

Writings by: MelodicEnigma

Main blog: <https://themelodicenigma.tumblr.com/>

## Original Work and Original Plan

There are several typical terms that signify authorship and other noteworthy credentials within the paratext [peritext] of Japanese produced works. Some simply have the same meaning for intent and purpose, while some have a certain nuance that creates a different understanding depending on the development of the material. Either way, it's there to provide essential production information that tells us about the making of the text.

To cover my bases, paratext is essentially information that communicates something about a text (e.g. a book, film, or video game's story). This information is delivered through the forms of epitext and peritext—the latter, which is information that “surrounds the text” (e.g. title, author name, publisher name, copyright, foreword/afterword, etc.). This paper will mostly be focusing on the peritext side of things. \*\*See my writing of [Paratext for Fiction and Fandom](#) for more.

Alongside the title of a product, the most noticeable form peritext takes is that of authorial information. There are two basic ways in which authorial credits are typically noted.

For one way, it's very common that a sole author of a given work, especially for a printed book, will simply have their name placed on the front cover without any accompanying identifying credentials. It's implied that whatever name is present is the primary author [and/or artist] of the work, and thus it would be unnecessary to include any extra identifying paratext that signifies this. It would also be fair to assume, then, that there aren't any other significant parties involved or relevant in the conception of the work, outside of the credited publishers and other editorial roles that might be spoken for on the cover or copyright section.

In the case of the second way, the Japanese language has its own use for authorial peritext, though interestingly enough, you'll still see products include some English language designation for authorship at times.

For identifying the author of a work, you'll see terms consisting of:

著 *cho* - work/book (by)

著者 *chosha* - author/writer

文 *bun/fumi* - text/writing (by)

漫画 *manga* - manga (by)

作画 *sakuga* - art/drawings (by)

Etc.

The first three have such a close meaning and functionality to each other in what they signify that they're understood as interchangeable in most contexts. I also haven't seen 文 used as often as the other two for the typical published material, but it has popped up, like for the Ultimania Guide novellas. In regards to the last two (漫画/作画) for a manga, if there is a sole author/artist, you'd often find only 漫画 (Manga by) being used. Alternatively, we still know that doing the first basic way of just listing the author/artist's name is still applicable.

This is all very cut n' dry in the peritext world—the conventional ways of designating authorship, and by extension originality, is apparent here.

But as you know, not every story is this simple.

Is it a manga with a different artist than the author? A novel that is based on another work or is using its setting? Or perhaps, there was a supervisor or another collaborator heavily involved? There are a number of Japanese terms specifically meant to cover the grounds of identifying those given credentials, which naturally goes beyond just the direct authorial—staff credits in an opening/ending sequence of an anime or movie will have a myriad of different designations. Sometimes, there might then be a certain obscurity for the previously understood connection between authorship and originality. If going by the peritext alone, this can wholly be due to the different types of terms being used.

For an adaptation or derivative work, having just 著 or 著者 for the actual author wouldn't simply suffice as it would with an entirely new original work, mostly if the originality of the context isn't applicable to the author listed. Or, consider the situation where a manga has a different author and artist. Both 漫画 or 作画 would be used to refer to the illustrator. So, surely one of the other words like 著 or 著者 would be used to identify the party responsible for the story of the manga, right?

Not exactly, and that's where all the fun begins.

In Japanese peritext, I've learned that's where two other common words come into play: Original Work (原作) and Original Plan (原案). These two have such versatile meaning to their usage in paratext that they can somewhat cause confusion in whether or not they mean the same thing.

- 原作 (Original Work)

原作 noun

*gensaku* [げんさく]

- an original work (such as the source of an adaptation or translation)

Example:

そのドラマは原作と違っている。

The drama differs from the original story.

- 原案 (Original Plan)

原案 noun

*gen'an* [げんあん]

- original plan, original bill (in a legislative body)
- draft plan, original proposal or motion

Example:

彼は原案に固執した。

He adhered to the original plan.

As it turns out, 原作 and 原案 are simple by the textbook definition, and they also have a pretty different span of definitive meaning. With that being said, they're both often used as useful credentials for fictional works.

Whether you're looking at a cover of a JPN manga, novel, or the opening credits of an anime, you'll see one of these words eventually. In applicable cases, you might see them both at the same time to give the credit to the corresponding parties involved. There's a meaning they retain specifically as paratext for a fictional work—which is where the actual confusion comes into play of whether they're conveying the exact same thing.

Any problems distinguishing the two from one another can mostly be alleviated by understanding what functionality they typically encompass in the context of fictional material in identifying authorship.

After consulting with some of my native Japan friends and taking a careful look at different Japanese materials and marketing, I've discovered that this particular functionality in context mainly refers to either (or both of) these two attributes:

1. The 原作/原案 of the author/company for **the external, original source**

Function #1 is a “based on” meaning, and arguably the most common functionality the two words use.

Applied typically for direct adaptations of the same given story, 原作/原案 are meant to convey what could be understood as a formality of sorts (along with legality aspects) in designating originality, if not just that, to showcase contribution in some form.

原作 (Original Work—sometimes translated as “Story by” or “Based on Story by”), close to its textbook definition, refers to the original source that the given adaptation or related work is based on.

原案 (Original Plan—often translated as Original Concept), which refers specifically to the original idea, proposal, concepts, setting, story drafts, etc. behind the origin source work the adaptation or related work is based on.

\*Keep in mind that when these two are used as paratext, they’ll typically list the appropriate original creator/company of the origin work/plan, NOT the actual title of the work. There are the rare cases, however, where the actual title of the origin work will be used instead of the creator/company name. Also, while those translations are what the official ENG localizations will often do, the JPN will retain their actual terms (Original Work/Original Plan) when providing the ENG wording on JPN versions of their products.

Anywho, you might find 原作 used more than that of 原案 because of its defining “based on” traits. Still, both of these can be used even for a work that is telling its own story in any capacity (whether the story is abiding by a specific continuity or not), or for a work that may be its own series altogether, but still associated with an original source. Whether there is actual involvement from those credited or not is up to investigation, but there are a lot of cases where involvement by either (or both of) the creator/company is clearly understood by other production credentials.

In Function #1 when a work has the 原作/原案 paratext identifiers, this is to accompany that of who is designated as the primary author and/or artist—the one who is responsible for the actual storytelling composition of the material. The most common example would be if a company hired an external author to write a novel adaptation for their anime or game series, instead of having the original creator/writer do it. They would be the author, while the creator/company is credited with 原作/原案.

