian, and to *Wénzì gǎigé* by Lǐ Zǐxīn of Jinzhou Middle School No. 5 in Liaoning: "Some think that if 陽 can be simplified to 阳, 楊 and 揚 may be simplified to 梍 and 㧕, unaware that 阳 is a character existing since ancient times." In 1961 梍 and 㧕 were denounced by teachers from Dongguan Normal School in Guangdong and in 1962 by Wáng Yún from Ningbo Cadre Literacy School in Zhejiang. The timing of this wave was not accidental. In 1958 陽 had become 阳 while 揚 and 楊 had not yet become 扬 and 杨, so writers grasped the closest analogy at hand. After the 1964 General List records fade away and cease with a 1990 letter mentioning a travel to 梍卅 (Yangzhou).

<div align="center">

養 養 养 养 *yǎng* provide for

</div>

養 consists of 食 (eat) and the phonetic 羊 *yáng*. The ｜ in 羊 and ノ in 食 were connected already in the 夫-topped 養 seen on Western Han wood slips. The bottom 食 was first contracted to 川 by Yuan blockprinters. The resulting 养 was legalised in the 1956 Scheme and was contracted further to 养 with 夫 in the 1964 General List.

<div align="center">

癢 痒 *yǎng* itch

</div>

Shuōwén has 痒 but no 癢, which first appears on the 736 Wēn Qīngdé stele. The enlarged form did not outcompete the older form; *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains three Qing 痒 but no 癢. The 1956 Scheme prescribed 痒.

<div align="center">

樣 样 *yàng* shape

</div>

样 with the phonetic 羊 *yáng* was promoted in Chén Guāngyáo's 1936 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo*. We first find it used in the phrase 你那样 (like you)

---

333 *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 130.
334 Nanjing Archives 5019-2-73, p. 3.

in a 1941 letter from a Wuxi party secretary to his brother.[335] The form was legalised in 1956.

要 *委 *yāo* demand *yào* want
票 *录 *piào* ticket

Wáng Xīzhī wrote 委 in cursive style, Huái Sù (725–785) 委 and Ráo Jiè (d. 1367) 委. Yuan blockprinters adapted the latter to square style and wrote 委.

Attempts have been made to formalise this form. The Script Reform Society included 委 in its 1950 List of Common Short Forms, and Professor Guǎn Xièchū suggested adding this and the analogous 录 to the 1956 Scheme. The Script Reform Committee did not comply at the time, but did include both forms in its 1962 List of Simplified Characters and List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme.

Guangdong Script Reform Committee objected: "Some think we should, as far as possible, adopt characters which the masses are used to, like 委 for 要 and 坝 for 霸." True, the masses in Guangdong were used to 委. In 1960 the Guangzhou *Yánchéng wǎnbào* wrote that 委 "is already used by some people", and the Script Reform Committee received reports of 委 from correspondents in Guangzhou, Wuhua and Heyuan in Guangdong, but also from Zongyang in Anhui, Wuhan in Hubei, Wuyang in Henan and Yancheng in Jiangsu. Southern records dominate, understandably if writers took 又 to be a phonetic. True, 要 and 又 are read differently in Cantonese, but Cantonese speakers tend to read both as *iau* in the standard language.

The 1981 Revised Draft left 要 and 票 untouched.

堯 尭 尧 *yáo* tall
繞 绕 *rào* coil
燒 烧 烧 *shāo* burn
曉 暁 晓 *xiǎo* dawn

垚 lost its bottom already in the Han. On a wood slip from Juyan we find 烧 for 燒, on one from Gangu 暁 for 曉. The 1617 *Zìkǎo* admonished writers: "堯 is written with three 土. 尭 is wrong." The Japanese Language Council nevertheless included 烧 and 暁 in its 1949 List of Forms.

Even Chinese reformers mooted 尧, including 晓 in the "handy characters" adopted by *Tàibái* in 1935. The 1956 Scheme saved three more strokes by

---

335   Letter from Lu Ping 陆平 in *Wuxi geming shi huace*, p. 141.

turning cursive 尧 into square 尧, which became official in 1959, followed by 烧, 晓 and 绕 in 1964.

鑰 鈅 钥 *yào* key

The 1955 Draft suggested 鈅 for 鑰. We are short of pre-1955 records of 鈅, and so were the reformers. Yì Xīwú descibed 鈅 as a "newly created" character, Chén Guāngyáo as a "new picto-phonetic character". Novelty may explain why 钥 became official as late as in 1959, with the Fourth Batch of Simplified Characters. 仝 on the left became钅 in 1962, as described in the 金 *jīn* section.

藥 薬 葯 药 *yào* medicine

Early writers shortened 藥 analogously to 樂 to 茶, 茱, 菜 or 葉. More recently we find another form in China, first in a 1915 Beijing police report on sales of 春药 (aphrodisiacs) falsely claimed to be 龟齡集葯 (elixir of life).[336]

The 1935 List of Short Forms and 1956 Scheme prescribed this 药 for 藥. Chén Guāngyáo explained: "The original sense of 葯 is 芍葯 [*sháoyao* herbaceous peony], but this character has long been used for the 藥 in 医藥 [*yīyào* medicine]. It [葯] is also more common than 茱, so we chose 药." Yes, 葯 was more common, appearing in twenty-five of our 1920–1954 manuscripts against 茱 in none. Recognition of 药 was nevertheless delayed until 1959, perhaps because of indecision concerning the 糸 component.

In our Japanese manuscripts we find no 葯, so the Language Council made 薬 official in 1949 analogously to its 楽 for 樂. Some have found this too bothersome. The 2016 *Zokuji no jiten* (A Dictionary of Informal Characters) says: "艼: informal form of 薬 [*yaku*]. We have received mail from two persons about this form, a 'grass' top with the katakana ヤ [*ya*]. It is said to be popular in the medicine industry and pharmacy departments of the universities." But not elsewhere, we take it, as none of our Japanese informants could identify 艼.

耀 *妖 *yào* shine

The 1956 Scheme changed 躍 (*yuè* leap) to 跃 with the phonetic 夭 *yāo*. An analogy soon turned up; in 1958 Huáng Míngyuǎn from Zhangzhou in Fujian noticed that some of his pupils wrote 妖 for 耀, and the following year Liú Hé saw 妖 "all over the Northeast".

---

336   Beijing Archives J181-19-10769, pp. 2, 5, 7.

This 妖 was included in the abortive 1977 Second Scheme and 1981 Revised Draft. The case was reopened in 2006 by Jīn Wénmíng, editor of *Yǎowén jiáozì* (Crunching Graphs and Chewing Characters): "Before and after my retirement [as a dictionary editor in 1996], I have proofread many manuscripts on social science and noticed that authors often spontaneously shorten 耀 to 妖. This practice is obviously influenced by the change of 躍 to 跃. […] So why do we not just follow the current and simplify 耀 to 妖 officially?"

曜 *旺 yào shine

In Japanese, Monday is 月曜日 (moonshine day), Tuesday 火曜日 (Mars-shine day) and so on. That makes 曜 common and in need of a short form. In 1962 Fujikawa Sukezō registered one, calling 旺 a "commonly used short form". In 1963 Language Council chairman Abe Shinnosuke wrote that "we need to consider the adoption of suitable short forms used to some extent in society today but not included in the List of Forms […] like […] 旺 (曜) […]." In 2014–2017 seven out of twenty-four Japanese informants identified 旺 as 曜.

旺 seems to be more common than the pointless 旺, which in turn seems to be the original form, having an 王 ō phonetic which rhymes with 曜 yō. The function of the point in 旺 may be to distinguish the form from the dictionary's 旺 (ō flourishing).

爺 耶 爷 *卩 yé father, old man

The place name 耶 was loaned for 'or what?', then for 'father'. *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn* gives the example 卷卷有耶名 (each volume includes her father's name) from the Tang *Mù Lán shī* (Ballad of Mù Lán). Writers soon began to specify this sense with 父 (father). In 1162 Zhāng Qiáo added the comment "耶 is nowadays written 爺" to the above passage.

In Qing blockprints this enlarged form appears shortened to 爷 or 卩. Our 1864 account book reveals why writers found it worthwhile to invent a short form for this to us obscure character, registering the liabilities of 陈卩 (陳爺 Mr Chén), 慶大卩 (Mr Qìng), 刘二卩 (the younger Mr Liú) and so on. In 1930 Beiping Police Department reported that the gang mentioned in the 亂 *luàn* section had 拐走赵某老卩之妻 (*guǎi zǒu Zhào mǒu lǎoyé zhī qī* abducted one Mr Zhào's wife).[337]

This is our last record of 卩 for 爺. The address 老爺 was falling out of

---

337   Beijing Archives J106-1-1, unnumbered pages; J181-31-3364, p. 6.

use, replaced by 先生 *xiānshēng*. 卩 in turn came to be used for the new weight measure 磅 (*bàng* pound) and, more often, for 部.

As 卩 had became ambiguous, reformers were left with 爷, which was included in the Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1956 Scheme.

葉 叶 *yè* leaf

Guǎngyùn called 叶 ancient for 協 (*xié* joint). In the Wu dialects of East China 協 *ji* 23 is close to 葉 *ji* 4. Writers exploited this similarity. In 1922 Qián Xuántóng saw "a Suzhou waiter writing 百叶 for 百葉 [mixed flavour beans] on a meal receipt." In 1928 the Shanghai publisher Hú Huáichēn called 叶 informal for 葉 and 協. In 1934 Xú Zémǐn registered 叶 for 葉 in the handwriting of his Nanjing students.

Reformers took note and included 叶 for 葉 in the "handy characters" adopted by *Tàibái* in 1935. The Education Ministry's ensuing List of Short Forms, however, rejected forms "used in one area only, like […] 叶 which is used for 葉 in Jiangsu and Zhejiang."

Yes, reports of 叶 for 葉 came from that area, and continued to. A 1949 registration form for people's organisations in Zhejiang is signed by one 叶文煥 (Yè Wénhuàn). In 1954 Hangzhou Trade Bureau recorded sales of 茶叶 (茶葉 *cháyè* tea leaves).[338] In 1950 Chén Róngpǔ observed: "In Jiangsu and Zhejiang some write 叶 for 葉, but that is not so elsewhere."

The 1956 Scheme nevertheless changed 葉 to 叶. Yè Làishì later explained:

The State Council discussed the simplified characters, presided over by Premier Zhōu Ēnlái himself. Some argued that 叶 was the 叶 in 叶韵 [*xiéyùn* rhyme] with another reading than 葉 and so could not replace 葉. Others said it was already in common use, and why not have two readings of one character? Neither side gave in. Premier Zhōu asked Foreign Trade Minister Yè Jìzhuàng: 'Your name is Yè, what do you think?' Yè said: 'I am for 叶, it is easier to write.' Premier Zhōu looked around, then said: 'As those named Yè have agreed, I think we can approve it.'

Did the State Council find time to discuss individual characters? Hmm. This story is suspiciously similar to the one related in the 鄧 *Dèng* section.

---

338   Hangzhou Archives 94-1-1, p. 20; 81-4-21, p. 81.

<h1 style="text-align:center">業 业 *叶 yè occupation</h1>

In 1942 Central Jiangsu Regulations on Land Rent required rents to be based on voluntary agreements between 业佃双方 (yèdiàn shuāngfāng owners and tenants) with the top 业 for 業. In 1944 Northern Jiangsu Party Committee on the other hand wrote a plan to improve schooling so students could work right after 初中毕叶 (finishing middle school), and tradespeople in Tongqingnan in Anhui were instructed to fill a form stating 营叶种额 (type of economic activity).[339] How could writers adopt 叶, a character read xié, for 業 yè? Because they had become used to reading 叶 as 葉 yè, as we saw in the preceding section.

叶 outpaced 业. Our 1950–1954 manuscripts contain eighteen 商叶 against one 商业 and twenty-seven 工叶 but no 工业. The 1955 Draft opted for 叶, which was changed to 业 in the 1956 Scheme. Chén Wénbīn explained: "After deliberation it became clear that 茶叶 [tea leaves] and 茶業 [the tea trade] cannot both be simplified to 茶叶. Therefore we now let 叶 replace 葉 only, while 業 will be shortened to 业." Doubts delayed official status for 业 until 1958.

Neither 叶 nor 业 made it to Taiwan, where writers tend instead to write 業 with a demolished top. Even this was originally a mainland habit; in Beijing Archives we find 事業 (activities) in 1947 and 营業 in 1948.[340]

<h1 style="text-align:center">醫 医 yī doctor, medicine</h1>

Yuan blockprinters adopted the obsolete 医 (yì quiver) for 醫 (yī medicine), a practice which became official in Japan in 1946 and in China in 1956.

Some found even 医 too long. In documents from Beijing Public Health Bureau we find notes about 天坛匚院 (Tiantan Hospital) and 中匚匚院 (The Hospital of Chinese Medicine) in 1963 and 北匚 (Beijing Medical Institute) and 匚专 (医专 Beijing Higher Medical College) in 1973.[341] In 1981 this author read about 临床匚学 (clinical medicine) on a Shanghai billboard.

In 1960 Xú Yǎnshòu reported in Yángchéng wǎnbào (Guangzhou Evening News) that "many in the medical profession simplify 医 further to 匚." The habit was mentioned that year also in letters to the Script Reform Committee from Shaoguan in Guangdong, Wuhan and Yichang in Hubei and Zhangzhou in Fujian. In 1981 this author saw 匚院 (hospital) signs in Hengyang in Hunan and in 1982 a 中匚 (traditional Chinese doctor) sign in Zhangzhou in Fujian.

---

339 Jiangsu kangzhan, pp. 108, 116. Anhui geming shi, p. 219.
340 Beijing Archives J2-4-466, p. 3; J5-5-58, p. 8.
341 Beijing Archives 135-1-1394, p. 2; 135-2-508, p. 60.

The southern dominance of records is not accidental. In 1981–1986 informants in Guangdong, Guangxi, Hunan, Hubei and southern Fujian identified 巨 while those further north did not.

壹 壱 *圭 *乙 yī one

壹 is an elaborate form for 一 used to avoid altering of receipts and contracts. Many have found it too elaborate. The calligrapher Suǒ Jìng (239–303), for one, wrote 壱 with 豆 contracted to 匕. The form spread to Japan where it was proposed for official use by the Education Ministry in 1919, 1923 and 1926 and by the Japanese Language Council in 1938, 1942 and finally successfully in 1946.

By then 壱 had become rare in China, where writers found another way out. From 1861 we find a grain tax receipt dated 太平天国辛酉拾圭年 (11th year of Taiping Tianguo [1861]) with a 㐅-less 壹. By the twentieth century the bottom ㇄ had been contracted to 一. Customs forms from 1906 and 1907 register, among other goods, 羊皮圭佰五拾帒 (*yángpí yībǎi wǔshí zhāng* one hundred and fifty sheepskins) and 西毡圭卷 (*xīzhān yī juǎn* one roll of felt).[342] This 圭 was proposed in List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme but abandoned in the 1981 Revised Draft.

There is a still simpler way of obstructing falsifications. A 1965 letter to *Wénzì gǎigé*'s "Yǔwén xìnxiāng" (Language mailbox) asked: "In student enrolment forms and advertisements one often sees 免冠相片乙张 [*miǎnguān xiàngpiān yī zhāng* one bareheaded photograph] and 自传各乙份 [one cv each]. May 乙 and 一 be used at will?" Answer: "乙 and 一 convey different senses, but in trade there is a habit of using 乙 for 一 (since 乙 is not so easy to alter to another digit). However, in common use like these examples it is appropriate to use 一."

義 义 yì justice
議 议 *詋 yì opinion
儀 仪 yí ceremony
蟻 蚁 yǐ ant

Shuōwén held 㐅 to be identical with 刈 (*yì* to cut). Song blockprinters replaced 義 with this 㐅, which Yuan writers enlarged to 义. Enlarged forms then outcompeted 㐅, 仪 and 訫, which are absent in Ming and Qing prints.

In 1922 Professor Qián Xuántóng proposed in *Guóyǔ yuèkān* to simplify 義 to 义 "on the basis of short forms now in use among the people." The

---

342   Guo 1955, item 71. *Shina keizai zensho*, vol. 9, pp. 254, 250.

Tàibái editors followed the advice and included 乂, 仪 and 议 in their 1935 "handy characters". Hú Xíngzhī objected: "In the list 義 is written 乂, as this was originally a kind of loan character. The form we normally use, however, is 义." True, in our 1900–1954 manuscripts we find twenty-nine 义 and forty-seven 訳 or 议 but no 乂 or 訳. The Education Ministry took note and chose 义, 仪, 蚁 and 议 for its 1935 List of Short Forms, as did the Script Reform Committee for its decisive 1956 Scheme.

义 forms have been promoted even in Japan. Dazai Shundai wrote in 1753: "Short forms may be used when writing small script, saving effort. If one does not know them, one cannot read such script. One should therefore learn from childhood that […] 义 is 義 […] 仪 is 儀 […] 议 is 議 […]." This advice was repeated in 1861 by Matsui Tadashi.

If Japanese writers ever learned 义, they had forgotten it by the twentieth century. Harada Minoru recalled:

> On 30 October 1954 Chairman Lǐ Dé of the Chinese Red Cross gave Chairman Shimazu Tadatsugu of the Japanese Red Cross a list of the last 2934 Japanese to be repatriated from China. The original list showed present residence in China and destinations in Japan written in modern Chinese short forms. At the time newspapers had little notion about Chinese short forms, so this two-page report became a jumble of mistakes. […] In various newspapers the name 义雄 became 又雄 or 叉雄 or 文雄, just not 義雄 [Yoshio].

义 forms reappeared in 1969, when Matsumoto Akira noticed phrases like 反战会议 (反戰會議 *han-sen kaigi* anti-war meeting) and 主义 (主義 -*shugi* -ism) in bulletins of students at Tokyo University of Education. Even these fell into oblivion and were recognised by none of our 2014–2017 informants.

Readers do recognise something else. In 1949 Shiraishi Mitsukuni wrote: "Something which has gained a sudden popularity since the war is writing the 議 in 爭議 [*sōgi* dispute] and 議題 [*gidai* agenda] as 䜩, which I have seen time and again on posters and placards of the workers' movement. Here the phonetic 義 has been changed to ギ [*gi*]." 䜩 was identified by eleven of our twenty-four Japanese informants.

藝 艺 芸 *yì* skill

Yin 埶 depicted a man planting a tree and meant 'to plant', later 'cultivate' and then 'skill'. In the Zhou it was enlarged with 'earth' to 埶 (執) and in the Han with 'herbs' to 蓺 and then to 藝 with 云, stressing the man's bent legs. Post-Han writers and dictionaries came to prefer the latter.

坴 was hard to squeeze in and turned into 圭, 丰, 禾 or 扌. The latter

became the more common. Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain fourteen 藝 and one 㙯 with 扌 against seven 蓻 with 禾 and no forms with 圭 or 丰.

The *Tàibái* reformers chose shortness to commonness and selected 㙯 for their 1935 "handy characters". The choice confused the journal's typographers, who slipped into using 藝 types in the 20 July issue before they closed ranks to adopt the prescribed 㙯 in the 5 August issue. By then the Education Ministry had opted to follow custom, selecting 藝 for its own List of Short Forms.

Reformers did not abandon plans to shed the 云 bottom. In 1943 Cáo Bóhán wrote in the Guilin *Guówén zázhì*: "There are short forms which are not in common use today but have an ancient basis. Promoting these should not be too hard. […] 藝 can be shortened to 萟."

Probably unknown to Cáo, the simpler 艺 was coming into use in the Liberated Areas, as we saw in the 态 *tài* section. This 艺 was proposed in the 1955 Draft. Not everybody approved. Jīn Míngshèng pointed out that the 乙 phonetic was ineffective in the south (where 乙 ends in *-t* or *-ʔ* and 藝 begins with *ŋ-* or *g-*). A meeting of teachers in Hunan (where *ŋ-* in 藝 is preserved) proposed using 艺 for 葉, not 藝. Letters to the Script Reform Committee suggested writing 芒 with the latin letter E as phonetic. Teachers at Zhongshan University in Guangzhou argued that as "臆, 億 and 憶 will become 肊, 亿 and 忆, […] 薏 [*yì* Job's tears] ought by the same logic to become 艺. The Draft's 艺 for 藝 makes no sense to the masses; it would be better to follow custom and adopt the already common 㙯 or the ancient 秇."[343] The same point was made by Guǎn Xièchū of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. Professor Yuè Sìbǐng worried in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Older persons find 艺, 疗, 床, 态 and 卫 unfamiliar." The committee member Yè Gōngchuò replied at the October script reform conference that 艺 "is now common in the realm of literature and art, although perhaps unfamiliar to the general public." Such doubts delayed official status for 艺 until June 1956.

In Japan 乙 *otsu* was no conceivable phonetic for 藝 *gei*. Instead writers took up 芸 without the centre, as in a 1939 registration form of 精華女子技芸學校 (*Seika joshi gigei gakkō* Seika Women's Art School) in Tokyo.[344] The relatively new 芸 was not on the table in 1946 and became official only with the 1949 List of Forms. Use of 芸 for 藝 was never mooted in China, where 芸 *yún* is used for 'rue', a medical herb.

343 1955 letter from Changsha. "Ge di renshi", p. 38. Pan 1955.
344 National Archives 1939.3.31, p. 1.

億 亿 *yì* a hundred million

忆 was promoted in Chén Guāngyáo's 1931 *Jiǎnzì lùnjí* and 1936 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo.* By the 1950s the form was in use, as in a 1954 report by Beijing Industry and Trade Office on a steel company owing the bank 4 亿 (400 000 000) and the tax office 2 亿.[345] Ordinary people did not deal with such sums and seem to have been unaware of this short form. The reformer Zhāng Zhōu wrote in 1956: "All the simplified characters were selected according to the established-by-custom principle, except a few newly created ones like 亿 and 毕."

Unfamiliarity to people of modest means, including script reformers, may explain why 亿 became official in China only with the second, June 1956 batch of simplified characters.

憶 忆 *yì* recall

忆 was launched together with 亿 by Chén Guāngyáo in 1931. Unlike 亿, 忆 seems not to have been in use before the reform. Wáng Màocái wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "When simplifying characters, applying the established-by-custom principle alone is not sufficient, one can also introduce some new forms if suitable. Characters like 尘, 灭, 厅, 卢 […] 丛 and 忆 truly demonstrate the creative wisdom of our people." Tellingly, 忆's official status was delayed until June 1956.

臆 肊 *yì* chest

Shuōwén said "肊 is also written with 意." Text examples of 肊 with 乙 are wanting, however, as in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu*, which contains five 臆 but no 肊.

The 1956 Scheme changed 億 to 亿 and 憶 to 忆. Some have proposed an analogous change of 臆 to 肊, like the calligrapher Liú Nǎizhōng in *Guāngmíng rìbào* in 1955, the Script Reform Committee in its 1977 Second Scheme and 1981 Revised Draft and the *Yǎowén jiáozì* editor Jīn Wénmíng in a 2006 article: "If the editors of the General List could create the earlier unseen 亿 and 忆 for 億 and 憶, why deprive the traditional and analogous 肊 of its chances to enter the General List?"

---

345 Beijing Archives 22-12-1761, p. 11.

意 *㣎 *yì* meaning

Wáng Xiànzhī (344–386) contracted the centre, wrote 㣎 and set a model for cursive style. We find the square version 㣎 in the Yuan drama *Tiáo fēng yuè* (Playing with the Wind and Moon), as did Liú Fù in the Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì*. In 1935 Guō Yìqīng unsuccessfully advocated 㣎 for the "handy characters" to be used by *Tàibái*.

The 1956 Scheme did not turn out a short form for 意, but the public did. In 1957 the Zhejiang teacher Fán Jiāng reported in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that seven of his students used 乙 for 意 and that "one student admitted that this was by analogy with 亿 and 忆." In 1958 Xióng Kāiyín complained in *Yǔwén xuéxí* that some writers "simplify at will", writing 㣎 for 意. In 1959 Lǐ Cuìhé noticed that "some write 意 as 㐅, others as 㣎,"

乙 *yǐ* in 㣎 is phonetic, but 于 *yú* in 㐅? *Wénzì gǎigé* explained: "Some simplified forms based on dialect reading, like the 㐅 used for 意 in Guangzhou, are not acceptable elsewhere."[346] Guangzhou writers read 于 as *ji* and found that phonetic more helpful than 乙 *jut*.

From 1960 to 1977 the Script Reform Committee received one account each of 㣎, 㝕, 乙, 㐅 and 㣎, compared with thirteen of 㣎, which it duly selected for its 1977 Second Scheme.[347] Out of six thousand respondents, twenty-seven counterproposed 乙, four 㣎, three 㣎 and two 㝕.[348] This did not sway the committee, which retained 㣎 in its likewise rejected 1981 Revised Draft.

疫 *疕 *yì* epidemic

The 1955 Draft proposed to change 疫 to 疕, a form not on earlier record, and listed by the reformer Yì Xīwú among "newly created characters."

There was a counterproposal. Pān Yǔnzhōng reported from a meeting of teachers at Zhongshan University in Guangzhou:

> 臆, 億 and 憶 have been simplified to 肊, 亿 and 忆, while 癔 [*yì* hysteria] remains as it was, reportedly because 疫 is to become 疕 […]. This is not a good solution. Is it not more rational to do the opposite, retain 疫 and let 癔 become 疕 by analogy? 疫 is simpler and can do without simplification, while the more complicated 癔 definitely needs to be simplified.

---

346   Zhonghua renmin gongheguo jiaoyu bu 1960, p. 5.
347   Deviant letters from Hanzhong, Rugao, Shaoguan and Fengxi. 㣎 in Xiao 1962, p. 62.
348   *Qunzhong dui "Cao'an"*, p. 3.

Similar criticism was put forward by Zhèng Yīnghàn in *Guāngmíng rìbào* and Wú Sānlì at the People's Political Consultative Conference. 疠 was duly withdrawn from the 1956 Scheme.

The proposed 疠 seems not to have interested medics. In 1964 Zēng Xiàndá of Yiyang District Health Office described short forms for 癣 (ringworm), 菌 (fungus), 窦 (cavity) and other expressions used in the profession, but quoted no form for either 疫 or 癮. Nevertheless the 疠 for 疫 proposal resurfaced in the abortive 1977 Second Scheme and 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">

驛 駅 驿 *yì* station
譯 訳 译 *yì* translate

</div>

See 釋 *shì.*

<div align="center">

異 异 *yì* different

</div>

Shuōwén said: "㠯 [异]: select. Consists of 廾 [two hands] and the phonetic 㠯 [已 *yǐ*]." This character was early on used for the almost-homonym 異 (*yì* different), as shown in *Kāngxī zìdiǎn*: "异 […]. Also same as 異. *Liè zǐ* says: 重囚纍梏]何以异哉 ([*zhòng qiú lěi gù*] *hé yǐ yì zāi* in what way does this differ [from severe imprisonment in layers of fetters?]). The Jin commentator Zhāng Zhàn did not expect his contemporaries to catch this and added: "异 means 異. This is an ancient character." Subsequent examples of 异 are wanting.

Reformers, however, knew their *Liè zǐ* and *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* and included 异 in their 1955 First List of Regulated Variants, abolishing 異. Others were less erudite, noted Professor Gāo Jǐngchéng: "Some of the selected characters are unusual and unknown to lots of people, like 泪 (淚), 弃 (棄) and 异 (異)."

<div align="center">

翼 *羿 *yì* wing

</div>

In 1958 Jì Dá wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that "everybody simplifies 翼 to 羿." By 1965 writers had come up with a still shorter form, described in *Guāngmíng rìbào* by Zhāng Ruìlín of Yicheng Middle School No. 1 in Shanxi:

> The 翼 in 翼城 [Yicheng] has not been simplified. There are, however, very few people here now who write the laborious seventeen-stroke 翼, as they have simplified it to the seven-stroke 羿. People write like this not only in their daily life, studies and work, but also in official documents and announcements. Yes, even the name of the county newspaper 翼城小报 is written with 羿. Very many primary school pupils know how to write 羿 but cannot write 翼. From the notes of middle school students 翼 has vanished.

The 1977 Second Scheme recommended 羽 together with the analogous 北 for 冀. As we saw in the 冀 *jì* section, that scheme was criticised for over-use of 一. The abortive 1981 Revised Draft then mooted the formerly unknown 巽 and 粪.

<div align="center">
易 *刭 yì easy
賜 赐 *赐 cì grant
踢 *踢 tī kick
惕 *惕 tì cautious
錫 锡 *锡 xī tin
</div>

The 易 and 昜 components were very early mixed up. On Western Han wood slips we find 昜 for 陽 and 扬 for 揚 but also 昜 for 易 and 赐 for 賜. In cursive style both 易 and 昜 turned into 刭. Writers used to this style therefore needed to be reminded of the difference, as in the Tang *Wǔjīng wénzì*: "場 場 [*yì* border]: the former is read 長, the latter 昜."

   The Script Reform Committee's 1956 Scheme prescribed 刭 for 昜 but left 易 intact. Many disregarded the distinction. In 1961 teachers at Dongguan Normal School in Guangdong complained of pupils writing 赐 for 賜. In 1962 Wáng Yún wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "Since 刭 is easy to mix up with 易, mistakes like 容刭 [easy] and 警惕 [vigilance] have appeared". The 1977 Second Scheme proposed to change even 易 to 刭 and so merge this component with 昜. One backer was Xú Zhōnghuá, director of Beijing Normal University:

> For the last twenty years, when 昜 has been shortened to 刭 but 易 has been left unsimplified, one has spent much energy on correcting characters. The popular *Zhèngzì xiǎo zìhuì* published by the Script Reform Publishing House repeatedly points out the difference between 易 and 昜:
>
> 赐 (賜) *cì*. The right side is 易, not 刭 (刭 is the short form of 昜) (p. 17).
>
> 锡 (錫) *xī*. The right side is not 刭 (p. 113).
>
> […]
>
> I fully support this [merger], as there are no overlaps between characters written with 易 and 昜, except 錫 [*yáng* golden adornment for horse] and 锡, of which 錫 is of no practical use.

Others hesitated. Two members of the committee's Character Group "made the reservation that when read *yáng*, 锡 should be provided with a pinyin

notification."[349] The committee found this too messy and excluded the merger of 易 and 多 from its 1981 Revised Draft.

陰 *陰 阴 *yīn* moon, north side of a hill, shade

陰 consists of 阝 (mound), 云 (cloud) and the phonetic 今 *jīn*. The arduous right side came to assume various shapes. Even standardisers wavered, prescribing 陰 in the Han Xīpíng Stone Classics, 陰 in the Wei Zhèngshǐ Stone Classics, 陰 in the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén,* 陰 or 陰 in the Tang *Gānlù zìshū,* 陰 in the Tang *Yùpiān,* 陰 in the 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì,* 陰 in the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng,* 陰 in the 1013 *Yùpiān* and 陰 in the 1039 *Jíyùn.* Later dictionaries stuck to the etymologically correct 陰.

Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprinters dodged the hard part by writing 阴 with 'moon' analogously to 阳 with 'sun'. The form did not become extremely common, appearing in two of our 1900–1954 manuscripts compared with 陰 in eight.

The Education Ministry nevertheless chose the short 阴 for its abortive 1935 List of Short Forms. In 1943 Cáo Bóhán in turn suggested adopting 仌 with its "ancient basis". However, the theory that 陰 is an enlarged 仌 was weakened when the text 其陰其陽 (其陰其陽 this vessel's lid and main part) with 陰 (阴) for 陰 turned up on the Spring and Autumn Earl of Ji cauldron in 1951, suggesting that 云, not 阝 is the later addition. More decisively, 仌 was not in use, being absent on Han to Qing steles and in our 1900–1954 manuscripts. The 1956 Scheme therefore retained 阴, which became official in 1958.

銀 *艮 银 *yín* silver

Liú Fù found 金-less 艮 for 銀 in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. This form was included in *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters" but not in later simplification schemes. In 1952 Jiǎng and Shào found 艮 for 銀 in Ming military documents, but characterised the form as "no longer in common use". Why did writers discard such a handy form? Perhaps because the renminbi currency introduced in 1949 eliminated the the need to specify the earlier gold or silver currencies on price tags.

隱 隐 隐 *yǐn* hidden

See 穩 稳 *wěn.*

---

349   *"Cao'an di yi biao" xiuding qingkuang shuoming,* 1979, p. 4.

嬰 嬰 *妛 *yīng* baby
櫻 櫻 桜 *yīng* cherry

Shibata Masao found the cursive-based 桜 in the 1505 letter writing manual *Unshū ōrai*. In 1949 this form became official in Japan.

In China the 1956 Scheme stipulated 樱 analogously to 婴 for 嬰 and 贝 for 貝. The calligrapher Mǎ Gōngyú objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "嬰 can be simplified to 妛, this form of contraction has been common for a long time." The 1977 Second Scheme repeated Mǎ's proposal. Respondents pointed out that 妛 was easily mixed up with 妥 (*tuǒ* proper), effectively excluding it from the 1981 Revised Draft.[350]

應 応 应 *yīng yìng* respond

The 1956 Scheme changed Chinese 應 to 应, a form based on cursive 应. The square version appears in blockprints from the Yuan onwards.

Japanese writers have been more inventive. A 1367 document in Tōji Temple in Kyoto records events from 歴广四年 (歷應四年 *rikiō yon nen* 1341).[351] However, as 广 came into use for 摩 and 魔, writers took up new forms for 應. In 1750 Kondō Saigai reported two: "応 and 応 are both short for 應."

The home-made 応 became the more popular; appearing in four of our 1900– 1946 manuscripts against 応 in none. The Education Ministry and Language Council proposed 応 in their 1919, 1938 and 1942 schemes and finally recognised the form in 1949.

A shorter form has been in occasional use; as we saw in the 慶 *qìng* section, students at Keio University in Tokyo some times call their school 庆応大学.

營 営 营 *芇 *yíng* operate
螢 蛍 萤 *yíng* firefly
勞 労 劳 *láo* toil
榮 栄 荣 *róng* glory

The official Japanese 営, 蛍, 労 and 栄 are older than the Chinese 营, 萤, 劳 and 荣. Records of point tops begin with 勞, 労, 営 and 栄 on wood slips from the Han, while grass tops begin in the Jin with a 萱 on the Lady Liú epitaph. The latter seem to have emerged from 炊 via 𤇾.

ⱴ tops came to thrive in Japan, even entering the sixteenth-century dictionary *Setsuyōshū*, which advocated writing *idonaru* (run a business) as 営.

---

350   *Qunzhong dui "Cao'an"*, p. 2.
351   *Enshū komonjo sen: Kodai-chusei hen*, item 54.

By the twentieth century ⺍ dominance had become total; our 1900–1946 manuscripts hold fifty-two 営, 労 or 労 but no 营, 劳 or 荣. 営, 労 and 栄 became official in Japan in 1946 and 蛍 in 1981.

Chinese tended to write ⺍ in cursive and ⺋ in square style. Liú Fù found 営 in eight Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprints, 営in none. Our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain eighty 営 against two 营. Unopposed, the grass-topped 营, 萤, 劳 and 荣 became official in February 1956.

In 1960 correspondents from Songxi in Fujian and Gaozhou in Guangdong informed the committee that locals wrote 营 as 艹 with the top only. The following year Dà Guāng wrote in *Hā'ěrbīn wǎnbào*: "Recently I have seen people write […] 蔬菜营业部 (vegetables trade section) as 苶芽艹业卩 […]." 艹业 (open) signs were still common when this author lived in China in 1982, but have since disappeared.

迎 *迊 *yíng* meet

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed 迊 for 迎. Jilin Education Bureau pointed out that "迎 and 迊 have the same stroke number." The Script Reform Committee's Character Group admitted that "迎 has not so many strokes and need not be simplified" and removed 迊 from its 1979 First Revised Draft, then restored it in its likewise abortive 1981 Revised Draft, on the grounds that the form "is extremely common and easier to write than the original character."[352]

迊 is a contraction of 迎, evolving from the 迊 in the 511 Yuán Yuè epitaph, 迊 in the 512 Yuán Quán epitaph and 迊 in the 910 Mù Jūnhóng epitaph.

影 *彤 *yǐng* shadow

In 1958 Hǎo Wànquán wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "If one pays a little attention in one's daily life, one may notice that people often write 舞, 韓, 影 […] as 午, 軔, 彤 […]." Two years later 彤 with the phonetic 井 *jǐng* was mentioned in letters to the Script Reform Committee from Baotou in the north to Nanchong in the south.

Also in 1958, a *Yǔwén xuéxí* article by Xiōng Kāiyín criticised writers who "simplify at will", using forms like 彡 for 影. In 1960 this form was mentioned in letters from Xiamen, Fuzhou and Pucheng and, in 1977, from Hui'an, all in Fujian. In 1981–1986 彡 was identified by informants in Fuzhou, Xiamen,

352   *"Cao'an" di yi biao xiuding qingkuang shuoming*, 1979, p. 7. *Erjian cao'an (yuangao) yu xiuding cao'an (di yi gao) duizhaobiao*, 1979, p. 4. *Di er ci hanzi jianhua fang'an xiuding cao'an*, 1981, p. 6.

Longyan and Yong'an in Fujian but not by those from neighbouring provinces. Understandably, since the 永 phonetic is read ŋ in the rising tone both in Fuzhou and Xiamen, matching 影.

Unsurprisingly the committee chose the shorter and more widespread 彤 for its abortive 1977 Second Scheme.

傭 佣 *yōng* hire *yòng* commission

In June 1956 傭 became 佣, a form known from a 1949 account by the party's Front Support Section in Wuwei in Anhui settling pay to 雇佣工 (雇傭工 hired labourers) and a 1950 report by Beijing Bureau of Commerce on taxation of 佣金 (傭金 agents' commissions).[353]

擁 拥 *yōng* embrace, support

We saw in the 護 *hù* section that 拥 was in use in the Liberated Areas by 1940. In 1954 Yì Xīwú argued in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that 擁 was a distorted form not worth preserving:

> 擁護 […] can be changed according to common writing habits to 拥护. 擁 is a mistake for 攤, first seen on the Han Cáo Quán stele. [The phonetic] 雖 [*yōng* harmonious] became 雘, then 雍 through distortion of 巛 to 亠 and 邑 to 纟 like the left part of 鄉.

擁 was duly changed to 拥 in February 1956.

