

From the Editor

The response to the inaugural issue of the Sino-Japanese Studies Newsletter (SJSN) was overwhelming. Several of the letters received from far and wide appear at the end of this issue. There were as well a number of errors needing correction; see the page of "Errata" below. As this page is being typed, 112 subscriptions have been received from Europe, Asia, Canada, Australia, and the United States. We have also been registered with the National Serials Data Program of the Library of Congress and have accordingly received our own ISSN number: ISSN 1041-8830. What has not been overwhelming is the receipt of promised contributions or reviews, but as the SJSN increases in circulation and popularity, we hope responsiveness will as well.

I was encouraged by one reader to elaborate a point from "A Note on Transcription and the Newsletter" (SJSN 1.1, pp. 8-9). The point in question concerns capitalization in transcribed terms. I noted that the only applicable logic for capitalization at all was that offered by the host language, because Chinese and Japanese recognize no distinction of higher and lower case lettering. For clarity's sake, I suggested capitalizing the first letter in a transcribed sentence or title, words that are proper nouns in English. The reader argued, again for the sake of clarity, that all the morphemes in the name of an institution, for example, should be capitalized. Hence: Tō-A Dōbun Shoin, Kyōto Daigaku, and Iwanami Bunko. The suggestion was a good one, and we shall accept it as an alternative in SJSN.

In this issue, we include a variety of materials. Barbara Brooks reports on the international conference held in October 1988 in Beijing on the history of Sino-Japanese relations (see SJSN 1.1, pp. 2, 4). Paul Scott draws from his research on Arai Hakuseki 荒尾清 to try and assess what exactly Arai meant when he spoke of Sino-Japanese "cooperation." Feng Zuozhe 冯佐哲 and Wang Xiaoqiu 王晓秋 introduce an important, rare Chinese work on Japanese history and culture from the mid-Qing period. There is also a section of reviews concerned primarily with Chinese and Japanese writings on the 19th century interactions, cultural and political, between China and Japan.

In future issues, we hope to publish work on other periods of Sino-Japanese interactions, pre-18th and post-19th century. This anticipation is, of course, entirely a function of what sorts of materials are contributed from our readers. We state this simply to allay any suspicions that the SJSN is devoted to publishing work solely for the eras thus far covered. One point, though, needs clarification. We do not publish material that has already appeared elsewhere, unless it is in Chinese, Japanese, or another East Asian

language. Submissions of translations are welcome, but must be accompanied by a copy of the original. In the next issue of SJSN, one article will begin an attempt to untangle the levels of meaning, nuance, and insinuation in the various Japanese names for "China," especially Shina 支那. Another, expected piece will examine aspects of medieval history, and another will examine Sino-Japanese scholarly bias.

**Errata:
Volume One, Number One**

Table of Contents; p. 4, l. 34; p. 48, l. 35. The title of Douglas Reynolds's article should be: "A Golden Decade Forgotten." For the sake of clarity, I should note that its citation as "4.2" in the Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan should be: fourth series, volume 2.

p. 9, l. 33-35. John Lee, a native speaker of Korean and scholar of medieval Chinese history from the St. Mary's University, informs me that the expression Nit-Chō 日朝, not Nis-Sen 日鮮 is used generally for Japanese-Korean relations. The latter term still bristles with pre-1945 connotations of colonialism and is to be avoided.

p. 10, l. 12 from bottom. "Japanese manjū (a bun...)"

p. 11, l. 43-44. The Chinese characters for the name, Matsumoto Sannosuke, should be: 松本三之介.

p. 13, l. 10-12. Two lines of text are missing. These two sentences should read: "He demonstrates vividly and in detail how early-modern Japanese society and politics differed from that in imperial China from Sung times onward. His emphasis on early-modern (kinsei), as opposed to a narrower Tokugawa, periodization is crucial."

p. 15, l. 10 from bottom. "of rarely cited primary..."

p. 16, l. 14. Kaibara Ekken 貝原益軒

p. 19, l. 5. "Watanabe's unsuitability thesis is unquestionably valid when..."