Examples:

➤ [Death Mark \(死印\) novel—Spirit Hunter series](#)

{Japanese}

著: 雨宮 ひとみ

原作: エクスぺリエンス

{English}

Work by: Hitomi Amamiya

Original Work: Experience

➤ [Fate/Zero manga series](#)

{Japanese}

漫画: 真じろう

原作: 虚淵玄(ニトロプラス)/TYPE-MOON

{English}

Manga by: Shinjiro

Original Work: Gen Urobuchi (Nitroplus)/TYPE-MOON

➤ [PERSONA -trinity soul- anime](#)

{Japanese}

原案: プレイステーション2用ソフト『ペルソナ3』(アトラス)

シリーズ構成: むとうやすゆき

{English}

Original Plan: PlayStation 2 Software “Persona 3” (Atlus)

Series Composition: Yasayuki Mutō

➤ [Kingdom Hearts novel series](#)

{Japanese}

著者: 金巻ともこ

原案: 野村哲也

イラスト: 天野シロ

{English}

Author: Tomoco Kanemaki

Original Plan: Tetsuya Nomura

Illustration: Shiro Amano

## 2. The 原作/原案 of the author/company for **the internal, present source**

Function #2 is relative to the production of the present material specifically, treating it as if it's the origin source.

While the “based on” mentality can be understood as possibly only a formality for designating originality, this function implies that those cited were much more hands on in the conception of that given work through the usage of 原作/原案.

原作 (Original Work—often translated as just “Story (by)” in this context) is more equivalent to the meaning of being the author for the given material, as opposed to that of an external original

source—pretty much how “author” would function normally. If to understand it in tandem of the word itself, “this is an original work by X” is the mindset to have.

原案 (Original Plan—still translated “Original Concept”, usually) is dedicating the story contents much more to that of the given material, as opposed to completely referring to the contents of another external original source. To note, 原案 would still be credited towards the origin creator/company of said story content, while accompanying another writer(s).

In most cases, Function #2 is understood naturally if the present material isn’t simply functioning as an adaptation of the same story, but is acting as an original source itself as it applies to the given series—this could be the case regardless if it’s a preexisting series or not. In the case of an origin manga series that always had a different author to the artist, 原作 (Original Work) will most often, if not always, be used to refer to the author, while either 漫画 (Manga by)/作画 (Art by) will be used to describe the artist. I’m sure there exists some situations where 原案 would be used instead of 原作 for original manga, but I haven’t come across that yet myself.

In addition, Function #2 would also be the case of supplemental material that acts as a part of the given series as an additional story, but it may have the circumstance of involving other parties other than the original writers/artists to where 原作/原案 is needed to cite them. This is similar to what was described in Function #1, but this supplemental material doesn’t simply have to be an adaptation of a previously told story.

Examples:

➤ [Final Fantasy XV -The Dawn of the Future-](#)

{Japanese}

著者: 映島 巡

原案: 『FINAL FANTASY XV』開発チーム

{English}

Author: Jun Eishima

Original Plan: “Final Fantasy XV” Development Team

➤ [The Promised Neverland](#)

{Japanese}

原作: 白井カイウ

作画: 出水ぽすか

{English}

Story: Kaiu Shirai

Art by: Posuka Demizu

➤ [High School Fleet anime](#)

{Japanese}

原案: 鈴木貴昭

原作: AIS

シリーズ構成・脚本: 吉田玲子

{English}

Original Plan: Takaaki Suzuki

Original Work: AIS

Series Composition/Script: Reiko Yoshida

➤ [One Punch Man](#)

{Japanese}

原作: ONE

漫画: 村田雄介

{English}

Story: ONE

Manga by: Yusuke Murata

---

While ultimately having different meanings, 原作 (Original Work) and 原案 (Original Plan) can function similarly as paratext in indicating authorship—the difference lays where the former represents the general origin source/series ("work/原作") and the latter represents the origin idea/concept ("plan/原案") of the credited author/company. This is understood even when both 原作/原案 are used at the same time for the different people who fulfill those representations. This is seen in the *High School Fleet* example, and it's actually applicable towards the *Fate/Zero anime series* as well where both are also used.

In addition, there is an understanding that both functions can be at play simultaneously—most specifically if Function #1 is primarily understood, but aspects of Function #2 had occurred in development, going beyond the sake of “based on” formality alone. This depends on the amount of involvement the credited representatives have in the conception of the materials that are based on their work. While it's definitely applicable for completely new works, this can even happen for an adaptation where the amount of involvement can correlate to either meaning of 原作/原案 in either functionality.

But, as you've probably been thinking, the paratext of either function looks pretty similar, if not downright identical to one another (especially the novel or manga examples).

Additionally, how can you tell which function 原作/原案 is being communicated when simply looking at the paratext alone? Especially in the case of a manga—is the 原作 on a manga significant of it being an adaptation, or of just signifying the author of the manga?

If just by sight, you reliably can't in most circumstances—cue the fun of research!

When determining what functionality is happening or is best applicable, investigation and/or having prior knowledge of the material is imperative in not only ultimately understanding which functionalities are at play, but also for understanding the level of involvement that those credited have within the project. In other words, what needs to be discerned is how much weight 原作/原案 carry. In a lot of cases, this is actually rather easy.

Finding out whether the work is an adaptation or a new, supplemental work is the best start—identifying who exactly the credited parties are, the purpose of the material and what storytelling it is covering, and even investigating other paratext [epitext—interviews, advertisements, referential materials, etc.] from proper authorities that speak on the material/production itself can help find the truth, or at the least, the most applicable truth.

These two words are indeed different and can't be used interchangeably, but they can function similarly. They're not as straightforward as accompanying credentials like 監修 (Supervision) or 協力 (Cooperation/Collaboration) alone, which you'll also see often as identifying paratext and even those are still open to investigation to determine involvement. However, 原作/原案 are very versatile words that hold a significance in authorship, so much to where 監修/協力 can be implied for those under 原作/原案 when applicable and vice versa.

漫画 (Manga) and 作画 (Art/drawings) are almost similar to that of 原作/原案, in that they are pretty similar in comparison, but their difference is much easier to understand in how they're used for manga. They are pretty interchangeable only in the situation where there is another author to credit, otherwise, 漫画 (Manga) by itself would be the only word expected to refer to both the author/artist for manga. Because of this, 漫画 (Manga) carries a certain nuance that, even with another author in charge of the story, it has a chance of implying that the artist still weighs in their own storytelling ideas as well. This could be understood even for 作画, but I've been told 漫画 is the heavier of the two with this implication. It's also something that, for the practical sake of making a manga, makes sense—the artist weighing in on how the story is told as a manga is appropriate. If it's just the more “Based On” meaning, however, then this might even be more true depending on if the original author is involved or not.

Anyway, a big question probably asked at the very beginning of this whole thing: **why is this important?**



Other than understanding the differences, its importance is the same reason why identifying who the author or publisher of a work is important. Really, it's why any paratext is important for that matter, whether purely for the formal or legality aspects associated with publishing.

Most, if not all, paratext exists to be informative with a purpose. 原作/原案 signifies the presence of originality from the accredited persons. With further investigation of the nature and purpose of the material, it also acts as a clear sign of involvement within the present work, and 原作/原案 is there to cover that ground as well. What then is understood initially for the sake of formality becomes more telling about the production process—this works in tandem with all other significant paratext. Without it, the present work is more likely to be taken fully as an original work of the only listed author, whether the prior knowledge of it being based on, or associated with, a preexisting work or not is at play.