癰 痈 *yōng* carbuncle

癰 contains the phonetic 雖 (雍) *yōng* which in turn contains the phonetic 邕 *yōng*. In its 1955 Draft the Script Reform Committee proposed to drop one step and write 癕, a form absent in previous records. In *Guāngmíng rìbào* Zhāng Yuǎntí suggested the simpler 痈. The committee welcomed the idea and included 痈 in its 1956 Scheme. The committee associate Chén Guāngyáo described 痈 as "a new picto-phonetic character". Newness may explain why 痈 became official only in 1959.

---

353   *Anhui geming shi huace*, p. 265. Beijing Archives 22-10-317, p. 5.

臃 *胐 *yōng* too fat to move, overstaffed

The Script Reform Committee proposed changing 臃 to 胐 in its 1977 and 1981 schemes. We have no prior record of this 胐.

湧 涌 *yǒng* surge
踴 踊 *yǒng* leap up

We do not know which are older, 湧 and 踴 with the 勇 (*yǒng* brave) phonetic or the now official 涌 and 踊 with 甬 (*yǒng* elevated path). We do know, however, which forms were more common when we meet them on Han steles, which have three 涌 but no 湧 and four 踊 but only one 踴.

Authorities backed practice. *Shuōwén* referred to 涌 and 踊 but mentioned neither 湧 nor 踴. The 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* spelled out that "writing 踴 is wrong." The 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* prescribed 涌 and 踊, conceding that "*Jíyùn* [says] 涌 is also written 湧" and "*Lèipiān* [says] 踊 is also written 踴 with 勇." As late as in 1952 *Rénmín xīn zìdiǎn* thoroughly explained the sense of 踊, just adding that "踴 is the same as 踊."

So it must have struck many as unnecessary when the 1955 Draft offered to simplify 湧 and 踴 to 涌 and 踊. It seems also to have struck the Script Reform Committee, which removed 涌 from the list of simplifications and left it to the 1955 First List of Regulated Variants to abolish 湧 and retain 涌. Somehow 踊 missed this list and ended up in the 1956 Character Simplification Scheme, becoming official in June 1956 with the second batch of simplified characters.

優 優 优 *yōu* excellent
擾 擾 扰 *rǎo* harass

Records of heartless forms begin with 優 on the 167 CE Yáo Temple stele, 夏 on the 168 Héng Fāng stele and 擾 on the 173 Lǐ Yì stele. In 1952 Jiǎng and Shào found 優, 擾 and 夏 (憂 *yōu* worry) in late Ming military documents, and said these forms were still in use at the time.

By then they had met competition with still shorter forms. In his 1931 *Jiǎnzì lùnjí* the reformer Chén Guāngyáo promoted 优, and in 1935 Ōuyáng Zhēn mentioned this 优 among "short forms already in use." By 1950 Huáng Ruòzhōu had sighted the analogous 扰 in Shanghai. This 扰 must have been in use earlier, however, since it appears in Luó Jiālún's 1954 list of "short forms often seen in the [Taiwan] military".

优 and 扰 were included in the 1955 Draft. Shí Hòu confirmed in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that they were well known: "Most of the 798 [proposed] characters are familiar to us, even common, like 拥, 护, 扰 […]." Objections concerned

instead the use of the 尤 *yóu* phonetic in 擾 *rǎo*. Jīn Míngshèng argued in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "I find shortening 優 to 优 suitable, since the readings of 憂 and 尤 are close, but analogously writing 擾 as 扰 is problematic." Yáo Jiāzhēn: "Replacing 優 with 优 is ideal, but shortening 擾 to 扰 fails to express the reading." Chén Guāngyáo, now at the Script Reform Committee, defended the phonetic: "*i-* and *r-* are interchangeable. 日本 [*Rìběn* Japan] is for example read 乙本 [*yiben*] by people in eastern Shandong. Therefore 尤 with *i-* can serve as a phonetic for 擾."

扰 became official in June 1956, four months after the uncontroversial 优. Objectors persisted. In June 1957 Qiū Chángnù of the Chinese Department of Northeast Normal University worried in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that 扰 was easily misread (especially by students in the Northeast who tend to read *yǎo* for 擾). In November Yú Chuánxián countered: "For hundreds and even thousands of years people have steered clear of mixing up 優 and 擾. We can be confident that they will also avoid mixing up 优 and 扰." He got the last word, as the anti-rightist campaign had begun and critics evaporated.

憂 夏 忧 *yōu* worry

In 1952 Jiǎng and Shào found the heartless 夏 in Ming military notes and described it as "still in common use". Accordingly, the 1955 Draft included that form, obviously the shortest its authors could then think of.

The 1956 Scheme, however, came up with the still shorter 忧, a 'heart' plus a 尤 *yōu* phonetic. We have no prior record of use of this form, but we do have a clue to its origin. In 1955 忧 appeared in Chén Guāngyáo's *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ*, marked °, indicating "characters which this author subjectively prefers, selected according to the simplifying principles of 'better short than complex' and 'change the phonetic'." As we know, Chén was at the time employed by the committee. His colleagues pondered for three years, then authorised 忧 in 1959.

猶 犹 *yóu* just as

Liú Fù found 尢, a variant of 尤 (*yóu* outstanding), for the homonymous 猶 in Yuan and Ming blockprints, alongside the picto-phonetic 犹. In Qing prints we find only the latter.

Unopposed, 犹 attained official status in 1956.

<div align="center">

游 *淋 *沈 *yóu* swim, roam
遊 *遊 *yóu* roam

</div>

The Japanese Education Ministry's 1919 Character Regulation Scheme proposed to permit writing 游 and 遊 as 淋 and 遊, contractions which had been common at least since 120 CE, when we find a 淋 on the Zǐ Yóu stele. This proposal would have saved only one stroke and was not repeated.

The Script Reform Committee of China instead let its 1955 First List of Regulated Variants merge 游 and 遊, abolishing the latter. This may have relieved learners, but not writers. So the latter picked up an idea from the 1956 Scheme, which shortened 優 to 优 and 猶 to 犹. In 1960 teachers in Longnan in Jiangxi and Nanchong in Sichuan notified the committee that pupils wrote 游 as 沈. The committee embraced the idea and included 沈 in its 1977 Second Scheme, but not in its 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">

郵 邮 *yóu* post

</div>

In 1936 a letter was sent by the post office in Guiyang to the 邮政局會計股 (post office accounting section) of another. In 1938 a postal form was issued by 唐縣臨時邮政 (The Temporary Postal Administration of Tang County) in Hebei.[354] This 邮 with the phonetic 由 *yóu* became official in China with the 1956 Scheme.

<div align="center">

於 于 *yú* in, at, by, than

</div>

於 (*yú* be in, at, by, than) and 于 (*yú* go to, in, at) were originally different words. Bernhard Karlgren showed that *Zuǒ zhuàn* consistently used 於 before personal names but 于 before place names in the sense of 'at'; the lack of mixing up implied that the two differed even in sound. However, since the forms were mixed up in *Lúnyǔ*, *Mèng zǐ* and other texts from Lu (Shandong), readings must have been merging already in the contemporary Shandong dialect. And elsewhere: 至於太原 (they came to Taiyuan) in the pre-Qin *Shījīng* became 至于太原 in the Han *Shǐjì*. Gāo Hēng collected sixty-two such overlaps from these and other classics.

Tàibái's 1935 "handy characters", *Lúnyǔ*'s "plain stroke characters" and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft aimed to replace 於 with the shorter 于 altogether. The 1956 Scheme, however, passed 於 over. *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn* nevertheless simplified 於 to 于. True, the 1998 edition restored a 於

---

354   Chang 1955, vol. 9, p. 619. *Zhongguo youpiao bowuguan cangpinji*, p. 46.

yú entry, but only to "於 *yú* ㄩ: same as 于." (The surname 於 *Yū* and the exclamation 於 *wū* have kept their entries).

餘 余 *yú* surplus

The 1956 Scheme merged 餘 with the obsolete homonym 余 (*yú* I). It was not an original idea. The early Han Lǎo zǐ B manuscript from Mawangdui has 眾人皆有命 for later versions' 眾人皆有餘 (everybody has enough). The 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* said: "余: same as 餘."

Not everybody approved of the Scheme's merger. Qiū Chángnù of Northeast Normal University worried in *Guāngmíng rìbào* about precision in classic texts, as did Liáng Dōnghàn of Shantou University: "Professor Dèng Guǎngmíng told me that if 餘 is simplified to 余, it will become impossible to distinguish [the *Hòuhàn shū* quote] 餘子碌碌 [*yú zǐ lùlù* the other scholars are mediocrities] from 余子碌碌 [my son is a mediocrity]."

The Script Reform Committee took note. In 1957 Cáo Bóhán offered to revoke forty-two proposed substitutions, including 余 for 餘. In the event a lesser concession was made, in a note to the 1964 General List: "When 余 and 餘 risk being mixed up one uses 餘 as before." The 1986 edition of the General List specified the example 餘年无多 (not have many years left)."

In Japan 余 had become official for 餘 already in 1946.

愚 *忎 *yú* foolish

In 1960 a proofreader from Shanghai and a teacher from Zhenyuan in Guizhou reported use of 忎 for 愚 to the Script Reform Committee, which included the form in List Two of its 1977 Second Scheme. 忎 was ciriticised for its closeness to the proposed 忎 for 感 and was abandoned in the 1981 Revised Draft.

魚 *甶 鱼 *yú* fish

The 1955 Draft proposed to retain 魚 in print but standardise handwriting to 鱼 with a 一 bottom as had been common since the Han and a 〆 top as in cursive 魚. The 1956 Scheme rejected the dual norm, prescribing 甶 for all purposes. This 甶 was close to classic cursive 魚 but not to everyday handwriting; our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain ten 鱼, ten 奥 and one 甶.[355]

Typographers were puzzled, rendering the character 甶, not 甶 in the 1957 edition of *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn*. Reformers took note. In 1957 Cáo Bóhán

---

355   鱼 on 32–6 BCE Wuwei wood slip 82 乙. 甶 in Beijing Archives 22-12-1934, p. 8.

announced: "Originally the components 金, 鳥 and 魚 were [to become] 全, 鸟 and 重. We now propose changing to 全, 鸟 and 鱼." The latter two were included in the 1962 edition of *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn* and the 1964 General List, leaving 鱼 with eight strokes instead of the preferred seven.

The above-mentioned manuscripts contained ten �쁘 with 大. Why write 大 if there is a shorter 一? The editors of the Japanese journal *Sinica* speculated: "The bottom of the 魚 in the 鮨 [*sushi*] on entrance curtains and signs outside sushi places often becomes 大. Is this a claim that the fish part of the sushi is larger than the rice part?"[356] Hardly, as 大 bottoms appeared before sushi restaurants, like in a 鱐 (鯨 *jīng* whale) on a 500–503 statue by Yáng Dàyǎn, in a 奐 in the 515 Huáng Pǔlín epitaph and so on. The roots of 大 are still older. When Yin 倉 (魚) turned into Zhou 쁘, the fish's tail merged with 火 (fire). which became 灬 in clerk style. A minority found the full 火 bottom more stately and wrote 奐, which then became 奐.

<h2 align="center">愉 *忄 yú happy</h2>

In 1960 correspondents from Shanghai, Qianshan in Anhui, Huaiyin in Jiangsu and Guangzhou in Guangdong reported use of 忄 for 愉 to the Script Reform Committee, which included the form in its 1977 Second Scheme. As we saw in the 输 *shū* section, 忄 for 愉 was criticised for being inconsistent with 轧 for 输 and purged from the 1981 Revised Draft.

<h2 align="center">雨*雨 yǔ rain</h2>

The 雨 character or component was contracted to 雨 or 田 in the early Han manuscripts from Mawangdui, to 雨 or 罒 on somewhat younger wood slips from Juyan and Wuwei and to 雨 in a 霄 on the 405 Cuàn Bǎo zǐ stele. The latter top came to dominate, appearing, for example, in thirty-three Later Wei to Qing 霄 (*xiāo* clouds) in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* against 雨 or 罒 in none.

The 1955 Draft proposed to normalise the handwritten form to 雨 but keep 雨 in print, a plan abolished in the 1956 Scheme. The 雨 proposal was repeated in a 1957 article by Cáo Bóhán, in List Two of the 1977 Second Scheme and in the 1981 Revised Draft.

<h2 align="center">與 与 与 yǔ give, together with</h2>

The Japanese Language Council simplified 與 to 与 and the Script Reform Committee of China to 与. Neither step was innovative. *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy

---

356   *Sinica* 2001:6, p. 43.

characters", *Lúnyǔ*'s "plain stroke characters", the Education Ministry's List of Short Forms and the Script Reforms Committee's 1955 Draft and 1956 Scheme all agreed on 与, while the Japanese reform schemes of 1919, 1923, 1926, 1938, 1942 and 1946 all advocated 与 with a piercing 一. This consistency was based on custom. In our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts 与 outnumbers 与 sixty-eight to one, whereas the latter beats the former four to one in our 1900–1946 Japanese texts.

与 was older than the above records. *Shuōwén* said 与 (与) meant "give" and was "the same as 與", which it in turn gave the sense of "ally with". However, even 與 must have had an original sense of 'give' or 'lift', consisting as it does of an object (与) passing between or lifted by two pairs of hands (臼廾). 与 in turn means 'ally with' already by 300 BCE, when it appears in a warning on the *Yǔcōng* (Collected Sayings) wood slips against 与予弜羖⿰ (与不孜教[好學]者遊 associating with those who do not like to study). 与 and 與 were interchangeable.

Users of the full form tended to contract it. On Western Han wood slips Sano Kōichi lists seventeen 畁, eleven 眂 and four 異 among seven 與. These contractions were later outcompeted by still shorter alternatives; our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain, alongside sixty-eight 与, ninety-nine 㐭, twenty-eight 㳿 and five 㦳.

㐭 was a novelty which we first encounter in 1904 letters from Lǔ Xùn. It quickly became popular and, as we shall see in Chapter 4:5, remained so even after 1956.

The puzzling 㳿 emerged via 眂 with a contracted left side in the 499 Yuán Bīn epitaph, 眂 with a contracted right side in the 512 Yuán Quán epitaph, 眂 with a blank right side in Ming blockprints and 㳿 in the above-mentioned Lǔ Xùn letters.

譽 *䜺 誉 *䜺 *奢 *yù* reputation

See 舉 *jǔ*.

禦 御 *yù* resist

The 1956 Scheme merged 禦 (*yù* resist) with 御 (*yù* rule). Chén Guāngyáo argued: "Today 御 is very rarely applied in its original senses of 'drive a chariot', 'rule' or 'majesty', so using it for 禦 will cause no confusion." Merging had long traditions; *Shǐjì*'s 何以禦水 (how shall we withstand the flood) is rendered 何以御水 in *Hànshū*. Gāo Hēng lists thirty-nine such overlaps in the classics.

籲 吁 *yù* plead

The 1955 Draft proposed to merge 籲 with 于 (*yú* at). Táng Bóxiān objected in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*:

> What will the consequences of this change be? Try to read the short sentence 由于請得到援助 [since one appealed for help]. Only after much brain-twisting can we make out what 于 represents here [the *yù* in *yóuyù* (plead for) and not the *yú* in *yóuyú* (since)]. […] 籲 may [instead] be replaced by 竽 [*yù* an ancient pipe instrument], since 竽 is unusual in its original sense and the original and new senses have something in common. 竽 retains the 竹 top of 籲, making it easy to memorise by those who already know 籲.

Pān Yǔnzhōng reported from a meeting at Zhongshan University in Guangzhou that participants were hesitant to use 于 *jy* 55 for 籲, which was read *wɒt* 5 in the local speech, and suggested instead to dispose of the 頁 component and keep 籥.

Professor Xú Shìsōng mooted yet another idea in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "Even if we enforce 玉 and 于 for 鬱 and 籲, this will still feel unfamiliar in practical use. In cases like this I find it better to create new, separate characters. We can, for example, simplify 鬱, 籲, 礬 and 漆 to 杦, 吁, 矾 and 沍."

Cáo Bóhán took a stand in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "In case of necessity, we cannot refrain from ordaining new homophonous substitutions, for example by using 于 or 竽 for 籲. […] Simplifying 籲 to 竽 is somewhat better than using 于, since the 竹 top preserves the link to 籲."

So two promotions of 竽 had been published, one by a Script Reform Committee staff member. It may therefore have been somewhat unexpected when Yè Gōngchuò at the October script reform conference announced the committee's choice of 吁, a character already occurring in the dictionary with the reading *xū* and sense of 'sigh'. Yè admitted that this 吁 was "not established by custom" for 籲. Chén Wénbīn later described the selection process:

> The character 籲 […] is not common alone, but the word 呼籲 [*hūyù* plead] is. 籲 has no current short form, so it was necessary to create one. The masses have proposed many forms for 籲, like 玉, 哢, 竽, 喻 [*yù* explain], 䫉, 凵, 頵, 吁 …, plus the committee's original proposal 于. After deliberation by the Revising Committee and discussions at the script reform conference, the present 吁 was decided by ballot. *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* says '吁 is also read 芋 [*yù*]', which is the same reading as 籲.

吁 became official with the first batch of simplified characters in February 1956.

<p style="text-align:center">鬱 *欝 郁 yù bushy, depressed</p>

Xīnhuá zìdiǎn calls 欝 a variant of 鬱. Once it was more than this, being prescribed by the Sui Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén and Tang Gānlù zìshū. This prescription matches early records, which begin with a 欝 on the 174 CE Zhōu Jǐng stele and continue with sixteen 欝 or 欝 but no 鬱 in Umehara Seizan's register of Later Wei inscriptions.

Shuōwén's 鬱, however, had 凵 and 彡 below. The 837 Jiǔjīng zìyàng reverentially prescribed 鬱, followed by the 1008 Guǎngyùn, 1013 Yùpiān and later dictionaries. Attitudes to the simpler 欝 gradually hardened. The 1039 Jìyùn said 鬱 "is also written 欝", the Yuan Zìjiàn said it was "informally written 欝" and the 1610 Súshū kānwù said "informally written 欝. This is wrong." Admonitions had some effect. Takuhon moji dētabēsu contains ten Qing 鬱 with 凵 and 彡 among twenty-two 欝 with 貝 and 寸.

Neither form of course satisfied the Script Reform Committee, whose 1955 Draft proposed to replace 鬱 with the homonym 玉. Xú Shìsōng thought 玉 for 鬱 would "feel unfamiliar in practical use", the committee associate Cáo Bóhán admitted that the form "lacked a historical basis" while Xú Shìsōng pointed out that 玉 and 鬱 readings differed in the south, giving examples:

	玉	鬱
Beijing	y	y
Shanghai	ɲyoʔ	iœʔ
Guangzhou	iuk	uat
Hakka	ɲiuk	iut
Fuzhou	ŋyk	out

Instead Xú suggested 彬, the beginning and end of 鬱, Táng Bóxiān 凶, the most distinctive part of the character, teachers at Zhongshan University 彗 after the cursive form and others 怃 with 'heart' and a 玉 phonetic.[357]

In the event the 1956 Scheme replaced 鬱 with the homonym 郁 (yù refined). Chén Guāngyáo argued that "[the 1928] Cíhǎi says 郁 and 鬱 may be used interchangeably."

357　Pan 1955. 怃 adherents registered in Chen Guangyao 1956, p. 29.

Ill-will seems to have remained. In 1957 Cái Bóhán offered on behalf of the committee to "change 鬱 to its frame 藜, saving fifteen strokes and avoiding substituting a homonym." The change was not implemented.

<h2 style="text-align:center">遇 *迂 *yù* meet</h2>

Use of 迂 for 遇 was reported in 1950 by Huáng Ruòzhōu in *Wénhuìbào* and in 1952 by Yì Xīwú in *Xīn Jiànshè*: "Some people say: A short form is unsuitable if it coincides with an already existing character, like 迂 for 遇 [which coincides with 迂 for *yū* (winding)]."

迂 was rejected in the 1956 Scheme but included in the 1977 Second Scheme. Fujian Education Bureau, Sichuan Interim Script Reform Working Group and the Culture Office of Jiangxi Revolutionary Committee warned against the misleading first tone in the 于 *yū* phonetic, effectively ousting 迂 from the 1981 Revised Draft.

<h2 style="text-align:center">預 预 *予 *yù* beforehand
豫 *予 *yù* pleased, Henan</h2>

In 1957 Fán Jiāng saw 予 for 預 in the works of Zhejiang students and Zhū Qìngxià in Suzhou stencils. In 1962 Chóng Wén complained in *Guāngmíng rìbào*:

> 予 is read in the second tone and means 'I' in classical Chinese. It is also read in the third tone in the sense of 'give'. Now, however, there are many who use 予 as a substitute for 預 (which is read in the fourth tone) like in 予防麻疹 [*yùfáng mázhěn* prevent measles]. There are also those who use it as a substitute for 豫 (read in the fourth tone). Both these practices are wrong.

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed to make them right. Fujian Education Bureau and Sichuan Interim Script Reform Working Group warned against adding a new reading to an existing character, thereby ousting both substitutions from the 1981 Revised Draft.

Differences in reading were no obstacle in Japan, where 預, 豫 and 予 are all read *yo*, making substitution less problematic. Shibata Masao found 予 for 豫 already in a 1233 manuscript by Fujiwara no Teika and Yamada Tadao did so in a sixteenth-century transcript of *Wa-Kan rōei shichū*. In 1946 this practice became official.

<div align="center">

淵 渊 *渁 *yuān* abyss

</div>

渊 became official for 淵 in China in 1964. This seems to have been the common short form, appearing in the 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn*, in the "handy characters" used in *Tàibái* in 1935 and in two of our 1900-1954 manuscripts.

渁 with the added ｜ may have developed via 淵 as on the 185 CE Cáo Quán stele, 渊 in the 531 Yuán Tiānmù epitaph, 渊 on the 567 Xīyuèhuáshān Temple stele and 渊 in the 575 Yuán Sháo epitaph, analogously to 肅 for 肅.

渁 was not common in Japan, where our 1900–1946 manuscripts turn up twelve 渊 and three 渁 but no 渊. 淵 may have turned into 渁 via 渁 as on the 496 Wáng Yuán epitaph, 渁 in the 499 Yuán Bì epitaph, 渊 on a 502 statue by Sūn Qiūshēng, 渁 on a 524 Buddha portrait by Sūn Liáo and 渁 on the 530 Xuē Fèngwán stele. The addition of 丶 and then ｜ may have been an attempt to turn the right edge into the more familiar component 刂 (knife). While Chinese records of 渁 cease in the Song, Japanese ones continue, perhaps influenced by the 渁 used by the ninth-century sect founder and calligrapher Kūkai.

Somewhat surprisingly, the Japanese Education Ministry's 1919 Character Regulation Scheme and the ensuing 1938 and 1942 schemes proposed 渁, not 渁. In 1946 淵 did not become a Character for Current Use so no decision was made on its form. Use of 渁 has nevertheless continued, also in print.

<div align="center">

原 *元 *厡 *yuán* original
源 *沅 *泈 *yuán* source

</div>

Liú Fù found 元 (*yuán* first) for 原 in Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprints and Hú Xíngzhī in 1935 handwriting. An analogous 沅 was called informal for 源 in the 1927 *Píngmín zìdiǎn*.

A more specific short form for 原 had been invented by 1942, when Central Jiangsu Party Committee wrote that its armed forces 完成了坚持厡地斗争的任务 (had accomplished the task of holding their original territory). In 1950 Guanghua Match Factory in Hangzhou tallied its stock of 厡料 (原料 raw materials).[358] An analogous 泈 for 源 was reported in the 1951 *Jiǎnbǐzì*. In 1959 Lǐ Cuìhé mentioned in *Wénzì gǎigé* that "some write 原 as 元, others as 厡." The latter came to dominate. Between 1960 and 1977 nineteen letters to the Script Reform Committee reported sightings of 厡 for 原 against one 元. The committee duly selected 厡 for its 1977 Second Scheme. Choosing a form for 源 was less straightforward; seven correspondents had reported 沅, three 泈. The committee opted for the shorter and apparently more common 沅.

---

358 *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 97. Hangzhou Archives 94-1-1, p. 185.

Fujian Education Bureau objected that 沅 was not analogous to 尻, Yunnan Script Reform leading Group that "沅 for 源 is easily mixed up with 沅水 [*Yuánshuǐ* Yuan River] in Hunan." The dialectographer Lǐ Róng provided an example: "The 27 December 1978 issue of *Guāngmíng rìbào* carries a photograph with the caption '… a train on the Zhicheng-Liuzhou railway crossing the bridge over 源江'." The Beijing typesetters had taken the manuscript's correct 沅 for a shortened 源. The committee responded by changing 沅 to 浉 in its also rejected 1981 Revised Draft.

<div align="center">

園 园 *yuán* garden
遠 远 *yuǎn* distant

</div>

园 and 远 with 元 *yuán* for the original 袁 *yuán* phonetic appear in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. Both forms appeared in the Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1956 Scheme. The official status of 园 was delayed until June that year, presumably because of doubts concerning the overlapping proposal to let 园 represent 圓.

<div align="center">

圓 *园 圆 円 元 *yuán* circle, dollar

</div>

'Circle' was originally written 圓 (員) with a circle depicting the brim of a cauldron (鼎). The frame distinguishing 'circle' from 'official' had appeared by 433 BCE, when we find a 圓 on a bamboo slip from the grave of Marquis Yǐ of Zeng. Frameless 'circles' did not disappear immediately. *Mèng zǐ* says 規矩方員之至也 (the compass and the carpenter's square are the best means for constructing squares and circles). On banknotes issued in Taiwan as late as in the aftermath of the 1894–1895 Sino-Japanese war Lǐ Wěi registered the denominations 壹大員 (one yuan), 伍大員 (five yuan) and 拾大員 (ten yuan).

By then shorter alternatives had turned up. In Yuan blockprints Liú Fù found 园 not only for 園 but also for 圓. On banknotes issued in 1904 Lǐ Wěi came upon the text 湖北官錢局銀元票。憑票取銀元壹大元 (Hubei Monetary Authority Silver Yuan Note. For this note collect one yuan in silver currency). The latter way of designating the 圓 currency became the most popular. In our 1900–1954 manuscripts we find one hundred and sixty 元 for 圓 against one 园 and no 員 (and, by the way, just eight 圓, 圎 or 圆).

In spite of this the *Tàibái* editors chose 园 for 圓 for their 1935 "handy characters", merging it with 園 which was also set to become 园. The Education Ministry dodged the problem by leaving 圓 out of its ensuing List of Short Forms, letting 园 represent 園 only.

The Script Reform Committee followed practice and chose 元 for its 1955 Draft. The People's Political Consultative Conference member Zēng Zhāolún

objected: "Changing the 圓 on banknotes to 元 is no problem, but it is worth pondering whether it is suitable to change the 圓 used in geometry to 元. The best would be to ask the mathematicians. 园 has long been used as short for 圓 in mathematics, where it is now common." So the change to 元 was abandoned. *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn* conceded, however, that "as a currency unit 圓 is also written 元."

In 1964 圓 became 圆 analogously to 贝 for 貝. For heavy users this was not short enough. Jīn Huá wrote in 1966 that "students say their maths teachers write 园 for 圆 all the time."

The 1977 Second Scheme repeated the 元 proposal. Criticism was also repeated. Yunnan Script Reform Leading Group pointed out that the geometric figure 圆 would coincide with the 元 (unknown) in an equation. Fujian Education Bureau feared mixing up of 圆月 (full moon) and 元月 (the first month of the lunar year). The Culture Office of Jiangxi Revolutionary Committee worried that 圆蛋 (round eggs) might be confused with 元旦 (new year), as even 蛋 was proposed to become 旦. The change was duly withdrawn from the 1981 Revised Draft.

But not from use. The Beijing teacher Wáng Yǒushēng criticised shop advertisements like 两用元珠笔 (dual-use ball-point pens) in 1985, and his Anhui colleague Wáng Guólín noted 桂元 (桂圆 *guìyuán* dried longan) price tags in 2011.

In Japanese 元 *gen* was no potential short form for 圓 *en*, nor a necessary one, as locals had solved the 圓 conundrum with the stroke of a pen, copying Kūkai's 806 圎 and Ryōgen's 972 円. Later writers came to prefer the latter, thus keeping the character distinct from 國 which was sometimes shortened much like 圎. In our 1900–1919 manuscripts 円 outnumbers 圎 twenty to eight, in 1940–1946 ones eleven to one. The Education Ministry's 1919 Character Regulation Scheme duly proposed 円, followed by the 1923, 1926, 1938 and 1942 schemes and the decisive 1946 List of Characters for Current Use.

願 愿 *顛 *頢 *忎 *恖 *yuàn* wish

Shuōwén said 願 "consists of 頁 and the phonetic 原." Writers certainly needed reminding. Records begin with 顛 in the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts and continue with 頢 on Later Wei steles and 顛 on the 458 Cuàn Bǎo stele. Before 500 we find only one form with 原, a 願 on a Han wood slip from Dingxian. Even standardisers wavered. The 175 CE Xīpíng Stone Classics advocated 頢 and the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* 顛. *Shuōwén*'s 願 was recognised as equivalent to 頢 by the 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì* and prescribed by the

1008 *Guǎngyùn*. Later dictionaries followed the latter and, with time, writers. Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contain thirty-one 願 against seven 顚.

Someone dug up a shorter homonym. In the blockprinted Yuan drama *Zhōu gōng shèzhèng* (Duke Zhōu As Regent) the line "I wish to explore the will of the gods for three days" is rendered 愿三天神意察愿 with 愿 (*yuàn* sincere) for 願. Wú Liángzuò found 愿 for 願 in documents from the Taiping Rebellion, and Mathews' 1931 dictionary said 愿 interacted with 願. Far from everybody used the form, however; our 1940–1954 manuscripts contain seven 顾 but no 愿. The Script Reform Committee included 愿 in its 1956 Scheme, but hesitated until 1964 before making the form official.

By then still shorter forms had appeared. In 1958 Jì Dá wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that "Everybody shortens 願 to 忈 (the proposed form is 愿)", while Lǐ Cuìhé advocated 忈. The two forms seem to have become equally common, each being mentioned in three letters to the committee.[359]

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed the shorter 忈. The education bureaus of Jilin and Fujian advocated 厡 analogously to the proposed 厡 for 原. The committee complied, proposing 厡 in its also abortive 1981 Revised Draft.

躍 跃 *yuè* leap

The 1956 Scheme prescribed 跃, a form not on prior record. Chén Guāngyáo claimed in his 1956 *Jiǎnhuà hànzì zìtǐ shuōmíng* that 跃 was "established by custom", although his preceding *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ* made no mention of the form. Tellingly recognition of 跃 was delayed until 1959.

嶽 岳 *yuè* high mountain

Both forms appeared in *Shuōwén*, which called 𭁚 (岳) an "ancient form" for 嶽. The 1946 List of Current Characters made 岳 the sole standard in Japan and the 1955 First List of Regulated Variants in China.

雲 云 *yún* cloud

The 雨 top was a late Zhou addition. Yin diviners asked whether 𢆶云其雨 (兹云其雨 these clouds will become rain). Topless 云 for 雲 reappeared in Yuan, Ming and Qing blockprints.

The 1955 Draft proposed to make that practice official. Critics were rebuffed in *Guāngmíng rìbào* by Cáo Bóhán: "Some have opposed letting 云

---

359 忈 in letters from Changzi, Hefei and Nanchong, 厡 in letters from Qianshan, Zhangzhi and Anyang.

replace 雲, since these two characters are read differently in Fujian. However, 云 is the ancient form for 雲 and is a part of 雲, so 云 may replace 雲 even if dialect readings differ." So the 1956 Scheme retained 云 for 雲.

運 运 *yùn* transport

运 with the 云 phonetic appears in a 1943 directive by the Administrative Office of Southern Jiangsu promoting 民主运动 (the democratic movement). It became official for 運 in February 1956.[360]

醞 酝 *yùn* brew

Chén Guāngyáo called 酝 "established by custom" in 1956. We find no trace of this custom, which was not mentioned even in Chén's own *Chángyòng jiǎnzì pǔ* a year before. The reformer Yì Xīwú mentioned 酝娖 (醞釀 brew) among unfamiliar characters generated by the committee. Not surprisingly, 酝's official status was delayed until 1959.

雜 雜 *槑 *什 杂 *zá* mixed

In the early Han Mawangdui manuscripts 雜 is written 襟 with a distinct 集 (collected) on the right and 衣 (clothes) on the left, but also 襟 or 雜 with 木 sliding left. This relocation left more space for 隹 but less for 衣, which was squeezed to 尢 in the 雜 on the 153 CE Yǐ Yīng stele and to 九 in Wáng Xiànzhī's 雜. The transfer of 木 gave 雜 the characteristic left side 杂, which came to be used for the whole character, as in the early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì*.

In 1935 the editors of the Shanghai *Tàibái* chose this 杂 for their "handy characters", while their colleagues at *Lúnyǔ* opted for the still shorter almost-homonym 什, an elaborate form of 十 (*shí* ten). The Education Ministry followed *Tàibái* in choosing 杂 for its List of Short Forms, rejecting characters "used in one area only, like […] 什 which is used for 雜 in Fujian and Guangdong".

什 could stand in for 雜 because the two are sound-alikes not only in parts of Fujian and Guangdong, but also somewhat further north:

	Beijing	Guangzhou	Xiamen	Fuzhou	Wenzhou	Shanghai	Nanjing
雜	*tsa* 35	*tʃɒp* 22	<u>*tsap*</u> 5	*seiʔ* 4	*zø* 212	<u>*zɒ*</u> 23	*tsaʔ* 44
什／十	*ʃʔ* 35	*ʃap* 22	<u>*tsap*</u> 5	*tsaʔ* 4	*zai* 212	<u>*zɒ*</u> 23	*sʔʔ* 44

---

360 *Jiangsu kangzhan*, p. 110.

By the 1950s another alternative had turned up. In his 1931 *Jiǎnzì lùnjí*, Chén Guāngyáo suggested 杂, the left side of 雜. In 1934 Xú Zémǐn noticed use of this 杂 by his Nanjing students, and in 1951 the Shanghai *Jiǎnbǐzì* listed 杂, alongside 什, among "characters already in use in society."

For its 1955 Draft the Script Reform Committee chose 杂, shorter than 条 and less ambiguous than 什, which it had reserved for 甚 (*shén* what). Lǐ Zhúchén pointed out: "Some characters [in the Draft], like 买, 尘, 帀 and 杂, are a bit hard to make out, because they are cursive forms turned into square form [like 买], revived ancient forms [like 尘], common only in one profession [like 帀] or common in a particular area [like 杂]." The committee admitted that "some characters in the Draft are not consistent with the established-by-custom principle, like 孕, 杂 and 汉 for 導 (导), 雜 (什) and 漢 (汗)."[361] At the October script reform conference Yè Gōngchuò nevertheless defended the selected 杂: "In the Wu dialect area [round Shanghai] 什 is used for 雜. However, in other areas 什 is not read 雜, besides 什 has other functions [like *shén* 'what' and *shí* 'ten']. Usually 雜 is shortened to 杂, so we adopted 杂." 杂 became official in June 1956 with the Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters.

As late as in 1959 Liáng Dōnghàn of Shantou University put in a word for 什: "In the Wu dialect area 杂志 is shortened to 什志, as 杂 and 什 are read identically. By now 什 has been absorbed into the writing of the whole country." Perhaps so, but by the 1980s it had retreated back to the south. This author's last records of 什 for 杂 are 1988 advertisements for 什柴 (various kinds of firewood) in Hangzhou in Zhejiang, 山货日什 (utensils and daily necessities) in Raoping in Guangdong, 外科什症 (surgery on various ailments) in Shantou in Guangdong and a 籿果什店 (糖果杂店sweets and fruit shop) in Wenzhou in Zhejiang.

Wáng Xiànzhī's 雜 spread to Japan but not later forms. Uncontested, 雜 entered the 1949 List of Forms.

贓 赃 *zāng* stolen goods

Jiǎng and Shào found 赃 for 贓 in late Ming military notes from Beijing. The phonetic 庄 *zhuāng* does not fit 贓 in the north, but does in the south, from where 赃 presumably stems:

---

361   *Wenzi gaige cankao ziliao*, p. 4.

	Beijing	Suzhou	Nanchang	Fuzhou	Guangzhou
贜	tsaŋ 55	<u>tsɒŋ</u> 44	<u>tsɔŋ</u> 42	<u>tsouŋ</u> 44	tʃɔŋ 55
庄	tʂuaŋ 55	<u>tsɒŋ</u> 44	<u>tsɔŋ</u> 42	<u>tsouŋ</u> 44	tʃɔŋ 55

赃 continued in use even in the north. In 1917 the Beijing police reported that the morphine addict Lǐ Xiùchāng had run off with a bamboo curtain 手携赃 (*shǒu xié zāng* carrying the booty in his hands).[362] The 1927 Shanghai *Píngmín zìdiǎn* called 赃 short for 贜.

赃 became official in 1959. The three years' delay may have been due to worries about the ill-fitting phonetic 庄 or, more probably, to indecision concerning the 貝/贝 component.

臟 脏 *zàng* internal organs
髒 脏 *zāng* dirty

The 1955 Draft proposed to replace 髒 and 臟 with 脏. Use of 脏 for 臟, but not for 髒, had been mentioned by Chén Guāngyáo in 1936 and by Huáng Ruòzhōu in 1950. Chén wrote in 1956 that 脏 was "established by custom" for 臟 but made no such claim for 髒, whereas his fellow reformer Yì Xīwú called 脏 "newly created" and meant phrases like 肮脏 (dirty) and 五脏 (the five internal organs) "may cause problems with reading,"

The October Revised Draft proposed to to distinguish 髒 from 臟 by changing it to the "already common" 肬 with the phonetic 丈 *zhàng*. The 1956 Scheme nevertheless stuck to 脏 for both 髒 and 臟. In 1957 Cáo Bóhán on behalf of the of the Script Reform Committee offered to refrain from changing 髒. 臟 finally became 脏 in 1959 and 髒 in 1964.

Further south 肬 has been used for 肠 *cháng* intestines.

藏 蔵 *茬 *芷 *zàng* Tibetan *cáng* conceal

Japanese 蔵 differs from Chinese 藏 in having a planed 爿 (plank) on the left. Planed 藏 appear already on Han wood slips and were later promoted by luminaries like Wáng Xīzhī, Yú Shìnán and Chǔ Suìliáng and by writing manuals like the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* and Tang *Yùpiān*.

