

On Japanese Expressions for "China"

Joshua A. Fogel
University of California, Santa Barbara

Generally speaking, before the Meiji period, Japanese referred to "China" either by the name of the dynasty in power (Tang 唐, J. Tō; Song 宋, J. Sō; Ming 明, J. Min; and Qing 清, J. Shin) or by some generic name, such as the synecdoche Nankin 南京 (Nanjing) or the more Japanese-sounding terms Kara から and Morokoshi もろこし. Other generic terms included Chūka 中華 (Ch. Zhonghua), Chūdo 中土 (Ch. Zhongtu), Ka-Ka 華夏 (Ch. Hua-Xia), and Shina 支那 (Ch. Zhina), just to name a few. Although the Japanese rendering of the term used by Chinese themselves, Zhongguo 中国 (or Chūgoku in Japanese), was on occasion employed in Japanese texts, it was used with far less frequency.

What follows is a brief examination of the history of the two most popular Japanese expressions for "China": Shina and Chūgoku. I by no means claim to have resolved this thorny issue for all time, but I do want to raise problems in both the intellectual history as well as the emotional background to the contention surrounding these terms. In part this effort is motivated by an interest in the fascinating phenomenon of how a people or nation seeks to name itself and the concomitant wish it may have of trying to control what others (in other languages) call it. Toponyms and ethnonyms are obviously not value-free entities; in fact, they often ironically tell us precisely what they do not denote, such as the "German Democratic Republic" or the "Holy Roman Empire." In part as well the motive behind this article lies in a more specific wish to correct a serious misunderstanding of the origin and intentionality attributed to the Japanese use of "Shina." The topic is a deeply emotional one for many Chinese and some Japanese as well.

The first Japanese to address this issue squarely was the remarkable scholar of Chinese literature, Takeuchi Yoshimi 竹内好 (1908-1977). Writing in the late 1930s and early 1940s for the journal Chūgoku bungaku 中国文学, probably the only prewar Japanese publication to use the Chinese toponym for "China" (in its Japanese reading), Takeuchi offered by far the most insightful remarks for his time. How do we respond, he asked, to the claim by Chinese that expressions "Shina" 支那 and "Shina jin" 支那人 (the Chinese) are insulting? Whatever its pre-modern origins, to be discussed below, did the fact that in contemporary usage "Shina" was a designation of foreign origin (different from the toponym of Chinese choice) imply that China had been denied an equal place in the world? By the same token, how in the modern world of independent nations could other countries be expected to refer to China by a name that conjured up a

bygone world view based on clear lines of inequity with China at the center of the universe? One might raise just as much doubt about whether "Shina" carried negative connotations simply in its usage as one could with Chinese use of the term "Zhongguo" 中國 (Chūgoku).

As was so often often the case in modern Chinese linguistic innovation, it was Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (1874-1929) who pioneered the reformulation of "Zhongguo" as a modern national designation for China. Others may have preceded him, but not in the consistent way he attempted to forge such a designation shorn of its earlier trappings. Yet, it was this same Liang Qichao who on many earlier occasions had used the Chinese correlate of "Shina" or "Zhina" (Chih-na, in Wade-Giles transcription). Obviously, there was no derogation intended in Liang's usage. The process by which "Zhongguo" became the established, generic term and "Zhina" dropped out of currency in Chinese would seem to have more to do with the development of anti-Japanese sentiments in 20th-century China than with the intrinsic and relative linguistic values of these two terms. The most outspoken opponent of "Shina" was, doubtless, Guo Moruo 郭沫若 (1892-1978) who railed against it, to the point of noting that in multiple national designations (such as "Sino-Japanese" in English) Japanese newspapers always placed the element for China (the "Shi" of "Shina") last: thus, "Nis-Shi" 日支 (Sino-Japanese), "Nichi-Ei-Shi" 日英支 (Japanese-English-Chinese), and the like.