It's just as natural as seeing any work that simply lists an author's name alone—this signifies prominent originality to that author specifically for that work. A work that doesn't have either 原作/原案 listed when it should thus is very likely significant of informing the audience that the product is an original work or interpretation. A work *should* have 原作/原案 when it's applicable, but sometimes it isn't listed in those, perhaps, deliberate cases. I have strong reasons to believe that the lack is for the emphasis of originality to the listed author, but this also doesn't mean 原作/原案 still isn't understood on a technical level when applicable.

If you're an external author writing for a preexisting series, you're typically going to want that paratext (along with the marketing value that comes with it), just as much as you'd want to work with the official authorities and authors at hand on said project. The original parties themselves would want this too for their own record of originality designation. Whatever adds to the accredited authenticity of the work and authorship is highly valuable for those involved. A reason they wouldn't could be because of designations of originality to that author, which isn't bad, but it also isn't bad to just include that paratext.

This doesn't take away from those credited as the actual authors—this especially in the examples where the external writer/artist is hired to write for a preexisting series by the proper authorities. The expectation is of the creative endeavors of the author and their writing/drawing capabilities as it would even if it was their original work. It's as much their product as it is who is credited for either 原作/原案.

And (as you've probably been waiting for it), this doesn't directly speak on canonicity.

When exploring paratext for the sake of canonicity, this will be an important piece of knowledge to take in when observing the Three A's of Authenticity (authority, authorship, and application). Since these are very common pieces of paratext for Japanese based material, it would be a good idea to get in the habit of recognizing their functionality and impact on the given material.

\*\*\*See my writing of [Concept of Canon in Fiction](#) for more.

However, the mention of 原作/原案 is all about what is being communicated through paratext about originality—it isn't always going to provide the end all answer to the designated author's authenticity to the canon or the levels of interpretation/creativity they may or may not put into the work. Originality, not authenticity. However, it can certainly affect the understanding depending on how much information is available that the use of 原作/原案 can supplement, especially if attributes from Function #2 are involved.

But there is a “food for thought” kind of idea: the more originality that is placed on an external source, the more the validation of authenticity is needed if it hasn't been already.

If there is a strong emphasis of originality for a work written by an author who doesn't have any information regarding their authenticity, then that is a telling component that researchers can use to address the work's canonical standing. But, if this originality is accompanied by the direct involvement from the authentic parties, then we're getting somewhere at the least in evaluating canonicity.

Either way, it's mostly about the observance of originality initially.

### Paratext Examples

Here are the many examples I've found while researching, including a sort of bonus for the flexibility of words used with 原案 for Japanese credentials.

You'll also catch some of my notes or comments in here as well lol They may also be useful for others who are looking at this list for research purposes, especially with some extended thoughts on varying paratexts that can be used to possibly signify 原作/原案 on the technical level, like 監修 (Supervision).

- Original Work (原作)
  - As Author

Like in Function #2, these are examples where Original Work is used to signify the author of the story directly as opposed to what could be understood as external like “based on”.

“原作 = [Original] Story by” is the idea here, and is usually how it is officially translated in the English version, if there is one.

#### 1. [Death Note](#)

原作: 大場 つぐみ  
漫画: 小畑 健

Original Work: Tsugumi Ohba  
Manga by: Takeshi Obata

## 2. [One Punch Man](#)

原作: ONE  
漫画: 村田雄介

Original Work: ONE  
Manga by: Yusuke Murata

{English at top of book}  
Story by ONE & Draw by Yusuke Murata

The English translation at top, as we'll sometimes see the JPN covers do.

## 3. [Shokugeki no Soma](#)

Includes a credit for “協力” (Cooperation/Collaboration) towards a chef (and model) they consulted with: [Yuki Morisaki \(森崎 友紀\)](#). She collaborated with them for the manga and even made an official recipe book for the series.

原作: 附田祐斗  
作画: 佐伯 俊  
協力: 森崎友紀

Original Work: Yūto Tsukuda  
Drawings by: Shun Saeki  
Collaboration: Yuki Morisaki

## 4. [The Promised Neverland](#)

原作: 白井カイウ  
作画: 出水ぽすか

Original Work: Kaiu Shirai  
Drawings by: Posuka Demizu

## 5. [Dignified Asleep Saeki](#)

原作: 春原ロビンソン  
漫画: 小菊路よう

Original Work: Robinson Haruhara  
Manga by: You Kokikuji

Interestingly enough, on [Haruhara's official website](#), he uses 作画 to describe Kokikuji's role instead of 漫画. Evidence of the interchangeability of 漫画 and 作画—I would still agree though that 漫画 MIGHT also imply involvement in the story more than 作画. In which, there might be a reason why 漫画 was used on the official cover anyway. This is actually the same for his other work on there, [the Princess "torture" series](#) w/ 漫画 by Hirakei).

## 6. [Fairy Tail 100 Year Quest](#)

ネーム原作: 真島ヒロ  
作画: 上田敦夫

Original Storyboard: Hiro Mashima  
Drawings by: Atsuo Ueda

That's Mashima being credited for both Storyboard (ネーム) and Original Work (原作). Though I think it's kind of combined in meaning, something like: "Original Storyboard". Would be an interesting use of OG Work. But, saying just "Story" as the translators have done is well enough, I'd agree. The official English version uses "Story and Layouts".

This is also the same [for the individual chapters](#).

Interesting enough, the volume covers and individual chapters credit the artist with "作画" (Drawings) while this [promo cover example](#) uses "漫画" (Manga by), showing the equivalency of the meaning here for manga context, but can also still infer that the "Manga" credit can also involve their input in the story direction and how it's told through the art.

## 7. [Star Ocean -Twin Eclipse-](#)

原作: 和ヶ原 聡司  
作画: 梶本ユキヒロ

Original Work: Satoshi Wagahara  
Artwork by: Yukihiro Kajimoto

Also featured below in the [Star Ocean OG Work](#) section, the manga series arguably functions "As Author" because of Wagahara's involvement and that it isn't simply an adaptation, but serves as supplemental expansion on the character's stories too.

- Based On

The more typical usage of Original Work, especially with adaptations. This in referring to who [or what] created the series/franchise the story is based on. This would be Function #1 mostly, but some examples might be applicable for Function #2 qualities depending on involvement, however.

#### 8. [An Archdemon's Dilemma](#)

A Manga adaptation of [the light novel](#).

漫画: 板垣ハコ

原作: 手島史詞

キャラクター原案: COMTA

Manga by: Hako Itagaki

Original Work: Fuminori Teshima

Original Character Design: COMTA

What's interesting about this series, and why it's the first out of this list, is because while on [the main cover](#) it uses 原作 for Teshima (which makes sense, given it's an adaptation), in the 1st chapters [actual title page](#) in the book, it uses 著者 (author/writer) instead, and basically writes Character Design in just straight Katakana as キャラクターデザイン for COMTA too.

This is showing that functionality that 原作 serves in being another way to signify authorship, but at the same time, I'm a little confused as to why they bothered to write the peritext differently in the book for both Teshima and COMTA. It's the first time I've seen that happen, really, especially because of the distinct difference that still lies between 著者 and 原作 naturally, despite the functionalities I have covered. Even though this is an adaptation, something like this could be evident that the 原作 serves the "As Author" function instead of simply "Based On" for the production of this book.

