**From the Editor**

With this issue of *SJS*, volume 15, publication comes to what I hope will be a relatively temporary close. As you hold this issue in your hands, you will feel its weight and know that we have made significant strides since the first issue went to the printers in the late 1980s. When someone in future picks up the reins and decides to recommence publication of *SJS* (“new series”) or to move the general field in new directions, he or she will be standing on firm shoulders, not because of the work of the editor but because of the important contributions of the various authors.

Several of the authors in this issue, notably John Tucker, Wai-ming Ng, and Tao De-min but Masako Nakagawa and David Askew as well, have published in these pages before. A number of the essays, however, are the work of new contributors, and they are marked for the advances our field has made over the last fifteen years. They also represent work from some of the younger members of the profession who have been inspired by our earlier efforts to bridge the Sino-Japanese gap—a gap that is not so yawning any longer. If people accept Sino-Japanese studies (the field, not the journal) as a given nowadays, I think we can momentarily pat ourselves on the back in self-satisfaction and then get back to work.

The first essay in this volume of *SJS* is a short piece announcing a fascinating recent discovery made by Tao De-min in the Yale University archives. His find was reported widely in the Japanese press recently. It is a letter and a petition from Yoshida Shōin and an associate to Commodore Perry, requesting passage to the West. Shōin’s efforts are, of course, well known, but these documents (one of which is reproduced here and both of which are translated) were heretofore unknown.

This is followed by a fascinating essay by Ishikawa Yoshihiro. As readers of *SJS* 14 will recall, Ishikawa has long been working on the history of Chinese Communism. His essay in this volume marks an early stage in new research on the origins of the social sciences in China and the impact from the West and Japan on the process. This piece looks at anthropology at the turn of the last century in Japan and China and the fundamental role that anti-Manchuism played in its formation.

We move next to the middle of the twentieth century with Jeff Long’s essay on Japanese reportage of the beginning of the second Sino-Japanese War on the mainland. Long examines (and translates selections from) Hayashi Fusao’s piece on the great battle of Shanghai of the late summer of 1937. Among other things, he complicates the issue of accurate war reporting versus pro-Japan war reporting through a close look at Hayashi’s writings at the time, and he compares them to the better known war reportage of 1938 by Hino Ashihei and Ishikawa Tatsuzō.

We then jump way back in time with Masako Nakagawa’s piece. She looks at the place of “Wo” (Wa, or what we would now render as Japan) in the text of the *Shanhai*
jing (The classic of mountains and seas). She examines as well the relationship between the ancient state of Wo and surrounding states and tries literally to map them for the contemporary reader.

This piece is followed by John Tucker’s detailed exegesis of the seventeenth-century Japanese text, Kana shōri (Neo-Confucian terms for Japanese). One of the most frequently cited and commented upon texts from the early Edo period, Tucker begins with a historiographical discussion of the text Kana shōri’s authorship and suggests that earlier suggestions that Fujiwara Seika was the man may be correct. He then provides a complete translation of the text and comprehensive comparison, section by section, with several other early Edo-period texts.

Wai-ming Ng, another inveterate scholar of the intellectual history of the Edo period, has long studied Japanese commentaries and responses to the ancient Chinese text, Yijing (Classic of changes). This essay examines Japanese approaches to another Chinese text, Xiaojing (Classic of filial piety). Ng looks closely at Edo-period Japanese views of the relationship between filial piety and loyalty to one’s lord in an effort to correct the one-sided notion that the latter ran roughshod over the former in Japan. He focuses especially on the work of the great seventeenth-century scholar of the Wang Yangming School in Japan, Nakae Tōju.

Examining the nature of Sino-Japanese diplomatic and trade relations in the Edo period, Mizuno Norihito argues in assiduous detail that the Tokugawa shogunal regime consistently aimed at not being an inferior constituent of the Sinocentric world order. This position puts him somewhat at odds with much of the scholarship on this issue, including the well known work of Ronald Toby. Mizuno situates his argument in the great wealth of documentation and secondary scholarship on this fascinating issue.

This is followed by a short essay by Araki Toshio on the curious phenomenon of the comparatively large number of women rulers who came to various East Asian thrones from the late sixth through the late eighth centuries. Whereas the Empress Wu is the best known case in the West—and undoubtedly elsewhere as well—Araki points to a handful of Japanese “empresses” (who were not consorts but emperors) and female kings in various Korean kingdoms—as well as the extraordinary but virtually unknown case of the rulers of “Dongnüguo.”

The final major essay in this volume is a meticulously detailed piece by David Askew attempting to come to a reasonably accurate estimate of the size of the Chinese forces in or near Nanjing on the eve of the infamous Japanese assault on that city in late 1937. He consults a plethora of Chinese and Japanese sources and compares his estimates with others who have attempted similar approximations.

We conclude with two reviews of recent books in Japanese.

When future editors emerge and wish to revive Sino-Japanese Studies, I trust that they will have a substantive basis upon which to build.