Bald left sides contradicted *Shuōwén*, which spelled out that 臧 consists of 臣 and 戕 which in turn consists of 爿 and 戈. The Song *Yùpiān* put things right by restoring 爿 in 藏, followed by later dictionaries. Unsurprisingly,

362   J181-19-14716, p. 1.

many stuck to Wáng Xīzhī's sleeker 蔵, notably the Japanese Language Council, which gave 蔵 official status in 1949.

蔵 was common even in China but not short enough for the Script Reform Committee, whose 1955 Draft instead advocated 茋. Chén Guāngyáo explained in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "藏 […] has no suitable short form. […] When the Draft adopted 茋, the idea was to link up with 脏 [for 臟] and 赃 [for 贓]". Fellow reformer Yì Xīwú pointed out that "newly created" forms like 茋 "may cause problems with reading." The 1956 Scheme duly abandoned 茋.

Demand for a short 藏 remained. Chén suggested 芰 with the phonetic 丈 *zhàng* "since there are already people who write 臟 as 肬". Jì Dá promoted 犾 in *Wénzì gǎigé*, while a group of Hunan teachers proposed 歹 in a letter to the committee.[363] Wú Dípíng of the Central Nationalities Institute wrote: "Some Tibetan students find the name of their ethnic group too hard to write. Since they use it every day and cannot avoid writing it, they have simplified it to 芰. Although this creation of theirs does not make sense, one can understand how they feel." In 1957 Zhū Qìngxià from Suzhou near Shanghai complained in *Yǔwén zhīshí* that "writers simplify at will," producing characters like 芷, with the local phonetic 上 *zāŋ* 231 for 藏 *zāŋ* 231.

Three forms came to wider use. In 1958 Wēn Yìngshí wrote that 芷 was "common among the people in Shanghai." Wáng Qí wrote: "In common handwriting some now use 芰 and some 芷, there are also those who turn 芷 into 茋, the situation is rather confused." From 1960 to 1977 Chén's 芰 was reported in letters sent to the committee from Siping in Jilin, Baotou in Inner Mongolia and Pengshan and Xichang in Sichuan; the committee's 茋 in sixteen letters; and the people's 芷 in more than thirty letters from all over.

For its 1977 Second Scheme the committee selected 芷. Few objected. Xinjiang Script Reform Committee said "the phonetic 上 is inconsistent with the reading in the standard language." Sichuan Interim Script Reform Working Group argued for 芰, "which represents the sound better (although there is a difference between tongue-tip and retroflex sounds). This 芰 has been common in Sichuan for many years and has a firm basis among the masses." The 1981 Revised Draft nevertheless retained 芷.

True, 芰 was common in Sichuan. In 1981–1986 it was identified by informants in Chengdu, Chongqing, Wanxian and Yajiang in Sichuan, in Guiyang and Xingyi in adjacent Guizhou and in Shashi in western Hubei, but not elsewhere. Sichuan reformers were obviously promoting a lost cause.

Soon the form would be forgotten even in Sichuan. Our youngest informant to recognise 芰 in our post-2010 survey was an engineer from Chengdu born

---

363   Chen Guangyao (1954) 1955, p. 31. 1955 letter from Changsha. Ji 1958, p. 15.

in 1960. The committee's 茊 proved even less resilient, being unknown to all post-2010 informants.

鑿 凿 *záo* chisel

Pre-1955 short forms for 鑿 are rare. Liú Fù found 茊 in the 1862–1874 blockprint *Lǐngnán yìshǐ*, Chén Guāngyáo promoted 凿 in his 1936 *Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo* and Huáng Ruòzhōu registered 凿 in his 1950 *Chángyòng jiǎntǐzì huì*. In 1952 Wèi Jiàngōng, member of the Committee for Research on Script Reform and later of the Script Reform Committee, mooted something shorter in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "鈼 appears both in *Yùpiān* and *Lóngkān shǒujìng*, but if we are to apply the copy-but-not-create principle, it feels a bit 'bookish' and not as easy to grasp as a change to 峜."

So the 1955 Draft advanced 峜. The public was puzzled. Shí Hòu described 峜 as "unfamiliar" and Jīn Míngshèng as "simply made up by the Script Reform Committee". Guǎn Xièchū suggested a change to 鈼 instead. Committee chairman Wú Yùzhāng explained to the People's Political Consultative Conference that "a small part of the common characters have no generally used short forms," therefore "a very small number of [Draft] characters are new creations, like 峜 for 鑿."

The October Revised Draft enlarged 峜 to 凿, "according to the opinions of the masses" as the attached comment said, tellingly not "according to the habits of the masses". Unsurprisingly offical status for 凿 was delayed until 1958.

棗 枣 *zǎo* Chinese date

枣 with 𠔃 for 朿 is known in China since the early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì* and in Japan since Dazai Shundai's 1753 *Wakai seika* (Right and Wrong in Japanese Square Style). Use of the repetition sign 𠔃 makes 枣 analogous to the Japanese 塁 for 壘 and 摂 for 攝 described in the 轟 *hōng* and 攝 *shè* sections.

枣 became official in China in 1958.

竈 灶 *zào* cooking stove

The complex form was a challenge for writers of all stripes. In 1954 one Yǐ Zhī recalled his school days in *Yǔwén zhīshí*:

> 'Everybody take note: no short forms!' After issuing this firm directive, Teacher Wáng started pacing up and down the classroom. 'Teacher, how does one write the 竈 in 爐竈?' one pupil asked over his composition.

Himself uncertain, teacher Wáng could only answer 'this character need not be written in the full form, just write like this' and wrote a swift 灶 in the pupil's notebook.

The fire-and-earth stove is known since the 1212 *Wǔyīn jíyùn*, which called 灶 "informal" for 竈. This short form had met competition by 1922, when Professor Qián Xuántóng noticed a 修理爐皂 (repair of cooking stoves) sign with 皂 (*zào* black) for 竈. In 1931–1937 correspondence between Beiping Bureau of Social Affairs and The Kitchen God Temple, the latter is variously called 竈君庙, 灶君庙 or 皂君庙.[364]

Reformers opted for 灶, including that form in *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters", the Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1956 Scheme.

<div align="center">

澤 泽 沢 泽 *zé* pool
擇 择 択 择 *zé* select

</div>

See 釋 *shì*.

<div align="center">

增 増 *圦 *坛 *垶 *坤 *zēng* increase

</div>

The Japanese Language Council shortened 增 with 囲 to 増 with 田 analogously to 層 for 層. The Script Reform Committee of China left 增 alone.

The Chinese public did not. In 1956 *Yǔwén xuéxí* related:

> Comrade Zhū Míng says he received a message from the Zhejiang branch of the People's Bank of China containing the phrase 坛設. He searched the Character Simplification Scheme and found that 坛 is short for 壇, but this did not make sense. Afterwards he deduced that this 坛 must be short for 增 [and 坛設 for *zēngshè* extend].[365]

This 坛 is analogous to 层 for 層 and of similar age, appearing in a 1942 regulation by the Administrative Office of Central Jiangsu curbing 坛加 (增加 increase) of land rents and in a 1953 complaint by Hangzhou Public Health Bureau about new policies which 坛加了手续 (have increased formalities).[366] In 1980 坛 was used for 增 in stencilled texts from Nanjing University. This East China bias may explain why the Beijing-based Script Reform Committee chose to use 坛 for 壇, not 增.

---

364 Beijing Archives J2-8-377, J2-8-627, J2-8-962, J2-8-1219.
365 *Yuwen xuexi tonglian zu* 1956.
366 *Jiangsu kangzhan,* p. 108. Hangzhou Archives 87-1-15, p. 68.

In 1958 Xióng Kāiyín complained in *Yǔwén xuéxí* that many "simplify at will" and write 增 as 坿. Reports of 坿 or 塯 continue in 1960 letters to the committee from Shijiazhuang, Luoyang and Changsha and end with a 1976 letter from a teacher in Jinan.

圦 appears in a 1956 report from Hangzhou Employment Office that wages had 圦长 (increased) by 6.45% after a reform, and in a memo from Hangzhou Public Health Bureau urging to 圦阔宿舍 (increase accommodation facilities) for workers.[367] In 1960 圦 was mentioned in letters to the committee from Hangzhou, Yongkang and Taishun, all in Zhejiang. In 1981–1986 圦 was identified as 增 by informants in Hangzhou, Huzhou, Jiaxing, Shaoxing, Ningbo, Linhai, Jinhua, Lishui and Wenzhou in Zhejiang and by one in Shanghai but by none in surrounding provinces.

圢 was mentioned in letters sent in 1960 to the Script Reform Committee from Shanghai and from Ningbo in Zhejiang. In 1962 Zhāng Yǒngmián found both 圢 and 圦 for 增 in university entrance exams of Zhejiang students. In 1981–1986 圢 was identified as 增 in Shanghai and in Hangzhou, Huzhou, Shaoxing and Ningbo in northern Zhejiang but not elsewhere.

坤 was described as a short form for 增 in letters sent in 1960 from Changzhi in Shanxi, Zhengzhou in Henan and Wuhan in Hubei. In 1963 Ní Shìzhōng wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that students and even teachers of Jincheng Normal School in Shanxi wrote 坤 or 塯 for 增. Later that year Professor Zuǒ Mín'ān complained in *Níngxià rìbào* about slogans like 坤强仗心 (*zēng-qiáng xìnxīn* let us increase trust). These records cluster in the Northwest. In 1962 坤 was unknown to the Beijing-based philologist Lín Hàndá, who wrote in *Guāngmíng rìbào*:

> The cartoon showed a stupefied Cāng Jié [the mythical inventor of the Chinese script] staring at the five characters 氵囗玑坤仴. Neither of these 'simplified characters' has been declared official. Of the five, 氵 (漆) and 囗 (器) have by now come to be used by many, but it was the first time I saw 玑 [現] and 坤, which I to this day do not know how to read. 仴 may be a contraction of 人民币.

In 1981–1986 坤 was identified as 增 in Taiyuan, Changzhi and Yangquan in Shanxi and in nearby Xingtai and Baoding in Hebei and, unexpectedly, in faraway Dalian in Liaoning, but not elsewhere.

We would expect 圦, 圢 and 坤 to be local because local readings fit the phonetics on the right, but that link is not stronger than in some other places:

---

367   Hangzhou Archives 94-1-104, p. 97; 87-2-35, p. 4.

	Beijing	Nanjing, Jiangsu	Shanghai	Hangzhou, Zhejiang	Wenzhou, Zhejiang	Taiyuan, Shanxi	Changsha, Hunan
增	*tsəŋ* 55	*tsən* 31	<u>*tsəŋ*</u> 53	*tsən* 323	<u>*tsaŋ*</u> 44	*tsəŋ* 11	<u>*tsən*</u> 33
人	*zən* 35	*zən* 13	*zəŋ* 113	*szən* 212	*zaŋ* 31	*zən* 11	*zən* 13
<u>正</u>_{正月}	*tʂəŋ* 55	*tsən* 31	<u>*tsəŋ*</u> 53	*tsən* 323	<u>*tseŋ*</u> 44	*tsəŋ* 11	<u>*tsən*</u> 33
中_{当中}	*tʂuŋ* 55	*tʂoŋ* 31	*tsoŋ* 53	*tsoŋ* 323	*tɕyoŋ* 44	*tʂuŋ* 11	<u>*tsən*</u> 33

This is all history. Our youngest informant to identify 坤 as 增 was a Shanxi teacher born in 1965, the youngest to identify 垭 was a Hangzhou university teacher born in 1971 and the youngest to identify the phrase 坛加 as 增加 was a Hangzhou office employee born in 1978.

齋 斎 斋 *zhāi* room

In 1956 Chén Guāngyáo wrote: "斋 (齋) is a character established by custom. There is also a habit of writing 亝, but 亝 is also an ancient form for 齐, so it was not adopted." Yes, 亝 is a very ancient form of 齊/齐, which is written 𪔅 on Zhou bronzes and 亝 in *Shuōwén*. 齊 *dziei* was often mixed up with 齋 *tʂai*, however, so 亝 came to be used even for the latter. *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn* records of this begin with the 1171 東屯高亝記 (Chronicle of the Venerable Residence in Dongtun).

斋 appears in the 1212 *Sìshēng piānhǎi*. The change from 齋 is less arbitrary than it looks. 𣥶 became 乂 as in 齐 for 齊, leaving 斋, whose bottom changed from 𠕲 to 𠕁 to 而.

By the twentieth century 斋 had come to dominate, appearing in sixteen of our 1900–1954 manuscripts against one 亝 and one 斎. Unsurprisingly 斋 was proposed by *Tàibái, Lúnyǔ* and the Education Ministry in 1935 and recognised by the Script Reform Committee in 1958.

In Japan 斋 was less successful. The 1705 *Dōbun tsūkō* said 斋 was the same as 齋, yes, but later 斋 records are lacking. The Japanese 1919, 1923, 1926, 1938, 1942 and 1946 reform schemes as well as the decisive 1946 List of Characters for Current Use all promoted 斎.

寨 *窄 *zhài* stockade

In 1960 a correspondent from Rongjiang Middle School in Guizhou reported use of 窄 for 寨 to the Script Reform Committee. Presumably locals needed a short form to write 寨蒿 *Zhàihāo*, a district in Rongjiang County. The 在 *zài* phonetic makes sense to locals, who read both this and 寨 as *tsai* 13.

窄 might have lingered on in obscurity, had not Dazhai in Shanxi become

a model village in 1964 and calls to 学大寨 (study Dazhai) and then to 学大窑 turned up all over China. In 1976 窑 was mentioned in letters to the committee from Taihe in Anhui, Ningqiang in Shaanxi, Santai in Sichuan and Gejiu in Yunnan.

So the committee selected 窑 for its 1977 Second Scheme. Jilin Education Bureau wrote: "People in the Northeast tend to read 寨 as *zài*. Simplifying like this will make the correct reading still harder to learn." Corresponding organs in Beijing, Tianjin, Heilongjiang, Hubei, Jiangsu, Shanghai, Zhejiang, Fujian, Yunnan and Xinjiang made the same point, effectively barring 窑 from the 1981 Revised Draft.

By then Dazhai slogans had become scarce, and so had the short form. Our youngest informants to recognise 窑 was born in 1979.

氈 *氊 毡 *zhān* felt

毡 with the 占 *zhān* phonetic for the older 亶 *dàn* appears on the 1740 Shànhuà Temple stele and became official in 1959.

展 *居 *㠯 *zhǎn* open up

In 1958 Xióng Kāiyín complained in *Yǔwén xuéxí* that some writers "simplify at will", writing 屉 for 展. The following year Hǎo Niànxún wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that 居 was "already in common use among the masses" and Lǐ Cuìhé that "some write 展 as 㠯, others as 㠯." In 1960 correspondents from Rongjiang, Lu'an, Taishun and Xiamen reported use of 尺 for 展 to the Script Reform Committee (this 尺 was also reported in the sense of 层). 㠯 became the more common form, mentioned in thirteen 1975–1977 letters to the committee against 屉 in two, 㠯 in two and 居 and 尺 in none.

The committee chose 居 with the 占 *zhan* phonetic for its 1962 List of Simplified Characters, but the shorter and more common 㠯 for its 1977 Second Scheme. Yè Nán objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào* that "the 㠯 top sticks out and creates associations with the 尸 in 尸体 [*shītǐ* dead body]." Beijing Education Section wrote: "Some say […] 㠯 looks like a body on a stretcher." Needless to say, 㠯 was ousted from the 1981 Revised Draft.

戰 戦 战 *zhàn* war

战 with the phonetic 占 was found by Jiǎng and Shào in late Ming military documents and in Qing blockprints by Liú Fù. This form became official in China in 1956. In Japan where 战 was absent 戰 became 戦 in 1949 analogously to 单 for 單.

長 长 *zhǎng* grow
張 张 *zhāng* display

See 長 *cháng*.

趙 *赵 赵 Zhào

赵 and 赵 turn up in Qing blockprints and then in our 1900–1954 manu-scripts, the former in seven and the latter in two. In 1935 the Education Ministry chose the apparently less common 赵 for its List of Short Forms, as did the Script Reform Committee for its 1955 Draft.

As we have seen, the Draft was criticised for its extensive use of 又 in 邓 for 鄧, 对 for 對, 凤 for 鳳, 观 for 觀, 汉 for 漢, 欢 for 歡, 双 for 雙 and 戏 for 戲. The committee responded by changing 赵 to 赵, authorising the latter in June 1956 with its Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters. Chén Guāngyáo explained: "There are also those who write 赵, but since the 又 component has been used too freely [in the Draft], that form was not adopted."

摺 折 *折 *zhé* bend, folder, booklet

The 1956 Scheme replaced 摺 (*zhé* bend) with the shorter 折 (*zhé* break). Chén Guāngyáo explained: "There is another short form, 折, but that form is not as common and easy to understand as 折. There are also those who propose 扪 analogously to [习 for] 習, but that form is unfamiliar and would be hard to promote, so it was not adopted."

折 is the older short form, turning up in a *Hanyǔ dà zìdiǎn* quote from the 961 *Táng huìyào* (Institutions of the Tang): 其中須有部折,各於當族注之 (inside were separate folders, each with records of the family in question). Why were not these two close characters mixed up before? Because they had till then been read differently, 摺 with a *-p* ending and 折 with *-t*. As such endings disappeared, readings merged and 摺 and 折 were mixed up.

折 appears in a 1938 letter from the Harbin branch of Jincheng Bank mentioning 存折 (deposit books).[368]

Of 扪 we have no pre-1955 record.

Chén seems to have been right about commonness. Our 1950–1954 man-uscripts mention two 折尺 (folding rulers) against one 折尺 and one 折刀 (folding knife) but no 折刀 or 扪刀.[369] The 1955 Draft nevertheless proposed

---

368 Beijing Archives J41-1-134, p. 27.
369 Beijing Archives 20-2-59, pp. 3,4,7; 22-12-1549, p. 7; 22-10-1332, p. 7; 20-2-65, p. 1.

抧. Ǎi Qū fretted in *Yǔwén zhīshí*: "In some areas which have the entering tone this is no problem, but in northern reading there is a huge disparity [between 摺 and the proposed phonetic 只]."

Disparity was not restricted to the north. Much of the south, preserved the *-p* *-k* distinction, clearly separating 摺 from 只. The unproblematic area referred to by Ǎi was that near Shanghai and Hangzhou, where *-p* and *-k* have merged to *-ʔ* and the 只 phonetic fits 摺:

	Beijing	Nanjing	Shanghai	Hang-zhou	Wenzhou	Fuzhou	Guang-zhou
摺	*tʂɤ* 35	*tʂə̆ʔ* 5	*tsɒʔ* 55	*tsɒʔ* 55	*tɕi* 323	*tieʔ* 23	*tʃip* 33
折	*tʂɤ* 35	*tʂə̆ʔ* 5	*zɒʔ* 23	*szɒʔ* 12	*tɕi* 323	*tsieʔ* 23	*tʃit* 33
只一只	*tʂʅ* 55	*tʂʅ* 31	*tsɒʔ* 55	*tsɒʔ* 55	*tsei* 323	*tsei* 23	*tʃɛk* 33
只只有	*tʂʅ* 214	*tʂʅ* 22	*tsɒʔ* 55	*tsɒʔ* 55	*tsei* 323	*tsʅ* 23	*tʃi* 35

The Script Reform Committee was based in Beijing, however, and so gladly changed 抧 to 折 in its 1956 Scheme.

In the far south both 折 and 抧 were hard to digest. That may explain why 可抧枱架 (可折台架 folding tables) and 抧椅 (folding chairs) were displayed in two Guangzhou shops as late as in 1981.

這 这 *zhè* this

这 appears in blockprints from the early Qing onwards. It may be a contraction of the 迲 appearing in blockprints from the Yuan onwards.

这 became official in February 1956.

眞 真 *真 *zhēn* real true genuine

See 具 *jù*.

鎭 镇 *钲 *zhèn* town, press down

In 1981 one could read timetables to 钲江 (镇江) at the bus station in Yi-xing in Jiangsu and at the train stations in Bengbu and Sùzhou in Anhui. 钲was first mentioned in 1950 by Huáng Ruòzhōu in the Shanghai *Wénhuì bào*, then in 1958 by Zhū Ěrchóu from Changshu in Jiangsu and in 1960 by correspondents to the Script Reform Committee from Hai'an in Jiangsu, Hangzhou in Zhejiang, Longnan in Jiangxi, Xichang in Sichuan, Modong in Guizhou and Hefei, Qianshan and Zongyang in Anhui.

The phonetic 正 *zhèng* does not fit 镇 *zhèn* in the standard language, but does in the central parts of China where 𡉉 was reported:

	Beijing	Jinan, Shandong	Lianyungang, Jiangsu	Hefei, Anhui	Shanghai	Hangzhou, Zhejiang	Xichang, Sichuan	Guangzhou, Guangdong	Xiamen, Fujian
镇	tʂən 51	tʂẽ 51	tʂəŋ 55	tʂən 53	tsəŋ 34	tsən 34	tʂəŋ 213	tʃan 22	tin 13
正	tʂəŋ 51	tʂəŋ 51	tʂəŋ 55	tʂən 53	tsəŋ 34	tsən 34	tʂəŋ 213	tʃɪŋ 22	tsɪŋ 13

By the 1980s 𡉉 had retreated, being unknown to 1981–1986 informants in Sichuan and Guizhou, although known to those in Hubei, Anhui, Jiangsu, Zhejiang and Shanghai. Today 𡉉 has disappeared. The youngest informant to recognise the form was a man from Nanjing born in 1963.

<div align="center">

爭 争 *zhēng* contend
靜 静 *jìng* calm
淨 净 *jìng* clean

</div>

爭 consists of two hands (爫⺕) struggling over an object (亅). The top hand was the least resilient, crumbling already in a 争 on a Western Han wood slip from Juyan. After that the norm vacillated. The 175 Xīpíng Stone Classics stipulated 靜 with 爫, the Sui *Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén* 静 with ク and the Tang *Gānlù zìshū* 爭 with 爫, which held sway until 争 with ク was reinstated in Japan with the 1949 List of Forms and in China with the 1965 Table of Printed Forms of Current Characters.

<div align="center">

徴 徵 征 *zhēng* levy

</div>

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council shortened 徵 by one 一 to 徴. Forms without 一 had long been common. Fushimi Chūkei's register of Han inscriptions contains nine 徴 against one 徵 with 一 and Umehara Seizan's Later Wei index twenty 徴 against three 徵.

However, the common 徴 was called "informal" by the 997 *Lóngkān shǒujìng* and "wrong" by the 1617 *Zìkǎo*. Wrong because it disagreed with *Shuōwén*, which had 壬 on centre top. The admonitions had some effect; *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* lists sixteen Qing 徵 with 一 among twenty-three plain 徴.

The 1955 Draft did not mention 徴. Yǐn Bīnyōng then suggested replacing 徴 with 征, a homonym meaning 'march', as this was "widely practised among the masses." So the 1956 Scheme adopted 征 even for 'levy'. Chén Guāngyáo provided the *Lǐjì* example 關譏而不征 (*guān jī ér bù zhēng* at the gates goods were inspected but not taxed).

<div align="center">

癥 症 *zhēng* tumor in the abdomen

</div>

In 1955 the Script Reform Committee staff member Cáo Bóhán wrote that "some characters which were originally distinct are now merged by some writers, like 帘 and 簾 and 症 [*zhèng* disease] and 癥 [*zhēng* tumor]." The committee's 1956 Scheme prescribed 症 in both senses.

The practice was not familiar to all. In 1957 Professor Liáng Dōnghàn wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé*: "The overwhelming part of the announced characters are 'established by custom' and have long been common in society […]. There is just a small number still worth discussing, like 症 for 癥 […]." Wēn Yìngshí proposed a change of 癥 to 痄 to instead of 症 which "the masses in any case do not use much." In 1957 Cáo offered to revoke 症 for 癥 and forty-one other substitutions. In the event no changes came about.

<div align="center">

整 **歪 zhěng* whole

</div>

In 1947 Beiping Bureau of Social Affairs urged one school to 乙理商业科 (reorganise its trade classes), writing the bottom 乙 (正) for 整. In 1955 an official change of 整 to 正 was proposed by Professor Zēng Zhāolún, by the Guangdong branch of the People's Political Consultative Conference and by the Language Section of People's University.[370] The Script Reform Committee turned a deaf ear.

Then in 1957 Fán Jiāng noticed 歪 with 大 (big) for 敕 in the compositions of Zhejiang students and Zhōu Qǐfèng in those of Anhui students. In 1959 Lǐ Cuìhé from Hunan wrote in *Wénzì gǎigé* that "some write 整 as 井, others as 歪." In 1960 use of 歪 for 整 was reported in letters to the committee from Inner Mongolia in the north to Guangdong in the south, 正 from Anhui, Jiangsu, Hunan and Fujian and 井 from Guangdong.[371]

Reports of 井 for 整 are limited to areas where readings merge:

	Beijing	Changsha, Hunan	Hengyang, Hunan	Guangzhou, Guangdong	Wuhua, Guangdong	Chaozhou, Guangdong
整	tʂəŋ 214	tʂən 41	tɕin 33	tʃiŋ 35	tʂaŋ 31	tsĩã 53
井	tɕiŋ 214	tsin 41	tɕin 33	tʃiŋ 35	tsiaŋ 31	tsẽ 53

---

370 Beijing Archives J2-4-478, p. 10. Renmin zhengxie 1955. Zhongguo renmin daxue 1955.

371 Letters from Baotou, Wugang (Jiang), Changzi, Xingtai, Hefei, Lu'an and Xichang; Qianshan, Hai'an, Wugang (Jiang) and Songxi; Wuhua.

In 1960 Qī Chángshùn of Shenyang Forestry and Pedology Institute opined in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "It is better to use the homonym 正 for 整 rather than 奁. In fact the masses have long used 正 for 整, there is no need to add 大 on top." *Wénzì gǎigé* let the maths teacher Bì Cāng counter: "整数 [whole numbers] and 正数 [positive numbers] are different concepts. This has caused problems for pupils. When asked to find a positive number, some take that for a whole number and get a wrong solution." So the committee chose 奁 for its 1962 List of Simplified Characters, 1977 Second Scheme and 1981 Revised Draft.

證 証 证 *zhèng* prove

Shuōwén said 證 meant 'prove' and 証 'complain'. The Song *Jíyùn* upheld the difference, rhyming 證 with 勝 *shèng* and 証 with 勁 *jìng*. By then, however, the distinction must have been fading; already the 742 Chuàngjiàn Mosque stele said 無所考証 (there is no verification) with 証 for 證. The 1627 *Zhèngzìtōng* said "証 is the same as 證." 証 became official for 證 in Japan in 1946 and in China in 1964.

鄭 郑 *Zhèng*

Jiǎng and Shào found 鄭 without 四 in late Ming military notes and Liú Fù registered 鄭 without 一 in the 1862–1874 *Lǐngnán yìshǐ*. By the twentieth century 郑 had outcompeted the less short 鄭, appearing in five of our 1940–1954 manuscripts against 鄭 in none.

郑 became official in China in June 1956 and analogies like 掷 (*zhì* throw) and 踯 (*zhí* loiter about) in 1964.

執 执 *zhí* hold

The left side turns up as 𡊅 on Western Han wood slips, as 𰀴 on the 151 CE Yuánjiā stone and as 扌 in Song blockprints. 执 with 扌 became official in February 1956 together with the analogous 报 for 報.

直 *𥄂 *zhí* straight

See 具 *jù*.

職 *戝 职 *耺 *zhí* duty, job 聀
識 *訳 识 *shí* know *zhì* remember
織 *纖 织 *zhī* weave knit
幟 帜 *zhì* flag

Liú Fù found 戝 for 職 in blockprints from the Song onwards. In 1935 the Education Ministry selected 戝 for its List of Short Forms.

By then an alternative to the 戠 *chì* phonetic had appeared. The handwritten 1929 rules of Qianshan Peasants' Association stated that opium smokers, drunkards, punters and gamblers 毋許组织 (*wú xǔ zǔzhī* are not permitted to join), and the 1943 Principles of Administration of Southern Jiangsu, a base area, defined the 职务 (duties) of the security organs.[372]

The picto-phonetic 职 quickly caught up with 戝, turning up in thirty-two of our 1950–1954 manuscripts, compared with 戝 in thirty-four. The 1964 General List adopted 职 analogously to 织, 帜 and 识.

职 never spread to Japan, unlike the older 戝 which was mentioned by Dazai Shundai in 1753. Records of 戝 cease, however, with Ōnishi Katsutomo's 1897 article on eyesight and reading. 戝 was never mentioned in the Language Council's reform schemes.

Instead new forms turned up. In a catalogue of letter covers we find one sent in 1942 by an army 耺員 (employee). A 1950 document describes 無聀 (unemployment) among different categories of 耺員 and 聀員.[373]

耺 and 聀 appeared too late to enter the 1949 List of Forms. Only in 1963 did Language Council chairman Abe Shinnosuke report to the education minister that "we need to consider the adoption of suitable short forms used to some extent in society today but not included in the List of Forms […] like […] 才 (第), 笒 (簿), 耺 (職) […]."

The younger forms are still current. 耺 was identified by fourteen of our twenty-four 2014–2017 informants, 聀 by thirteen and the older 戝 by none.

祇 只 *zhǐ* only
隻 只 *zhī* piece of

Shuōwén said 只 "is a word ending a sentence. It is written with 'mouth' and the a breath below." As this suffix disappeared from the language, writers found other use for its character, as on a 519 statue by Gāo Héng inscribed 只以掇拾 (*zhǐ yǐ duōshí* just to pick this up). Chén Guāngyáo wrote in 1956 that "只 has been used for 祇 for so long that ordinary people do not longer

---

372   *Anhui geming shi huace*, p. 58. *Jiangsu kangzhan*, pp. 110.
373   *Military Mail*, p. 245. Yamaguchi Archives 劳民部 30.

know there is even a character 祇." Yes, 祇 had been out of sight for a long time. From the Tang to the Qing, *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* contains five 只是 (merely) but no 祇是, three 只今 (now) but no 祇今. No one reacted when 只 officially replaced 祇 in February 1956.

Writing 只 for 隻 is a more recent idea. Chén Guāngyáo wrote in 1931 that "people in Zhejiang and Jiangsu write 隻 as 只 all the time," and two years later that "I suspect the loan of 只 is based on the local reading of 隻". Very plausibly. While 隻 and 祇/只 are distinguished by tone in northern speech, both are read *tsəʔ* in the departing tone in Shanghai and most of Zhejiang and Jiangsu. With time this loan became mainstream; the 1952 *Xué wénhuà zìdiǎn* and the 1953 *Rénmín xīn zìdiǎn* called 只 "the same as 隻." The 1956 Scheme abolished 祇.

In Japan 只 started invading dictionaries already in 1597, when the Ekirin version of *Setsuyōshū* recommended 只 for *tada* (only) and 只今 for *tadaima* (now), omitting 祇. As for 隻, however, no Japanese would ever think of writing 只 *shi/tada* for 隻 *seki*.

紙 *帋 纸 zhǐ paper

Ambitious dictionaries enter the variants 紙 and 帋. The latter is younger, traced to the Jin by *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn*, which quotes the Song encyclopedia *Tàipíng yùlǎn* (Imperial Readings of the Taiping era) which quotes the Jin historian Wáng Yǐn who refers to the Jin philologist Zhāng Yī: "In the sixth year of Tàihé [232 CE], Scholar Zhāng Yī from Hejian presented his *Gǔjīn zì gū* [Explaining Old and New Characters] which comprised a 巾 section including 帋 for the at present used 紙." Although shorter, 帋 never out-competed 紙, which appears in twenty-four of our 1900–1954 manuscripts compared with 帋 in five.

The Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms proposed to replace 紙 with the shorter 帋. The Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft List of 400 Retained and Abolished Variants in turn advocated keeping 紙 and abolishing 帋. Dài Tiānjiàn objected: "As for selecting and discarding variants, I think one should look to shortness rather than to custom. It would be better to change [...] 紙 to 帋 [...]." The 1964 General List upheld both custom and shortness with its 纸 with 纟.

緻 致 zhì refined

The 1956 Scheme merged 緻 (*zhì* refined) and 致 (*zhì* send) to 致. This was a return to older practice. The Qing commentator Duàn Yùcái explained: "Han writers used only 致 for 精致 [refinement]. 緻 with 糸 was added by Xú Xuàn [in the 986 edition of *Shuōwén*]." Duàn gave the *Lǐjì* example 必功

致爲上 (one must give craftsmanship and refinement the highest priority [when producing sacrificial vessels]).

質 质 质 *zhì* quality

The two axes on top of 質 were hard to squeeze in and were reduced to one already in the 貭 on the 128 CE Xīpǔ stele and 143 Jǐng jūn stele. The one-axe 质 became official in China in 1959.

The Japanese Language Council never simplified 質, but chairman Abe Shinnosuke did suggest in 1963 that "we need to consider the adoption of suitable short forms used to some extent in society today but not included in the List of Forms […] like […] 貭 (質), 選 (選), 离 (離) and 类 (類)."

製 制 *垫 *zhì* make

Pre-1956 dictionaries distinguished 製 (make) and 制 (regulate). *Shuōwén* did so just barely, defining 制 as 'cut' and 製 as 'cut garment'. Even this trifling distinction is ignored in *Shījīng*'s 制彼裳衣 (preparing clothes for others) where 制 is used in the latter sense.

In 1949 we encounter another alternative to 製, on a leaflet which was 中國人民解放軍雲和詔邊政治處垫 (produced by the Political Office of the Yunxiao, Pinghe and Zhao'an Border Unit of the People's Liberation Army).[374] In 1950 Huáng Ruòzhōu noticed this 垫 in the streets of Shanghai.

The 1955 Draft took no action against 製. The proofreader Zhào Xī argued in *Zhōngguó yǔwén*: "Replacing […] 製 and 準 with […] 垫 and 㳬 is something the masses have been used to for a long time. It is necessary to add these characters to the simplification scheme and announce them with the rest." The Language Section of People's University in turn held that "homophonous substitutions already in use should be included in the simplification scheme, like […] 制 (製) […]."[375]

The reformers followed the latter and replaced 製 with 制 in their 1956 Scheme. Chén Guāngyáo defended the choice: "For the last few years there have also been people writing 垫, but this form has a weaker basis than 制."

---

374 *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 338.
375 Zhongguo renmin daxue 1955.

鐘 *鈡 钟 *zhōng* bell, clock
鍾 *鈡 钟 *zhōng* cup

The slightly shorter 鍾 has been used for 鐘 from time immemorial, as in the inscription on the Spring and Autumn 邾君鐘 (Bell of Zhu) which calls this bell a 鐱 (鍾). The Tang *Gānlù zìshū* said: "鍾鐘: the former is a wine vessel, the latter a bell. Today the former is used for both."

鈡 appeared in the 1932 reading manual *Guóyīn chángyòng zìhuì* and was chosen to replace 鐘 in the Education Ministry's 1935 List of Short Forms and the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft. In 1959 both 鐘 and 鍾 became 钟 (the change from 金 to 仐 to 钅 is described in the 金 *jīn* section). The 2010 edition of *Xīnhuá zìdiǎn* re-permitted 鍾 for use as a surname.

腫 肿 *zhǒng* swell

肿 was first reported by Huáng Ruòzhōu in 1950. It is analogous to the older 种 for 種 and became official together with that form in 1959.

種 *秳 种 *zhǒng* species *zhòng* to plant

Liú Fù found 秱 for 種 in the early Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì*, an analogy to the 禹 for 重 in the next section. We find this form cut down to 秱 in a 1933 directive from the Central Workers' and Peasants' Democratic Government and further to 种 in a 1934 message from the Military Commission of the Chinese Soviet Republic.[376] The 1932 *Guóyīn chángyòng zìhuì* featured a 秳 with a right side which looks like the top of the handwritten form 蚕 for 重.

For their 1935 "plain stroke characters" the *Lúnyǔ* editors chose the newish 种 with the pure 中 *zhōng* phonetic. By the 1950s 种 had outcompeted its rivals, appearing in forty of our 1950–1954 manuscripts compared with 秳 in eight and 秱 in two. Unopposed, 种 replaced 種 in February 1956.

重 *禹 *蚕 *zhòng* heavy *chóng* repeat

Use of 禹 for 重 was first recorded by Liú Fù in Ming and Qing blockprints and last in 1960 letters to the Script Reform Committee from Shanghai, Zhengzhou and Nanchong. Today 重 is often shortened to 蚕 after the cursive form.

---

376 *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 192. *Changzheng tujian*, p. 65.

<h1 style="text-align:center">衆 *眾 众 *乑 *中 zhòng crowd</h1>

Thorough dictionaries give the variants 衆 with 血 and 眾 with 罒. For a long time writers and dictionaries stuck to 衆. Then in 1615 *Zìhuì* advocated 眾, with the addition that "衆 is the same as 眾. The 1627 *Zhèngzìtōng* less flexibly called 衆 a "mistaken variant of 眾." Mistaken because it was inconsistent with *Shuōwén*'s thesis that 眾 consists of 目 (eye) and 仈 (men). The 1716 *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* followed *Zhèngzìtōng*, but even this authority did not convert writers; *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* registers one hundred and fifty-two Qin inscriptions with 衆 but none with the etymologically correct 眾. The latter does not appear in the database until the 1927 Qiū Chángchūn stele.

By then writers had found shorter ways. In 1852 the economist Wáng Màoyīn recommended a man whose 心思材智出乑 (wisdom and abilities exceed the ordinary). An 1874 blockprint of *Wǎgǎngzhài yǎnyì* says 乑兵囘 走 (all the soldiers ran off).[377] This 乑 is a reduced 重 here borrowed for 衆.

众 appears for 衆 in a 1926 letter from a Fujian political activist discussing organisation of the 群众 (masses), then in a 1928 leaflet by Fujian Temporary Party Committee.[378] 众 stems from *Shuōwén*, which said 仈 meant 'crowd' but was "read 欽 [*qīn*] or 崟 [*yín*]." The 1013 *Yùpiān* nevertheless took 众 to be identical with 衆. After that 众 appeared in the Yuan blockprint *Gǔjīn zájù* but not, however, in later prints. The 1627 *Zhèngzìtōng* said "众 is the original form of 眾," not "the informal form" or "short form". The 1920s resurrection of 众 was thus its second revival.