However, since it IS an adaptation, I've decided to put it within this category regardless, and it can serve to be an example of how one can find that the "Based On" functionality can also have a flexibility of showcasing more. Though, anything more to say would need a little more information on production, of course, but the curious interchanged usage of 著者 gives us a practical nudge to pursue this information.

#### 9. [Fate/Zero](#)

Primarily, this is for the Anime Opening:

原作: 虚淵玄 (ニトロプラス)/TYPE-MOON

原案: 奈須きのこ

Original Work: Gen Urobuchi (Nitroplus)/TYPE-MOON

Original Plan [Concept]: Kinoko Nasu

There are important things to note, however.

Kinoko Nasu is the co-founder (w/ friend and artist Takashi Takeuchi 武内 崇) and main writer of Type-Moon company, the creator of “Fate/stay night” and overall Fate series. (also “Tsukihime”...interesting)

Gen Urobuchi was the author for Fate/Zero and writer for theNitroplus company. Fate/Zero was initially a novel prequel to F/sn, and they worked very closely with each other for this, so much that Urobuchi took the reigns for it mostly. In this case, the 原案 for Nasu is significant of the concept behind Fate/Zero, not that of the Fate series in general.

The Fate/Zero novel mainly credits Urobuchi as its creator, as observed by [the cover](#). Takeuchi did the art for the novel, too.

With the expansion into Anime and Manga, they are still involved in its production. Other than the credits during the Opening, here is the [official website credit](#) for the Anime. It doesn't feature Nasu's credit, but it does Urobuchi. The Director is someone else however, as well.

[This website](#) also claims he is listed as “Script Supervisor”.

The [manga cover](#) features:

漫画: 真じろう

原作: 虚淵玄(ニトロプラス)/TYPE-MOON

漫画: Shinjirō

原作: Gen Urobuchi (Nitroplus)/TYPE-MOON

Which is still similar to that of others, like Fate/Stay Night ([ENG](#)).

## 10. [High School Fleet](#)

原案: 鈴木貴昭

原作: AIS

シリーズ構成・脚本: 吉田玲子

Original Plan: Takaaki Suzuki

Original Work: AIS

Series Composition/Script: Reiko Yoshida

AIS (also Maritime Safety Development Bureau) produced anime series and the manga that happened slightly before the anime. Also, Reiko Yoshida was a main writer for the anime too, as “Series Composition” credit. Suzuki still serves as the person this story is based on, and they were still involved in the show, OVA, and movie [based on this page](#).

The [main website](#) just features Suzuki’s credit. There’s the movie section on this website that features similar credits as well.

For the most part, it does seem like this originated as an anime, really, but the manga came first (which is a bit different than that of the anime, which is most likely why 原作 is listed—it’s referring to the series in general.) I spent quite a while trying to confirm this and still somewhat feel confused. Lol Anyone who has more knowledge of this series, definitely hit me up with answers.

#### 11. [Dragon Ball GT](#)

Akira Toriyama is given [原作 credit in the OP](#), though the ENG version has him as “author”.

To go on a bit about this example, DBGt was not written directly by Toriyama, but he was involved in very small part to the name of the series, the initial character designs and planet designs, and the initial planning behind the setting of the show and outline of the plot. [Geekdom is the source of some of this](#), in which I believe he is credible in that, but it’s also noted on the [DBGt fan wiki](#).

However, with Toei owning the series, and having its own writers take the reigns, this is still something that is applicable to be canon if by their choosing. In which, for all intents and purposes, it was canonical at the given time in following the events of DBZ and being a part of that continuity.

It may not be anymore by the ways of Dragon Ball Super, but this wasn’t the case from the beginning.

Even if you take Christopher Sabat’s words that GT is “not even canon anymore” to heart, the understanding that it WAS canon at one point is still there. Though he’s not exactly a proper authority in regards to this type of statement on the franchise, really.

There is however, what Toriyama said.

*On the same Dragon Box that Toriyama illustrated the Super Saiyan 4 form, he refers to the series as “a grand side-story of the original Dragon Ball”.*

While some take this as “non-canonical”, really, it isn’t if you understand what the term “side-story” means. A spin-off or side-story isn’t always canonical or non-canonical inherently—it wholly depends on the content and application, which GT certainly was.

## 12. [Boruto: Naruto Next Generations](#)

原作・監修: 岸本斉史

漫画: 池本幹雄

脚本: 小太刀右京

Creator/Supervisor: Masashi Kishimoto

Art by: Mikio Ikemoto

Script by: Ukyo Kodachi

Both Ikemoto and Kodachi collaborated with Kishimoto on past Naruto projects.

\*11.15.20 apparently, Kishimoto will do script after Ch. 53 since Kodachi is leaving, I’ll confirm later after this date when applicable.

## 13. [Persona](#)

There’s a lot of examples, but they all follow the similar formula with Original Work—using the game title as the credit. This is the first time I’ve seen the product/series used instead of the original creator/company. That is, except for the TV Show -Trinity Soul-, [which is featured in Original Plan section](#).

The first example applies to all, just think of 原作 corresponding to relevant game.

### ➤ [Persona 3 Movie](#)

原作: 「ペルソナ3」(アトラス)

Original Work: “Persona 3” (Atlus)

- [Persona 4 Animation](#)
- [Persona 4 The Golden Animation](#)
- [Persona 5 The Animation](#)
- [Persona 5 The Animation - The Day Breakers](#)
  
- [Persona 5 Manga](#)

漫画: 村崎 久都

原作: ペルソナ



Manga (Art and Story by): Hisato Murasaki  
Original Work (Original Concept?): Atlus

The [official English version](#) translated 漫画 as “Art and Story”—this shows that “Manga by” is story + art. There’s also the fact the cover says “Murasaki Hisato presents”, giving that impression as well. However, the 原作 was translated as “Original Concept”, which is what 原案 usually is, so...weird. Lol This would be evidence for Manga by inferring that the artist also was involved in the story, but, as we know, Original Plan and Original Work aren’t exactly interchangeable as this would suggest.

#### 14. Experience Inc.

##### ☐ Death Mark Series

##### ➤ [Death Mark \(死印\) novel—Spirit Hunter series](#)

著: 雨宮 ひとみ (Work by: Hitomi Amamiya)  
原作: エクスぺリエンス (Original Work: Experience)  
出版社: PHP研究所 (Publisher: PHP Institute)  
Released: February 20, 2019

Tells the backstories of characters in the game.

##### ➤ [Death Mark \(死印\) manga—Spirit Hunter series](#)

漫画: 恵那 (Manga by: Ena)  
原作・協力: エクスぺリエンス (Original Work/Cooperation: Experience)  
出版社: 画期的 (Publisher: Kakkiteki)  
Released: February 21, 2019

##### ➤ [Death Mark \(死印\) \[Collection Edition\] manga—Spirit Hunter series](#)

漫画: 恵那 (Manga by: Ena)  
原作・協力: エクスぺリエンス (Original Work/Cooperation: Experience)  
出版社: 画期的 (Publisher: Kakkiteki)  
Released: December 13, 2019

A collection of all manga volumes.