Takeuchi found this line of argument specious. "Shina" was the term to which he had become accustomed when writing in his native language; and, even if words do take on a life of their own, it had not a trace of ridicule attached to it, he claimed, in his usage. China and the Chinese people, as far as Takeuchi was concerned, could not be reduced to words. In addition, all of these discussions were meaningless to the everyday, ordinary people Takeuchi had come to know in the years he spent in China. How knowledgeable were those people who had suggested replacing "Shina" with "Chūgoku" with the actual feelings of the Chinese people about the term "Shina?" How confident were they that the term "Chūgoku" could be inserted into the quotidian Japanese lexicon? Would simply changing the term to "Chūgoku" insure that any alleged abuse in the former term "Shina" would disappear? Was this not like humoring a child? Must we love the "Chinese people?" I may love certain Chinese, he argued, but it is not simply because they are "Chinese." "I couldn't care less whether you say 'Shina,' 'Chūgoku,' or whether you spell out 'Zhongguo' in katakana. I don't want to believe that this is simply a problem of language."¹

Takeuchi was not the only Japanese concerned with this issue before the end of the war, just the most perceptive. A fascinating exchange, which would seem to have been altogether unaware of earlier discussions of this issue, transpired in the pages of the Asahi shinbun 朝日新聞 in December 1952. The renowned Sinologist, Aoki Masaru 青木正児 (1887-1964), was struck by the sudden shift in

usage, following the end of the war, from Shina to Chūgoku in Japan, and he was at a loss to understand why the Chinese so hated the term Shina. True, he agreed, the term as utilized by many Japanese had accrued a negative sense, but there was nothing intrinsically derogatory about it, despite Chinese arguments to the contrary. The two-character expression derived, he argued, from an early Sanskrit transcription of "Qin" 秦, the ancient dynastic name which had become associated beyond China's borders with the country's name, much as Tang/Tō (and Han/Kan 漢) later would become in Japan. There was certainly nothing inherently evil about the two characters, nor was there anything evil in the initial Japanese adoption of the term. Aoki claimed simply that many Japanese preferred some generic toponym for the country of China over the name of a specific state or regime, such as "Zhonghua minguo" 中華民國 (J. Chūka minkoku) after 1912, just as had been the case under the Ming and Qing dynasties earlier. Indeed, the expression Shina often appeared for China in the Buddhist canon, as did various other two-character transcriptional approximations for however the character "Qin" was pronounced at that time.²

Actually, Aoki averred, the several theories for what those two characters for "Shina" implied--"country where the people have much on their minds," "country of civilization," and the like--all clearly indicated praise, not derision, for China. Many Japanese expressions had been developed as designations for China, and Shina--a term not of Japanese innovation--could be traced back to at least the Kamakura period. It became current late in the Edo era through the writings of Dutch Studies scholars and even more so through the Meiji era. In fact, it had even been adopted by some Western scholars. Clearly, even if the term was perceived by Chinese as loaded with negative connotations, he concluded, there was no such original intent on the part of the Japanese who adopted it.³

Two weeks later an exceedingly angry reply by Liu Shengguang 劉勝光, a Chinese newspaperman in Tokyo, was published in the same newspaper. Liu repeated entire paragraphs from Aoki's piece, interspersing his rebuttals. Yes, he began, Japanese had chosen at the time of the Qing to refer to China by what they took to be the dynastic designation, rather than a generic toponym; but, they had gotten it wrong. The term used by Japanese was Shinkoku 清國 or "Qing nation," when it should have been Shinchō 清朝 (Ch. Qingchao) or "Qing dynasty." The former had never existed; there was no "Qing nation." Liu admitted that Aoki had cleverly marshalled countless old references where Shina had a positive or neutral connotation, but the simple fact, Liu declared, was that when Chinese people saw those two characters, Shina, they saw Japanese militarists and imperialism. And, he denied "absolutely" that any foreigner had ever used the expression Shina; it was only the Japanese!