中 enters our records with a 1929 letter from the communist party's central committee urging its armed forces to 癸動群中 (發動群衆 mobilise the masses).[379]

In 1922 Professor Qián Xuántóng proposed to give official status to 乑, a form "now in use among the people." The *Tàibái* editors followed suit, selecting 乑 for their 1935 "handy characters". By then 乑, however, had been outcompeted by the newly revived 众, which appears in eighteen of our 1920–1934 manuscripts, compared with 中 in two and 乑 in none. So *Lúnyǔ* and the Education Ministry opted for 众 in their ensuing schemes. By 1955 众 had grown even more dominant, occurring in fifty-one of our 1950–1954 manuscripts against 乑 and 中 in none. 众 duly became official in February 1956.

Why did Chinese writers invent an eight-stroke 中 if the six-stroke 乑 and 众 were already in use? Most probably they did not invent it. In 1753 the

---

377 Wang Maoyin 1851–1853, p. 60. *Wagangzhai yanyi*, p. 71.
378 *Fujian geming shi huaji*, pp. 17, 40.
379 *Fujian geming shi huaji*, p. 75.

Japanese scholar Dazai Shundai wrote: "There are also informal Japanese short forms, which one should definitely not use […] 卆衆 […]." In 1915 Ōmachi Keigetsu referred to 卆 as "an informal short form for 衆." Soon after that we find 卆 in China.

周 週 *zhōu* circuit, week, Zhou

周 meant 'circuit', 'complete' or 'the state of Zhou'. 週 with 辶 (walk) is a later invention turning up on Tang steles, competing with 周 in the former senses. The 1955 First List of Regulated Variants abolished 週 and returned 周 in all cases.

晝 昼 *zhòu* day, daylight

Liú Fù found 昼 for 晝 in blockprints from the Yuan onwards. The 尺 top is analogous to that in the older 昼 for 晝.

昼 became official in Japan only with the 1949 List of Forms and in China with the 1959 Fourth Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters. Were reformers worried about the lack of analogy with the just adopted 画 and 画 for 畫?

硃 朱 *zhū* cinnabar

Dictionaries have distinguished the 朱 in 朱衣 (red clothes) from the 硃 in 硃砂 (*zhūshā* cinnabar). The latter is an innovation, appearing in 1008 in the *Guǎngyùn* entry 硃: 硃研朱砂 (硃: inkstone for red ink, cinnabar). We notice that in the definition 'cinnabar' is written with 朱, not 硃. Mathews' 1931 dictionary entered both 硃筆 ([the emperor's] red signature) and 朱筆.

The 1956 Scheme changed 硃 to 朱.

燭 烛 *zhú* candle

See 獨 *dú*.

築 筑 *zhù* build

In February 1956 築 (*zhù* build) and 筑 (*zhù* guitar) were merged to 筑. Chén Guāngyáo asserted: "During the last few years 筑 has been used for 築 in building projects, and has reached a wide use."

<h1 style="text-align:center">專 専 专 zhuān special</h1>

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council shortened 專 to 専, a form turning up already in the early Han manuscripts from Mawangdui and then remaining common, appearing for example in forty-five 専, 傳 or 轉 in Umehara Seizan's register of Later Wei inscriptions compared with 專 in two. This practice defied *Shuōwén*, which ruled that 專 consisted of 寸 (*cùn* hand) and 叀 (*zhuān* spindle). The Tang *Gānlù zìshū* loyally classed 專 as "correct" and was followed by later dictionaries.

専 was common even in China, but less so than the shorter 专, which occurs in seventeen of our 1900–1954 manuscripts against 専 in seven. The 1955 Draft proposed to standardise handwriting to 专 but keep 専 in print. This separate norm for handwriting was abandoned for a general printed norm. 专, however, was hard to render in print. Guō Yìqīng suggested 专 in 1936, Yì Xīwú 专 in 1952 and 专 in 1954 and Chén Yuè 专 in 1955. The 1956 Scheme ended up with专, probably inspired by Liú Fù's 1930 *Sòng-Yuán yǐlái súzì pǔ*, which reproduced a form from the Qing blockprint *Mùliánjì* as 专 (although the analogous 轉 was rendered 转). This 专 became official in 1959 and the analogous 传 and 转 in 1964.

<h1 style="text-align:center">轉 転 转 zhuǎn shift zhuàn rotate
傳 伝 传 zhuàn biography chuán spread</h1>

The Script Reform Committee went to great lengths to shorten 専 because the common 傳 and 轉 were also at stake. The Japanese Language Council was less pressed, having the readily available alternatives 伝 and 転, with a reduced 叀 on the right. 伝 and 転 were well entrenched by 1910, when Kuroyanagi Isao declared he would no longer deduct points from pupils who wrote them. Official approval took longer. The council bypassed 傳 and 轉 in its 1926, 1938, 1942 and 1946 schemes and gave 伝 and 転 official status only in 1949.

伝 and 転 were not unknown in China. In the 宣 *xuān* section we saw a 1948 decree banning 宀伝 (propaganda) for Kuomintang currency in Henan, Anhui and Jiangsu Border Area. In 1954 Liú Wényīng observed that "one character may be written in two or three ways, and some in as much as six or seven, like 種秷种, 廣广庿, 與与与, 學孞学, 傳傳伝 [...]." 伝 and 転 are rare in Chinese manuscripts, however, and were described by Liú Zéxiān as Japanese forms "rather unfamiliar or very unfamiliar to us."

The 1955 Draft proposed no new dictionary form for 傳 and 轉, only a 傳 and 轉 standard for handwriting. Tián Qíchāng objected in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Some short forms often used by people have not been included in the Draft; I think they should be added, like [...] 伝 (傳), 転 (轉) [...]." The

committee ignored him, including 传 and 转 in the 1964 General List analogously to 专 for 專.

伝 writers did not vanish. In 1972 *Hóngqí* received a letter from a reader in Benxi in Liaoning concerning "the new simplified characters in use among the masses." Guō Mòruò answered: "Some of the simplified characters mentioned in the letter have spread from Japan, like 沢 for 泽, 伝 for 传 and 転 for 转. I presume these are used in the Northeast and certainly not all over." True, 伝 was identified as 传 in 1981–1986 by informants in Qiqihar, Harbin, Changchun, Jilin, Anshan and Dalian in the Northeast and in the border town of Shanhaiguan, but not further south (where it was often identified as 价). Our last report of 転 came in 1994 from Liáng Xiāngchūn of Jining Railway Middle School No.2 in distant Inner Mongolia, another area once run by Japan: "Recently I noticed that almost all materials written and copied by teachers for their open lectures contain irregular simplified characters, for example: […] 专 on the right of 转 becomes 云 […]." Perhaps not so much longer; our youngest informant to recognise 伝 and 転 was a man from Jiamusi born in 1982.

The 1956 reform turned out an unexpected by-product. In 1981 this author saw a 仔呼电话 (*chuánhū diànhuà* public telephone) sign in Guangzhou and the following year a 祖仔中医 (*zǔchuán zhōngyī* Chinese doctor in a family tradition) sign in Lianyungang in Jiangsu. The puzzling 仔 was explained in 1956 by Fù Cháoyáng in *Guāngmíng rìbào*: "Some see [the new official form] 团 for 團, think every 專 may be shortened to 才 and write 傳 as 仔." In 1960 仔 was reported to the committee by correspondents from Huaiyin in Jiangsu and Wuhua in Guangdong. 1981–1986 interviews revealed that the form was known in Jiangsu and Guangdong but, unexpectedly, not in the intervening provinces.[380] Today 仔 is recognised by none.

莊 荘 庄 *zhuāng* village

莊 consists of the phonetic 壯 and 艹 (grass), which Han writers rendered 丷 and then 亠. This gave 庄 as on the 160 CE Sūn Shū'áo stele. Yuan block-printers shortened this 庒 to 庒 or 庄, a house (广) on the ground (土), which villagers may have found more palpable than the former sick (疒) earth (土).

The 土 and 圡 components have alternated since the Han. In 庄 the latter

---

380   仔 identified as 傳 in in Guangzhou, Meixian, Shantou, Shaoguan and Zhaoqing but not Haifeng and Zhanjiang in Guangdong, in Nanjing, Huaiyin, Lianyungang, Suzhou, Wuxi, Yangzhou, Yixing and Zhenjiang but not Yancheng in Jiangsu and in Huzhou and Jiaxing in northernmost Zhejiang but not further south in that province nor in surrounding provinces.

came to dominate. Twenty of our 1900–1954 manuscripts contain 庄 while two have 庄. Nevertheless the Education Ministry in 1935 and the Script Reform Committee in 1956 chose 庄 with 土, presumably to keep the character distinct from the proposed 压 *yā*.

、 writers persisted. The 1964 General List had to spell out: "庄 contains six strokes. There is no point to the right of 土." As late as in 1998 *Xiàndài Hànyǔ guīfàn zìdiǎn* reminded writers: "The right bottom part of 庄 is 土, not 㐸."

The Japanese Language Council turned 莊 into 荘 analogously to 壮 for 壯.

椿 桩 *zhuāng* stake

The 1955 Draft proposed 桩, a form called a "newly created character" by Yì Xīwú and a "new picto-phonetic character […] not established by custom" by Yè Gōngchuò. 桩 was legalised in 1959 with the Fourth Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters.

妝 妆 *zhuāng* make up
裝 装 *zhuāng* clothing
狀 状 *zhuàng* shape
壯 壮 *zhuàng* robust

In the early Han manuscripts from Mawangdui 壯 was written 壮 or shortened as 壮. Analogous 妆, 装 and 状 followed and became official together with 壮 in Japan in 1949 and in China in 1958.

準 准 *乒 *zhǔn* rule, level, exact

The 1952 *Rénmín xīn zìdiǎn* defined 準 as 'water-level', 'rule', 'nose', 'level', 'exact', 'certainly' or "the same as 准", which it in turn defined as 'to determine', 'to permit' or 'according to'. The two had not always been kept apart; the Tang *Gānlù zìshū* called 准 common for 準, the Song *Guǎngyùn* and *Yùpiān* informal for 準, the Ming *Zhèngzìtōng* the same as 準 and the 1916 *Zhōnghuá dà zìdiǎn* informal for 準. We first meet 准 in a 准則 (rule) on the 161 CE Tóngbǎi Temple stele, in the sense of 'rule', not 'permit'. While 準 consists of 氵 (water) and the phonetic 隼 (*sǔn* falcon), 准 makes no etymological sense and is obviously just a reduced 準.

An alternative short form had turned up by 1950, when Huáng Ruòzhōu registered 乒 for 準 in Shanghai. In 1954 we read that the party committee of Hangzhou Public Health Bureau 乒俻菱展三个党员 (準備發展三個黨員 was

preparing to recruit three members).[381] It is no accident that we first find 苹
in Shanghai, where the 正 phonetic fits 準:

	Beijing	Nanjing	Shanghai	Hangzhou	Wenzhou	Guangzhou
準	*tʂuan* 214	*tʂuən* 3	<u>*tsən*</u> 334	*tsyən* 51	*tɕyoŋ* 45	*tʃøn* 35
正_{公正}	*tʂəŋ* 51	*tʂən* 5	<u>*tsən*</u> 334	*tsən* 334	*tsəŋ* 42	*tʃɛŋ* 33_白

When the 1955 Draft passed 準 over, Dài Tiānjiàn proposed 苹 in *Zhōngguó
yǔwén*. The proofreader Zhào Xī asserted that writing 苹 "is something the
masses have been used to for a long time." The 1956 Scheme in turn opted
for the more established 准. Chén Guāngyáo argued: "During the last few
years there have also been those who write 苹, but this has not as solid a
basis as 准. This way one also gets one character less to learn."

Our last record of 苹 is in a 1961 letter to the committee from an opera
troupe in Dehong in Yunnan.

總 総 总 *總 *總 *揔 *zǒng* assemble
聰 聡 聪 *聰 *cōng* intelligent

The Japanese Language Council simplified 總 to 総 in 1946 and 聰 to 聡 in
1949, while the Script Reform Committee of China legalised 总 and 聪 in
1956. The split was based on habits. Our 1900–1954 Chinese manuscripts
contain one hundred and sixty-three 総, twenty-five 揔 and seven 总 but no
総, 1900–1946 Japanese ones forty 総 but no 総, 揔 or 总. (扌 was first seen
for 扌 in a 揔 on the 182 Kǒng Dān stele.)

The 囪 (*cōng* opening) phonetic in 總 and 聰 has taken many shapes: ♦
on the Western Zhou Dà Kè tripod, ⊠ on a Warring States wood slip from
Guodian, ➤ in the silk manuscripts from Mawangdui, ⊗ in *Shuōwén* entries,
囪 in *Shuōwén* explanations and 匆, 田, 厶, 厸, 厺 or 公 on Han stones. Of
these, 公 survived to become official in Japan.

Shuōwén's 囪 is absent in these records, and remained so throughout
the Jin, Wei and Sui. The Tang *Gānlù zìshū* tried to restore the *Shuōwén*
form, classing 聰 as the "correct" form of the "common" 聡 and 聰, adding
that this "applies to all characters with 悤." Few if anyone complied. Even
dictionaries like the 776 *Wǔjīng wénzì*, 1008 *Guǎngyùn*, 1013 *Yùpiān* and
1039 *Jíyùn* stuck to 總. The latter did, however, add that "總 was written
總 in the past", not specifying when. The Yuan *Zìjiàn* made a new attempt
to restore that past: "總; informally written 總." The 1617 *Zìkǎo* was more

explicit: "聰 is written with 恖. 聰 is wrong." *Kāngxī zìdiǎn* followed suit. These admonitions were effective. On Qing steles in *Takuhon moji dētabēsu* we find thirty-four 總 against four 総 and three 緫.

The latter was a novelty, obviously based on the heavily propagated but bothersome 總. 丷-topped 聪, 総, 揔 and 总 were first seen by Jiǎng and Shào in their late Ming military documents and had, as we have seen, come to dominate by the twentieth century. For their 1935 "handy characters" the *Tàibái* editors chose 揔, shorter than 総 and more common than 总, as did the *Lúnyǔ* editors for their "plain stroke characters". Twenty years later the Script Reform Committee prioritised shortness even more, recognising 总 together with 聪 in 1956.

Why did Japanese writers not take up 总 and 聪? Perhaps because the *Shuōwén*-based 總 and 聰, the prototypes of 总 and 聪, were not as intensely promoted and therefore not as common as in China. The sixteenth-century *Setsuyōshū* and *Ikyōshū*, for example, recommended writing *sōryō* (heir) not as 總領 but as 揔領, and the 1917 *Kan-Wa daijirin* called 総 not "informal" or "wrong" but "equal to 總."

⟋/⿱⿻⿻ has thus survived as 公 in Japanese 総, 聡 and 窓, as 丷 in Chinese 聪 and 总, as 囱 in Chinese 窗 and as 匆 in Chinese 葱 and 匆.

<p style="text-align:center">縱 縦 纵 *zòng* vertical</p>

Analogously to 從, 縱 became 縦 in Japan and 纵 in China.

<p style="text-align:center">卒 *卆 *zú* soldier
醉 酔 *zuì* drunk
粹 粋 *cuì* pure
碎 砕 *suì* smash</p>

In 1949 the Japanese Language Council changed 粹, 碎 and 醉 to 粋, 砕 and 酔. The transition from 卒 to 卆 is analogous to that from 雜 to 雑, via Han 平 and Later Wei 卆.

Chinese legalisation of 卆 forms has been proposed in *Tàibái*'s 1935 "handy characters", the Education Ministry's List of Short Forms, the Script Reform Committee's 1955 Draft, 1977 Second Scheme and 1981 Revised Draft.

The Japanese Language Council shortened the 卒 component to 卆 but retained the character 卒. Many shorten even the latter. In 1963 council chair Abe Shinnosuke wrote to the education minister that "we need to consider the adoption of suitable short forms used to some extent in society today but not included in the List of Forms […] like […] 卆 (卒), 旺 (曜) […]." Notices about 卆業 (*sotsugyō* graduation) remain common on Japanese campuses.

鑽 钻 *zuān* drill, get into *zuàn* drill, jewel

In 1951 the Shanghai *Jiǎnbǐzì* said 鑽 was shortened to either 钻 or 占.

The 1956 Scheme opted for 钻. Chén Guāngyáo called this "a character established by custom, written with 金 and the phonetic 占. There is also a habit of writing simply 占, since some in the Wu dialect area [round Shanghai] read both 占 and 鑽 as *zuan*. This way one gets words like 占探机 [*zuāntànjī* drilling machine] and 十七占手表 [17-jewel watch]. Nevertheless, for the sake of clarity it is better to use 钻." So 钻 was authorised in 1959 (the changing shapes of the 'metal' component are explained in the 金 *jīn* section).

占 came into use for 钻 even outside the Wu area. This author saw 占头 (drill bits) for sale in Luoyang in 1982.

遵 *迶 *zūn* abide by
尊 *专 *zūn* respect

The 1977 Second Scheme proposed to shorten 尊 and 遵 to 专, a form based on the handwritten 艻 and first mentioned in an August 1960 letter to the Script Reform Committee from Hefei. 专 writers were obviously inspired by the 专 which had just been introduced for 專/专.

An alternative surfaced in a 1958 *Zhōngguó yǔwén* piece by Mǎ Guófán, a young graduate who thirty years later served as editor of the character-preserving monthly *Hànzì wénhuà*:

> On the tickets of Shanxi Opera House in Taiyuan the text 迶守秩序, 請勿喧哗 [*zūnshǒu zhìxù, qǐng wù xuānhuá* please keep order and make no noise] is printed. 迶 is an arbitrarily created form for 遵. 迶 not only lacks a basis among the masses, it is also unscientific. In Taiyuan speech 中 and 尊 rhyme, so someone has replaced 尊 with 中 to make up this new picto-phonetic character. In the standard language, however, 中 and 尊 do not rhyme.

中, 尊 and 遵 not only rhyme in Taiyuan, but are read identically as *tsuŋ* 11. Unsurprisingly, further records come from Shanxi and environs: a 1960 letter to the committee from Wanrong and one 1977 from Anyang in northern Henan, a 1963 article by Ní Shìzhōng of Jincheng Normal School, a 迶守交通规则 (follow traffic regulations) sign seen in 1982 by this author outside Changzhi and a 1984 *Níngxià rìbào* article by Professor Zuǒ Mín'ān criticising such road signs. In 1981–1986 迶 was identified as 遵 by informants in Taiyuan, Yangquan and Changzhi in Shanxi and in adjacent Luoyang, Baotou and Lenghu, but not elsewhere. Further south 迶 was, as we have seen, identified as 通.

Another local form was mentioned by Fèi Jǐnchāng, who in 1985 identified "simplified characters current only in one area or in one trade, among them picto-phonetic characters based on dialect reading, like 栌 (楼) in Wuhan in Hubei, 逻 (遵) in Hai'an in Jiangsu […]." We also know the latter from a 1960 letter to the committee from a teacher who found 逻 in his pupils' works in just Hai'an.

CHAPTER 4
CONCLUSIONS

Inventions by the Script Reform Committee

Zhào Tàimóu estimated the proportion of new forms invented for the Character Simplification Scheme at 17%. We have seen that this figure was exaggerated, as it included forms like 辽, 胶, 审, 乡, 习, 汉, 币, which we have shown to have been in use before 1955. Our survey has in turn identified forty-five characters new to the public, namely 肮, 把, 坝, 毕, 毙, 仓, 缠, 彻, 尘, 丛, 粪, 疖, 洁, 竞, 拦, 栏, 烂, 岭, 龙, 卢, 虏, 虑, 买, 灭, 鸟, 虐, 牵, 窍, 涩, 兽, 誊, 网, 宪, 旋, 寻, 钥, 忆, 痈, 忧, 吁, 跃, 酝, 凿, 专 and 桩. Four characters, 灿, 偿, 舰 and 仆, were probably new and two, 胡 (for 鬍) and 惊, were possibly new. Novelties thus made up 9 to 10% of the 484 characters in the 1964 General List.[380]

Picking winners

In Chapter 1 we asked what made the committee select 飞, 归, 层, 矿, 厂 and so on.

Chapter 3 shows that 归, 矿 and 厂 were obvious choices, being shorter and at least as common as the competing 逼, 帰, 砿, 礦, 礦, 广, 厊 and 厴. Not so 层 and 飞. 层 was more common but less short than the competing 尺 and 尼, and 飞 was shorter but less common than the competing 飛 and 𫘝. Our survey has shown what the committee's priorities were.

In twenty-three cases the committee preferred shorter forms to more common ones, 备 to 俻, 残 to 殘, 处 to 処, 从 to 従, 儿 to 児, 发 to 発, 飞 to 飛 and 𫘝, 关 to 関, 龟 to 亀, 汉 to 汙, 兰 to 苎, 丽 to 丽, 龙 to 龙, 气 to 気, 释 to 释, 肃 to 肅, 无 to 幺, 兴 to 奨, 亚 to 亜, 盐 to 塩, 业 to 叶, 与 to �385 and 总 to 総.

In nine cases the committee preferred common forms to shorter ones, 风

---

380   The number 484 in the 1964 General List differs from the 515 in the 1956 Scheme quoted by Zhao Taimou. The difference is illusory; the 1956 Scheme counts analogies like 万迈厉励 separately while the 1964 General List counts them as one.

to 凡, 检 to 杴, 据 to 㧖, 粮 to 籵, 两 to 両, 数 to 籹 and 攺, 岁 to 屵, 学 to 孝 or 孝 and 层 to 尺 and 屸. Five of the shorter forms were rejected for specific reasons. The phonetics in 杴 and 㧖 were misleading, 厂 was earmarked for 'factory', 历 for 励 would mix up 'history' and 'reward', 卟 might be mixed up with 'lump' and 籹 or 攺 were inconsistent with the proposed 楼.

In five cases the committee preferred picto-phonetic characters to graphic simplifications, 购 to 賜, 价 to 伬, 阶 to 阤, 围 to 囲 and 职 to 戩, even though 囲 was more common and 戩 shorter than the forms adopted.

The more etymological 点 beat out the more common 奌,

The phonetically more fitting 舰 beat the shorter and more common 肝.
The politically correct 国 beat the shorter and more common 囯.

In its preference for shorter forms over more common ones the Script Reform Committee differed from the Japanese Language Council, which preferred the common 鉱 to the shorter 鈩 and 矿; the common 経 to the shorter 圣 and the common 気 to the shorter 气.

Sino-Japanese clashes

Could the present differences between Chinese and Japanese characters have been avoided with cooperation? Let us look at characters in the 1964 General List which differed from already simplified Japanese forms.

Table 10. Differing Japanese and Chinese simplified forms.

Japanese simplified form	rejected in China because:
辺, the more common form by far,	not in use in China, unlike 边
変, the more common form,	not as short and common as 变
弁, the shorter and more common form	less common than 辩, or unused
浜, the only short form in use,	identical with the Chinese 浜 *bāng*
層, the only short form in use,	not as short as 层
称弥, the more common forms,	not as common as 称弥
懲, the only short form in use,	not as short as 惩
遅, the only short form in use,	not as short as 迟
歯, the only short form in use,	not as short as 齿

Japanese simplified form	rejected in China because:
処, the only short form in use,	not quite as simple as 处
聡, the more common short form,	less common than 聪
従, the more common short form,	not as short as 从
帯, the most common form,	not as short as 带
单, the shortest form in use,	not as short and common as 单
逓, the only short form in use,	less pedagogical than 递
畳, the most common form,	not as short as 迭
闘, the most common short form in use,	not as short as 斗
対, the only short form in use,	not as short and common as 对
児, the only short form in use,	not as short as 儿
発, the most common form,	not as short as 发
豊, the only short form in use,	not as short as 丰
観権歓, the common short forms,	not in use and not as short as 观权
広, the only short form in use,	not in use and not as short as 广
亀, the only short form in use,	not in use and not as short as 龟
帰, the only short form in use,	not as short as 归
撃, the common short form,	not as short as 击
画, more common than 画,	not as common as 画
画, the only short form in use for 劃,	not as short and common as 划
鶏, the common short form,	not as short as 鸡
価, the only short form in use,	not as common and short as 价
検験, the most common short forms,	not in use in China, unlike 检验
将, the only short form in use,	not as short as 将
経径, the most common forms by far,	less common than 経径 and close to 圣 (聖)
挙, the only short form in use,	not in use in China, unlike 举
拠, the only short form in use,	less common than 据
蘭, the only short form in use,	not as short as 兰
労, the only short form in use,	not in use in China, unlike 劳

Japanese simplified form	rejected in China because:
塁, the only short form in use,	not in use in China, unlike 垒
隷, the only short form in use,	not as short as 隶
練, a common short form,	not as short as 练
両満, the more common short forms,	less common than 两满
猟, the only short form in use,	not in use in China, unlike 猎
竜, the only short form in use,	not in use in China, which chose 龙
売, the only short form in use,	not in use in China, unlike 卖
脳悩, the more common short forms,	not as short as 脑恼
醸, the only short form in use,	not as short as 酿
斉, the only short form in use,	not as short and common as 齐
気, the more common short form,	not as short as 气
浅銭残, the only short forms in use,	not as short as 浅钱残
譲, the only short form in use,	not as short as 让
渋, the common short form	not in use in China, which chose 涩
実, the more common short form by far,	not as common as 实,
积択沢訳駅, the shortest forms in use,	not used in China, unlike 释择泽译
糸, the only short form in use,	not in use in China, unlike 丝
摂, the only short form in use,	not in use in China, unlike 摄
縄, the only short form in use,	not in use in China, unlike 绳
粛, the only short form in use,	not as short as 肃
庁, more common than 厅,	not as common and short as 厅
図, the more common short form by far,	not in use in China, which chose 图
団, the more common short form by far,	not in use in China, unlike 团
囲, the only short form in use,	not analogous to 韦 and 伟
為, the common short form,	not as short as 为
戯, the shortest form in use,	not as short as 戏
繊, the shortest form in use,	not as short as 纤
県, the more common short form by far,	not as short and common as 县

Japanese simplified form	rejected in China because:
写, the common short form,	not as common as 写 by far
圧, shorter than the equally common 圧,	less common than 圧 and too close to 庄
亜, the more common short form by far,	not as short as 亚
塩, the only short form in use,	not as short as 盐
厳, the only short form in use,	not as short as 严
薬, the common short form,	not as short as 药
芸, the only short form in use,	not in use in China, unlike 艺
応, the only short form in use,	not in use in China, unlike 应
与, the common short form,	not as common as 与 by far
円, the only short form in use,	not in use in China, unlike 元
楽, the only short form in use,	not as short as 乐
戦, the common short form,	not as short as 战
専, the only square style short form in use,	not as short as the invented 专
伝転, the only short forms in use,	unknown in China, which chose 传 转
総, the only short form in use,	not in use and not as short as 总

Seventy-eight differences stem from differing writing habits, just two from different priorities: Japanese reformers chose the common 脳 where Chinese reformers preferred the shorter 脑; and the Japanese side chose the common 専, unlike their Chinese colleagues who created the shorter 专.

Local short forms

Yes, there were local short forms. Our 1982–1986 interviews showed that 薄 at times appeared as 茫 in the Northeast but as 泊 in Guangdong, 察 as 芥 in areas of Zhejiang and Jiangsu, 厕 as 灰 in Guangdong, 插 as 择 in and near Shanghai, 察 as 宊 in East China, 肠 as 肤 in and near Shanghai, 厂 as 仄 in Zhejiang but as 厔 further south, 带 as 帝 in Guangdong, 戴 as 六 in East China but as 代 further north, 稻 as 权 in Jiangsu and Anhui, 碟 as 矼 and 蝶 as 虬 in Guangdong and Guangxi, 佛 as 仸 in Guangdong, 赣 as 圲 in Jiangxi, 购 as 贩 in Central China but as 贴 in southern Fujian, 灌 as 芅 in northern Jiangsu, 罐 as 矼 in Guangdong and Guangxi, 蝴 as 虰 in

Guangdong, 集 as 朵 in parts of Zhejiang, 价 as 伝 in Central China, 检 as 杆 in East China but as 枯 further south and as 枍 in most of the rest, 建 as 辻 in the northwestern parts, 街 as 徦 in Wenzhou, 剧 as 刡 in parts of Guangdong, 裤 as 庚 in Guangdong and Guangxi, 块 as 圤 in the north, 两 as 刄 in the west but as 刄 in the east, 龄 as 岭 in parts of Anhui and Jiangsu, 楼 as 柚 in the north but as 朩 in Central China, 律 as 彴 in East China, 煤 as 炘 in East China, 糯 as 粘 in the south, 盘 as 盇 in parts of Jiangsu and in parts of Fujian, 漆 as 沢 in East China, 禽 as 夆 or 仐 in East China, 儒 as 仟 in Central China, 赛 as 宧, 宆 or 宋 in parts of East China, 狮 as 猫 in Fujian and parts of Anhui, 输 as 轴 in Zhejiang, 蔬 as 芤 in Guizhou, 薯 as 苿 in North China, as 茨 in Guangdong and as 茹 in Guangxi, 随 as 阤 or 阞 in East China, 岁 as 才 in the Northeast, 摊 as 扙 in East China, 藤 as 苊 in Zhejiang but as 荇 in Guangdong and 苧 in parts of Guangxi, 通 as 迊 in Central China, 溪 as 汐 in Anhui, as 汙 in Zhejiang, as K in Fujian and as 氿 in Sichuan, 喜 as 乬 in the Northeast but as 呫 in Central China, 厦 as 厌 in Fujian, 现 as 玌 in the Southwest, 兴 as 艿 in Zhejiang, 盐 as 圤 in the south, 验 as 驲 in the north, as 骅 in the south and as 驲, 骈 or 骈 in East China, 要 as 委 in the south, 医 as 𠃊 in the south, 影 as 彡 in Fujian, 藏 as 芅 in Sichuan but as 茬 in Guangdong, 增 as 圦 or 𡎸 in Zhejiang but as 坤 in Shanxi, 镇 as 钲 in East China, 传 as 伝 in the Northeast but as 偌 in Shandong and as 伩 in Jiangsu and 遵 as 迊 in the Northwest.

Most of the above have phonetics which fit locally but not nationally, like 芤, 厌, 択, 宆, 肽, 仄, 矴, 蚖, 祜, 贴, 朵, 辻, 徦, 刡, 庚, 朩, 彴, 沢, 夆, 仐, 仟, 宋, 猫, 轴, 茨, 阤, 阞, 扙, 苊, 荇, 汙, K, 氿, 骈, 委, 彡, 圦, 𡎸, 坤, 钲 and 迊.

Dialect readings do not fully explain their limited distribution; we have found dialect-based forms which did spread, like 裇 (裤) from Guangdong, 忓 (慢) from Fujian and 芝 (藏) from Shanghai.

Others can be more reliably explained. 伕, 炘 and 厌 were needed locally to write place names. 荶, 乬 and 伝 were inherited from the pre-1945 Japanese administrators in the Northeast. 六 was needed in the east because the elsewhere common substitute 代 for 戴 was not homonymous and so unacceptable in the Wu dialect area. 柚 did not spread to the south because it collided with 柚 *yòu*, a southern citrus fruit.

Why 涫, 厉, 帒, 权, 茨, 矴, 疝, 枯, 枍, 刄, 刄, 岭, 盇, 炘, 粘, 肽, 迊, 呫, 玌, 尹, 𠃊, 茬 and 伩 were used just locally is anybody's guess.

Eliminating disorder

In Chapter 1 we learned that the Script Reform Committee aimed to "select one simple and easy form among many different ones and do away with all the others", so that "if everybody writes according to this norm, we can

prevent people from creating short forms at will and creating confusion."

Did the reform effectively do away with the rejected variants? Let us make a count in pre- and post-reform manuscripts.

Table 11. Changes in writing habits after the 1956 reform.

Adopted form + rejected forms	1950-1954	1956-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	2000-2016	Adopted form + rejected forms	1950-1954	1956-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	2000-2016
备	3	4	9	9		长	–	1	2	1	13
甫	1	–	–	–		长	–	–	–	–	8
俻	14	2	–	–		长	17	10	13	14	9
備	9	–	–	–		長	20	7	5	5	1
俻	7	–	–	–		长	6	3	8	7	8
俻	6	–	–	1		专	6	5	1	2	–
厂	36	22	22	23	11	场	1	–	–	1	24
广	5	–	–	–	–	坊	31	5	3	5	1
						场	1	–	–	–	–
处	22	–	7	4	17	从	7	9	10	6	4
处	47	1	3	3	–	從	15	–	–	–	–
						徔	1	–	–	–	–
						徔徔徔	–	–	–	–	–
单	67	8	15	16	16	点	6	1	1	–	1
单	22	2	4	1	–	奌	46	6	5	6	1
單	1	–	–	–	–	点	14	–	1	1	–
儿	–	1	5	6	1	发	8	7	5	5	14
兜	11	2	2	1	–	友	–	–	–	–	–
児	–	–	–	–	–	发友	–	–	–	1	–
						茇茇茇	81	2	–	1	–
						発発	30	–	–	–	–
飞	–	1	2		5	风	8	5	3	7	7
乤	–	–	–		–	凡	1	–	–	–	–
飞	3	–	–		–	风	3	–	–	–	–
						㐾	–	–	–	1	–

Adopted form + rejected forms	1950-1954	1956-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	2000-2016	Adopted form + rejected forms	1950-1954	1956-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	2000-2016
凤	6	4	3	–	7	购购沟	15	2	8	9	14
风	5	–	3	–	–	䢹赒洴	10	3	4	3	–
凨	–	–	–	1	1	赚　泲	2	–	–	–	–
凬	–	–	–	1	–	赆贼	1	1	–	–	–
关	37	34	28	43	7	广矿扩	10	8	15	14	12
関阓	71	–	–	1	–	庴砿捛	10	1	1	–	–
闗	2	–	–	–	–	庴砿捛	1	–	–	–	–
闗	7	–	–	–	–	庬	2	–	–	–	–
阕	6	–	–	–	–						
国	3	5	3	3	26	汉	2	3	9	11	3
囯	10	1	–	–	–	汗	6	4	5	–	–
囗	33	3	3	1	–						
旺	1	–	–	–	–						
旺	1	–	1	–	1						
后	18	27	28	33	8	护	6	3	6	4	2
没攴	79	3	2	2	–	诉,	1	–	–	–	–
彶	3	–	–	–	–	茯	1	–	–	–	–
						芦	2	–	–	–	–
划	40	8	6	13	1	击	2	1	2	1	–
刬	32	1	–	–	–	壴	2	–	–	–	–
剐	4	–	–	–	–						
画	2	–	–	–	–						
济齐	16	5	6	7	9	价	19	2	5	3	20
济斉	5	–	–	–	–	俰	20	2	–	–	–
济齐	9	–	–	–	–	价	7	1	5	3	–
						佅	2	–	–	–	–
						伝	–	–	1	–	–
检验	10	6	3	5	9	阶	1	–	1	5	
枱骀	7	7	9	–	–	阽	7	6	3	1	
杄骍	2	–	1	–	–						

Adopted form + rejected forms	1950-1954	1956-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	2000-2016	Adopted form + rejected forms	1950-1954	1956-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	2000-2016
节	–	3	3	2	14	经径轻	–	–	2	3	7
竻	–	–	–	–	–	经径軽	43	1	2	3	–
莭節卽	8	–	–	–	–	经径軽	34	3	6	4	–
						绖輕轻	19	2	–	–	–
据	54	5	7	16		块	1	1	1	3	1
拠	7	–	–	1		圤	6	–	1	–	–
拫	4	–	–	–							
兰	4	6	6	–	8	历	11	2	5		2
茾	8	1	1	1	–	厂	1	3	–		–
芏	1	–	–	–	–	厂止	1	–	–		–
励	–	2	4	4	–	丽	–	–	–	–	41
历	7	2	–	–	1	丽丽	5	2	3	1	2
						冋	1	1	–	1	–
						冋丽	–	–	–	–	1
						丽	–	–	1	–	–
两	86	9	6	18	5	龙	–		2	2	120
両	9	–	–	–	–	龙	1		3	–	–
刃	1	–	1	–	–	龍龒龓	3		–	–	–
刃	1	–	1	–	–	龍龙	2		–	–	–
						龙龙	1		–	–	–
马	0	7	14	8	10	卖读续	3	1	5	5	8
马	2	1	–	–	1	卖读	7	2	3	3	–
馬	85	10	5	3	–	卖讀	5	–	3	5	–
						籴	1	1	–	–	–
气	–	4	2	2	6	钱残浅线	3	–	6	7	5
氕	6	–	–	–	–	錢残浅綫	26	6	4	6	–
庆	–	3	5	4	17	区	22	4	5	6	33
庆	2	–	7	4	1	区	16	6	4	5	2
庋	2	–	–	–	–	区	22	1	3	4	1
						乥	1	1	2	4	14

Adopted form + rejected forms	1950-1954	1956-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	2000-2016	Adopted form + rejected forms	1950-1954	1956-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	2000-2016
释译泽泽		–	1	2	7	书	2	4	7	9	14
释译择泽	6	1	4	–	–	㐃	5	1	5	2	1
譯泽	–	1	1	1	–	书	–	1	2	–	–
釈訳択沢	–	–	1	–	–						
数	33	1	2	2	1	岁	4	4	4	4	1
敉	3	–	2	–	1	岁	5	3	7	4	–
籹	2	–	–	–	–	屵	–	–	2	–	–
牧	9	2	2	5	–	歩歨	3	–	–	–	–
叔	1	–	–	–	–	岁岁	2	–	–	–	–
做	2	–	1	3	–						
厅	2	4	8		6	图	6	2	1	4	2
厅	3	–	2		–	图	3	–	–	2	–
厛厛	4	–	–		–	图	14	–	–	–	–
所	3	–	–		–	图	–	–	–	–	–
						㐌	3	–	–	–	–
						畠畬	19	2	1	1	–
围	2	–	–	–	2	卫	8	4	14	13	9
围	14	–	1	2	–	卫	3	–	1	4	1
						彵彵	11	–	1	–	–
						彶	3	–	–	–	–
						衖	7	–	–	–	–
						衒	2	–	–	–	–
						衒	1	–	–	–	–
无	–	1	7	5	3	县	2	5	14	13	42
无	–	–	4	–	–	县	–	5	3	11	6
⺄	12	–	–	–	–	县	1	–	–	1	2
⺄	8	2	–	–	–	县	3	9	2	6	–
⺾	2	4	2	1	–	県㕠	1	–	–	–	–
						県呆	2	–	–	–	–

Adopted form + rejected forms	1950-1954	1956-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	2000-2016	Adopted form + rejected forms	1950-1954	1956-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	2000-2016
兴	8	4	9	16	20	学	32	12	18	21	23
凥奠	21	6	1	–	–	学	11	11	8	9	6
奠	1	–	–	–	–	學	17	1	1	–	–
共	–	–	–	–	–	學	5	2	–	–	–
						孝	1	2	2	–	–
亚恶	1	–	–	1	4	盐	–	–	–	–	3
亜悪	15	6	4	1	–	塩	7	–	1	–	–
						盐	–	–	–	1	–
业	2	23	26	22	16	与	37	4	5	9	3
叶	123	2	1	1	–	㚯	84	9	8	8	–
						典	24	–	1	–	–
						典	5	–	–	–	–
						奥	2	–	–	–	–
职	32	6	7	7	6	种	46	21	13	11	5
戗	34	1	1	1	–	秜	9	1	–	1	–
专传转	–	2	8	15	14	总	2	11	15	17	7
㫐侍转	61	9	4	12	5	総	93	3	1	–	–
專傳轉	11	–	1	–	–	捴	13	–	–	–	–

Unsurprisingly, less short variants like 從, 阕, 芏, 気, 釋, 厎, 图, 畾, 塩 and 総 were quickly discarded by writers, even though they had been more common than the shorter forms adopted by the committee. More surprisingly, writers obligingly abandoned even 国, 囲 and 戗, forms which were both simpler and more common than the adopted 国, 围 and 职. Most strikingly, use of the formerly obscure 业 quickly replaced the until then overwhelmingly common 叶.