##### ➤ [Demon Gaze manga](#)

作画: くろの (Drawings by: Kurono)  
協力: 川辺 ケイン (Cooperation: Kawabe Kane)

原作: 角川ゲームス, エクスぺリエンス (Original Work: Kadokawa Games, Experience)  
出版社: KADOKAWA (電撃コミックスNEXT—for “Dengeki Comics NEXT”)  
Released: December 11, 2014

Adaptation of “Demon Gaze” game, developed by Kadokawa Games and Experience Inc.

□ [Stranger of Sword City](#)

墜ちて修羅、鋼刃舞うは極夜の空  
著: ベニー松山  
原作: 株式会社エクスぺリエンス

Shura crashes, Steel Blade Dances in the Night Sky  
Author: Benny Matsuyama  
Original Work: Experience Inc.

For the game series, 剣の街の異邦人 (Stranger of Sword City), developed by Experience Inc, but this novel is for the PS Vita version: 新釈・剣の街の異邦人 (New Interpretation/Shinshaku・Stranger of Sword City) and has the subtitle of 黒の宮殿 (Black Palace).

新釈・剣の街の異邦人: 黒の宮殿 (New Interpretation・Stranger of Sword City: Black Palace)

The [main website](#) here features the game, but for the different consoles, it has a different subtitle, until the newest version on the Xbox One which is just the main title in english. There's slight differences between the console versions, which is why they are distinct titles.

It's considered an original work by Matsuyama, but is well endowed in being integrated with the marketing of the game. It is even [featured on the official website](#), and has the 1st and 2nd chapter, including an additional epilogue on the website after initial limited edition release—the novel in paperback is included in the Limited Edition version (so similar to Jun Eishima's FFXIII story being included with the Xbox version of FFXIII), and based on [Matsuyama's blog](#), finally sold separately as paperback on [Experience's Online Shop](#) that includes the additional epilogue on the website prior. It also seems then, there are two versions of “Black Palace”, [the one mentioned above](#) (based on official website, released in 2016) and then [this one](#) (released 2015). The latter may have been the one released initially, while the one Matsuyama writes for is, maybe, like a “Final Mix” that has changes. I believe it IS the Limited Edition version, which has game changes too.

## 15. Naruto Novels

Another “Original Work” example, though it's an interesting one.

So, even though the fan wiki says the “original story” is that of the designated author, the evidence suggests this may not be the whole, blatant truth even in the conception of this specific story. (to be fair, there could be an interview where this is stated, but it surely isn’t indicated in the source material)

While the [ENG version](#) specifies the original story to Kishimoto and the writing to Higashiyama inside the book (the typical congruent way to JPN paratext), the [JPN version](#) doesn’t even indicate this on the same page, not even that the illustration being from Kishimoto is mentioned in the book. Matter of fact, the only time authorship is specifically mentioned is on the [main website’s product pages](#):

原作: 岸本斉史 (Original Work: Masashi Kishimoto)  
著者: (whoever author is)

However, in the copyright section inside book for Kakashi example:

著者: 岸本斉史/東山彰良 (Author: Masashi Kishimoto/Akira Higashiyama)

After checking some, I see this is the same for other books as well.

Here for the [Sakura](#) and [Shikamaru](#) stories for examples.

Even though we know Kishimoto has done the illustrations (this is spoken for in [product description on main website](#), if anyone wants to be technical, but it’s not on the actual book as far as I’m aware in JPN), we also know he is the writer for the series as a whole, hence the “Original Work” credit. So, if it’s also signifying him as the author on equal standing with Higashiyama, this very reasonably suggests Kishimoto at the very least was responsible for supervising and weighing in on this additional story to the series. The implication of this can be understood even more since a lot of these novels (even ones written by different authors) were told within the anime too.

Truly, “Original Plan” (Function #2) probably would’ve worked here as well if Kishimoto did indeed work with the authors on the story. Which, to be honest, would seem rather silly if he didn’t have ANY input on the story details. The ideal behind “Original Work” functions well here, but just like with Experience Inc. it is also signifying more than just a reference point.

We have to keep in mind that between the publishers, author, and other appropriate parties, paratext will vary—paratext also being the cover art design and whatnot. Usually there is a consistency held, which definitely happens with these novels.

Interesting.

## 16. Full Metal Alchemist

[List of 7 light novels based on series and also 3 novelizations of the games.](#)

Most of the Light Novels are spin-off stories not directly told in the manga or anime, but the first novel of the series, Fullmetal Alchemist: The Land of Sand, was used as the source material for episodes 11 and 12 of the Fullmetal Alchemist anime adaptation.

This is very similar with the Naruto examples, not only with the use of “Original Work”, but also with the manga artist/author (Hiromu Arakawa) providing illustrations for the book. All the 7 light novels are written by Makoto Inoue.

However, the 3 game novelizations don’t have “Original Work” for Arakawa, but instead just have him listed under “Cover Illustration”. This is kind of inconsequential, same as with Naruto examples, especially with the first game since Arakawa was the story supervisor for that one. Inoue also wrote the novel for the first game, continuing their involvement with one another. Arakawa isn’t noted as story supervisor for the other two games, though—maybe that also contributes to [Jun Eishima writing the other two](#) instead of Inoue.

It still is interesting, as either way, Arakawa SHOULD still have “Original Work”, I’d say.

## 17. [Dragon Ball Super](#)

### ❑ [Anime](#)

Akira Toriyama is credited under:

原作, ストーリー原案, and キャラクター原案

Original Work, Story Concept, and Original Character Design (Concept)

### ❑ [Manga](#)

原作: 鳥山 明

漫画: とよたろう

Original Work: Akira Toriyama

Manga by: Toyotarou

The manga doesn’t completely follow suit with the Anime by just 原作, which is technically not wrong anyway—not to mention still typical for an adaptation. But it doesn’t provide the more necessary information in the production of the book, which honestly 原案 (or the more specific ストーリー原案) would be more appropriate if just to use a single paratext.

To note, both the [anime](#) and [manga](#) started at the same time, taking from the same plot outline that Toriyama created—the idea of “based on” kind of works here then as Toei (anime) and Toyotarou (manga) have flexibilities to tell it in their way, as if it’s THEIR adaptations.

However, Toriyama works much more closely with Toyotarou, and based on interviews, seems to advocate the manga’s storytelling much more. Either way, both are canonical in their own right, and while both Toei and Toyotaro add or change elements from the original plan as they see fit, it does seem it might be arguable that Toyotaro is closer to the original vision here.

[Based on the 2019 Tokyo Skytree event](#), the manga also seems to take its place officially as canonical like the other manga establishments, which somewhat creates the idea that the anime is functioning as an adaptation to the manga series. We know this isn’t the case though given the production of the anime. It pretty much just establishes the manga as the official canon route as opposed to the anime.

#### 18. [Hyouka](#)

The original is the novel, so the 原作 is significant of the manga being an adaptation.

