

**\*\* From the Editor \*\***

I recently picked up Leo Ou-fan Lee's new book, *Shanghai Modern: The Flowering of a New Urban Culture in China, 1930-1945* (Harvard University Press, 1999). One would think I should know better, but I naïvely began flipping through it with the thought: "Gee, this is one topic that fairly begs for Sino-Japanese comparisons and mutual influences." Instead, in what is surely a fine book otherwise—I cannot comment until I've finished it—I discovered a total of six pages (out of 341 of text) devoted to "The Japanese Connection." Here Professor Lee examines the extremely famous novella, *Shanghai* 上海 (Shanghai), by Yokomitsu Riichi 横光利一 (1898-1947). Beside the fact that Yokomitsu's given name is repeatedly mistranscribed as \*Reiichi and his novella mistranscribed as \*Shanghai, virtually every single Japanese reference is misromanized: e.g., \*Kaizo should be *Kaizō*; \*tenko should be *tenkō*; \*Yokomitsu Reiichi *ki* should be *Yokomitsu Riichi zenshū*; \*Kawadeshobo should be *Kawade shobō*; \*Chikuma shōbo should be *Chikuma shobō*; and the like. What's more, his entire discussion is based on a student presentation in his graduate seminar in 1992. The author of that paper has since grown up, finished his thesis, and found a highly respectable teaching position; he is a subscriber and, indeed, a contributor to these pages. One cannot tell whose errors these were, but Harvard professors probably should be held responsible for their published writings. Professor Lee goes on to almost completely misrepresent Yokomitsu, a man about whose life and writings Japanese critics have written mountains, and his justly famed novella. It is basically seen as denigrating of the Chinese because of its portrayal of the Shanghai demi-monde and the seamy underside of Shanghai life in the late 1920s. Worst of all, Yokomitsu used "the more traditional and disparaging *Shina* rather than the more modern *Chūgoku*" which Professor Lee goes on to assert was "an Oriental 'other' to Japan and to the Japanese characters in Yokomitsu's *Shanghai*" (p. 318). One thing is for sure: he does not read *Sino-Japanese Studies*. If he did, he never would have hauled out the old *Shina* ca(n)rd.

All of which is not to denigrate a fine scholar of modern Chinese literature, but to underline, once again, that there is so much work out there remaining to be done in the Sino-Japanese field. The message is still not getting through. One simply, in this case, cannot study the phenomenon of Shanghai modernity by pigeon-holing "Japan" into a handful of pages dubbed the "connection." The importance of Japan is absolutely fundamental to everything from the widespread numbers of translations from Japanese literature and literary criticism (of original works by Japanese or of translations from other languages into Japanese) to the format and appearance of modern journals, to women's styles of clothing and hairdo, and much more. We are not just talking about Lu Xun 魯迅 and his brother Zhou Zuoren 周作人, but they are an essential part of the story. I am reminded of an important story in this connection. Shortly after Lu Xun met and fell in love with Xu Guangping 徐廣平, he wrote to her about a nagging lapse in her education to that point. Lu Xun was older and his words have a somewhat patronizing air: "I think you do not have as much knowledge of life as I have.... I feel that it would

help you considerably to study something new.... You have another weak point as well in that you cannot read works in foreign languages. It would be very valuable for you to learn Japanese. I will see that you study [Japanese] hard next year.” *Lu Xun quanji* 鲁迅全集 (Collected works of Lu Xun) (Beijing: Renmin daxue chubanshe, 1987), vol. XI, p. 478. He was telling her that she would, in effect, be unable to understand his work fully if she could not understand Japanese.

**With this issue of *Sino-Japanese Studies***, we begin the twelfth year of publication—going strong. In this issue, we have four essays: one on literature, one on contemporary politics, one on early twentieth-century history, and one on early eighteenth-century history. In addition, a total of ten Chinese books (eight of which belong to a series) are introduced and reviewed.

We start with an extraordinary essay, originally presented at a conference in Santa Barbara, by Sang Bing of Zhongshan University in Guangzhou. It concerns the treatment Liang Qichao’s work met with in Japan and China in the last decades of his life, as well as his research in Chinese history and culture. Considering the attention lavished on Liang by scholars in the West and Japan, the fact that virtually all of this information is new will be a great boon to researchers everywhere.

We then shift gears to Jing Zhao’s essay on several alarming changes underway in the views of the Japan Communist Party. As he shows, the JCP has of late been moving in a sharply nationalistic direction, especially as involves issues of concern to China. He focuses discussion on such issues as the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands controversy and the Tian’anmen Massacre.

We then go back to early modern Japan. Noriko Rieder describes a fascinating case of an eighteenth-century Japanese retelling of an earlier Chinese story. In her sensitive reading of this story, she shows how Ueda Akinari used a Chinese tale but changed it to fit the circumstances—culture and society—of his own time and place.

Finally, we produce here part nine of the ongoing translation of Ôba Osamu’s major work on Sino-Japanese contacts during the Tokugawa period. This segment of the story focuses on Chinese “hired” by the Japanese government, largely in the Kyôhô era (1716-36): Chinese doctors, horse doctors, and Buddhist abbots, among others. As always, he brings to bear on the subject a plethora of source materials from both sides—often documents he has himself discovered—to paint his portrait.