Other outlawed forms turned out to be more resistant. Use of 坊, 奠 and 阰 receded slowly, and the discarded 庆 and 亚 long competed with the shorter 庆 and 亚. Less surprisingly, the newly coined 经 took its time to replace the habitual 绖 and 経. The slowest of all to gain acceptance has been the four-stroke 长, which has not even yet quite replaced the still popular five-stroke 长 and six-stroke 长.

Preventing disorder

So the reform did away with existing variants, but did it actually "prevent people from creating short forms at will and creating confusion"? Obviously not. We have registered one hundred and twenty-six forms appearing between 1956 and 1960: 沃 (澳), 罡 and 贾 (霸), 鼻 (鼻), 坒 (壁), 广 (病), 拵 (播), 芓 (菜), 扗 (插), 亣 and 宲 (察), 仛 (储), 丠 and 希 (带), 利 and 权 (稻), 辺 (道), 忈 (德), 矴 (碟), 茞 (董), 忪 (懂), 苻 and 実 (富), 忎 (感), 稐 (稿), 浂 (灌), 叙 and 缶 (罐), 莽 (癣), 蚨 (蝴), 笈 (籍), 朵 (集), 穴, 宀 and 宋 (家), 仆 (假), 浮 (酱), 亍 (街), 狎 (街), 氿 (酒), 倍 (靠), 昻 (量), 庁 (廖), 呤 (龄), 伶 (领), 朴 (楼), 孕 (率), 耒 (糯), 忟 (慢), 帽 (帽), 炻 (煤), 灱 (煤), 峃 (蒙), 宓 (密), 帟 (幕), 芍 (葡), 靑 (南), 申 (囊), 虍 (虐), 籼 and 耘 (糯), 为 (男), 沧 (漆), 囗 (器), 汘(潜), 许 (谦), 勖 and 劦 (勤), 仐 and 仐 (禽), 衽 (褥), 宨, 宀, 宣 and 宋 (赛), 仐   (伞), 仐 (食), 轵 (输), 沄 (潭), 苉 and 荇 (藤), 赴 (题), 仃 (停), 舡 (艇), 迪 (通), 汗 and 沇 (溪), 苫 (喜), 雫 (霞), 厈 and 厌 (厦), 玑 (现), 汇 (演), 妛 (要), 妖 (耀), 巨 (医), 忎, 艺, 忈 and 志 (意), 彤 (影), 彡 (影), 沈 (游), 忎 (愚), 忏 (愉), 跃 (跃), 酝 (醞), 芏 and 芝 (藏), 堆, 扒, 坛, 埕 and 坤 (增), 穵 (寨), 屄, 尸, 尼, 居 and 尺(展), 杢 (整), 估 and 仴 (传) and 迗, 迋 and 迪 (遵). Creating a new norm did not stop writers from creating new forms.

We also saw that the Cultural Revolution has been blamed for instigating the new forms. This is unjust; the 択 (插), 輀 (输), 阣 (随), 芍 (萄) and 汐 (溪) we registered between 1966 and 1976 are dwarfed by the one hundred and twenty seven created between 1956 and 1960.

What happened to the Second Scheme?

Many of the above-mentioned forms got a boost from their inclusion in the 1977 Second Character Simplification Scheme. From 1986 onwards, however, campaigns have been waged to keep such forms out of the public space. But were they out of people's mind and memory? We can test by asking readers of different ages to identify forms without context. Between 2010 and 2016 Wáng Jiālín, Xuē Lín, Yoon Kwan Song, Marja Kaikkonen and the author showed characters from List One of the 1977 Second Scheme to forty-five informants born in 1930–1969, sixty-seven born in 1970–1979 and ninety-one born in 1990–1996. Their answers are shown in Table 11.

Table 12. Percentage of informants recognising forms of the 1977 Second Scheme (excluding those known by less than 10% in all groups, like 㸆 for 爆, 厶 for 私 etc.).

Informants identifying	Born 1930 1969	Born 1980 1989	Born 1992–1996	Informants identifying	Born 1930–1969	Born 1980–1989	Born 1992–1996
鼻 as 鼻	24	10	13	㧑 as 播	20	1	0
卩 as 部	56	42	5	芽 as 菜	49	16	2
歺 as 餐	67	81	53	芷 as 藏	24	1	0
宊 as 察	20	1	0	㠯 as 弹	11	1	0
秝 as 稻	16	0	0	辺 as 道	44	34	4
茋 as 董	29	4	0	忩 as 懂	29	4	0
矴 as 短	16	1	0	踆 as 蹲	11	0	0
実 as 富	58	13	0	忈 as 感	33	19	0
叙 as 罐	11	1	0	北 as 冀	11	0	0
沾 as 建	56	37	13	亍 as 街	67	48	3
钅 as 镜	13	4	0	芁 as 韭	20	9	1
氿 as 酒	53	49	9	玏 as 璃	22	7	0
畅 as 量	71	28	8	仃 as 僚	13	0	0
灯 as 燎	13	1	1	峀 as 留	64	27	2
忞 as 慢	24	0	0	帒 as 帽	42	3	0
灱 as 煤	36	3	0	尸 as 眉	20	0	1
芏 as 蒙	13	0	0	百 as 面	33	25	1
酏 as 酿	13	1	0	㐲 as 虐	11	0	0
氻 as 漆	24	4	1	囗 as 器	60	31	0
劤 as 勤	56	13	1	圭 as 青	53	15	10
吐 as 嚷	18	3	0	圵 as 壤	16	3	0
宭 as 赛	38	15	0	轫 as 输	13	1	0
屖 as 属	40	19	2	祘 as 算	58	46	25
糖 as 糖	69	45	3	坣 as 堂	16	9	7

Informants identifying	Born 1930 1969	Born 1980 1989	Born 1992–1996	Informants identifying	Born 1930–1969	Born 1980–1989	Born 1992–1996
仃 as 停	67	57	15	迣 as 鞋	29	9	1
� as 信	38	45	5	厷 as 雄	22	7	0
叅 as 修	16	19	3	宀 as 宣	38	9	2
靴 as 靴	22	3	1	氿 as 演	27	1	1
妖 as 耀	33	4	5	昜 as 易	36	7	0
忈 as 意	33	4	0	迊 as 迎	42	24	3
彤 as 影	51	36	1	沈 as 游	11	0	1
厡 as 原	80	33	31	㚩 as 整	80	39	0
屟 as 展	76	19	5	丏 as 尊	13	0	0

With the exception of 尐, 祢, 迊 and 厡, forms from the Second Scheme are unknown to the younger generation. This shows that the post-1986 anti-variation campaigns have been effective in shielding youth from harmful exposure to variation in writing. Chinese writing is more uniform than it has ever been.

APPENDIX A

Reform schemes

Chinese schemes

1935.2 "Handy characters" 手头字 (200). *Tàibái* and 14 other periodi-
cals.

1935.5 "Plain stroke characters" 簡筆字. *Lúnyǔ*.

1935.8 List of Short Forms 簡体字表. Education Ministry.

1950.8 List of Common Short Forms (Manuscript) 常用簡字表(草稿).
Script Reform Society.

1955.1 Draft of the Character Simplification Scheme 漢字簡化方案草案.
Script Reform Committee.
Consisting of:
Draft List of Simplifications of 798 Characters 798 個漢字簡化表
草案.
Draft List of 400 Retained and Abolished Variants 擬廢除的 400
個異體字表草案.
Draft List of Simplified Handwritten Character Components 漢字
偏旁手寫簡化表草案.

1955.10 Revised Draft of the Character Simplification Scheme 漢字簡化
方案草案 (修正草案). Script Reform Committee.

1955.12 First List of Regulated Variants 第一批异体字整理表. Script Re-
form Committee and Culture Ministry.

1956.1 Character Simplification Scheme 漢字簡化方案. Cabinet.

1956.2 First Batch of Simplified Characters 漢字簡化第一表. Cabinet and
Script Reform Committee.

1956.6 Second Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters 第二批推行
的簡化字表. Script Reform Committee and Culture Ministry.

1958.5 Third Batch of Simplified Characters 第三批簡化字表. Script Re-
form Committee and Culture Ministry.

1959.7 Fourth Batch of Implemented Simplified Characters 第四批推行
的簡化字表. Script Reform Committee and Culture Ministry.

1962.4 List of Simplified Characters. 1962 年拟公布第一批简化汉字表.
Script Reform Committee.

1964.3 General List of Simplified Characters 简化字总表. Script Reform
Committee and Education Ministry.

1965.4   Table of Printed Forms of Current Characters 印刷通用汉字字形表. Script Reform Committee.

1973.8   Draft of a dictionary with 133 new simplified characters, seen by Helmut Martin. 文字改革出版社 Script Reform Publishing House.

1977.12   Second Character Simplification Scheme – Draft 第二次汉字简化方案 (草案). Script Reform Committee.

1979.11   First Revised Draft of the Second Character Simplification Scheme 第二次汉字简化方案修订草案(第一稿). Script Reform Committee.

1981.8   Revised Draft of the Second Character Simplification Scheme 第二次汉字简化方案修订草案. Script Reform Committee.

1986.10   General List of Simplified Characters 简化字总表 (with minor changes). Script Reform Committee, Culture Ministry and Education Ministry.

Japanese schemes

1908   Survey of Characters 漢字要覽 including list of Variants 別体. Education Ministry's Language Survey Committee 文部省內國語調查委員會.

1919   Character Regulation Scheme 漢字整理案. Education Ministry 文部省.

1923.5   List of Characters for Common Use 常用漢字表. Interim Committee on the Japanese Language, including a List of Abbreviated Characters 略字表.

1926.7   Proposal for the Regulation of Character Forms 字体整理案. Interim Committee on the Japanese Language.

1938.7   Proposal for the Regulation of Sino-Japanese Character Forms 漢字字体整理案. Japanese Language Council 国語審議会.

1942.6   List of Standard Characters 標準漢字表. Japanese Language Council.

1946.8   Simplified Forms 簡易字体. Textbook Office of the Education Ministry 文部省教科書局.

1946.9   List of Simplified Forms 簡易字体表. Japanese Language Council's Committee on Character Survey 国語審議会漢字主査会.

1946.11   List of Characters for Current Use 当用漢字表. Japanese Language Council and Cabinet.

1949.4   List of Forms of Characters for Current Use 当用漢字字体表. Japanese Language Council and Cabinet.

1951.5   List of Characters for Use in Personal Names 人名用漢字別表.

1954.3   Deliberative Report on the List of Characters for Current Use 当用漢字表審議報告. Japanese Language Council.

1977.4   Draft of New List of Characters 新漢字表試案. Japanese Language Council.
1981.10 List of Characters for Common Use 常用漢字表. Japanese Language Council.
2010.6   Revised List of Characters for Common Use 改定常用漢字表. Culture Council.

APPENDIX B

Time periods

China

Yin or Shang 殷	–1045 BCE
Zhou 周	1045–256
Western Zhou 西周	1045–771
Spring and Autumn 春秋	770–476
Warring States 战国	475–221
Qin 秦	221–206 BCE
Han 汉	206–220 CE
Western Han 西汉	206–9 CE
Xin 新	9–24
Eastern Han 东汉	25–220
Three Kingdoms 三国	220–280
Wei 魏	220–265
Jin 晋	265–420
Northern and Southern Dynasties 南北朝	386–581
Later Wei 后魏	386–556
Northern Wei 北魏	386–534
Liang梁	502–557
Sui 隋	581–618
Tang 唐	618–907
Liao 辽	907–1125
Song 宋	960–1279
Yuan 元	1279–1368
Ming 明	1368–1644
Qing 清	1644–1911
Taiping Rebellion 太平天国	1851–1864

Japan

Heian 平安	794–1185
Kamakura 鎌倉	1185–1392
Muromachi 室町	1392–1568
Edo 江戸	1600–1867

APPENDIX C

Surveyed manuscripts

Frequency statistics in Chapter 2 are based on the following manuscripts:

Chinese manuscripts from	1900–1909	1910–1919	1920–1929	1930–1934	1935–1939	1940–1949	1950–1954	Total
Beijing Archives	1	28	24	79	48	209	282	671
Guangdong Archives						2	18	20
Hangzhou Archives						1	8	9
Hubei Archives		1	4			6	12	23
Nanjing Archives			2	3		3	46	54
History books	3	4	15	36	37	76	5	176
Authors' manuscripts		1	4	3	5	2	1	16
Letters and covers	24	18	6	18	13	98	6	183
Receipts and accounts	6		14			4	10	34
Other documents		3	1	1		6	11	22
Total	34	55	70	140	103	407	399	1208

Japanese manuscripts from	1900–1909	1910–1919	1920–1929	1930–1939	1940–1946	Total
National Archives of Japan	43	67	56	43	86	295
Aichi Archives		4	6	2	1	13
Okayama Archives	2	1		1		4
Osaka Archives	2			2	3	7
Tokyo Archives		1	3			4
Yamaguchi Archives	7	12	29	21	14	83
Facsimiles in history books		5	5	6	6	22
Authors' manuscripts		1	2	5	4	12
Letters and covers	24	2	2	7	14	49
Headlines, cartoons, advertisements		1		1	1	3
Other	1				1	2
Total	79	94	103	89	130	494

Frequency statistics in Chapter 4:5 are based on the following manuscripts:

	1956–1960	1960–1969	1970–1979	2000–2016	Total
Manuscripts in Beijing Archives	32	36	30		98
Other administrative documents	39	33	60	2	134
Advertisements and posters		2		60	62
Letters and covers		12	9	164	185
Total	71	83	99	226	479

APPENDIX D

Informants

Between 1981 and 1986 informants in or from the following places were asked to identify characters out of context.

Anhui Hefei (interviews by RB, BH and TL), Anqing (RB), Bengbu (RB), Fuyang (RB), Huaibei (RB), Huangshan (HH), Jingxian (HH), Ma'anshan (RB), Sùzhou (RB). Tongling (RB).

Beijing Beijing (RB).

Fujian Fuzhou (RB), Dehua (RB), Longyan (RB), Putian (RB), Quanzhou (MZ), Xiamen (RB), Yong'an (RB), Zhangzhou (RB).

Gansu Lanzhou (RB), Yumen (IH).

Guangdong Guangzhou (RB), Haifeng (RB), Huizhou (RB), Jiangmen (RB), Maoming (RB), Meixian (GT, RB), Shantou (RB), Shaoguan (RB), Zhanjiang (RB), Zhaoqing (RB), Zhuhai (RB).

Guangxi Nanning (GB, RB), Beihai (RB), Guilin (AG, BL), Lingshan (RB), Liuzhou (RB), Wuzhou (RB), Yulin (GT, RB).

Guizhou Guiyang (RB), Xingyi (RB).

Hebei Shanhaiguan (RB), Tangshan (RB), Xingtai (RB).

Heilongjiang Harbin (VS), Daolu (TN), Qiqihar (RB), Yichun (RB),

Henan Zhengzhou (RB), Kaifeng (RB), Luoyang (RB), Nanyang (RB), Sanmenxia (RB), Shangqiu (RB), Xinyang (RB).

Hubei Wuhan (RB), Shashi (RB), Yichang (RB), Huangshi (RB).

Hunan Changsha (AG, PW, RB), Chaling (RB), Chenzhou (RB), Hengyang (RB), Jishou (JE), Lianyuan (RB), Shaoyang (RB), Xiangtan (RB), Yueyang (RB), Zhuzhou (RB),

Inner Mongolia Baotou (RB).

Jiangsu Nanjing (RB), Changzhou (RB), Huaiyin (RB), Lianyungang (RB), Nantong (BM, RB), Suzhou (GT, HH, RB), Yancheng (RB), Yixing (RB), Wuxi (RB), Xuzhou (RB), Zhenjiang (RB), Yangzhou (RB).

Jiangxi Nanchang (RB), Ganzhou (RB), Ji'an (RB), Jingdezhen (RB), Jinggangshan (RB), Jiujiang (RB), Ruijin (RB), Shangrao (RB), Xiushui (RB), Yongxin (RB).

Jilin Changchun (RB), Jilin (RB), Tonghua (RB).

Liaoning Shenyang (RB), Anshan (RB), Benxi (RB), Dalian (RB).

Qinghai Lenghu (IH).

Shandong Jinan (RB, RS), Dezhou (RB), Linyi (RB), Qingdao (LN, RB), Yanzhou (RB), Zibo (RB).

Shanghai Shanghai (LN, MF, RB).

Shanxi   Taiyuan (RB), Changzhi (RB), Yangquan (RB), Yuncheng (RB),
Shaanxi   Xi'an (PL, RB-s, IH), Tongchuan (RB), Yan'an (RB).
Sichuan   Chengdu (RB, MF), Chongqing (RB), Guanxian (GM, RB), Wanx-
          ian (RB), Yajiang (LN).
Tianjin: Tianjin (RB).
Yunnan   Kunming (RB), Qujing (RB).
Zhejiang Hangzhou (RB), Huzhou (RB), Jiaxing (RB), Jinhua (RB), Linhai
          (RB), Lishui (RB), Ningbo (RB), Wenzhou (RB), Shaoxing (RB,
          PL).
AG: Anne Gunn. BH: Bhavatośa. BL: Bertil Lundahl. BM: Bào Míngwěi.
          GM: Göran Malmqvist. GT: Giusi Tamburello. HH: Helena Hå-
          kansson. IH: Inge Hoem. JE: Joakim Enwall. LN: Laura Newby.
          MF: Magnus Fiskesjö. MZ: a man from Zhenjiang. PL: Per Lei-
          mar. PW: Philip Wickeri. RB: Roar Bökset. RS: Rune Svarverud.
          TN: Tomas Nilsson. VS: Vikram Seth.
Informants easily tired so each was shown only a part of the forms.

APPENDIX E

Index of irregular characters

一一

3 丁(街) 专(长) **4** 亓(其) 乃(发) **5** 戋(錢) 孔(现) 讵(出) 专专(青) 叔(数) **6** 未
(来) 戋(錢) 北(冀) 劼(勤) 圭(壹) **7** 忈(感) 忎(愚意) 彤(影) 忎(感) 圭(壹)
8 悥(愿) 圭(壹) **10** 祢(酸) **11** 麱(面) **14** 蝅(参) **15** 麺(面)

一丨

2 丁(题) **4** 扑(矿) 丐(面) 古(南) 六(戴) 冚(丽) **5** 卟(盐块) 仈(增) 切(切) 由
(块) 芋(藤) 兰(兰篮) 芇(营) 尣(韭) 芍(葡萄) 艾(其) 冋(丽) 申(囊) 卋(世) 孔
(现) 广(严) **6** 圤(壤) 古(世) 辻(走) 芏(篮兰) 芷芰(藏) 咠(喜) 苢(菌) 芽
(菜) 芏(蒙) 芇(第) 申(囊) **7** 坛(增) 坩(境) 坤(增) 坊(场) 乎(准) 北
(冀) 苊(藤) 苇(董) 芘(蓖蔽) 芼(笔) 芮(蔡) 芡芏(蒙) 苣(董) 苊(藤)
苻(藤) 芋(等) 杤(機) 杄(碟) 叓(事) 迊(迎) **8** 耴(职) 垽(增) 㦿㦿
(戴) 茇(发) 茨(灌) 苍(管) 芩(董) 荻茷(护) 茉(苏) 荣(药) 卖帯(卖)
坛(檀) 相(杨) 忝(想) 夵夵(森) 枪(腔) 恊(协) **9** 尃(击) 菩(等) 苊
(蔽) 茇茇(罚) 芕(华) 茬(藏) 荮(薅) 苻(藤) 赵(赵) 禺(区) 耕(构) 柗
(检) 枞(机) 枟(楼) 枯(检) 柊(槟) 贾(霸) **10** 戙戙(職) 欨(款) 埖(增)

苘(简) 荭(护) 莠茫(薄) 卽(节) 栀(橡) 紏(韩) 恶(恶) 酃(霸) 覔(覆)
酳(酿) 曹(曹) 11 聑(聯) 埥(增) 萡(箱) 蓈(丽) 夷(轟) 遠(还) �羕(严)
酨(戏) 酔(醉) 12 聠(联) 晉(晋) 葙(箱) 戴(戴) 萹(篇) 13 塩(盐) 韩(韩)
麗(丽) 楠(构) 畺(疆) 14 覇(霸) 樹(树) 15 塩(盐) 襛(农)

<center>一丿</center>

4 厷(雄) 卅(州) 卝(带) 5 厈(厦) 百(面) 夲(本) 厶(去) 卌(带) 6 厡
(原) 夸(套) 帝(幕带) 7 矴(碟) 叝(罐) 厌(厦) 尨(龙) 套(套) 8 尣
(整) 盉(盘) 厬(厦) 厡(厂) 灰(厕) 9 压 厅(厅) 砕(碎) 厇(厐) 盉
(盘) 頋(愿) 10 愿(愿) 髙(乔) 碟(碟) 砱(磷) 11 碵(矿) 12 顾
(愿) 磙(碟) 碵(矿) 奋(厐) 13 殧(餐) 14 砿(矿)

<center>一、</center>

5 忈(德意) 8 勁(劲) 亜(疆) 9 雫(霞) 10 霘(霸) 11 雫(霞) 14 靇
(霸)

<center>一フ</center>

3 巨(医) 㠪(虐) 工(工) 4 邓(邓) 弋 什(甚) 5 扟(担) 㢺(正) 丗
(世) 劼(勤) 与(与) 𨍏(输) 东(東) 6 扞(插检) 扔(报插) 扚(搞) 卟
(韩) 帚(幕) 㐂(喜) 车(辆) 𨊥(輸) 7 択(插) 坛(擅) 扶(摊) 扣
(扬) 抡(枪) 㱮(款) 扲(于) 择(插) 轫(辆) 迏(达) 坒(壁) 毕(弊) 8 拵
(播) 拠(据) 転(转) 枼(叶) 韩(韩) 轫(辆) 9 挍(擦) 摠(总) �&(扩) 轴
(輸) 10 揷(插) 捘(擦) 搰(搞) 摀(扩) 轾(轻) 11 遊(游) 摁捴
(总) 擇(择) 12 摠捴(总)

<center>|一</center>

5 歺(餐) 6 岁(岁) 点(点) 7 岁(岁) 旹(旨) 迠(建) 8 奌(点) 迠
(建) 10 徤(健) 11 處(处) 12 埽(归) 歳(岁)

<center>| |</center>

5 帳(张) 6 恬(张) 7 屮(蒙) 儿(儿) 興(与) 8 與(与) 烖(发) 9 興
(与) 烖(发) 10 丵(凿) 11 擧(举) 烖(发) 12 烖(发) 13 弒(发) 蒙
(蒙) 14 烖(发)

<center>|丿</center>

12 丬(行) 5 皈(后) 9 卿(卿)

<center>|、</center>

8 坣(堂) 10 妖(耀) 12 甞(尝)

3 冋(同) 去(书) 4 皿(器) 囚(圆) 囸(国) 5 当(岁) 罒(贾) 6 皿
(器) 吐(嚷) 岀(动) 回(因) 圗(图) 7 盯(了) 昂(量) 旺(国) 呪
(品) 叫(叫) 迪(通遵) 囬(回) 图(图) 帽(帽) 岽(岁) 屺(巉) �
(兴) 赐(赐) 8 虾(虾) 蚊(蝶) 龟(龟) 严(严) 旺 园(国) 罡罜
(罢) 赈赒(购) 9 龟(龟) 敂(数) 眀(明) 杲(县) 旺(曜) 赶(题) 跔
(蹈) 囱囵(国) 贴赚(购) 10 蚨(蝴) 踢(踢) 11 圕(图) 踎(蹲) 跃
(跃) 赴(题) 明(明) 12 圕(图) 13 跨(蹲) 赌(购) 16 叠(叠)

5 气(气) 6 缶(罐) 気(气) 重(重) 7 𥝱(短) 利(稻) 杈(稻) 利
(稻) 𥝱(插) 𢆡(无) 8 叙(罐) 炊(款) 秽(稿) 秋(艺) 9 毡(毯) 钍
(镶) 秋(稳) 耘(种) 竺(篮) 笈(籍) 10 钲(镇) 势(势) 型(制) 11 秭
(种) 12 铏(镜) 缺(罐) 秸(稿) 13 筹筡(簿) 14 释(释) 17 穤(糯)

4 仃(停) 仈(儒) 仪(仪) 仔(僚) 5 伓(假) 仟(儒) 才(传) 伯(个) 佊
(卫) 6 俪(价假) 伝(价传) 使(使) 仸仅(信) 𠆥(佛) 伊(雇) 乑
(众) 7 储(储) 估(传) 伶(领) 体(体) 伏(使) 皃(貌) 8 俪价(价) 俪
(儒) 帒(袋) 倄(橡) 兜(儿) 宊(众) 奂(兴) 9 鼻(鼻) 倚(靠) 10 岭
(龄) 俻(备) 11 僄(儒)

4 彳(行) 5 彴(律) 彴(卫) 尒(尔) 6 余(集) 徂彴(卫) 7 虍
(虎) 8 衧(街) 径径(径) 衍(卫) 舡(艇) 9 徎(径) 徔徔(从) 衍(卫) 舯
(舰) 10 逓(递) 衢(衢) 衘(卫) 舩(船) 11 衛(卫)

2 义(义) 3 亼(集) 亾(亡) 4 𠆢(食) 仓(仓) 5 仝(同) 伞(伞) 佘
(人民币) 6 余(集) 迠(建) 7 俞佘(命) 叕(图) 迠(建) 酋(酱) 8 俞
(命) 9 豹(貌) 10 金(金) 看(看) 11 晋(管)

2 几(风) 3 凤(风) 幺(公) 4 卆(卒) 𦣞(能) 凤凫凰(风) 5 色
(包) 6 危(象) 乡(修) 7 帋(纸) 肚(肠) 8 胏(胜) 股胅(腰) 狨(获) 逼
(运) 9 肿(胜) 胺(腰) 奂(鱼) 猫(狮) 10 胶胺(胁) 龟(龟) 11 朋
(脘) 13 觧(解) 19 顚(愿)

丶一

4 広(应) 5 圹(病) 庁(廖) 6 芢(意) 厇(厦) 庲(广) 庅(慶) 彦(廖) 広
(幺) 7 庲(广) 庚(库) 庄(庄) 庆(庆) 孛(学) 8 竟(觉) 9 畆畆(亩) 庇
(广) 疮(疮) 10 竟(觉) 厛(厅) 11 懂(懂) 諽(議) 斋(斋) 誊(誉) 庙
(庙) 13 鼓(护) 竜(龙) 15 譯(译) 16 讟(讲) 竟(竞) 龍(龙)

丶丨

5 闫(问题) 6 忬(愉) 忛(慢) 惕(惕) 殳(後) 闬(关) 7 忝(懊) 闱
(斗) 闶(关) 8 忕(情) 忪(懂) 怑(懒) 闧(关) 9 惚(恼) 10 怶(懂)

丶丿

5 张(张) 6 张(张) 18 顠(愿)

丶丶

4 汀(潦) 儿(儿) 丷(照) 为(男) 宀(宣) 5 沁(漆) 溪 氿(酒) 呂(召)
氕(第) 灳(煤) 宂(家) 宁(寮) 6 汐(溪) 汗(潜溪) 专(尊) 朴(粮) 籴
(糯) 攴(数) 朴(爆) 炎(光) 妥(妥) 宊(家) 窄(寨) 宙(密赛) 宣(赛)
攵攵(察) 芝(定) 7 泄(滿) 洴(沟) 沈(游) 沄(潭) 泓(酒) 浄(淬) 沃(澳)
汇(演) 牀(床) 焊(焊赣) 贠(贸) 实(富) 宋(赛) 宂(察) 凭(凭) 8 浸(灌)
泄泄(沟) 洴(清) 泫(法) 澜(澜滥) 耗(糯) 攵(数) 郑(郑) 炖(煤) 甾(留)
鼠(鼠) 侻(管) 宛(家) 符(富) 秔(糯) 9 泸(护) 遵(遵) 沉(源) 汉(汉)
沃(灌) 籺(糖) 羊(墙) 烟(烟) 举(举) 宙(赛) 穿(窦) 10 涛(薄) 節(节)
秔(糯) 枚(数) 粹(粹) 鉴(鉴) 11 游(游) 涌(沟) 泽(泽) 宁(宁) 12 游
(游) 迸(选) 刘(刘) 13 養(养) 冀(冀) 14 難(难) 墙(墙) 窗(窗) 寶(宾)
18 糯(糯)

丶フ

3 亠(高) 4 才(第) 6 讯(译) 礻(褛) 7 讲讲迸(讲) 诗诂(请) 讠(澜) 礻
(褛) 寫(写) 戏(戏) 8 讦(谦) 袄(裤) 彡(影) 9 運迍(运) 袄(褛) 10 译
(译) 崔(鹤)

フ一

3 彐(雪) 4 尼(尼) 5 屄(展尼) 尺(展层) 年(年) 6 多(多) 录(要) 刵
(剧) 勽(疆) 7 屄(展) 8 郰(邹) 屄屄屄(属) 居(展) 弹(弹) 9 寻(寻) 展
(殿) 10 閂(问题) 遭(遵) 耶(邹) 畫(画) 屄(属) 弸(疆) 12 肃(肃) 刉
(划) 迟(迟) 13 開(关) 疆(疆)

2 卩阝(部) 4 尸(眉) 5 财(随) 6 共(兴) 匋(陶) 7 陏(随) 11 陰(阴)

2 为(身男) 3 㑊(易) 双(两) 飞(区) 乩(乱) 4 刃(两) 卛(率) 5 㝈(导) 辺(道) 剡(剔) 娒(娘) 6 羋(解) 7 屚(属) 絲(丝) 14 疆(疆) 15 闗(关) 18 鬬(斗)

2 厶(私) 3 乇(正) 囯(国) 4 乇(无) 5 妛(要) 忥(意) 6 貟(员) 靴(靴) 飞(飞) 7 翌艺(翼) 8 柔(业) 鞋(鞋) 魚(斋) 9 叅(参) 貟(员) 畄(留) 発(发) 飛(飞) 10 圖(图) 業(业) 唯(唯) 11 选(选) 餐(餐) 12 辞(辞) 叅(参)

2 卫(卫) 3 彑(彝) 4 妛(要) 6 骄骈(验) 劦荔(州) 7 骈 骈(验 8 骟(验) 纟(缆) 绍(绍) 经(经) 9 经(经) 10 脊(胁) 练(缆) 網纲(网) 线(线) 12 總(总) 17 總总

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and articles

A Rare Collection of Chinese Stamps Kept by China National Postage Stamp Museum: *The Revolutionary War Period* 中国邮票博物馆藏品集–革命战争时期卷. 1990. China National Postage Stamp Museum, ed. People's Posts and Telecommunications Publishing House, Beijing.

Ā Zhēng 阿征. 1966. "'麻烦字'要多簡化: 山西聞喜临汾农村干部对汉字简化的要求". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1966.3.30.

Abe Shinnosuke 阿部真之助. 1963. "国語の改善について (報告)". In Inokuchi 1982, pp. 120–127.

Ǎi Qū 靄區. "汉字簡化要不要照顧方音". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:5, pp. 26–27.

Ài Wěi 艾偉. 1949. 漢字問題. Shanghai.

Andō Masatsugu 安藤正次. 1948. Speech in Inokuchi 1982, pp. 96–102.

Ānhuī gémìng shǐ huàcè 安徽革命史画册. 2003. Ānhuī shěng Xīnsìjūn lìshǐ yánjiūhuì, ed. Hefei.

Ānhuī shěng jiàoyùjú 安徽省教育局. "安徽省关于'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'讨论情况的汇报". 1978. *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 27–28.

Aoki Masami 青木正美. 2001. 近代作家自筆原稿集. Tokyo.

Arai Hakuseki 新井白石. *Dōbun tsūkō* 同文通考. Completed c. 1705, published 1760. In Sugimoto 1974, vol. 1.

Atsuji Tetsuji 阿辻哲次. "異体字のはなし". *Sinica* 2001:6, pp. 14–19.

Bái Jùnrú 白俊儒 (哈爾濱師範專課學校). 1951. "建議字要寫端正 (一)". *Yǔwén xuéxí* 3, pp. 55–56.

Bào Yòuwén 鮑幼文. 1955. "对'汉字简化方案'的几點意見". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:8, pp. 39–41.

Bǎo Qí 保琦. "談談簡化漢字的幾種方法". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1952:4, pp. 10–12.

Bǎo lián dēng 宝蓮灯. [1982?]. [Guangzhou?], stencil.

Běijīng kàngzhàn túshǐ 北京抗战图史. 2005. Zhōnggòng Běijīng shìwěi dǎngshǐ yánjiūshì, ed. Beijing.

Běijīng rénmín gémìng dòuzhēng 北京人民革命斗争. 1991. Beijing.

Běijīng shìwěi jiàoyùjú gōngzuòbù 北京市委教育工作部. 1978. "'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'意见的综合报告". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 2–4.

Běijīng shì yǔyán wénzì gōngzuò wěiyuánhuì 北京市语言文字工作委员会. "整顿 300 条大街社会用字加强社会用字管理". *Yǔwén jiànshè* 1990:5, pp. 16–20.

Bì Cāng 璧滄. " '整'不应简写为'正' ". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1960:13, p. 13.

[Cáo] Bóhán [曹]柏寒. 1943. "有根據的簡筆字". *Guówén zázhì* 4–5, pp. 23–25.

[Cáo] Bóhán [曹]伯韓. "关于'汉字簡化方案草案'編製経过的几点說明". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.3.2. Also in *Jiǎnhuà hànzì wèntí*. (On 滨仓卢.)

Cáo Bóhán 曹伯韓. "關於漢字簡化中的同音代替問題". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.9.14. (On 伙帒吁郁云.)

—— "关于修正'汉字簡化方案'的問題". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1957:1 (Aug.), pp. 28–30.

—— "汉字簡化工作必須繼續推进". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1958.2.24.

Cáo Rúpíng 曹茹萍. 1955. "從一个'造象記'研究簡体字的產生时代". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.2.16.

Cáo Wǎnrú 曹婉如. 1989. "有关天水放马滩秦墓出土地图的几个问题". *Wénwù* 1989:12, pp. 78–85.

"Cǎo'àn" dì yī biǎo xiūdìng qíngkuàng shuōmíng "草案"第一表多订恃况说明. 1979. Script Reform Committee's Character Group [文字改革委员会]汉字组. Beijing, stencil.

Chang, Paul Ke-Shing 張愷升. 1995. 中國郵戳史·第九册 History of Postal Cancellation of China, Part 9. San Francisco.

Chángyòng jiǎnzì biǎo (*cǎogǎo*) 常用簡字表(草稿). 1950. Zhōngguó wénzì gǎigé xiéhuì mìshūchù, ed. [Beijing], stencil.

Chángzhēng tújiàn 长征图鉴. 2006. 刘益涛 ed. Changsha.

Chén Bāngfú 陈邦福. (1926) 2000. 殷契琐言. Beijing.

Chén Guāngyáo 陳光垚[堯]. 1931. 簡字論集. Shanghai.

— 1936. 常用簡字表. Shanghai.

— 1953. "談精簡漢字". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1953:12, pp. 3–6.

— 1955 (finished in 1954). 常用簡字普. Beijing.

— 1955. "我們可不可以造簡體字?". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:2, pp. 11–13.

— 1955. "798 個簡化漢字的來源". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.2.2.

— 1956. 簡化漢字字体說明. Beijing. (Unspecified Chén quotes are from this book.)

Chén Lìsēn 陈立森 (福建省建設厅工业設備安裝公司). 1965. "工人乐用簡化字". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1965:3, p. 16.

Chén Mèngjiā 陈夢家. 1957. "关于汉字的前途". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1957.5.19.

Chén Qìngwǔ 陈庆武 (福建). 1985. "街头用字必须规范化−福州街道使用文字情况的调查". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1985:1, p. 11.

Chén Róngpǔ 陳榕甫. 1950. "從漢字發展談到簡體字的應用". *Xīnwénzì zhōu kān* 43, pp. 1–2; 44, p. 5; 45, pp. 4–5. Also in Dù 1952.

Chén Wénbīn 陈文彬. 1956. "对漢字簡化第一表中的一些字的說明". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1956:4, pp. 19–23.

Chén Yuè 陈越. 1956. "認真使用簡化汉字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1956.12.5.

— 1962. "試論汉字簡化的規律性". *Xīn jiànshè* 1962:2, pp. 11–19.

Chén Zhōngfán 陈中凡. "關於漢字改革的方針步驟問題". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.12.21. Same as "陈中凡代表的發言" in *Quánguó wénzì gǎigé huìyì wénjiàn huìbiān*, pp. 75–79.

Chén Zuòlín 陳作霖. 1888. 冶山房叢書. Manuscript in *Míng-Qīng wèi kān gǎo*.