原作: 米澤 穂信

漫画: タスクオーナ

キャラクター原案: 西屋 太志 (京都アニメーション)

Original Work: Honobu Yonezawa

Manga by: Task Ohna

Original Character Design (Concept): Futoshi Nishiya (Kyoto Animation)

There is an anime adaptation as well.

#### 19. [Star Ocean](#)

People often forget, but remember that [tri-Ace](#) is who developed/creates Star Ocean, while Square Enix publishes their content, except for Sega, who did *Resonance of Fate* for tri-Ace.

A lot of the earlier manga published by [Gangan Comics](#), which is owned by Square Enix—at the time of earlier ones, the Enix side owned only, and then SE after merger.

The earlier manga series are a good comparison to the idea that a name alone, especially for a manga, insinuates not only 漫画 (Manga by), but also that the person is primarily responsible for the art AND story, even if based on an original work. This can be seen similar to Matsuyama’s situation in terms of authorship: this where 原作 is absent, but can still be assumed despite emphasis of originality of the listed author. That is if you have the knowledge of it being based

on something else. It's mostly curious in this scenario because adaptations are so naturally inclined to include OG Work or Plan.

To show for this, the missing “Original Work” could be a Gangan Comics publication thing in their earlier days (publishers will have consistent paratext), as the first series to actually list it (Second Evolution), was published by Dengeki Maoh. Not including this paratext is most likely a Gangan Comics thing until we get to things like the KH Manga series (and more current products, which [uses paratext appropriately when applicable as far as I'm aware](#)), but that could be the factor of the KH affiliation as opposed to Gangan Comics.

Who knows, but I'm willing to bet it's significant of originality to who is listed.

❑ No OG Work

➤ [Star Ocean: And Then to the Far Reaches of Time](#) (1998)

かぢばあたる ([Kajiba Ataru](#)) story and art.

➤ [Star Ocean: The Second Story](#) (1999–2001) & [Star Ocean: Blue Sphere](#) (2002–2005)

東まゆみ ([Mayumi Azuma](#)) story and art—also was the “Character Conceptual Design” for Star Ocean EX TV show. It's an adaptation of HER manga, specifically, which is why she's involved in it probably. Also, Blue Sphere is a continuation of the Second Story manga (for the game too) as well, which is why Azuma created it too.

So she primarily worked on the 2nd installment of Star Ocean manga, it's an original and direct sequel, except for the remake Second Evolution.

Her being attributed largely for drawing AND writing the manga, also to the point of having the show and Drama CD based on her manga, gives the impression of a separation from the original source. (similar to How to Train Your Dragon?) The designation of originality truly fits here in what has been done with her work.

There are also novels for [Second Story](#) (1998) and [Blue Sphere](#) (2001) written by Takashi Umemura (梅村 崇). I have zero context for these, but based on the Amazon description, they were released a year before the respective manga stories above, so same year as the game's release.

➤ [Star Ocean: Till the End of Time](#) (2003–2006)

神田 晶 ([Akira Kanda](#)) story and art.

[There is also a novel series](#) (2003, published by SE), written by 北原尚彦 (Naohiko Kitahara) and the cover art done by Kanda. No Original Work/Plan mentioned still, and it's between 4 Volumes labeled as Side 1, 2, 3, and 4. There is a "Special Side" in reflection of the director's cut additions as well.

This is the same on [SE website](#) as well for the manga.

#### ❑ OG Work

From all above, there is a lacking of either 原作/原案. If having the pre-knowledge, at the least 原作 is understood. However, the impression of their names being primarily featured there gives the idea that their originality is prominent, for both the artwork and story.

For this section however, there is a bit more paratext and understanding of originality. Wagahara's work in particular could be understood as canonical as he works on the actual game of Anamnesis.

#### ➤ [Star Ocean: Second Evolution](#) (2008–2009)

よしだ もろへ ([Yoshida Morohe](#)) artwork.

原作: スクウェア・エニックス (Original Work: Square Enix)

Second Evolution was a [remake of the 2nd game](#), and this manga was for that, but the manga is primarily from Rena's side of the game. This is the first example where 原作 is actually used, and thus, Morohe could be understood for the artwork and story beats depending on investigation. (where 漫画/作画 is applicable) Manga artists, even with the direct involvement of another author, can still weigh in on the storytelling.

#### ➤ [Star Ocean: Anamnesis -The Beacon of Hope-](#) (2017)

#### ❑ [Online version:](#)

Novel: 和ヶ原 聡司 (Satoshi Wagahara)

Illustration: 大熊まい (Illustration: Mai Okuma)

#### ❑ [Print version:](#)

和ヶ原 聡司 (Satoshi Wagahara)

イラスト: エナミカツミ (Illustration: Enami Katsumi)

原作・監修: スクウェア・エニックス (Original Work/Supervision: Square Enix)

Novel adaptation of Episode 1.

The online version is on Dengeki's website, and even though it doesn't have Original Work listed there, it AND Supervision is on the print version of the book. Goes to show that some things can

be understood even if not present initially, but this is only true if there is evidence that suggests or straight up shows it. As an adaptation, while 原作 could be assumed in the Online version, 監修 wouldn't necessarily be. In tune with that, it being online on Dengeki where they essentially state it's based on the game adds to the knowledge needed for 原作 anyway. The print version has this inherently, where that paratext is arguably more necessary in how it'd be accessible to fans.

There's also that the online version attributes the authorial credits as "novel" (which can be understood for 著 or 著者 inherently) to Wagahara, while the print version doesn't with that paratext, but because of his name being treated as the author, it's inconsequential and still understood to mean the same thing.

➤ [Star Ocean: Anamnesis -Twin Eclipse-](#) (2018–2019)

原作: 和ヶ原 聡司 (Original Work: Satoshi Wagahara)

作画: 梶本ユキヒロ (Artwork by: Yukihiro Kajimoto)

Manga based on [Episode 2 of the Anamnesis game "Twin Eclipse"](#), and was published on the game's official website for each character. It isn't an adaptation though, as it expands on the characters introduced in this part of the game—so much more just extra content. So, this could be understood not as "Based On", but as "Author" with Wagahara's involvement.

Wagahara is [credited for the in-game](#) シナリオ (scenario—translated as Story) for -Twin Eclipse- (also seen on official website above), so his material is as good as canonical. He is also credited for the scenario for [Episode 3 -The Leash Code-](#) . ([official website](#))

- Original Plan (原案)

Similar to Original Work "Based On" section above, these will either be Function #1 or #2, or somewhat both, depending on involvement of those credited under OG Plan.

- Novels/Manga

1. Kingdom Hearts Novels

All KH novels (and Manga) use Original Plan. However, they list different credits for this depending on who is credited for the scenario of the corresponding game.