Chéng Yí 澄镱. 1957. "对个别簡笔字的意见". *Wénzì gǎigé* 3, pp. 39–40.

"Chéngshì bù guīfàn yòng zì héshí xiū?" "城市不规范用字何时休?" 2005. 南通师范学校语言文字网. http.www//yywz.ntsf.edu.cn/ShowArticle.asp?ArticleID=40, accessed 27 April 2005.

Chìsè yóuzhèng zànxíng zhāngchéng 赤色郵政暂行章程. 1932. Ruijin. Facsimile in *Jíyóu vánjiū*, 1985:3, p. 6.

Chóng Wén 崇文. 1962–1963. "簡字正誤". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1962.12.12, 1962.12.26, 1963.1.9. Also in *Wénzì gǎigé* 1963:3.

Chu, Joe Hing Kwok. 2010. Traditional Chinese Medicine (TCM). http://alternativehealing.org/traditional_chinese_medicine.htm, accessed 19 July 2010.

"Chūgoku no kanji: kako–genzai–mirai (ge)". "中国の漢字·過去·現在·未来 (下)". 1994. 三省堂ぶっくれっと 108, pp. 8–21.

Chūgoku shodō zenshū 中国書道全集 第 2 卷. 1986. Tokyo.

Chūgoku hōsho sen 中国法書選. 1988–1990. Tokyo.

Cíhǎi 辭海. 1979. Cíhǎi biānjí wěiyuánhùi 辞海编辑委员会. Shanghai.

Cíyuán (xiūdìng běn) 辭原(修訂本). 1979. Guǎngdōng, Guǎngxǐ, Húnán, Hénán *Cíyuán* xiūdìng zǔ, eds. Beijing.

Clark, Kenneth G. 2004. *The History & Postal History of Japan's Wars*. Japan Philatelic Group Ltd. Farnham Common, Buckinghamshire.

Cuī Xǐzhōng 催喜忠. 2007. "80 后: 大学生营销之路的现状". http//www.emkt.com.cn/article/324/32465.html, accessed 9 October 2010.

Dà Guāng 大光. "要正确地使用簡化字". *Hā'ěrbīn rìbào* 1961.6.26.

Dài Tiānjiàn 戴天健. "讀'汉字简化方案'以后". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:3, p. 39.

Dài Tóng 戴侗 (1200–1284). 六書故. Ming edition reprinted 2006 in Shanghai.

Dàjiāng nánběi 大江南北—新四军抗日战争革命史料画集. 1987. Lǐ Guǎng et al., eds. Shanghai.

Dazai Shundai 太宰春臺. *Wakai seika* 倭楷正訛. 1753. In Sugimoto 1974, vol. 4.

"Dì èr cì hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn (cǎo'àn)" "第二次汉字简化方案 (草案)". Zhōngguó wènzì gǎigé wěiyuánhùi. *Rénmín rìbào* 1977.12.20.

Dì èr cì hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn xiūdìng cǎo'àn – Zhēngqiú yìjiàn biǎo 第二次汉字简化方案修订草案–征求意见表. 1981. Zhōngguó wènzì gǎigé wěiyuánhùi. [Beijing].

"Dì yī pī yìtǐzì zhěnglǐ biǎo" "第一批异体字整理表". 1955. In *Guójiā yǔyán wénzì zhèngcè fǎguī huìbiān*, pp. 62–80.

Dīng Chén 丁晨 (杭州大学中文系). "也談簡化汉字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1960.9.8.

Dīng Shān 丁山. 1930. 說文闕義箋. Beiping.

Dīng Xīlín 丁西林. 1952. "現代漢字及其改革的途徑". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 2, pp. 5–9; 3, pp. 14–19.

— "为什么必須繼續簡化汉字和怎样繼續簡化?". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1960.7.28.

Dōbun tsūkō, see Arai Hakuseki.

Dǒng Jiànshēn 董健身. "对'汉字简化方案草案'的一些意见". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.2.16.

Dǒng Wèichuān 董渭川 (北京师范大学教育系教授). 1964. "需要进一步做好汉字简化工作". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1964:7, p. 3.

Dōngguǎn shīfàn yǔwénkē sānjí jiàoxué xiǎozǔ 东莞师范语文科三级教学小组. "如何糾正不規范簡化字". *Nánfāng rìbào* 1961.11.9.

"Dōnghàn jiǎn 'Jiǎqú hóu Lì jūn suǒ zé kòu ēn shì' cè" "东汉简'甲渠候粟君所责寇恩事'册". 1986. *Shūfǎ cóngkān* 11, p. 58.

"Dōnghàn jiǎn 'Wǔwēi Hàn dài yījiǎn'" "东汉简'武威汉代医简'". 1986. *Shūfǎ cóngkān* 11, pp. 64–65.

Dōngtái xiàn zhì 東臺縣志 (一). 1817. By Cài Fùwǔ et al. Reprinted 1960 in Taibei.

Dù Dìngyǒu 杜定友. "精簡漢字爲拼音化舖平道路". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:2, pp. 10–11.

Dù Yǒngdào 杜永道. 2009. "'象''像'相'怎样区分". *Rénmín rìbào hǎiwaibǎn* 2009.1.17.

Dù Zhāohuī 杜朝晖. "'袜'字源流考". *Yǔyán yánjiǔ*, 2006:3, pp. 101–102.

Dù Zǐjìng 杜子勁, ed. 1952. 一九五0年中國語文問題論文輯要. Beijing.

Duàn Dàpéng 段大鵬. "我对某些简化汉字的意见". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:4, p. 25.

Duàn Yùcái 段玉裁. Written 1776–1807, published 1815. *Shuōwén jiězì zhù* 說文解字注. Reprinted 1981 in Shanghai.

Dūnhuáng bǎozàng 敦煌寶藏. 1984. 黃永武 et al., eds. Taibei.

Emori Kenji 江守賢治. 1986. 解説字体辞典. Tokyo.

Enshū komonjo sen: Kindai hen 演習古文書選: 近代編. (1979) 1995. Nihon rekishi gakkai, ed. Tokyo.

Enshū komonjo sen: Shōen hen 演習古文書選: 荘園編. (1979) 1995. Nihon rekishi gakkai, ed. Tokyo.

Èrjiǎn cǎo'àn (yuángǎo) yǔ xiūdìng cǎo'àn (dì yī gǎo) duìzhàobiǎo, 1979. [Wénzì gǎigé wěiyuánhuì, ed.]. [Beijing], stencil.

Fán Dīng 凡丁. "为什么不能把簡化字的部分結構当作簡化偏旁使用?". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1965:3, pp. 10-11.

Fán Jiāng 樊江 (浙江省於潜初级中学). "从简化字公布后副作用問題談起". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1957.11.14.

Fèi Jǐnchāng 费锦昌. "商店用字调查报告". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1985:5, pp. 30–33, 52.

Féng Liǔtáng 馮柳堂. 1937. "記載款項上面應用一什麼字". *Shēnbào* 2:20, pp. 444–445.

Fēng Zǐkǎi 丰子恺. 1935. "漫談". *Tàibái* 2:1, pp. 18–19.

Fù Cháoyáng 傅朝陽. "容易写錯用錯的簡化汉字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1956.12.5.

Fù Yǒnghé 傅永和 (中国文字改革委员会汉字处工作人员). "第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'的修订工作". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1982:1, pp. 22–23.

— "巩固整理和简化汉字工作的成果促进汉字使用的规范化". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1984:1, pp. 30–33.

Fù Yuán qiàn gǔjīn zájù sānshí zhǒng 覆元槧古今雜劇三十種. 1959. Kyoto.

Fújiàn gémìng shǐ huàjí 福建革命史画集. 1982. Fújiàn gémìng shǐ huàjí biānjí wěiyuánhùi, ed. Fuzhou.

Fújiàn shěng jiàoyùjú 福建省教育局. "福建省关于'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'征求意见情况的汇报". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 25–27 (dated 1978.7.1).

Fujikawa Sukezō 藤川助三. "略字について". *Kokugo seikatsu* 1962:7, pp. 86–87.

Fushimi Chūkei 伏見沖敬, ed. 1964. 書道大辞典. Tokyo.

— (1977) 1988. 書道辞典. Tokyo.

— 1989. 隷書大字典. Tokyo.

Gānlù zìshū 干祿字書. By Yán Yuánsūn 顏元孫 (–714). 1781 transcript in *Sì kù quánshū*, vol. 224, pp. 243–50.

Gāo Hēng 高亨. 1989. 古字通假會典. Jinan.

Gāo Jǐngchéng 高景成. 1957. "关于'第一批异体字整理表'的一些問題". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1957.4.18.

— 2008. 常用字字源字典. Beijing.

Gāo Míng 高明. 1980. 古文字类编. Beijing.

Gāo Míngjìng 高明镜. "'皃'和'兒'". *Yǔwén xuéxí* 1980:4, p. 49.

Gāo Shòuyǒng 高寿永 (南京市珠江路小学). 1978. "谈简化汉字的兼顾问题". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1978.4.21

Gāo Sōng 高嵩. "要認真学習'汉字簡化方案'". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1958:7, p. 324.

"Gè dì rénshì duì 'Hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn cǎo'àn' de yìjiàn tíyào" "各地人士对'汉字简化方案草案'的意见提要". Zhōngguó wénzì gǎigé wěiyuánhuì hànzì zhěnglǐ bù 中國文字改革委員會漢字整理部, ed. *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:3, pp. 37–39.

Gōng Shì 恭士. "汉字简化中的同音代替問題". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:4, pp. 18–20.

Gù Yánwǔ 顧炎武 (1613–1682). 唐韻正. Quoted in *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn*.

Guì Fù 桂馥 (1736–1805). 繆篆分韻. Reprinted 1985 in Shanghai.

Gǔjīn zájù sānshí zhǒng 古今雜劇三十種. Quoted in Liú 1930.

Guǎn Xièchū 管燮初. "关于汉字简化的意见". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:6, pp. 39–40.

Guǎng Yì 广邑 (长春十二中学教学教师). "正字正音要从教师做起". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1965:7, p. 12.

Guǎngxī zhuàngzú zìzhì qū wénzì gǎigé língdǎo xiǎozǔ 广西壮族自治区文字改革领导小组. 1978. "广西壮族自治区讨论'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'的情况汇报". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, p. 42.

Guǎngyùn 廣韻. 1008. By Chén Péngnián 陳彭年. Song edition reprinted in 2005 as *Sòngběn Guǎngyùn* by Jiāngsū jiàoyù chūbǎnshè. 1704 edition reprinted 1964 in *Guǎngyùn jiàoběn*.

Guǎngyùn jiàoběn 廣韻校本. 1964. Taibei.

"Guānyú 'Dì èr cì hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn (cǎo'àn)' dá dúzhě" "关于'第二次汉字简化方案 (草案)'答读者". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1978:3, pp. 28–29.

"Guānyú jiǎnhuà hànzì ruògān wèntí de jiědá" "关于简化汉字若干问题的解答". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1960:14, p. 18.

Guō Mòruò 郭沫若. 1932. 金文叢考. Beiping.

— 郭沫若. "怎样看待群众中新流行的简化字?" *Hóngqí* 1972:4, pp. 84–85.

Guō Ruòyú 郭若愚. 1955. 太平天國革命文物圖錄 補編. Shanghai.

Guō Yìqīng 郭挹清. 1936. 手头字概論. Shanghai.

Guōdiàn Chǔjiǎn jiàoshì 郭店楚簡校釋. 2005. By Liú Zhāo 劉釗. Fuzhou.

Guōdiàn Chǔjiǎn wénzì biān 郭店楚簡文字編. 2000. Zhāng Shǒuzhōng 张守中 et al., eds. Beijing.

Guójiā túshūguǎn cáng zhěnguì gémìng lìshǐ wénxiàn túlù 国家图书馆藏珍贵革命历史文献图录. 2001. Guójiā túshūguǎn shànběn tècáng bù, ed. Beijing.

Guójiā yǔyán wénzì zhèngcè fǎguī huìbiān 国家语言文字政策法规汇编. 1996. Beijing.

Guóyīn chángyòng zìhuì 國音常用字彙. 1932. Jiàoyùbù guóyǔ chóubèi wěiyuánhuì, ed. Shanghai.

Gǔwénzì shìyào 古文字解释要. 2010. Lǐ Pǔ and Zhèng Míng, eds. Shanghai.

Hǎi Gē 海戈. 1934. "論俗字 (下)". *Lúnyǔ* 37, pp. 652–657.

Hán Róngshí 韓鎔石. "汉字簡化工作也可以大跃进". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1958:11, pp. 16–17.

Hànshū 漢書. 111. By Bān Gù 班固. Jingyou (1034–1037) edition in Sì bù cóngkān: *shǐ bù*.

Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn 漢語大字典·縮印本. 1993. *Hànyǔ dà zìdiǎn biānjí wěiyuánhuì*, ed. [Chengdu and Wuhan].

Hànyǔ fāngyīn zìhuì 汉语方音字汇. 第二版. 1989. Běijīng dàxué zhōngguó yǔyánxué xì, yǔyánxué jiàoyán xì, eds. Beijing.

"Hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn" "漢字簡化方案". 1956. 中華人民共和國國務院. *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1956:2, pp. 48–51.

"Hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn cǎo'àn gōngbù yī gè duō yuè lái de qíngkuàng" "'汉字簡化方案草案'公布一个多月來的情况". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.3.2.

"Hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn cǎo'àn shuōmíng" "漢字簡化方案草案說明". 1955. Zhōngguó wénzì gǎigé wěiyuánhuì 中國文字改革委員會. *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:1, appendix, pp. 1–14.

Hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn (xiūzhèng cǎo'àn) 漢字簡化方案 (修正草案). 中國文字改革委員會, ed. [Beijing, 文字改革委員會], 1955.

"Hànzì jiǎnhuà zuòtánhuì jìyào (èr)" "汉字簡化座談会記要 (二)". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1960.9.22.

Hànzì lìhuà 汉字例话. 1984. By Zuǒ Mín'ān 左民安. Beijing.

Hǎo Niànxún 郝念郇. "群众要更多簡化字". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1959:8, p. 20.

Hǎo Wànquán 郝万全. "大胆躍进, 力争再簡". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1958:5, p. 35.

Hǎo Wàngsān 郝望三 (山西省忻县专区干部文化补习学校教员). "从教学实践中体驗簡化字的优点". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1958.3.10.

Hara Kei 原敬. 1900. 漢字減少論. Osaka.

Harada Minoru 原田稔. 1977. "'新漢字表試案'の批判·中国文字改革の成果を踏まえて". Ōtemon gakuin daigaku bungakubu kiyō 11, pp. 73–95.

Hasegawa Motoi 長谷川基. 1955. 当用漢字新字体の解説. Tokyo.

Hé Yǎngmíng 何养明. "从'識字不識字, 咬住半拉字'談起". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1964.8.19.

Héběi shěng wénzì gǎigé línshí lǐngdǎo xiǎozǔ 河北省文字改革临时领导小组. "总结工作继续前进". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 10–11.

Hēilóngjiāng shěng 'Dì èr cì hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn (cǎo'àn)' tǎolùn gōngzuò lǐngdǎo xiǎozǔ 黑龙江省'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'讨论工作领导小组. "黑龙江省'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'征求意见工作总结". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 17–18.

Hénán shěng jiàoyùjú hànzì jiǎnhuà bàngōngshì 河南省教育局汉字简化办公室. "河南省关于'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'讨论情况的汇报". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979: 3–4, pp. 13–14.

Hóng Kuò 洪适. 1167. 隸釋. Reprinted 1986 in Beijing.

Hoshina Kōichi 保科孝一 (臨時國語調查會幹事). "漢字の字体整理について". *Kānpō* 1926.7.7 supplement.

Hòuhàn shū 候漢書. Shaoxing (1131–1162) edition in *Sì bù cóngkān: shǐ bù*.

Hóumǎ méngshū 侯马盟书. 1976. Shānxī shěng wénwù gōngzuò wěiyuánhuì, ed. Beijing.

Hú Huáichēn 胡懷琛. 1928. 簡易字説. Shanghai.

Hú Shì 胡適. 1965. 胡適手稿第一集. Taibei.

Hú Xíngzhī 胡行之. 1935. "阕于手头字". *Xiàndài* 6:4, pp. 50–52.

Hú Zhāoguǎng 胡昭广 (北京市副市长、北京市语委主任). "加强用字管理, 维护首都风貌". *Yǔwén jiànshè* 1996:2, pp. 6–8.

"Huáixī xiǎoxué zǔzhí kāizhǎn shèhuì yòngzì diàochá huódòng" "坏西小学组织开展社会用字调查活动". 2005. http://74.125.77.132/search?q=cache:fU-5wowD3xwJ:www.whjhe, accessed 2 April 2010.

Huáng Bóróng 黄伯榮. "簡體字的結構". *Yǔwén xuéxí* 1955:3, pp. 4–9. Also in *Jiǎnhuà hànzì wèntí*.

Huáng Fùjiā 黄復佳. "簡化漢字應分清'輕重緩急'". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.3.30.

Huáng Guǒ 黄果. "汉字简化必须同'表音化'紧密结合". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1978:4, pp. 23–24.

Huáng Hé 黄河. "从学生的錯別字談起". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1965:3, pp. 17.

Huáng Míngyuǎn 黄明远. "听周总理当前文字改革的任务报告的体会". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1958.3.10.

Huáng Pèizé 黄沛泽. 2011. "夏令营活动第一天". http://blog.xmnn.cn/?uid-556417-action-viewspace-itemid-1202545.

Huáng Ruòzhōu 黄若舟. 1951. 常用簡體字彙. Shanghai, 東方書店. First published 1950.9.20 in *Wénhuì bào*. Sixth [enlarged] printing 1954.

Huáng Shìzhōng 黄世忠 (浙江温州第六中学). "群众欢迎新形声簡字". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1965:4, pp. 15–16.

Huáng Xuětíng 黄雪婷. 2006. "白色城区社会用字规范化情况调查与分析". http://www.bsuc.cn/html/special/yywz/gzjg/200611802702.html, accessed 6 March 2010.

Huáng Zhēng 黄征. 2010. "曹操墓辨伪长云充专家太失水准". http://blog.sina.com.cn/s/blog_499f7cee100l1p0.html.

Húběi shěng wénzì gǎigé lǐngdǎo xiǎozǔ bàngōngshì 湖北省文字改革领导小组办公室. 1978. "湖北省对'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'的意见和反映". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 38–39.

Huī Zhī �br之. "漫谈'扙'". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1957:3, pp. 14–15.

Húnán shěng wénzì gǎigé wěiyuánhuì 湖南省文字改革委员会. "湖南省讨论'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'的情况". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 36–37 (dated 1978.7).

Húnán shěng wénzì gǎigé wěiyuánhuì bàngōngshì湖南省文字改革委员会办公室. "关于贯彻全国文字改革坐谈会精神的情况报告". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1978:2, pp. 17–18.

"Hyōjun kanji hyō" "標准漢字表". 1942. In Inokuchi 1982, pp. 408–417.

Ikyōshū 伊京集. Late Muromachi (pre-1568) copy in Nakada 1968.

Inokuchi Yūichi 井之口有一. 1982. 明治以後の漢字政策. Tokyo.

Ise sangū meisho zue 伊勢叅宮名所図會. 1797. Edo blockprint.

Ishida Yasuhiro 石田泰弘. 1984. "牛のよだれ (その1) —簡略字へのすすめ—". *Seimitsu kikai* 50:2.

Jì Dá 季达. 1958. "还应当繼续簡化一批汉字". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1958:16, pp. 15–16.

Jī Dá 基达. "上海语文教师谈简化汉字和拼音教学问题". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1964.7.22.

Jì Gébào 季阁豹 (山东省即墨县革委会). *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1974.11.25.

Jì Xùshēng 季旭昇. 2010. 說文新證. Fuzhou.

Jiǎ Yuán 賈援. "簡化漢字對成人識字的好處". 1955. In *Jiǎnhuà hànzì wèntí*, pp. 90–94.

Jiǎnbǐzì 簡筆字. 1951. *Jiǎnbǐzì biānjí wěiyuánhuì*, ed. Shanghai.

Jiǎng Chāobó 蔣超伯. 1853–1874. "通齋先生未刻手稿". In *Míng-Qīng wèi kān gǎo*.

Jiǎng Chuányī 将传一. "贫下中农喜爱新简化字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1978.8.21.

Jiāng Huī and Lǔ Gē 江晖、鲁歌. "从鲁迅的墨迹得到的启示". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1973.10.10.

Jiǎng Rúlín 蔣儒林. [1921]. 潮語十五音.

Jiǎng Xīwén and Shào Róngfēn蔣希文、邵榮芬. "明末'兵科抄出'檔案中的簡字". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1952:4, pp. 18–20.

Jiāng Yuánsēng 江緣僧. 1954. "可以推行簡體字". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1954:5, p. 32.

Jiāngsū kàngzhàn 江苏抗战. 1987. Jiāngsū shěng dàng'ānguǎn, ed. Beijing.

Jiāngsū shěng gémìng wěiyuánhuì jiàoyùjú 江苏省革命委员会教育局. "江苏省对'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'征求意见的报告". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 22–24 (dated 1978.6).

Jiànguó yǐlái wénzì gǎigé gōngzuò biānnián jìshì 建国以来文字改革工作编年记事. 1985. Wénzì gǎigé zázhì, ed. Beijing.

Jiāngxī shěng gémìng wěiyuánhuì wénbàn jiàoyù zǔ 江西省革命委员会文办教育组. 1978. "江西省关于讨论'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'情况的报告". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 43–44.

Jiǎnhuà hànzì wèntí 簡化漢字問題. 1956. *Zhōngguó yǔwén*, ed. Beijing.

Jiǎnhuàzì zǒngbiǎo 简化字总表. 1964. Zhōngguó wénzì gǎigé wěiyuánhuì 中国文字改革委员会. Beijing.

Jiǎnhuàzì zǒngbiǎo (second ed.) 简化字总表 (第二版). 1964. 中国文字改革委员会. Beijing.

"*Jiǎnhuàzì zǒngbiǎo* dá wèn" "'簡化字简总表'答問". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1965:4.

Jiǎntǐ zì biǎo: dì yī pī 简体字表: 第一批. 1935. Jiàoyù bù 教育部. [Nanjing]. 1935 reprint by *Guóyǔ zázhì*.

"Jiàoyù bù guānyú xuéxiào shǐyòng jiǎnhuàzì de pǔtōng tōngzhī" "教育卩关于学校使用简化字的补充通知". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1978:5, p. 32.

Jiěfàng zhànzhēng shíqī Běipíng xuéshēng yùndòng tújí 解放战争时期北平学生运动图集. 2008. Beijing.

Jílín shěng jiàoyùjú 吉林省教育局. "吉林省'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'征求意见工作总结". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 15–16 (dated 1978.11.7).

Jīn Guótài 金国泰 (吉林师院人文分院). 1997. "萧""肖"补说. *Yǔwén jiànshè* 1997:10, pp. 14–16.

Jīn Huá 金华. "我对简化字有了新的看法 — 工农兵和学生使用简化字情况的调查". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1966.3.30.

Jīn Lúnhǎi 金輪海 (江苏師範学院教授). "文字改革与文化的发展". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.4.27.

Jīn Míngshèng 金鳴盛. "我對 '798 個漢字簡化表草案' 的分析和意见". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.3.30. Also in *Jiǎnhuà hànzì wèntí*.

Jīn Ruòjīng 金若静. 1993. "中日両国の漢字簡化問題試論". Chūgoku bungaku ronsō (Ōbirin daigaku) 18.

Jīn Wén 金文. 1955. "両点小意见". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:4, p. 26.

Jīn Wénmíng 金文明. "'当简未简说'臆'耀'". *Yǎowén jiáozì* 2006:7, pp. 33–34.

Jīngběn tōngsú xiǎoshuō 京本通俗小說. Quoted in Liú 1930.

Jìnjiāng gémìng shǐ huàcè 晋江革命史画册. 1999. Zhōnggòng Jìnjiāng shìwěi dǎngshǐ yánjiū shì ed. Fuzhou 福建人民出版社.

Jinnō shōtōki 神皇正統記. 1338–1341. By Kitabake Chikafusa 北畠親房. 1529 Kyōroku version 享禄本 reprinted 1975 by Tenri kokusho kan.

Jìnshū 晉書. 644–646. By Fāng Xuánlíng 房玄齡 et al. Song edition in *Sì bù cóngkān: shǐ bù*.

Jirin 辭林. 1907. Kanazawa Shōsaburō 金澤庄三郎, ed. Tokyo, Sanseidō.

Jiǔjīng zìyàng 九經字樣. 837. By Táng Xuándù 唐玄度. 1781 transcript in *Sì kù quánshū*, vol. 224.

"Jìxù tǎolùn hànzì jiǎnhuà wèntí" "繼續討論漢字簡化問題". Rénmín zhèngxié Guǎngdōng shěng wěiyuánhuì. *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.9.14.

Jíyùn 集韻. 1039. By Dīng Dù 丁度 et al. Song edition in *Sòng kè Jíyùn*. 1814 edition in *Sì bù jíyào· jīngbù*.

Jūyán Hànjiǎn shìwén héjiào 居延汉简释文合校. 1987. By Xiè Guìhuá 谢桂华 et al. Beijing.

Kagaku shū 下学集. 1444. 1617 edition reprinted in 1968.

Kan-Wa daijirin, see Zōho teisei Kan-Wa daijirin.

Kanji hyakka daijiten 漢字百科大事典. 1996. Satō Kiyoji 佐藤喜代治 et al., eds. Tokyo.

"Kanji jitai seiri an" "漢字字體整理案". 1938. Kokugo shingikai. *Kokugo kyōiku* 13:9, appendix, pp. 1–47.

Kanji kōza 漢字講座. 1987–1989. Satō Kiyoji 佐藤喜代治, ed. Tokyo.

Kanji seiri an 漢字整理案. 1919. Mombushō. Tokyo.

Kanji yōran 漢字要覽. 1908. Kokugo chōsa iinkai. Tokyo.

Kanno Michiaki 簡野道明. 1923. 字源. Tokyo.

Kanō Yoshimitsu 加納喜光. 2014. 漢字語源語義辞典. Tokyo.

Karlgren, Bernhard. (1957) 1964. *Grammata Serica Recensa*. Stockholm.

Katō Jōken 加藤常賢. 1970. 漢字の起原. Tokyo.

Kenkyusha's New Pocket Japanese-English Dictionary. 1964 second ed. K. Masuda, ed. Tokyo.

Kitagawa Hirokuni 北川博邦. 1975. 偏類碑別字. Tokyo.

— 1991. 日本上代金石文字典. Tokyo.

— 2004 (2001). 日本歷代書聖名迹書法大辞典. Beijing.

Kokuhō 国宝 vols. 9–11. 1984. Mainichi shimbunsha, ed. Tokyo.

Kokuji mondai ronshū 國字問題論集. 1950. Inokuchi Yūichi and Yoshida Sumio, eds. Tokyo.

Kondō Saigai 近藤西涯. 1750. *Seikai roku* 正楷錄. In Sugimoto 1974, vol. 7.

Kǒng Xiángdé 孔祥德. "簡化是廣大青年的希望". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:4, p. 22.

Kono Masahiro 小野正弘. 1996. "『徒然后草』の異体字". In *Kanji hyakka daijiten*, pp. 347–353.

Kuroyanagi Isao 黑柳勳. 1910. "俗字略字". Wakayama. Manuscript in Sugimoto 1974, vol. 10.

Lǎo Shě 老舍. 1957. "文字改革是广大人民的迫切要求". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1, pp. 4–5.

"Lǎo zǐ yǐ běn" "老子乙本". Ca. 200 BCE transcript in *Mǎwángduī Hàn mù bóshū* (*yī*).

"Lǎo zǐ jiǎ běn" "老子甲本". Third c. BCE transcript in *Mǎwángduī Hàn mù bóshū* (*yī*).

Lì biàn 隸辨. 1718. By Gù Kējí 顧藹吉. 1986 Beijing reprint.

Lǐ Chángzhī 李長之. Speech in "Wénzì gǎigé wèntí zuòtánhuì jìlù", pp. 17–18.

Lì Chéng 立成. "关于'冈'". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1957:3, p. 15.

Lǐ Cùihé 李粹和. "用总路线的精神推行汉字簡化". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1959:8, p. 20.

Lǐ Jīngyuǎn 李静远. "对今后进一步简化漢字和整理漢字的意见". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1956.4.11.

Lǐ Lèyì 李乐毅. 1996. 简化字源. Beijing.

Lǐ Mùhán 李慕韓. "农村常用字极待简化". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1964.12.9.

Lǐ Róng 李荣. "汉字演变的几个趋势". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1980:1, pp. 5–20.

Lǐ Wěi 李炜. "货币上的'远, 元, 员'". *Yǔwén jiànshè* 1993:4.

Lǐ Wénxiū 李文修 (江苏无錫市轉业干校招待所讀者). "不要乱造乱写簡化汉字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1956.10.24.

Lǐ Xīzhōng 李希仲 (幹部業於初中文化班教师). "讀者來信". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.5.11.

Lǐ Yǒng 李甬 (云南省砚山中学). "彻底整理汉字". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1965:1, pp. 8–9.

Lǐ Zhúchén 李燭塵. "漢字必須改革". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1957:10, pp. 1–3.

— "谈简体字及其他". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1964.5.13.

Lǐ Zǐxīn 李子新 (錦州五中). "必須認真对待簡化字". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1960:9, p. 23.

Lǐ Zōngxián 李宗贤 (林口县教是师进修学校). "怎样对待尚未规范的簡化字?". *Hēilóngjiāng rìbào* 1961.12.7, p. 3.

Liáng Dōnghàn 梁东汉. "关于'汉字的前途'讀后感". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1957.7.11

— "彻底揭露和批判右派分子对文字改革所进行的恶毒攻击". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1957:9, pp. 11–12.

— 1959. 汉字的結构及其流变. Shanghai.

Liáng Shānbó yǔ Zhù Yīngtái. [1981]. 梁山伯与祝英台. [Putian]. Stencil.

Liáng Xià 梁下. "我改变了旧習慣". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1958:8, p. 12.

Liáng Xiāngchūn 梁相春 (内蒙古集宁铁路二中). "中学生用字不规范原因浅谈". *Yǔwén shìjiè* 1994:8, p. 48.

Lín Hàndá 林汉达. "必須防止濫用簡字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1962.7.25

Lín Yìguāng 林義光. 1920. 文源. In *Gǔwénzì shìyào*.

Lín Zhōngyì 林仲易 (人民政協全國委員會委員). "統一方言和簡漢字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.6.8.

Liú Fēngjié 刘丰杰 (天津). "简化汉字利弊辩议". *Biānjí zhī yǒu* 1997:2, pp. 34–40.

Liú Fù 劉復 and Lǐ Jiāruì 李家瑞. 1930. 宋元以來俗字譜. Beiping.

Liú Hé 刘禾. "进一步簡化汉字". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1959:7, pp.15–16.

Liú Kuímín 劉揆民. "我的意見". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:4, p. 26.

Liú Lóngliáng 刘隆良 (贵州宇光电工厂). "工人需要简化字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1973.12.25.

Liú Nǎizhōng 劉迺中. "对'漢字簡化方案草案'中几个問題的商榷". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.3.2.

Liú Shàofǎng 刘紹舫. "我对漢字簡化討論的意見". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:9, pp. 14–15.

Liú Wànxīn 刘万新 (梧州市东正路小学). "容易写错的常用簡化汉字". *Jiàoxué cānkǎo zīliào* 1964:8, pp. 24–25, 34.

Liú Wényīng 劉文英. "漢字的簡化問題". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1954:5, p. 32.

Liú Xīngēng 刘新耕 (武汉无线电接插元件厂工人). "文字是劳动人民创造的". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1974.3.10.

Liú Yínnián 刘寅年. "要继续简化地名用字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1975.3.25.

Liú Zéxiān 刘澤先. "略談汉字在日本的整理和簡化". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:9, pp. 30–31.

Liùshū zhèng-é 六書正譌. c. 1350. By Zhōu Bóqí 周伯琦. 1781 transcript in *Sì kù quánshū*, vol. 228, pp. 106–182.

Lóngkān shǒujìng 龍龕手鏡. 997. By Xíngjūn 行均. Koryo (918–1392) print based on Liao (927–1125) carving. Beijing reprint 1985.

Lóulán, see Rōran.

Lù Màodé 陸懋德. 1950. "书经顾命篇侍臣执兵器考". *Yānjīng xuébào* 38.

Lǔ Xùn shǒugǎo quánjí 鲁迅手稿全集. 1979. Lǔ Xùn shǒugǎo quánjí biānjí wěiyuánhuì, ed. Beijing.

Lù Zhìwéi 陆志韦. 1958. "关于簡体字和拼音方案". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1958:2, pp. 19–21.

Lù Zhìwéi et al. 陆志韦、管燮初、王克仲、何乐士、谭全基. "对于自造簡体字的几点意见". *Běijīng rìbào* 1964.1.16.

Lùnhéng 論衡. Wáng Chōng 王充 (23–c. 97). 1588 edition in *Sì bù cóngkān: zhèngbiān*, vol. 22.

Lúnyǔ 論語 57–64, 79 (1934–1935).

"*Lúnyǔ* shíxíng jiǎnbǐzì qǐshì" "論語實行簡筆字啟事". 1935. *Lúnyǔ* 57, cover p. 2.

Luó Fúyí 羅福頤. 1730. 古璽漢印文字徵. www.guoxuedashi. com/kangxi/pic.php?f=gwzgl&p=2024.

Luó Guāng 罗光 (贵州省郎岱县巴赖小学). "报刊上不要乱印自造的簡化汉字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1956.10.24.

Luó Jiālún 羅家倫.簡體字運動. 1954. Taibei.

Luó Rónggēng 罗荣耕. "合理的地方性简化字应该承认". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1978:3, p. 19.

Luó Zhènyù 羅振玉. 1928. 增訂碑別字. In Kitagawa 1975.

Mǎ Chéngyuán 馬承源. 1988–1990. 商周青銅器銘選. Beijing.

Mǎ Gōngyú 馬公愚. 1957. "談文字改革". *Wénzì gǎigé* 3, pp. 8–10.

Mǎ Guófán 馬国凡. "不能濫造簡体字". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1958:7, p. 24.

Mǎ Xùlún 馬敘倫. "中國文字改革研究委員會成立會開會辭". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1952:1, p. 4.

Martin, Helmut. 1982. *Chinesische Sprachplanung*. Bochum.

Mathews' Chinese-English Dictionary. 1931. By R. H. Mathews. Taibei reprint 1971.

Matsui Tadashi 松井義. 古今字樣考. 1861. In Sugimoto 1974.

Matsumoto Akira 松本昭. 1969. "学生運動とことば". *Gengo seikatsu* 69:7, pp. 74–80.

Matsumoto Guzan 松本愚山. 1803. 省文纂攷. In Sugimoto 1974, vol. 5.

Mǎwángduī Hàn mù bóshū (*yī*) 馬王堆漢墓帛書(壹). 1974. Mǎwángduī Hàn mù bóshū zhěnglǐ xiǎozǔ, ed. Shanghai.

Mǎwángduī jiǎnbó wénzì biān 馬王堆簡帛文字編. 1999. By Chén Sōngcháng 陈松长. Beijing.

McNair, Amy. *The upright brush: Yan Zhenqing's calligraphy and Song literati politics*. 1998. Honolulu.

Michel-Lodders, Carla. 1990. *Taxe-Perçue-Stempel der Volksrepublik China*. Essen, Forschungsgemeinschaft China-Philatelie.

Military Mail 軍事郵便. 2010. By Nippon yūbin kyōkai 日本郵便協会. Tokyo.

Míng-Qīng wèi kān gǎo huìbiān chūjí 明清未刊稿彙編初輯. 1976. Qū Wànlǐ 屈萬里, ed. Taibei.

Mǐnzhōng gémìng shǐ huàcè 闽中革命史画册. 2011. Lín Qīnghuá, ed. Beijing.

Mizuhara Meisō 水原明窗. 1992. 華郵集錦. Tokyo, Japan Philatelic Publications.

Nakada Norio 仲田祝夫. 1968. 古本節用集六種研究並びに総合索引. Tokyo.

Nanashi zō wa hana ga unagi da! 名無し象は鼻がウナギだ!. 2006. "文字を徹底的に略すスレ", comment no. 158. mimizun.com/log/zch/gengo/1049173991/

Nánxióngzhōu zhì 南雄州志, 廣東省直隸 1824. 1967 Taibei reprint.

Nakane Genkei 中根元珪. 1692. *Itaiji ben* 異體字辨. In Sugimoto 1974, vol. 2.

Nánjīng dà túshā túzhèng 南京大屠杀图证. 1995. Zhōngyāng dàng'ànguǎn, ed. Changchun.

Ní Shìzhōng 倪世忠 (山西晋城师范学校). "我們是怎样教育学生正确使用簡化字的". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1963:4 p.15.

Nihon kitte meikan 日本切手名鑑. 1979, 1980, 1981, 1983. Nihon kitte meikan henshū iinkai, ed. Tokyo.

Nihon kofun daijiten 日本古墳大辞典. 1989. Ōtsuka Hatsushige 大塚初重 et al., eds. Tokyo.

Nihongo no genjō 日本語の現場: 第1集. 1975. Yomiuri shimbun shakai bu, ed. Tokyo.

New Atlas and Commercial Gazetteer of China. Second edition. 1917. Edwin John Dingle, ed. Shanghai.

Ōiwa Masanaka 大岩正仲. 1949. "黨用漢字字體表について林田氏の辯明を讀む". *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 308, pp. 47–54.

Ōmachi Keigetsu 大町桂月. 1915. 謝れる文字文書. Tokyo.

Ōnishi Katsutomo 大西克知. 學生近視ノ一豫防策. 1897. In *Kokuji mondai ronshū*, 1950, pp. 24–50.

Ono Shigehiko. 2006. "'衛'の略字". http://www.shoge.com/diary/diary.cgi?id＝06102819, accessed 6 June 2012.

Ōuyáng Zhēn 歐陽溱 (江西省會婁妃基小學校). 1935. 簡筆字之研究. [Nanchang], manuscript copy formerly in the library of the Script Reform Committee.

— 1936. 簡體字考證. Nanchang.

Pān Guìyuán 潘桂元 (吉林省农安第四中学). "日常生活和农业用字应該簡化". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1965:4, p. 13.