All manga examples only have Nomura's name credited for it. However, the novel's will list different credits for 原案 depending on who did the scenario of the game (so, Director + Scenario writer). Nomura is always the director, but the credited scenario writer changes at times. A few examples of this for the novels include:



➤ [Kingdom Hearts 2](#)

著者: 金巻ともこ  
原案: 野村哲也 & 野島一成  
イラスト: 天野シロ

Author: Tomoco Kanemaki  
Original Plan: Tetsuya Nomura & Kazushige Nojima  
Illustration: Shiro Amano

➤ [Kingdom Hearts: Birth by Sleep](#)

著者: 金巻ともこ  
原案: 野村哲也 & 岡勝  
イラスト: 天野シロ

Author: Tomoco Kanemaki  
Original Plan: Tetsuya Nomura & Masaru Oka  
Illustration: Shiro Amano

➤ [Kingdom Hearts: 358/2 Days](#)

著者: 金巻ともこ  
原案: 野村哲也  
監修: 野島一成  
イラスト: 天野シロ

Author: Tomoco Kanemaki  
Original Plan: Tetsuya Nomura  
Supervision: Kazushige Nojima  
Illustration: Shiro Amano

Those are just a few examples, but what's interesting about the Days example is the noticeable absence of the scenario writer of the game not being included with Nomura. That's because Kanemaki was this for the game, so having her just as the author is fitting enough for this particular game adaptation. Again, this is all different from any of the KH manga examples, which will just credit Nomura for Original Plan.

## 2. FFXIII Series

[Final Fantasy XIII: Episode Zero -Promise-](#)  
[Final Fantasy XIII-2: Fragments Before](#)  
[Final Fantasy XIII-2: Fragments After](#)

著者: 映島 巡

原案: 鳥山 求 & 渡辺 大祐

Author: Jun Eishima

Original Plan: Motomu Toriyama & Daisuke Watanabe

The novels here follow the similar peritext scheme that KH does with attributing Original Plan to both the Director and the Scenario writer.

It's good to note there is also [Final Fantasy XIII -Episode i-](#), which was included with the Xbox 360 Ultimate Hits version of FFXIII. It only has Jun Eishima's name and no 原案. It's very possible that this is purposeful to indicate her originality with the short story. It would be fine then, really, since concerning canonicity, Eishima worked on the scenario for FFXIII-2 as a story advisor, and this story sets up the game essentially.

### 3. [FFXV: -The Dawn Of The Future-](#)

著者: 映島 巡

原案:『FINAL FANTASY XV』開発チーム

Author: Jun Eishima

Original Plan: "Final Fantasy XV" Development Team

### 4. FFIV Novels

Final Fantasy IV [Vol. 1](#) and [Vol. 2](#)  
[Final Fantasy IV The After Return of the Moon](#)

著者: 手塚 一郎

イラスト: オグロ アキラ

原案・監修: 時田 貴司

Author: Ichiro Tezuka

Illustration: Akira Oguro

Original Plan/Supervision: Takashi Tokita

Another interesting situation here that is very similar to the KH Days and FFXIII-2 examples where the author, despite working on the scenario, is still subject to OG Plan credits with someone else.

Ichiro Tezuka (手塚一郎), the author, was also the Scenario Writer for FFIV After Years. Tezuka was also the [scenario/story writers for Final Fantasy Dimensions](#). (interesting, he's also one of

the Co-Founders and now current Co-Director of Studio BentStuff, who write the Ultimania books)

Takashi Tokita (時田 貴司), under Original Plan/Supervision, was the Producer/Game Designer/Scenario Writer (along with Tezuka) for FFIV After Years. Was also the Scenario Writer/Game Designer for the first FFIV, and later Executive Producer and Director for the FFIV 3D Remake for DS.

Akira Oguro (オグロ アキラ), the illustrator, was also the main Character Designer for the After Years and the Art Designer for the FFIV 3D Remake for DS.

## 5. SInoALICE

Another Jun Eishima novel, a different series that Yoko Taro directed. Also another example for the double usage of OG Plan and Supervision.

[Main SE website](#) and then [SE magazine website](#) (can get preview if interested in reading).

原案・監修:ヨコオタロウ  
著者:映島 巡  
イメージアート:幸田和磨  
本文イラスト:ヒミコ

Original Plan・Supervision: Yoko Taro  
Author: Jun Eishima  
Image Art: Koda Kazuma  
Text Illustration: Himiko

Interesting is that it includes promo codes for the game (according to the first link) and also additional comics and such. Very official and applied towards the series in everything it stands for. The second link includes a description of labeling it as "SInoALICE" original story novelization presented by Yoko Taro x Jun Eishima x Himiko".

## 6. [Persona -Trinity Soul-](#)

Uniquely, we have a “原案” given not to an author, but to the work itself, perhaps capturing the idea of “original setting of X”.

原案:プレイステーション2用ソフト『ペルソナ3』(アトラス)

Original Plan: PlayStation 2 software “Persona 3” (Atlus)

Of course, you have the “Series Composition/Main Scenario” listed to someone as well. But, it’s interesting that the 原案 (i.e the concept, the initial idea, plan, etc.) is attributed to the game Persona 3 and not a person. I feel Original Work would’ve been accurate, but I believe it’s for conveying how the game’s story elements are what act as the foundation of this work. (similar to all the other Original Work credits for [the other persona entries](#)).

- 原案 w/ Other words

So there is also the interest of where “原案” is used in other terms to define “original” of that descriptor. As a short note, keep in mind the use of [ネーム原作 in Fairy Tail example](#).

- キャラクター原案

Where キャラクター (Character) combines with 原案 (Original Plan) to convey the meaning of “Original Character Design (Concept)”.

This has been used in [Persona](#), [Fate/Zero](#), and [High School Fleet](#)—probably pretty standard in the industry to convey an original character design credit.

- ストーリー原案

Where ストーリー (Story) combines with 原案 (Original Plan) to convey the meaning of either just “Story Draft”, “Story Concept”, or “Original Story Plan [Concept/Draft]”. It’s the closest to Original Plan (原案), but is much more specific to the story being the “plan”, essentially.

- 悪魔デザイン原案

悪魔 (Devil) and デザイン (Design) combines with 原案 (Original Plan) to convey the meaning of “Original Devil [Persona] Design (Concept)”, where I’m pretty sure Devil is the word for Persona in context, but the title does indeed use ペルソナ for Persona, so I’m not sure to be honest.

- Supervision as OG Work/Plan

There exists other examples in paratext where, instead of 原作/原案, we’ll have 監修 (Supervision).

Now, Supervision is a whole other word with a different meaning. Supervision could be significant of a guidance role or a go-to for information/necessary items when needed, or it can be a much more heavier content check-like nature for having control over the work—this is why you often find Supervision (監修) and/or Cooperation (協力) listed to represent this. This can be credited to the original author or company of the work, or can be credited to a specialist who came in to help the author write the subject of their story. You’ll see this a lot with works that require specific knowledge of the story concept, like cooking or sports related stories.

It's straight forward usage is a bit different than that of the nature of OG Plan/Work.

But, just as we've learned, OG Work/Plan can be known for a work even if absent on a technical level, or in this case, recognized through another credit, which in comparison is better than not having anything at all.

Let's mess with this a bit.

Just as we mentioned, depending on the context of the work, the person listed under Supervision can also be applicable to be under either OG Work/Plan. In some cases, like the FFIV novel examples and other, OG Work/Plan AND Supervision are grouped together to signify different things.