Pān Mò 潘沬. 1957. "一个普通公民的意见". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1957.6.13.

"Pìyù jīng" "譬喻經". 256. Scroll. Facsimile in Shimonaka 1931, vol. 4, plate 3.

Pān Yǔnzhōng 潘允中. "關於簡化漢字幾個原則問題的商討. 中山大學中國語言文字系集體討論". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.7.20.

Pān Zhòngguī 潘重規. 1954. 論羅家倫所提倡之'簡體字'. Taibei. First published in *Xīnshēng bào* 1954.3.27.

— 1978. 敦煌俗字譜. Taibei.

Píngmín zìdiǎn 平民字典. 1927. By Fāng Yì 方毅 and Mǎ Yíng 馬瀛. Shanghai.

Qī Chángshùn 戚长顺. "簡字台". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1960.8.11.

Qí Jǐ 齊己 (863?–937?). 白蓮集. Ming transcript in *Sì bù cóngkān: zhèngbiān*, vol. 38.

Qián Xī 钱希. "汉字还需要继续简化". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1978:8, pp. 28–29.

Qián Xuántóng 錢玄同. 1920. "减省漢字筆畫底提議". *Xīn qīngnián* 7:3, pp. 111–116.

— 1922. "减省現行漢字的筆畫案". *Guóyǔ yuèkān* 1:7, pp. 160–163.

Qín Bówèi 秦伯未. 1959. "整理中樂簡体字的初步意见". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1959:14, pp. 14–15.

Qīng mò Mín chū Yīxiàn Lú shì jiāshū huì chāo 清末民出黔县卢氏家书汇抄. 2009. Guilin.

Qīnghǎi shěng jiàoyùjú 青海省教育局. 1978. "青海省讨论'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'情况的报告". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, p. 20.

Qiū Chángnù 邱常怒 (長春東北師大中文系). "我对調整部分簡化字的意见". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1957.6.27.

Qiú Chéngyuán 裘成源. "太平天国的反孔斗御推动了汉字改革". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1974.7.10.

Qiú Xīguī 裘锡圭. 1992. 古文字论集. Beijing.

Quán Yuán zájù 全元雜劇. 1962. 楊家駱 et al., eds. Taibei.

Quánguó wénzì gǎigé huìyì wénjiàn huìbiān 全国文字改革会议文件汇编. [1955]. 全国文字改革会议秘书处, ed. [Beijing].

Qúnzhòng duì "Cǎo'àn" dì yī biǎo jiǎnhuà zì yìjiàn biǎo 群众对草案第一表简化字忌见表. [1978]. [中国文字改革外委员会]. Beijing, stencil.

Rén 仁. "对'汉字簡化方案'的四点建訤". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.4.27.

Rén Shuāngyàn 任双燕 (北京师大工农中学). "应大力推行簡化汉字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1958.7.14.

Rénmín xīn zìdiǎn 人民新字典. (1952) 1953. Liáng Jūndù 梁君度 and Qián Gōngxiá 淺公俠. Beijing.

Rénmín zhànzhēng bì shēng 人民战争必胜－抗日战争中的晋察冀摄影集. 1988. Luó Guāngdà 罗光大, ed. Shenyang.

Rénmín zhèngxié Guǎngdōng shěng wěiyuánhuì mìshūchù 人民政協廣東省委員會秘書處. "人民政協廣東省委員會座談漢字簡化問題記要". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.6.22.

Rinji kokugo chōsakai 臨時國語調見會. "漢字の字体整理案について". *Kanpō* 1926.7.7 (4161) supplement 154.

Róng Gé 荣革. "从新简化字的创造传布看汉字的发展趋向". *Wénhuìbào* 1973.6.27.

Róng Gēng 容庚. 1931. 秦漢金文錄. Beiping.

— 1936. 簡體字典. Beiping.

— 1939. 金文編. Shanghai.

— 1955. Comments in Rénmín zhèngxié 1955.

Rōran zanshi mokudoku shohō sen 楼蘭残紙木牘書法選. 1988. Tanimura Kisai 谷村憙斎, ed. Tokyo.

"Rúhé qūbié 'xiàng' yǔ 'xiàng'" "如何区別'像'与'像'", 2006. *Láiyáng nóngxuéyuàn xuébào (shèhuì kèxué bǎn)* 2006:1, p. 66.

Sano Kōichi 佐野光一. 1980. 金石異體字典, 2nd ed. Tokyo.

—木簡字典 二版. 1991. Tokyo.

Sasahara Hiroyuki 笹原宏之, Yokoyama Shōichi 横山昭一 and Eric Long エリク・ロング. 2003. 現代日本の異体字. Tokyo.

Satō Minoru 佐藤稔. 1978. "漢字字形の史的把握". *Kokugogaku* 114, pp. 1–15, 63.

— 1987. "異体字". In *Kanji kōza,* vol. 3.

Setsuyōshū 節用集. 1496 Meiō version 明応本, 1597 Ekirin version 易林本 and late Muromachi Manjuya version 饅頭屋本 in Nakada 1968. 1597 Kien version 枳園本 in *Setsuyōshū ni shu.*

Setsuyōshū ni shu 節用集二種. 1974. Tokyo.

Shaka goichidaiki zue 釋迦御一代記圖會. 1846. By Yamada Isaisō 山田意齋叟.

Shāndōng shěng jiàoyùjú 山东省教育局. 1978. "山东省关于'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'征求意见情况的汇报". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 35–36.

Shāndōng shīfàn xuéyuàn Zhōngwén xì qīsì jí gōngnóngbīng xuéyuàn hé jiàoshī 山东师范学院中文系七四级工农兵学员和教师. "人民群众简化汉字的洪流不可阻挡". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1975.8.10.

"Shànghǎi shì jījí kāizhǎn 'Dì èr cì hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn (cǎo'àn)' de pínglùn gōngzuò" 上海市积极开展'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'的评论工作. *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1978:5, pp. 29–30.

Shànghǎi shì wénzì gǎigé línshí língdǎo xiǎozǔ 上海市文字改革临时领导小组. "上海市半年来文字改革工作的汇报". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 5–7 (dated 1978.10.10).

Shànghǎi shì yǔwěi bàngōngshì 上海市语委办公室. "对社会用字管理工作的思考与实践". *Yǔwén jiànshè* 1998:7, pp. 15–17.

Shàngshū gùshí 尚书故實. Tang. By Lǐ Chuò 李綽. 1781 transcript in *Sì kù quánshū*, vol. 862, pp. 467–480.

Shānxī shěng jiàoyùjú 山西省教育局. "山西省组织讨论'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'的情况汇报". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, p. 12 (dated 1978.8.23).

Shěn Chángchūn and Wáng Hóngzhēn 沈长春、王宏珍 (安徽合肥第一中学). "应当为青少年着想". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1964:9, pp. 3–4.

Shěn Qǐyǔ 沈起予. "本期沈起予先生「藝尤哲學」原稿的一頁". 1935. *Tàibái* 2:2, unnumbered page.

Shěnyáng shì wénzì gǎigé bàngōngshì 沈阳市文字改革办公室. "沈阳市关于组织讨论'(草案)'情况的总结". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 48–50 (dated 1978.6.10).

Shì ér biān 示兒編. Introduction 1205 by Sūn Yì 孫奕. 1780 transcript in *Sì kù quánshū*, vol. 864, pp. 411–584.

Shí Hòu 石后. "對漢字簡化方案的意見". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:4, p. 43.

Shibata Masao 柴田雅生. 1988. "古往来の異体字". *Kanji hyakka daijiten*, pp. 302–326.

Shidehara Tan 幣原坦. 1923. "教育上注意すべき言葉及び文字の変遷". *Kyōiku kenkyū* 教育研究 252.

"Shígǔ wén" "石鼓文". Late Zhou. In *Chūgoku hōsho sen*, vol. 2.

Shimbun kenkyū editors 新聞研究編集部. 1957. "日本の略字". *Shimbun kenkyū* 68, pp. 1–13.

Shimonaka Yasaburō 下中彌三郎, ed. 1931. 書道全集 第四卷: 三國集西晉. Tokyo.

Shina keizai zensho 支那經濟全書. 1906–1907. By Tōa dōbunkai 東亞同文會. [Tokyo].

Shiraishi Mitsukuni 白石光国. "漢字の整理・制限並に改造について". 1949. *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 307, pp. 31–41.

Shirakawa Shizuka 白川静. 1994. 字統. Tokyo.

Shōkai Kan-Wa daijiten, Zōho 詳解漢和大辞典, 增補. 1940. By Hattori Unokichi 服部宇之吉 and Koyanagi Shikita 小柳司氣太. Tokyo.

Shōwa jūnen zengōki Shina chūtongun kempeibu monjo 昭和十年前後期支那駐屯軍憲兵部文書. 1990. Kita Hiroaki, ed. Tokyo.

Shūhǎi lízhū 書海驪珠. 2014. Zōu Yǐngwén 鄒穎文 et al., eds. Hongkong.

Shuōwén jiězì 說文解字. 100 CE. By Xǔ Shèn 許慎. Song transcript of enlarged 986 edition by Xú Xuàn et al. in *Sì bù cóngkān: zhèngbiān*, vol. 4. 1873 edition by Chén Chāngzhì 陳昌治 reprinted in 1963 by *Zhōnghuá shūjū*.

Sì bù cóngkān: shǐ bù 四部叢刊: 史部. 1931–36. Shanghai.

Sì bù cóngkān: zhèngbiān 四部叢刊:正編. 1979–81. Wáng Yunwǔ 王雲五 et al., eds. Taibei.

Sì bù jíyào: jīngbù 四部集要: 經部. 1959. Taibei.

Sì kù quánshū, Qīndìng 欽定四庫全書. 1782. Facsimile in *Yǐngyìn Wényuángé Sì kù quánshū.*

Sì pī tuīxíng de jiǎnhuà hànzì biǎo 四皮推行的简化汉字表. 1959. Wénzì gǎigé chūbǎnshè, ed. Beijing.

Sìchuān shěng wénzì gǎigé gōngzuò línshí xiǎozǔ 四川省文字改革工作临时小组. 1978. "四川省关于讨论'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'的情况". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 45–47.

Sīmǎ Guāng 司馬光. 1084. 資治通鑑. Song edition in *Sì bù cóngkān,* vols. 6–9.

Sōng Jiānshuāng 松间霜. "无耻台商! 诬蔑我们伟大的国庆节! 照片为证". 2006. http//bbs.tiexue.net/post21539601, accessed 9 October 2010.

Sòng kè Jíyùn 宋刻集韻. 1989. Beijing.

Sòng Liánchāng 宋连昌. "也谈同音代替及其他". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1978.4.21.

Sòng Zhòngxīn 宋仲鑫 (北京市第四女子中学). "几点建議". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1965:3, p. 16.

Stone Drums from Qin, see "Shígǔ wén".

Sū É 蘇鶚. Ca. 890. "蘇氏演義". In *Sì kù quánshū,* vol. 850.

Sū shì yǎnyì 蘇氏演義. By Sū È 蘇鶚. In *Sì kù quánshū,* vol. 850, pp. 185–208.

Sugimoto Tsutomu 杉本つとむ, ed. 1974. 異体字研究資料集成. Tokyo.

Sugiyama Junichi 杉山淳一. 2014. "「鉄」が嫌いな鉄道会社がある". news. mynavi. jp/series/trivia/262

Sūn Bóchún 孙伯純 and Yú Yùnzhī 俞运之. 1958. 古代的简化汉字. Beijing.

Sūn Hǎibō 孫海波. 1935. "卜辭文字小記". *Kǎogǔ xuéshè shèkān* 3.

Sūn Xiǎohuī 孙曉輝 (四川农学院). "簡化农业常用字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1965.8.4.

Sūn Zhōngyùn 孙中运. 2003. "'阎''闫'的历史和现状". *Yǎowén jiáozì* 2003:9, pp. 19–21.

Súshū kānwù 俗書刊誤. 1610 preface by Jiāo Hóng 焦竑. 1777 transcript in *Sì kù quánshū,* vol. 228, pp. 539–585.

Suzuki Naoe 鈴木直枝. 1996. "'牛店 雜談安愚 楽鍋'異体字一覧". In *Kanji hyakka daijiten,* pp. 362–363.

Tàiháng gémìng gēnjùdì huàcè 太行革命根据地画册. 1987. *Tàiháng gémìng gēnjùdì huàcè biānjízǔ,* ed. Taiyuan.

Tài Yáng 泰羊. "由方塊字談到簡字". *Dàgōngbào* 1951.9.19.

Takuhon moji dētabēsu 拓本文字データベース. http://coe21.zinbun.kyoto-u.ac.jp/ djvuchar.

Tanaka Dōsai 田中道齋. 1757. 道齋隨筆. In Sugimoto 1974, vol. 4.

Tanaka Iwao 田中巖. 1957. "明代俗字攷". *Yokohama shiritsu daigaku kiyō* 65.

Tanaka Toshiaki 田中俊明. 1985. "高句麗長安城城壁石刻の基礎的研究". *Shirin* 68:4 (332), pp. 117–145.

Tang Bóxiān 唐伯先. "关于同音代替的商討". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:9, p. 42.

Táng Guìxīn 唐桂馨. 1939. "說文識小録". *Gǔxué cóngkān* 2.

Tāngxī xiàn zhì 湯溪縣志. 1931. By Dài Hóngxī 戴鴻熙 et al. Taibei reprint 1975.

Téng Rénshēng 滕壬生. 2007. 楚系简帛文字编. Wuhan.

The Languages of China. 1987. By S. Robert Ramsey. Princeton.

Tián Qíchāng 田其昌 (部队文化教育工作者). "简化漢字应该適应群衆需要". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.5.11.

Tiānjīn shìwěi wénjiàozǔ 天津市委文教组. "天津市关于"汉字简化方案(草案)"的讨论情况". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 7–8 (dated 1978.10.7).

Tiáo fēng yuè 調風月. Yuan. By Guān Hànqīng 關漢卿. In *Quán Yuán zájù*, vol. 1.

Tōdō Akiyasu 藤堂明保. 1965. 漢字語源辞典. Tokyo.

"Tuīxíng shǒutóu zì yuánqǐ" "推行手头字緣起". 1935. *Tàibái* 1:11, appendix.

Umehara Seizan 梅原清山. (1987) 2005. 北魏楷书字典. Tianjin.

— 梅原清山. (1994) 2004. 唐楷书字典. Tianjin.

Wǎgǎngzhài yǎnyì 瓦崗寨演義. Shanghai reprint of 1874 blockprint.

Wáng Báixiáng 王白祥. 1957. Speech in "Wénzì gǎigé wèntí zuòtánhuì", pp. 19–20.

Wáng Guólín 王国林 (临安市教师进修学校). 2011. "临安市'语言文字规范化'漫谈". www.xici.net/d1447135.htm, accessed 8 October 2011.

Wáng Hóngjìn 王鸿进 (北京市邮局邮政处). "邮件上的自造字怪字和潦草字影响邮局投递工作". *Běijīng Rìbào* 1964.1.3.

Wáng Jiàn 王鉴 "分门别类话'白字'". *Rénmín rìbào* 1984.2.7.

Wáng Jǐngwén 王景文. 2012. 胶东邮史钩沉. Jinan.

Wáng Màocái 王茂材. 1957 "貢獻一点关于修正'汉字簡化方案'的意见". *Wénzì gǎigé* 4, pp. 45–46.

Wáng Màoyīn 王茂蔭. 1851. 王少宰奏議. Manuscript, reprinted 1965 in Taibei.

Wáng Mǐnxué 王敏学 (安徽省语言文字工作委员会办公室秘书). 1986. "关于社会用字的调查". In *Xīn shíqī de yǔyán wénzì gōngzuò*, pp. 229–234.

Wáng Màiqiǎo 王麦巧 (渭南师范学院). 2002. "为什么不规范字屡禁不止". Shaanxi RTVU Journal 4:1. p. 47.

Wáng Qí. "讀者来信: 关于民族名称用字的几点建議". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1958.7.14.

Wáng Shìxiāng 王士襄. "运用同音代替方法擴大精簡範圍". 1955:9, p. 43.

Wáng Tiěkūn 王铁昆 (国家语委文管司规范处). "用字不规范并非小事". *Yǔwén shìjiè* 1994:2, pp. 46–47.

Wáng Tónghàn 王同漢. "我有四点意见". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:6, p. 23.

Wáng Wénhào 王文浩[律师]. 2010. "一个字写错官司没达成". http://hi.baidu.com/cywwh/blog/item/b41f4b67b0e66529aa184c84, accessed 18 January 2011.

Wáng Xiǎn 王顯. 1955. "略談汉字的簡化方法和簡化歷史". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:4, pp. 21–23. Also in *Jiǎnhuà hànzì wèntí*.

Wáng Yǒngkāng 王永康. 1955."王永康代表的書面發言". *Quánguó wénzì*, pp. 205–206.

Wáng Yǒushēng 王有声 (北京第一实验小学). "识字教学, 校内外要一起抓". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1985:2, pp. 46–47.

Wáng Yún 王云 (宁波干部文化学校). "怎样帮助工农干部学会简化字". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1962:6, pp. 15–16, 12.

Wáng Zhèng 王正. "肅清殘存的'協和語'". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1954:5.

Wáng Zhìpéi 王志培. "我对几个字的意见". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:4, p. 24.

Wáng Zìqiáng 王自强. "期刊的名称应当用简化字". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1985:6, p. 34.

Wèi Jiàngōng 魏建功. "漢字發展史上簡體字的地位". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1952:4, pp. 15–17.

— 1955. "漢字化的歷史意義和漢字簡化方案的歷史基礎". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:2, pp. 5–7.

— 1957. "我对汉字改革的一些粗淺的看法". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1957:8, pp. 4–11.

Wéi Què 韋愨. "關於漢字簡化的幾個原則性的問題". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.8.31.

Wēn Yìngshí 温应时. "少删改, 多类推, 收新字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1958.7.28.

Wén Bīng 文兵. "学生写了'汉字简化方案'以外的简化字该怎么处理?". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1961:10, p. 21.

Wēng Wénhào 翁文灝. 1955. Speech in "Wénzì gǎigé wèntí zuòtánhuì jìlù", pp. 10–11.

"Wèntí jiědá" "問題解答". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1956.6.20.

Wénzì gǎigé editors 文字改革编辑部. "把文字改革的火焰继续燃烧下去". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1982:1, pp. 3–11.

Wénzì gǎigé cānkǎo zīliào 文字改参考资料. 1955. 中國文字改革委員會. [Beijing], stencil.

"Wénzì gǎigé wèntí zuòtánhuì jìlù" "文字改革問題座談會記錄". *Pinjin* 1957:7, pp. 1–35.

"Wénzì – róngyi wùyòng de bù guīfàn de jiǎntǐ zì" "文字 – 容易误用的不规范的简体字". 四川语言文字网. http://yuweiban.scxxt.com.cn./xunlian/wz08.php, accessed 27 April 2005.

Wieger, Léon. (1915) 2013. *Chinese Characters*. New York.

Wú Dípíng 吳滌平. "少数民族同胞拥擁漢字改革和語言規範化". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.10.26.

Wú Jiǎfēng 吴甲丰. "对新简化字的意见". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1978.3.21.

Wú Jìng 吳競. "我对'汉字簡化方案草案'的意见". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:4, pp. 25–26.

Wú Liángzuò 吳良祚. "太平天国文件中的简体字". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1958:4, pp. 43, 6.

Wú Nánxīng 吳南星 ([北京] 三家村). 是簡化字还是錯別字呢". *Qiánxiàn* 1963:5, p. 18.

Wú Sānlì 吳三立. 1955. Comments in Rénmín zhèngxié Guǎngdōng shěng 1955.

Wú Yùzhāng 吳玉章. "在中國文字改革研究委員會成立會上的講話". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1952:1, p. 5.

— (中國文字改革委員会主任). "关于汉字簡化問題 – 在政协全國委員會上的報告". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:4, pp. 3–5. Also in *Rénmín rìbào* 1955.4.7 and Wú 1978.

— 文字改革文集. 1978. Beijing.

Wú Zōnghuá 伍宗华. "对'汉字簡化方案'的几点意见". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1957.2.27.

Wǔjīng wénzì 五經文字. 776 preface by Zhāng Cān 張參. 1781 transcript in *Sì kù quánshū*, vol. 224.

Wúxī gémìng shǐ huàcè 无锡革命史画册. 2009. Gāo Xiúqǐng 高秀请, ed. Beijing.

Xià Yǎn xuǎnjí 夏衍选集. 1988. By Xià Yǎn. Chengdu.

Xiǎn 顯. "'國'字可不可以簡化作'国'". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:2, p. 7.

"Xī'ān shì guānyú zǔzhí tǎolùn 'Dì èr cí hànzì jiǎnhuà fāng'àn (cǎo'àn)' de huìbào" "西安市关于组织讨论'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'的汇报". Shǎnxī shěng Xī'ān shì jiàoyùjú. *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 50–51 (dated 1978.8.22).

Xiàng Huī 向晖. "汉字得简化与规范化". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1974.6.10.

Xiāo Tiānzhù 萧天柱. 1962. 正确使用汉字. Harbin.

— "注意掌握'簡化字总表'的字形". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1965:4, pp. 7–9.

Xiāo Zhìqiān 蕭志謙. 1954. "'蕭'字的故事". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1954:6, p. 21.

Xīn shíqī de yǔyán wénzì gōngzuò 新时期的语言文字工作. 1987. Quánguó yǔyán wénzì gōngzuò huìyì mìshūchù, ed. Beijing.

Xīn zìdiǎn 新字典. 1948. Fù Liánsēn et al., eds. 34th ed. [Hongkong].

Xīnhuá zìdiǎn 新华字典. 1958 reprint of 1st 1957 edition, 3rd edition 1962, 1973 reprint of revised 1971 edition, 9th edition 1998, 11th edition 2011. Beijing.

Xīnjiāng Wéiwú'ěr zìzhìqū wénzì gǎigé wěiyuánhuì 新疆维吾尔自治区文字改革委员会. 1978. "新疆维吾尔自治区对'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'的意见与建议". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, p. 12.

Xióng Kāiyín et al. 熊開銀、翟連林、林容远、黃光、溫斌、王冰. "正确对待簡化汉字". *Yǔwén xuéxí* 1958:2, p. 16.

*Xīpíng shíj*īng. 175 CE. Reproduced in Fushimi 1989.

Xú Chuánxíng 徐傳行. "討論簡化汉字中的几种意见". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:4, pp. 18–20.

Xú Huàwén 徐化文. "對於漢字簡化的初步意見". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1954:9, pp. 34–35.

Xǔ Shèn, see *Shuōwén jiězì*.

Xú Shìsōng 徐世松. "談'汉字簡化方案草案'中的'同音代替'問題". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:9, pp. 41–42.

Xú Xīn 徐忻. 1957. "信赖羣众, 进行改革". *Wénzì gǎigé* 3, pp. 12–13.

Xú Yǎnshòu 徐衍授. "不应'因噎废食'". *Yángchéng wǎnbào* 1960.6.10.

Xú Yīhuī 徐一辉. "对汉字簡化的意见". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:7, pp. 7–8.

Xú Zémǐn 徐则敏. 1934. "550 俗字表". *Lúnyǔ* 43, pp. 916–917, 44, pp. 962–963, 45, pp. 1005–1007.

Xú Zhìqīng 徐志清. "对汉字簡化方案草案的意见 (二)". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:6, pp. 40–41.

Xú Zhōnghuá 徐仲华. "读'第二次汉字简化方案 (草案)'". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1978:1, pp. 64–68.

Xú Zhōngshū 徐中舒. 1981. 漢語古文字字形表. [Chengdu].

— 甲骨文字典. 1988. Chengdu.

Xué Wén 学文. "'简化字总表'解释". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1965.3.17.

Xué wénhuà zìdiǎn 學文化字典. 1952. Běijīng shīfàn dàxué, ed. Beijing.

Xuéshēng chángyòng hànzì qiǎnshì 学生常用汉字浅释. 1981. By Chén Tāo 陈涛 and Dǒng Zhìguó 董治国. Tianjin.

Xúzhōu zhì 徐州志. 1522–1566. Reprinted in *Zhōngguó fāngzhì cóngshū: Huázhōng dìfāng,* vol. 430.

Yamada Tadao 山田忠雄. 1958. 当用漢字の新字体. Tokyo.

Yamashita Mari 山下真理. 2010. 「広」の字体について—略字体の出現時期とその要因—. www.kanken.or.jp/project/data/investigation, accessed 16 January 2014.

Yamauchi Yōichirō 山内洋一郎. 1978. "金沢文庫蔵仏教説和集の漢字字体". 鎌倉時代語研究 1, pp. 85–104.

Yàn Yánwú 晏炎吾. "释单". *Huádōng shīfàn xuébào* 1983:1.

Yān Zhèngyào 燕正曜. 1955. "对'同音代替'和'废除异体字'的意见". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.3.16.

Yán Zhēnqīng kǎishū zìhuì 颜真卿楷书字汇. 1993. By Shěn Dàoróng 沈道荣. Tianjin.

Yán Zhītuī 顏之推 (531–c. 590). 顏氏家訓. 1524 edition in *Sì bù cóngkān: zhèngbiān,* vol. 22.

Yáng Bóqīng 杨伯青. "汉字简化势在必行". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1973.8.10.

Yang, N. C. 楊乃強. 1982. *1982 Postage Stamp Catalogue of The People's Republic of China.* Hong Kong.

Yángzǐ wǎnbào 扬子晚报 2010.8.23. "全国 23 名学者质疑曹操墓造价将公布证据".

Yáo Jiāzhēn 姚家珍 (江苏省工業廳檔案員). "我的意见和希望". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.8.17.

Yè Gōngchuò 葉恭綽. "整理通用字(即漢字)及規定其簡寫法(即簡體字) 的一套辦法". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1950.10.8.

— 叶恭綽. 1955. "關于漢字簡化工作的報告". In *Quánguó wénzì gǎigé huìyì wénjiàn huìbiān,* pp. 20–36.

— "漢字整理和漢字簡化". *Rénmín rìbào* 1955.6.1. Also in *Jiǎnhuà hànzì wèntí.*

Yè Làishì 叶籟士. 1995. 简化汉字一夕谈. Beijing.

Yè Nán 叶南. "读者来信". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1978.4.7.

Yè Yǒngliè 叶永烈. 1960. "鹹"与"碱"不能合并唯一.

Yì Xīwú 易熙吾. 1952. "簡體字的幾個問題". *Xīn jiànshè* 1952:2, pp. 27––31.

— (completed 1954) 1955. 簡體字原. Beijing.

— 1954. "再談簡體字". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1954:4, p. 15.

— 1955. "'國'字的簡體, 該選用哪一個?" *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:1, pp. 14–17.

— 1955. "我對'漢字簡化方案'的意見". In *Wénzì gǎigé lùnjí,* pp. 98–102.

Yǐ Zhī 以之. "自討苦吃". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1954:2, p. 24.

Yǐn Bīnyōng 尹斌庸. "同音代用字还可以適當增加一些". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:9, pp. 15–16.

— (四川荣县第五初級中学). "在初級中学推广簡化汉字的体会". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1965.11.7

Yīn Huànxiān 殷煥先. "熱烈歡迎'漢字簡化方案草案'". *Wén shǐ zhé* 1955:3, pp. 3–5. Also in *Jiǎnhuà hànzì wèntí.*

Yǐngyìn Wényuángé Sì kù quánshū 影印文淵閣四庫全書. 1986. Taibei.

"*Yìnshuā* tōngyòng hànzì zìxíng biǎo de jīběn nèiróng" "印刷通用汉字字形表基本内容". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1965.4.14.

Yomiuri shimbun shakai bu 読売新聞社会部. 1975. "�ぱを追う". In *Nihongo no genjo*, vol. 1, pp. 84–95.

Yoshida Yoshio. 2003. 漢字の写真字典 Photo dictionary of rare Chinese characters. http://homepage2.nifty.com/Gat_Tin/kanji/kaindex.htm, accessed 18 December 2003.

Yú Chuánxián 俞傳賢. "我對汉字簡化的一些意見". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.11.28.

— 1957. 我对汉字簡化的一些意見. *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1957.11.28.

Yú Shěngwú 于生吾. "'鄂君启节'考釋". *Kǎogǔ* 1963:8, pp. 442–447.

Yú Xiàlóng 于夏龙. "关于第二次汉字简化工作的一些意见". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1978:2, pp. 127–29.

Yú Xīn 俞欣. "'万'字简体起源考". *Yīndū xuékān* 2001:4, pp. 103–104.

Yú Xīnbó 余新伯. "我对'某些簡化汉字'的意见". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:5, pp. 29–30.

Yuán Shūqīng 袁輪青 (人民政協全國委員會委員). "我贊成文字改革". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.6.22.

Yuán Zhèn 袁振. "「怪字」與「簡體字」問題". *Dàgōngbào* 1951.8.22, p. 5.

Yuè Sìbǐng 樂嗣炳. "簡化漢字的幾個原則問題". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.8.3.

Yùn Huī 蘊輝 and Jùn Tāo 俊濤. "我們對'798个汉字簡化表'的意見". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:4, pp. 20–22.

Yúnnán shěng wénzì gǎigé língdǎo xiǎozǔ 云南省文字改革领导小组. "云南省关于讨论'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'的情况报告". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 31–34.

Yùpiān 玉篇, Song version. 1013. By Chén Péngnián 陳彭年. Qing edition reprinted in 1987 under its full title *Dà guǎng yìhuì Yùpiān* 大廣益會玉篇.

Yùpiān 玉篇, Tang version. By Sūn Jiàng 孫强. Fragments of four transcripts reprinted in 1985 by Zhōnghuá shūjú as 原本玉篇殘卷. Original 543 version by Gù Yěwáng 顧野王 is lost.

Yǔwén xuéxí tōnglián zǔ 语文学习通联组. 1956. "要重視簡化漢字, 正確使用簡化漢字". *Yǔwén xuéxí* 1956:8, p. 41.

"Zài tán 'xiàng' hé 'xiàng'" "再谈'象'和'像'". By Sū Péichéng 苏培成. *Yǔwén jiànshè* 1991:6, pp. 41, 30.

Zēng Shǐ 曾史. "萧院长, 您到底姓什么". *Yǎowén jiáozì* 2008:3, pp. 27–29.

Zēng Xiàndá 曾宪达 (湖南益阳专署卫生科). "医药上的簡化字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1964.12.9.

Zēng Zhāolún 曾昭掄 (人民政協全國委員會委員). "文字改革和科學用字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.7.6.

Zhàndòu zài Chángchéng nèiwài 战斗在长城内外. 1987. Jiěfàngjūn huàbàoshè, ed. Beijing.

Zhāng Décún 張德存. "有些簡化字还可以考虑". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:6, p. 25.

Zhāng Péng 张朋 and Fèi Jǐnchāng 费锦昌. "文字改革 30 年记事 [一] (初稿)". *Yǔwén xiàndàihuà* 1980:4, pp. 250–257.

Zhāng Ruìlín 张瑞麟 (山西翼城一中). "从中学語文教学談汉字的进一步簡化". *Guāng-míng rìbào* 1965.7.21.

Zhāng Sānwèi 张三位. "我們希望看到更多的簡化字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1964.3.17.

Zhāng Sānwèi et al. 张三位等 (解放军某部教员). "我們希望看到更多的簡化字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1965.3.17.

Zhāng Shènglín 张胜林 (抚顺电器设备厂). "采用多种办法简化汉字". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1974.3.25.

Zhāng Sījìng 张思敬 (河北省邯郸是郭二庄煤矿业余学校). "在扫除文盲教育中如何正确对待簡化汉字問題". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1958.7.28.

Zhāng Yǒngmián 张永绵. "从高等学校考生的语文试卷谈简化字问题". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1962:3, pp. 17–18.

Zhāng Yǒngquán 张涌泉. "韩、日汉字深源二题". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 2003:4.

— "简化字探源三题". *Shàoxīng wénlǐ xuéyuàn xuébào* 2006:3, pp. 50–51.

Zhāng Yuǎntí 張遠褆. "汉字简化应该多从'音'的方面着手". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.4.27.

Zhāng Yúnqīng 张云卿. "石家庄市中小学教师集会评论新简化字". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1978:5, pp. 30–31.

Zhāng Zhī 张之 (河南林县第一完中語文组). "讀了'学生写了'汉字简化方案'以外的简化字該怎么处理'以后". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1961:12, pp. 22–23.

Zhāng Zhōngjié 張中傑. 1955. "張中傑代表的發言". In *Quánguó wénzì*, pp. 108-110.

Zhāng Zhōu 張周. 1956. 簡化漢字的好处. Guangzhou.

Zhào Dì 赵地. "怎样認識群众新創簡字?". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1958.5.5.

Zhào Tàimóu 趙太侔. "關於漢字簡化問題". 山東大學學報(人文科學) 1957:1, pp. 165–186.

Zhào Xī 赵曦. "对汉字简化方案草案的意见(一)". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1955:6, p. 40.

Zhào Yǒngshǎng 赵永赏. 1955. "对汉字简化提几点意见". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1955:7, pp. 9–10.

Zhèjiāng shěng Húzhōu zhōngxué gémìng wěiyuánhuì 浙江省湖州中学革命委员会. "农村常用字的简化大有可为". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1975.8.25.

Zhèjiāng shěng jiàoyùjú, Zhèjiāng shěng wénzì gǎigé bàngōngshì 浙江省教育局、浙江省文字改革办公室. 1978. "浙江省讨论'第二次汉字简化方案(草案)'的情况". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1979:3–4, pp. 29–31.

Zhēn-cǎo qiān zì wén 真草千字文. (Sui). By Zhìyǒng 智永. In *Chūgoku hōsho sen*, vol. 27.

[Zhèng] Línxī [鄭]林曦. "同音假借是精簡漢字的一個方法". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1953:12, pp. 7–10.

Zhèng Lìyí 郑立仪. "对进一步简化汉字的意见". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1960:12, p. 17.

Zhèng Yīnghàn 郑英漢. "对'从俗'和'类推'的意见". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.4.27.

Zhèng Yún 鄭芸. "我對漢字簡化的几點意见". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.8.3

Zhèngmíng yàolù 正名要録. By Láng Zhīběn 郎知本 (594–649). Copy of Stein Dunhuang manuscript No. 388 in Library of British Museum provided by Nishihara Kazuyuki 西原一幸 of Kinjo Gakuin University.

Zhènjiāng jiàoyù xīnwén editors 镇江教育新闻编辑部. "街头用字—城市文明的眼睛". *Zhènjiāng jiàoyù xīnwén* 2004.11.8. http://www.zje.net.cn/new/new/3/2004110806.htm, accessed 27 December 2010.

Zhèngshǐ shíjīng 正始石經. 241. Reproduced in Fushimi 1989.

"Zhèngzì xiǎozìhuì (1)" "正字小字汇 (1)". 正字小字汇編輯小組. *Wénzì gǎigé* 1965:1, cover p. 3.

Zhèngzìtōng 正字通. (1627) 1671. By Zhāng Zìliè 張字烈. Reprinted 1996 in Beijing.

Zhōng Zhìxiáng 钟志祥 (内蒙古军区某部). "繁难字可适当地用同音字代替". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1974.5.10.

Zhōngguó bǎnkè túlù 中國版刻圖祿. 1961. Běijīng túshūguǎn, ed. Beijing.

"Zhōngguó mínzhǔ cùjìn huì zǒngbù zuòtán wénzì gǎigé wèntí de jìlù (zhāiyào)" "中國民主促進会总部座談文字改革問題的記錄(摘要)". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.4.27.

Zhōngguó rénmín dàxué yǔwén jiàoyánshì yùkè xiǎozǔ 中國人民大學語文教研室預科小組: "应該擴大同音代替的範圍". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.9.14.

Zhōngguó wénmíng wǎng 中国文明网www. wenming.cn

Zhōngguó wénzì gǎigé yánjiū wěiyuánhuì mìshūchù 中國文字改革研究委員會秘書處. "中國文字改革研究委員會的成立經過和工作情況". *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 1952:1, pp. 38–39.

Zhōngguó zuòjiā xiéhuì 中国作家協会. "討論'漢字簡化方案草案'的記錄". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.5.25.

Zhōnghuá dà zìdiǎn, suōběn 中華大字典, 縮本. (1916) 1922. Xú Yuánjié et al. Shanghai.

Zhōnghuá rénmín gònghéguó jiàoyù bù, Zhōnghuá rénmín gònghéguó wénhuà bù, Zhōngguó wénzì gǎigé wěiyuánhuì 中华人民共和国教育部、中华人民共和国文化部、中国文字改革委员会. "关于征集新簡化字的通知". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1960:11, pp. 4–5.

Zhōnghuá rénmín gònghéguó wénhuà bù, Zhōngguó wénzì gǎigé wěiyuánhuì 中华人民共和国文化部、中国文字改革委员会. 1955. "Guānyú fābù dì yī pī yìtǐ zì zhěnglǐ biǎo de liánhé tōngzhī" "关于地一批异体字整理表的联合通知". Reprinted in *Guójiā yǔyán wénzì zhèngcè fǎguī huìbiān*.

Zhōngshān bào 中山報 1959.9.25.

Zhōu gōng shèzhèng 周公摄政. By Zhèng Guāngzǔ 鄭光祖. In *Quányuán zájù*, vol. 2, pp. 5–21.

Zhōu Qǐfèng 周起鳳. "駁'汉字簡化糟得很論'". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1958:4, pp. 21–22.

Zhōu Qíwēi 周其威 (解放军某部). "部队拥护简化字". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1964:8, p. 5.

Zhōu Yǒuguāng 周有光. (1961) 1979. 汉字改革概论. Beijing.

Zhōu Zǔmó 周祖謨. Speech in "Wénzì gǎigé wèntí zuòtánhuì jìlù", pp. 14–15.

Zhū Ěrchóu 朱尔儔. 1958. "怎样对待新出现的簡化字". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1958:10, p. 51.

Zhū Fāngpǔ 朱芳圃. 1962. 殷周文字釋叢. Beijing.

Zhù Júxiān 祝菊仙. "我对'从俗'和'颣推'的看法". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1955.6.22.

Zhū Qìngxià 朱慶夏. 1957. "希望繼續公布汉字簡化表". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1957:7, pp. 55–56.

Zhū Ruìqīng 朱瑞卿. 1978. "新简化字多数易学易记但有不足". *Wénzì gǎigé tōngxùn* 1978:5, cover pp. 3–4.

Zhū Yǒngkūn 朱勇坤. 2001. 老信封. Shanghai.

Zimmermann, Hans. 2002. "Über philatelistische Geldüberweisung innerhalb der VR China – Teil 1". *Die China-Philatelie* 124 (2002), pp. 23–41.

Zìhuì 字彙. (1615) 1787. By Méi Yīngzuò 梅膺祚.

Zìhuìbǔ 字彙補. 1666. By Wú Rènchén 吳任臣. Quoted in *Kāngxī zìdǎn.*

Zìjiàn 字鑒. c. 1330. By Lǐ Wénzhòng 李文仲. 1780 transcript in *Sì kù quánshū*, vol. 228, pp. 17–74.

Zìkǎo 字考. 1617. By Huáng Yuánlì 黃元立. In Sugimoto 1974, supplement, vol. 1.

Zìxué jǔyú 字學舉隅. 1839. By Huáng Hǔchī 黃虎癡. In Sugimoto 1974, supplement, vol. 1.

Zìxué qī zhǒng 字學七種. 1836 (written 1829). In Sugimoto 1974, supplement, vol. 1.

Zìyàng 字樣. By Inspector Yán 顏監 [Yán Shīgǔ 顏師古 581–645]. Copy of Stein manuscript No. 388 in Library of British Museum provided by Nishihara Kazuyuki of Kinjo Gakuin University.

Zōho Kagakushū 増補下學集. 1669. By Yamawaki Dōen 山協道圓.

Zōho teisei Kan-Wa daijirin, 増補訂正漢和大辭林. 1917. Tokyo.

Zokuji no jiten 俗字の字典. N.y. http://hp.vector.co.jp/authors/VA00964/html/zokuji.htm, accessed 31 March 2016.

Zuǒ Huànrén 左煥仁. "不同意陈夢家要做回汉字简化方案的意见". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1957.6.27.

Zuǒ Zhìhuá 左志華. 1957. "独出心裁". *Yǔwén zhīshí* 1957:3, pp. 16–17.

1962 nián nǐ gōngbù dì yī pī jiǎnhuà hànzì biǎo (dì sān cì cǎo gǎo) 1962 年拟公布第一批簡化汉字表 (第三次草稿). 1962. [By Script Reform Committee]. Stencil.

Manuscripts and documents

Account book, 1909. From Beijing flea market.

Aichi Archives 448-3-42. 1910. 共進品評会台湾南部物産共進会観覧人并出品物船車割引証送商工課.

Beijing Archives J1-4-467. 1948. 北平市政府转饬交通部拟定修正加强检查邮包私递烟毒办法的训令.

— J2-4-466. 1947–1948. 行政院关于停止广播及灌制淫靡歌曲的训令.

— J2-4-478. 1947. 骆驼文丛社、北京人画报、知行励学会呈请登记备案及市政府指令.

— J2-7-22. 1892–1894. 圆明园正黄旗光绪十八、十九两年应修兵房工程和镶黄旗光绪十七年应修官员兵房工程查估丈尺做法清册.

— J2-7-261. 1939. 社会局统计制图员试卷.

— J2-8-377. 1931. 外四区灶君庙道士陈明霈登记庙产的呈及社会局的批示.

— J2-8-627. 1931–1936. 内三区灶君庙尼人智通登记庙产的呈文及社会局的批示.

— J2-8-962. 1936. 西郊区桂军龟君庙主钱桂林送寺庙登记表及社会局的批示.

— J2-8-1219. 1936–1937. 皂君庙管理人卢吉送寺庙登记表及社会局的批示.

— J2-8-1252. 1939–1940. 东郊区东坝白衣庵住持迈真送寺庙登记表及社会局的批示.

— J4-2-1855. 1948. 东北中学学生流平溪畔盘山永光哈尔滨.

— J4-3-26. 1912–1914. 京师学务局所辖各小学校自民国元年五月迄民国三年十二月设立及废止各情形一览表.

— J5-1-118. 1935. 第三卫生区事物所关于领款印鉴、翁文渊所长任差日期.

— J5-3-925. 1948. 新药业同业公会关于拟售卖盘尼西林办法的呈及卫生局的指令.

— J6-1-214. 1947–1949. 冀北电力公司北平分公司关于签报赴汉沽运输盐酸经过情形的报告和函催购置之铆钉、电池、变压器、温度计等与天津炼铁厂、天津海关北平分关等单位的来往函.

— J31-1-771. 1920–1929. 中国银行琼州支行、汕头支行、广州支行有关业务问题与京行的来往函.

— J31-1-1088. 1923. 沪行、浙行等行关于防冒领取款、采取新措及台风影响暂时停业等事宜给各支行的通函.

— J32-1-2398. 1947. 有关电报密码、印鉴等事项湘潭、兰州等联行往来文书.

— J41-1-134. 1937–1940. 金城银行哈尔滨分行有关存储汇解款,代收付托办人事调动、津薪、机构归并押借透支等问题的来函。

— J106-1-1. 1856 [1864]. 咸丰六年新正月诸公外欠总老帐.

— J181-17-44. 1925–1937. 北平市警察局令发拟定管理新闻、营叶汽车人力车厂等规则.

— J181-19-10769. 1915. 京师警察厅内左一区分区关于张维政售卖春药而假称为炉火龟龄集的详.

— J181-19-14716. 1917. 京师警察内友三区警察署关于李秀昌偷窃竹并扎打吗啡一案的详.

— J181-19-31013. 1921. 吉林长春县警察所关于传知宫奎喜领取被拐幼女宫平儿就近查护的呈.

— J181-21-1389. 1928. 京师警察厅外右二区分区关于沈陈氏等吸鸦片一案的呈.

— J181-21-17380. 1933. 北平市公安局保安二队关于陈贵兰等载运空弹壳的呈.

— J181-21-17389. 1933. 北平市公安局保安二队关于查获邢庆长私运弹壳一案的呈.

— J181-31-3364. 1930. 北平市警察局关于王庆称田晁衡系詹大慧党羽并拐走赵某老爷之妻的函.

— J183-2-5932. 1934. 北平市警察局内三区关于仿古斋拖欠税款、景白奋[仑]等人衣服、首饰、床上用品被盗及王榕生走失案的表

— 1-6-174. 1946–1949. 许京骐同志关于北平市院校教职员联合会成立经过情况及组织群众性学术性会议的意见.

— 1-8-1. 1947. 1947 年至 1948 年冀鲁豫边区政府、晋察冀边区行政委员会、晋察冀边区财经处和华北局有关财经问题的通知、规定.

— 1-9-42. 1948. 市委研究室关于入城前后对长辛店、石景山、门头沟、琉璃河、南口等工厂、平绥路恢复等调查.

— 1-9-156. 1951. 彭真同志在北京市各届代表会上的报告、讲话和关于召开代表会议的意见.

— 2-1-136. 1956. 市长、副市长、政府委员就职及政府委员会成立典礼纪录.

— 2-15-376. 1963. 人委办公厅转发国务院财贸办公室转发北京市有关商业部门乱用简化字发生政治性错误的反映, 市人委关于检查和整顿商店牌匾广告等滥用通知.

— 2-21-69. 1963. 市副食局关于几种主要副食品供应办法变动情况资料.

— 2-21-269. 1963. 市人委关于检查和整顿商店滥用简化字的通知及国务院财办转发"北京市商业部门乱用简化字发生政治错误的反映"以及市财办的通报和财贸有关局对滥用简化字的检查报告与通知.

— 4-2-24. 1949. 关于特种手工艺情况报告及特种手工艺品出口研究工艺会组织规章市府关于港口间贸易为内地贸易的规定.

— 4-2-27. 1949. 特种手工艺业基本情况.

— 4-8-124. 1952. 公营企业公司关于永茂公司酱油厂新建仓库发酵室、安装高周波发酵装置和发酵室暖气设备予算的请示及财委的批复.

— 4-9-118. 1951. 财政税务局关于 1951 年农叶地方直接工商所得税汇算清交工作等的总结报告.

— 4-13-35. 1953. 公营企业公司等单位关于北京建筑器材公司所产蓝板瓦、红泥瓦调整售价等问题报告及本委的批复.

— 4-13-44. 1953. 华北财委关于钢丝产销呆滞铜材料及废铜品的处理通知本委关于杂铜问题的报告.

— 8-2-72. 1949. 对剧影汇报登记处理意见报告及有关文件.

— 9-1-167. 1959. 烟酒价格, 芝麻叶、葡萄叶收购价格请示通知.

— 20-2-65. 1953. 关于折尺制造商登记根据目前情况暂停发证明的报告.

— 22-10-317. 1950–1951. 商业局关于房纤登记管理问题的报告及市府批复.

— 22-10-1349. 1954. 私营工业企业调查表(糕点糖果业).

— 22-10-1369. 1954. 私营工业调查表(橡胶业).

— 22-12-589. 1951. 保定市土产会议文件.

— 22-12-1441. 1953. 本局对天丰楼、祥茂增盛、兴茂等果店高价出售果品、出售烂果、不够分量违法行为的处理

— 22-12-1637. 1954. 关于春节前在京西斋堂举行扩大集市的的计划草案和报告与人员配备名单.

— 22-12-1934. 1954. 振记公鱼店、张记、明记、张禾书、成顺斋、便宜房等鸡鸭店趁机抬高价格, 并出售病死、压死鸡鸭等违法情况的处理.

— 31-2-160. 1950–1952. 面粉公司各厂盘盈盘亏来往文书.

— 36-2-93. 1958. 北京木材厂、油毡厂、油漆厂、轮胎厂工作计划、总结、精简方案等文件.

— 37-1-50. 北京市南苑区人民委员会。关于劳动就业摊商开, 歇业综合表, 农业生产报表, 农作物播种面积表.

— 38-1-90. 1954. 前门区妇联 1953 年工作总结.

— 45-5-40. 1951–1952. 九区清洁队关于评模考绩及处理贫污犯过违法人员的报告有关文件.

— 87-7-2. 1948. 橡胶业会员基本情况表.

— 87-31-8. 1946. 油酒醋酱业会员调表入会申请、介绍书.

— 88-1-369. 1954. 市社关于网的规划、意见、请示、报告.

— 90-1-326. 1961–1962. 民用五金、钟表修理、三轮车焊活价格电工价格通知.

— 101-1-244. 1949. 搬运工人工作委员会关于三轮车工人基本情况调查和签订集体合同、车租、车费等专题报告.

— 115-1-107. 1952. 电车、公共汽车公司关于路线开辟、调正的请示及局的批复等文件.

— 117-1-672. 1954. 政务院、市人民政府关于录用工作人员及职工福利待遇的规定.

— 117-1-1128. 1959. 市指挥部运输工作情况报告、请示等文件.

— 119-1-180. 1957. 本局关于调整大白菜、菠菜、姜、蒜、小白菜、韭菜、大葱、生笋、小油菜[…]价格的请示、批复、通知、签报.

— 119-1-343. 1959. 本局关于高温有毒气体、作业人员、部队医生、病人、外宾专家、使馆人员、回国观光华侨、假期学生、产妇儿童、运动员各种付食品货源供应的请示、报告、计划、意见、通知.

— 123-1-211. 1951. 市关于黑龙潭疗养院、北京疗养院、干部任免的报告及批复.

— 135-1-40. 1949. 北京市人民政府批准成立北京市防疫委员会及发布北京市鼠预防暂行办法的报告.

— 135-1-1394. 1963. 北京市卫生局关于调整门诊镶牙、包床、检验收费问题的请示报告及"医院门诊收费暂行规定"试行通知.

— 135-2-508. 1973. 全国虐疾防治研究工作座谈会及本局不能承担北京地区协作组长的复函.

— 152-1-105. 1951. 本市 1951 年职工业余教育优秀教师、学员获奖大会的报告、函通知及"发奖特刊".

— 153-1-803. 1949. 关于新华、中华、九三、北方、协化、崇慈、平民、东方、北宁助产、世熙九个中学的调查材料及有关学校的一些文件.

Guangdong Archives 253-2-275-123~125. 1977. 关于下达湛江罐头厂冷酷措施拨资项目的通知. 省计委.

— 295-1-7-160. 1950. 转中财部关于征收硝卤石膏税规定办法. 省税局.

Hangzhou Archives 29-1-8. 1954. 商业局、人民银行、财政局、税务局、各党组有关开展工作的计划、方案、意见报告.

— 81-4-21. 1954. 杭州商业局, 行政物价类. 本局 54 年对私营商业开、转、歇业变动情况统计月报和杭州市摊贩调查资料.

— 87-1-15. 1953–1954. 中共杭州市卫生局委员会. 本委、卫生局总支关于一九五三年季月度工作的计划、总结.

— 87-2-35. 1956. 本局关于工厂保健工作计划、总结. 杭州市卫生局.

— 94-1-1. 1949. 劳动局 7、8、9 月工作计划.本局工作计划、会议计划、工作制度和对调整财政粮价问题的请示、简报等.

— 94-1-104. 1956–1957. 杭州市劳动局. 本局工资改革办公室关于工资改革调整、步伐、定级的意见、报告、通知.

Hubei Archives LS10-5-1294. 1916–1934. 湖北省钟祥县兰台中学校况及员生表册.

— LS19-5-7726. 1947. 樊城藉池争购食盐酿成人命调查情形.

— LS31-8-301. 1946–1948. 湖北省建设听清理六河沟制铁工司欠付象鼻山铁矿砂价款之令呈函.

— LS56-1-30. 1917–1933. 汉冶萍公司通饬各处公函汇存事.

— SZ3-1-233. 1952. 京山县城关区四岭乡第一至七村中医、雇贫佃农及地富逐户调查登记表.

— SZ18-2-139. 1956. 各县农场关于粳稻、小麦、棉花生产及各地、县委关于春耕、夏收、夏种、冬播、生产计划、增产示范及生产技术等的报告.

— SZ29-4-47. 1951–1954. 中南工委、中南工会干校关于举办私企班、业务班、第一期基础班的通知、教学计划、总结和学员名册.

— SZ34-2-154. 1951. 修建湖北省人民政府招待所武昌梳桩台楼房放工程合同图纸.

— SZ81-2-1039. 1956. 湖北省商业厅组技科。商业厅在宝丰路建办公大楼和宿舍的请示报告及批复.

— SZ139-1-201. 1970. 修建隔卜桥、阳新县鸡龙山铜矿、省原交通厅船舶修造厂、修建襄樊大桥、修建汉蔡公路征用土地.

Jìnán yínháng Tūnliú zhīháng bàogào 冀南银行屯留支行报告. 1948. From Beijing fleamarket.

Jīxī liángkù géwěi 鸡西粮库革委. 1969. 关于任[...]的历史调查和处理意见. From fleamarket.

Letter dated 1990.10.20. Sent from Sichuan. Provided by Wáng Jiālín.

Museum of Chinese History. 史 5678. 1925. 故宫图說.

Nanjing Archives 1005-1-289. 1924. 江苏省第一造林场关于明陵, 铺植草皮事项.
— 1048-1-24. 1930. 永利碱厂简介, 生产概况及工业用盐统计表. 南京化学公司.
— 5013-3-36. 1951–1952. 本局与各厂矿企业有关欠缴工会经费处罚滞纳金问题的来往函等. 南京市人民政府劳动局.
— 5019-2-73. 1959. 江苏省计委、农林厅等联会下达 1959 年下年农业机械新式农具生产、试制计划. 南京市人民委员会计划委员会.
— 5023-3-55. 1955. 1954 年农民家计调查资料. 市统计局.
— 5034-3-327. 1954. 南京市人民政府地方工业局.
— 5034-3-461. 1955–1956. 工业局植物油厂等工业企业决算报告.
— 5059-4-1. 1950. 南京市人民政府工商局玻璃镜框、缝工业登记表.
— 5065-2-525. 1953. 市中医院建筑门诊部改建归病房的文件. 南京市卫生厅.
— 8003-3-55. 1956. 1956 年度栖霞区属各乡社的规划、计划等文件. 中共栖霞区委员会.

National Archives of Japan 1868.1.9. 聖護院宮ヲ議定ニ拝ス.
— 1915.11.25. 猟犬輸送に関する件電報.
— 1917.8.6. 越部停車場設備省略ノ件.
— 1922.1. 秘書官服部愿夫以下二十八名残務取扱任命ノ件.
— 1922.11. 秘書官服部愿夫以下二十八名残務取扱任命ノ件.
— 1929.10.22. 瑞西宛手形遅延ノ件.
— 1932.5.17. 関東州生産係る乙号品の輸入単価及國別割合調査.

— 1941. 独、仏郵便小切手制度ニ関スル照会及回答.

— 1941.2.26. 警察連帯支弁金算定に関する件.

— 1944.3.3. 原簿到着通知.

— 1944.8. 戦闘想定.

— 1946.6.4–1946.12.19. 国語審議会に関する件.

Táo Gēngzá 逃畊雜. 1892. 民間宣謝攷. East Asian Library, Stockholm.

Tokyo Archives ウ 208.20.06. 1953. 北多摩村山村穂町との境界変更について.

Yamaguchi Prefectural Archives 高津家 129. 1894. 雁のゆきかひ.

— 労民部 30. 1949–1950. 昭和 24 年職務関係安徽革命史画册.

— 矢田部家 2. 1882. 塩田頭取之職務書類.

— 戦前 A 農業 489. 1938. 森林組合十二度.

— 戦前 A 農業 571. 1926. 機船底曳網違反取締一件.

— 戦前 A 農業 688. 1943. 風水害補助申請一件.

— 戦前 A 土木 325. 1923. 府県道田万崎萩線萩町地内雁島橋架換一件.

— 戦前 A 土木 435–436. 1912–1917. 県庁舎建築ニ関スル往復一件.

— 戦前 A 土族. 1887. 年賦祖替及廃棄捐其他報告.

— 戦前 B 89. 1923. 功労者調査ニ関スル件.

— 戦前 B520. 1942. 舊電氣局職員履歴書.

— 戦前 B1100. 1941. 電気事業株式一件.

— 戦前 B1101. 1932–1933. 電燈山口電力業務課.

— 戦前 B2522. 1938. 流水利用許可一件.

— 戦前 B2955. 1938. 縣立字部工業學校教室増築其他工事一件.

— 戦前 B2996. 1921. 大正十年度県立下関測候所職員住宅新築工事一件.

Letters to the Script Reform Committee

Throughout its existence, the Script Reform Committee received correspondence from inventors of alphabets and characters and, more interestingly for us, from collectors of short forms. The latter peaked during the 1960 character collection campaign and again in the mid 1970s.

Below letters are listed with sender's county or city, date, name when known, address and contents as described by sender. 1960 data are faulty, taken down in great hurry in May 1982 when the committee staff were busy reallocating work assignments, attending meetings which no one dared miss. Notes of 1973–1977 correspondence were taken in 1986, but are incomplete as fifteen cupboards with correspondence had just been thrown away. By 1990 all pre-1977 correspondence had been disposed of.

Ankang, Shaanxi. 1960.11.24. Lǐ Chángjì 李长记, Ankang University 安康大学.
    "Characters often written by some people in our area."

Anyang, Henan. 1977.4.25. Mèng Xiàndá 孟宪达, Xinzheng Brigade, Gonghetun Commune 洪河屯公社辛正大队. "Collected characters."

Baicheng, Heilongjiang. 1960. Chinese Section, Baicheng Normal School 白城师专中文教研室. "Relatively common characters."

Baotou, Inner Mongolia. 1960. Sūn Fúhé 孙福和, Printing House of Baotou Daily 包头日报社印刷厂. "Examples of the new creativity in character use."

Beijing. 1961.2.17. Jiuqiao People's Bank, Dongzhimenwai 东直门外酒桥人民银行.

Bengbu, Anhui. 1960.6.16. Dean's Office, Bengbu Normal School 蚌埠师范专科学校教务处. "Characters seen in the works of first year students."

Dehong, Yunnan. 1961.5.14. Jiǎng Xuéchāng 姜学昌, Luxi Dai Opera Troupe 潞西傣剧团. "Characters seen here."

Duchang, Jiangxi. 1961.11.16. Léi Kèfēi 雷克非, Wangdun Middle School 汪墩中学. "Characters used by the masses."

Changsha, Hunan. 1955.2.13. Meeting of Hunan middle school teachers.

Changsha, Hunan. 1960.8.4, 1960.8.10. Zhōu Liàncǎi 周炼采, Hanzhuang Primary School 汉庄小学. "Report from discussions on the 1955 Draft of the Character Simplification Scheme."

Changsha, Hunan. 1960.8.10. Zhōu Liàncǎi 周炼采, Hanzhuang Primary School 汉庄小学.

Changtai, Fujian. 1960.7.7. Lín Jìngān 林晋干, Changtai Experimental Primary School 长泰县实验小学. "Collected new simplified characters."

Changyuan, Henan. 1977.9.12. Hóu Wǔqún 侯武群, Dashiqiao, Changchun Commune 尝村公社大石桥. "Characters which can be simplified."

Changzi, Shanxi. 1960.7.12. Duàn Yùtáng 段玉堂, Changzi Middle School 长子中学. "Characters used by the masses."

Chaozhou, Guangdong. 1960.6.8. Xí Jǐngkāng 龚景康, Chaozhou Town 潮州镇.

Fuzhou, Fujian. 1960. Huáng Xiàochū 黄孝初, Fujian Agriculture Office 福建省农业厅. "Characters used by the masses, collected during work with propaganda and education."

Gaozhou, Guangdong. 1960.9.22. Liào Fēi 廖飞, Huaifen Commune Party Office 怀分公社.

Gaozhou, Guangdong. 1961.6.12. Lǐ Qìngzhāng 李床璋, Gaozhou Middle School 高州中学.

Gejiu, Yunnan. 1976.1.20. Jīn Yǐxiá 金以侠, Jigui Middle School 鸡圭中学. "What has the committee been doing for the last ten years?"

Guangzhou, Guangdong. 1960.10.21. Dèng Lèxián 邓乐贤, Office of Chinese Department of South China Normal University 华南师范大学中文系办公室.

Guangzhou, Guangdong. 1960.8.6. Guangdong Education Bureau 广东省教育局. "New simplified characters used in parts of Guangdong Province."

Guangzhou, Guangdong. 1960.8. Lǐ Cuìhé 李粹和, Chinese Department, South China Normal Institute 华南师院中文系. "Characters I think can be adopted."

Guidong, Hunan. 1961.11.15. Wàn Zhōngyǒu 万忠友, Jinxi Primary School, Datang Commune 大塘公社金溪小学.

Hai'an, Jiangsu. 1960. Yán Shàopíng 阎少平, Qutang Middle School 曲塘中学. "Characters seen in pupils' works."

Hangzhou, Zhejiang. 1960. Sandun Cereals and Vegetable Cooking Oil Purchase Section 三墩粮油购消站. "Characters invented by the peasants, and other characters."

Hanjiang, Jiangsu. 1975.4.17. Jì Bǎomín 季保民, Revolutionary Committee of Hanjiang Agricultural Production Equipment Company 邗江县农业生产资料公司革委会.

Harbin, Heilongjiang. 1960. Heilongjiang Education Bureau 黑教. "Materials from every province concerning new simplified characters."

Hefei, Anhui. 1960.7.23. Hú Zhìnóng 胡治农, Language Teaching Section of Chinese Department of Hefei Normal Institute 合肥师院中文系语言学教研组. "Characters found in examination papers."

Hefei, Anhui. 1960.8. Liú Fányáo 刘凡瑶, Anhui Hydropower Institute 安徽水利电力学院. "Characters collected since late 1959."

Heyuan, Guangdong. 1960.11.25. Fēng Fēng 峰峰, Heyuan Middle School 河源中学.

Huaiyin, Jiangsu. 1960.5.28. Pupil of Yugou Middle School 渔沟中学学生. "Characters used by most people."

Hui'an, Fujian. 1977.3.4. Kē Wěimín 柯伟民, Hui'an Middle School No. 2 惠安二中. "Collected characters."

Hui'an, Fujian. 1977.6.27. Kē Wěimín 柯伟民, Hui'an Middle School No. 2 惠安二中. "Characters collected after discussions with educated youth and others."

Huzhou, Zhejiang. 1976.9.2. Shěn Shífēng 沈时峰, Huzhou Chemical Factory 湖州化肥厂. "Simplified characters which I know."

Jinan, Shandong. 1976.3.2. Gāo Gēngshēng 高更生, Chinese Teaching Group, 1975 Class of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Institute, Chinese Department of Shandong Normal Institute 济南市山东师范学院中文系七五级工农宾学院汉语教研组. "Characters used by the masses of Shandong."

Lichuan, Hubei. 1976. Táng Yǒngsī 唐永思, Zhongling Middle School 钟灵中学, Xiaohe Commune 小河公社. "Characters common here."

Liling, Hunan. 1977.2.1. Chén Xiǎnmíng 陈显明, Leiguqiao Brigade 擂鼓桥大队, Babuqiao Commune 八步桥公社. "Collected characters."

Linxiang, Hunan. 1960. Chén Qìngnán, Zhongfangwan Primary School 忠防完小学陈庆南. "Characters used by the people."

Longnan, Jiangxi. 1960.12.6. Yàn Xīnxīng 彦新兴, full-time anti-illiteracy cadre in Longnan County 龙南县扫盲专职干部. "Characters used by the masses, used in pupils' works, etc."

Lu'an, Anhui. 1960.6.22. Jiāng Guǎngliáng 姜广良, Lu'an Normal School 六安师专. "Characters common in Lu'an District."

Mengcheng, Anhui. 1977.5.17. Yáng Mínshēng 杨民生, Mengcheng Normal School 蒙城师范学校. "Characters simplified by the masses, collected by me."

Nanchong, Sichuan. 1960.7.27. Duàn Huīcōng 段辉聪, Chinese Department, Nanchong Professional Training School 南充专科学校中语科. "Characters used here."

Nanjing, Jiangsu. 1960.12.21. Maji Middle School, Liuhe 六合县马集中学. "Characters seen in pupils' works."

Ningbo, Zhejiang. 1960.11.29. "Characters common here."

Ningqiang, Shaanxi. 1976.7.27. Jǐng Chéngyì 景成义and Shū Yānlín 舒燕林, Gonghe Commune, Daijiaba District 代家坝区巩河公社. "Characters used by workers and peasants."

Pengshan, Sichuan. 1960.5.16. Lǐ Jiǔgāo 李九皋, language teacher at Pengshan Junior Middle School 彭山初中. "Characters common here"

Pengxi, Sichuan. 1977.4.30. Hú Zuòzhōng 胡祚忠, Huaihua Primary School 篷溪县槐花小学.

Pucheng, Fujian. 1960.6.3. Jì Bǐngcōng 季秉聪, Pucheng Cadres' Part-Time Literacy School 蒲城县机关干部业余文化学校. "Characters from students' compositions."

Pingnan, Guangxi. 1960.4.18. Féng Rúyǔn 冯儒允, Pingnan Normal School 平南师范. "Characters in use among the masses."

Pingyang, Zhejiang. 1960. Dèng Zhāoyì 邓昭逸, Wanfeng Production Team, Mendongyu 门东屿万丰生产队.

Qianshan, Anhui. 1960. Lín Lánguì 林兰桂, language teacher at Yezhai Middle School 野寨中学语文教师. "Characters popular in Anqing District"

Qichun, Hubei. 1975.5.6. Hú Jǐngquán 胡景全, Brigade No.1, Shizi Commune 蕲春县狮子公社一大队. "Characters collected from letters, wall bulletins and manuscripts for typing."

Qichun, Hubei. 1975.6.20. Hú Jǐngquán 胡景全, Brigade No.1, Shizi Commune 蕲春县狮子公社一大队. "More collected Characters."

Qingjiang, Jiangxi. 1977.8.25. Zhèng Zhōushū 郑洲书, Shanqian Middle School 山前中学. "New simplified characters which have appeared in this area."

Quanzhou, Guangxi. 1961.2.3. From Cài Zhènhuá 蔡振华, Quanzhou Senior Middle School 全州高中.

Rongjiang, Guizhou. 1960.9.18. Lǐ Yǒngchéng 李永成, Rongjiang Middle School 榕江中学. "Characters common in our area."

Santai, Sichuan. 1976.6.28. Educated youth Shuǎ Yīngpíng 知青耍英平, Fourth Combined Team 联合四队, Quanxing Commune 全星公社. "Collected characters."

Shanghai. 1960.5.22. Huáng Róngzhōu 黄荣洲, Chinese Department, East China Normal University 华东师大中文系. "Collected common characters."

Shanghai. 1960.5.30. Huì Wénkǎi 惠文恺, Proofreading section, Xīnmín wǎnbào 新民晚报编辑部校对组.

Shaoguan, Guangdong. 1960.7.26. Bái Zhàodà 白召大, Sun Yat-sen Memorial Middle School 中山纪念中学.

Shaoguan, Guangdong. 1960.12.22. Cāng Yù 仓玉, Guangdong Institute of Mining and Metallurgy 广东矿治学院.

Shaojue, Sichuan. 1961.6.8. Hè Jíxīn 贺集鑫, Wubo 乌坡, Shaojue 绍决县.

Shaoxing, Zhejiang. 1976.5.6. Huáng Wàngtǔ 黄望土, Gaofeng Brigade 高峰大队, Yuefeng Commune 越峰公社. "Collected characters."

Shaoyang, Hunan. 1960. Sù Qiūwén 粟秋文, Jiugongqiao Middle School No. 3 九公桥第三中学.

Shenyang, Liaoning. 1977.10.7. Qiáo Guìwǔ 乔桂五, Xiaohemo Middle School, Xincheng District 新城区小河没中学. "Characters seen in students' works."

Shijiazhuang, Hebei. 1960. Shijiazhuang Industries School 石家庄工业学校. "Characters seen by me."

Sihong, Jiangsu. 1961.6.22. Sihong Middle School 泗洪中学.

Sihong, Jiangsu. 1977.10.24. Hán Qíshān 韩奇山, Qianjin Brigade, Chengtou Forestry Centre 泗洪县城头林场前进大队. "Simplified characters in use."

Siping, Jilin. 1960. Hé Huá 何华, Publications Section, Jilin Normal University 吉林师范大学出版部. "Characters seen."

Songxi. Fujian. 1960.9.30. Chén Zǐliáng 陈子良, Songxi and Zhenghe Middle School No.1 松政第一中学. "Characters used in our counties."

Taihe, Anhui. 1976.12.10. Gǒng Sīliáng 巩思良. Taihe County Committee 太和县委机关. "Characters collected among the masses

Taishun, Zhejiang. 1960.6.11. Guō Jiànhuá 郭健华, Sixi Central Primary School 泗溪中心小学. "Characters with a history of five to ten years, or of three years."

Tianjin. 1960.2.25. Lǐ Mèngxiáng 李梦祥, Chinese Department, Hebei University 河北大学中文系. "Characters in common use."

Tianjin. 1961.3.27. Lǐ Chūnnián 李椿年, Third grade class, Tianjin Middle School No. 1 天津一中高三文史班. "Simplified characters which I have seen used by the masses."

Ürümqi, Xinjiang. 1960.7.9. Guō Chénshàn 郭臣善, Xinjiang Railway Institute 新疆铁路学院. "Characters seen here."

Wáng Qí. "讀者来信: 关于民族名称用字的几点建議". *Guāngmíng rìbào* 1958.7.14.

Wáng Yǒushēng 王有声 (北京第一实验小学). "识字教学, 校内外要一起抓". *Wénzì gǎigé* 1985:2, pp. 46–47.

Wanrong, Shanxi. 1960.7.1. Chéng Gēng 呈赓, Wangxian Middle School, Wansungu Commune 万孙古公社王显小学. "Simplified characters common here."

Wenling, Zhejiang. 1976.5.6. Jīn Míng 金明, Wenling County Theatre 温岭县剧院. "Characters collected by me."

Wenzhou, Zhejiang. 1960. Lín Bǎochūn 林宝春.

Wugang, Hunan. 1960.4.19. Jiǎng Àiguì 蒋艾桂, Wugang Progressive Primary School 武冈前进小学.

Wugang, Hunan. 1960. Lǚ Chǔzhì 吕楚峙, Wugang Normal School 武冈师范.

Wuhan, Hubei. 1960.11.14. Biàn Huá 卞华, Minzu Road Red and Expert School 民族路红专学校.

Wuhua, Guangdong. 1960.7.20. Luó Zhì 罗志, Wuhua Military Service Office 五华县兵役局.

Wuyang, Henan. 1977.2.10. Zhāng Déyàn 张德彦. "New simplified characters often seen here."

Xiamen, Fujian. 1960. Lín Kāijī 林开基, language teacher at Workers' and Peasants' Preparatory Department, Xiamen University 厦门大学工农预科语文教员. "Simplified forms used in this area."

Xichang, Sichuan. 1960.12.23. Liào Tíngchàng 廖廷畅, Language Section, Xichang Vocational School 西昌专科学校语文科.

Xingtai, Hebei. 1960.7. Xingtai Annex School 邢台附属学校. "Characters which have become common here."

Yancheng, Jiangsu. 1960.11.26. Sòng Miǎn 宋缅, Yancheng Medical School 盐城区卫生学校. "Characters common in Yancheng District."

Yangchun, Guangdong. 1960.7.12. Chén Lùzhōu 陈路周, Yangchun Mining Office 阳春矿务局.

Yichang, Hubei. 1960.7.4. Dīng Rénjīng 丁人金, Yichang Agriculture School 宜昌农专. "Characters collected in Yichang."

Yiyang, Henan. 1960. Yiyang Middle School No.1 宜阳县第一中学.

Yunyang, Sichuan. 1977.11.28. Liú Yúnxià 刘云厦, Hongshi Middle School Sparetime Script Reform Study Group 红狮中学业余文改研究小组.

Zhengzhou, Henan. 1960. Zhengzhou Mining School 郑州煤矿学校.

Zhengzhou, Henan. 1960.8.21. Jiǎng Yīnnán 蒋荫枏, Chinese Department, Zhengzhou Normal Institute 郑州师院中文系. "Common short forms."

Zhenyuan, Guizhou. 1960.7.3. Lóng Liánróng 龙连荣, Southeast Guizhou Normal School 黔东南师专.

Zongyang, Anhui. 1960.9.21. Chén Qíngchéng 陈情呈, Fujun Primary School 府君小学. "Characters common here."

INDEX

KVHAA *FILOLOGISK-FILOSOFISKA SERIEN:*

1 Ström, F., *Diser, nornor, valkyrjor. Fruktbarhetskult och sakralt kungadöme i Norden* (Disen, Nornen, Walküren. Fruchtbarkeitskult und sakrales Königtum im Norden). 1954

2 Ekwall, E., *Studies on the population of medieval London.* 1956

3 Kjellén, A., *Diktaren och havet. Drift- och drömsymbolik i svenskspråkig lyrik 1880–1940* (The poet and the sea). 1957

4 *Svenska skrock och signerier, samlade av Leonhard Fredrik Rääf* (Popular superstitions and incantations in Sweden collected by Leonhard Fredrik Rääf. Ed. with an introduction and textual notes by K. R. V. Wikman). 1957

5 Wessén, E., *Runstenen vid Röks kyrka* (Der Runenstein von Rök, Östergötland). 1958

6 Wessén, E., *Historiska runinskrifter.* 1960

7 Ståhl, H., *Ortnamnen i Kopparbergslagen.* 1960

8 Rooth, E., *Zu den Bezeichnungen für "Eiszapfen" in den Germanischen Sprachen. Historisch-wortgeografische und etymologische Studien.* 1961

9 Wessén, E., *Svensk medeltid. En samling uppsatser om svenska medeltidshandskrifter och texter. I. Landskapslagar.* (Zusammenfassung) 1968

10 Wessén, E., *Svensk medeltid. En samling uppsatser om svenska medeltidshandskrifter och texter. II. Birgittatexter.* (Zusammenfassung) 1968

11 Rooth, E., *Niederdeutsche Breviertexte des 14. Jahrhunderts aus Westfalen.* 1969

12 Dixelius, O., *Hans Järta och litteraturen. Hans Järta i litterär debatt och kulturpolitik under romantikens tidevarv 1809–1825* (Hans Järta and literature. Hans Järta in literary and cultural politics in the romantic era. 1809–1825). 1973. ISBN 91-7192-061-7

13 Beijer, A., *Dramatiken i Bröllops Besvärs Ihugkommelse. En tidsbild och ett tolkningsförsök.* 1974. ISBN 91-7192-173-7

14 Ridderstad, P., *Konsten att sätta punkt. Anteckningar om stenstilens historia 1400–1765.* 1975. ISBN 91-7192-242-3

15 *Proceedings of the VIth congress of Arabic and Islamic studies.* 1975. ISBN 91-7192-209-1

16 Wessén, E., *Svensk medeltid. En samling uppsatser om svenska medeltidshandskrifter och texter. III. De fornsvenska handskrifterna av Heliga Birgittas Uppenbarelser.* 1976. ISBN 91-7402-011-0

17 *Proceedings of the international colloquium on gnosticism.* Stockholm 20–25 augusti 1973. 1977. ISBN 91-7402-025-0

18 Norberg, D., *L'uvre poétique de Paulin d'Aquilée.* 1979. ISBN 91-7402-092-7

19 Sarajas, A., *Studiet av folkdiktningen i Finland intill slutet av 1700-talet.* 1982. ISBN 91-7402-144-3

20 Johns Blackwell, M., *C. J. L. Almqvist and romantic irony.* 1983. ISBN 91-7402-119-2

21 Makaev, È. A., *The language of the oldest runic inscriptions. A linguistic and historical analysis.* Translated from the Russian by J. Meredig in cooperation with E. H. Antonsen. 1996. ISBN 91-7402-259-8

22 Landgren, B., *Den hotade idyllen. Gunnar Mascoll Silfverstolpe, Finland och den lyriska intimismen.* 2008. ISBN 978-91-7402-379-4

23 Lindberg, B. (ed.), *The Pufendorf Lectures. Annotations from the teaching of Samuel Pufendorf 1672–1674.* 2014. ISBN 978-91-7402-426-5

24 Hidal, S., *Ivan Engnell. En bibelforskares bana.* 2019. ISBN 978-91-88763-01-3

25 Engwall, L., Hedmo, T. & Persson, O., *Corpus linguistics in Sweden. Pioneers and their context.* 2019. ISBN 978-91-88763-02-0

26 Bökset, R. *Long Story of Short Forms. Simplified Chinese Characters from A to Z.* 2021. ISBN 978-91-88763-22-8