For Supervision "covering" OG Plan, I feel I ended up thinking about this in a more backwards approach because of the Kingdom Hearts: Chain of Memories novel. Just like I outlined above in the Kingdom Hearts novels section, this [novel](#) (along with all other CoM related novels) too follows the typical pattern of peritext:

Author: Tomoco Kanemaki

Original Plan: Tetsuya Nomura & Daisuke Watanabe

Illustration: Shiro Amano

What's interesting is that later in the Days novel's Afterword, Tomoco reveals that Watanabe had also acted as "novel supervisor" for the novel, despite only being listed under the OG Plan (原案) credit. I realized then that the peritext information doesn't always fully address the roles given for a book, but in consideration of that, what IS marked might then be grounds for layered meanings given their involvement, which really flexes the meaning behind Function #2. This is arguably true for more situations that might just have OG Plan for certain books that, more than likely, had the person/company credited under that also take a supervisory role as well (e.g. the FFXV novel mentioned in the above section). As you'll see in the Type-0 and NieR examples, it's flipped this time, where Supervision (監修) is marked on certain materials, but then with the knowledge of the game production, we understand OG Plan/Work can still be understood for those credited regardless.

However, keep in mind that the lack of OG Plan/Work can still be significant of the recognition of that author's originality for the product, even IF the technicality of it being based on another's work is ultimately true. Hence, Supervision could really just be Supervision, even if it still can be reflective of the OG Plan/Work depending on who exactly is credited.

We also still can't forget the examples that take the more straight forward route and just simply include both, like the FFIV or SInoALICE novels exemplified above, amongst others that will do a combination of other words like that of Original Work or Cooperation (協力). It's case by case,

really, as opposed to any rule of sort—research and pre-knowledge would still play a role here in what someone can observe through the use of this peritext. Supervision and Original Plan still aren't interchangeable always or even simultaneously applicable—this in-line with that fact both can be used at the same time and thus signify different things. So, when Supervision is used instead of Original Plan, it might be this way to give an emphasis of originality to the listed author under 著者. Even if OG Plan is applicable in an absolute sense, its non-inclusion can reveal other things—I'll explain this more in the Nier and Type-0 examples.

Still, I do believe there are certain usages that have these terms imply the presence of the other when those cases do fall through. And since most of my examples of this are Square Enix publications (which mostly use 原案), I felt it necessary to put these examples in this section.

## 7. NieR Series

Something to note, the official ENG versions of these books have “incorrect” peritext where Supervision is replaced with “Original Story” (which is what would typically be translated when Original Work 原作 is used). It isn't wrong in the ultimate sense, but it just isn't the right credit. It could be an example of the correlation between Supervision and Original Work/Plan. Or, it could also just be a simple mistake. Either way, Supervision is used in the JPN version, where OG Work/Plan is still applicable.

Similar to the Type-0 examples featured next, the lack of OG Work/Plan (presence of only Supervision) here can also be an indication of originality to the Eishima and Yoko Taro respectively. There's also the added knowledge that the stories included with “Short Story Long” were previously included in either the epitext of [World](#) or [Strategy](#) Nier Guides, where OG Work/Plan is absent in peritext for Eishima's credit as well, which Strategy includes a short story from Yoko Taro himself.

➤ [Long Story Short JPN version](#) | [ENG version](#)

著者: 映島 巡  
監修: ヨコオタロウ

Author: Jun Eishima  
Supervision: Yoko Taro

➤ [Short Story Long JPN version](#) | [ENG version](#)

著者: 映島 巡  
著者・監修: ヨコオタロウ

Author: Jun Eishima  
Author/Supervision: Yoko Taro

The first time I've seen the combination of Author/Supervision like that. It's like this because this second novel is a collection of short stories written by both Eishima and Taro.

➤ [YoRHa Boys JPN version](#) | [ENG version](#)

著者: 映島 巡  
監修: ヨコオタロウ

Author: Jun Eishima  
Supervision: Yoko Taro

## 8. Type 0 Novels/Manga

### ❑ Type-0 Novels

[Final Fantasy Type 0: Change the World -The Answer-](#)  
[Final Fantasy Type 0 Vol.2: Change the World -The Penultimate Truth-](#)

著者: 月島総記  
監修: 『FINAL FANTASY 零式』開発チーム

Author: Souki Tsukishima  
Supervision: "FINAL FANTASY Type-0" Development Team

These two novels tell the story of the previous cycle before the game, and the fan wiki for [Vol.1](#) and [Vol.2](#) feature the summaries for all chapters.

This [interview](#) from the [Type-0 artbook](#) has Tabata talking about his involvement along with the scenario writers, but the interest here is that Tsukishima is said to have had “free roam”—this being the prominent indication of originality congruent to lack of originality paratext, even if it's still understood on the technical level, but also where Supervision is still warranted regardless. It's worth noting too that Tabata talks about it as if it truly is applicable to the series (when he mentions Machina, not to mention the quote above).

This being an example of giving an author and their writing (the free roam bit emphasizes this) validation along with their originality, but also how this can be understood by the lack of either OG Plan/Work. It very well could be purposeful.

### ❑ Agito Novel

[FF Agito: Change the World -A Whiter Shade of Pale-](#)

著者: 月島トラ (チーム月島)

監修: 『ファイナルファンタジー アギト』開発チーム

Author: Tora Tsukishima (Team Tsukishima)

Supervision: “Final Fantasy Agito” Development Team

Both Souki and Tora are the main writers for their production office, [Team Tsukishima](#).

The same above should reasonably be understood here as well, I'd say.

#### ❑ Both Manga

The Prequel manga series might add insight on the idea of “Supervision”, where the freedoms typically taken in manga forms can also be somewhat authentic as well because of the authoritative backing here. The interview above also applies to the mangas (the term comicalization is used), not just the novels. The main manga is also sold as a part of the Collector's Edition of Type-0, along with the Art Book where the above interview is featured.

Either way, it's still a show of the correlation between Supervision and OG Plan. Scenario is also an interesting use here instead of OG Plan, as well, something to make note of in whether not it's significant of really the game's writing or the specific writing of the main manga.

[Main Manga](#) credits:

作画: 塩沢天人志

シナリオ: 千葉広樹

キャラクター原案: 野村哲也

Drawings by: Takatoshi Shiozawa

Scenario: Hiroki Chiba

Original Character Design: Tetsuya Nomura

[Kurasame Prequel](#) Credits:

作画: 塩沢天人志

監修: 野村哲也

Drawings by: Takatoshi Shiozawa

Supervision: Tetsuya Nomura

Apparently according to the fan wiki, [Sara Okabe](#) who was a scenario writer for the Type-0 game, was also the story writer for the main manga and the Kurasame prequel manga, but I don't have a way to check, but I trust it's probably written somewhere inside the books. Well,



with some caution, anyway. She might be part of the people who Tabata mentioned within that interview above about scenario writers checking things, along with, for the main manga, Hiroki Chiba (long-time SE employee) who actually gets the Scenario credit for the main manga.