Liu went on to cite a passage written by Jiang Jieshi 蔣介石 (1887-1975), who must have known Japanese well at an earlier stage in his life, in which the Generalissimo claimed that the term itself

sounded like "a person at death's door," apparently because of its similarity to the Japanese verb shinu 死ぬ 'to die.' Indeed, Liu claimed, the use of the term seemed to deny the very life of China. It was thus extremely humiliating to Chinese. "I can say with surety that this expression [Shina] absolutely does not appear in Chinese books." He concluded with a note indicating what must have touched off this discussion. In recent Sino-Japanese negotiations, Yoshida Shigeru 吉田茂 (1878-1967) had occasionally misspoken "Shina," indicating a pre-1945 mentality or education.⁴

We have here two clear, polar statements of the arguments over the nuances (intended and unintended) of this particular Japanese designation for "China." It is part of one of the more confusing stories in the development of Japanese Sinology and Japanese views of China generally: the many expressions used over the years to designate "Asia," "East Asia," the "Orient," and "China."

In the best, although still not the definitive, analysis to date of the Japanese use of the term Shina, Satō Saburō 佐藤三郎 examined a multiplicity of texts, especially from the Edo through early Shōwa eras to describe, first, the emergence and predominance of Shina and, then, its supersession by Chūgoku.⁵

Satō demonstrates conclusively that there was no consistency in the Japanese use of terms for "China" before bakumatsu times. Indeed, one often finds two or more different expressions for China in the same text. Shina was rarely used prior to the middle years of the Edo period, and the bakufu usually used Tō. When Arai Hakuseki 新井白石 employed the term Shina in 1713, it carried only positive connotations. At the time it was believed to reflect an Indian pronunciation of the toponym for China which Buddhist travelers, such as Xuanzang 玄奘 (ca. 596-664) and others, had often used centuries earlier. It was thought to have derived from the dynastic name Qin and carry the sense of a vast, unified empire. According to Fayun 法雲 (12th century), a Chinese monk of the Song period, the term implied a "nation of culture" (wenwu guo 文物國) and was originally a term of high praise, which was how it had been understood in China. By the 18th century, no Chinese were using the term, although Hakuseki held a reverential attitude toward China and could only have used it in a positive sense.

To count the number of times the various terms for China were used in all Japanese texts is virtually impossible, but Satō examines one large body of sources, the collections of accounts written by people who were shipwrecked during the Edo period and found themselves washed up on Chinese soil. Since travel to China was illegal under the sakoku 鎖国 policy, these accounts were the only primary materials concerning China by Japanese at the time. His conclusions show that, although there were as many as eleven individual terms for China and somewhat fewer for the Chinese people, the overwhelming favorites were Tōkoku 唐国 (or similar terms with Tō as the first

element, such as Tōdo 唐土) and Tōjin 唐人 , respectively. Although Shina was at the time a scholarly or technical term for China, it was scarcely used to designate the real thing.

During the early and mid-19th century, use of Shina began to increase, and its connotation began to decline. In a famous letter of 1855, for example, Yoshida Shōin 吉田松陰 (1830-1859) referred to "Shina" as an object for Japan to conquer; earlier, in 1808, Satō Nobuhiro 佐藤信淵 (1769-1850) offered high praise for the Qing government and encouraged close Sino-Japanese ties, but only fifteen years later he was calling for the Japanese conquest and annexation of "Shina." During the same period, however, Yokoi Shōnan 横井小南 (1809-1869) was urging close ties between "Shina" and Japan, and clearly the term did not have a negative sense to him. While it is rather easier to understand how the general image of China was declining in Japanese eyes during the age of Western encroachment, defeat in wars with the British and the French, the Taiping Rebellion, and the like, it still remains difficult to explain why during these years the use of Shina rose. The diarists aboard the Senzaimaru 千歳丸 voyage of 1862 (see SJSN I.2, pp. 41-56) often used "Shina" as well as Shin (Qing) and Tōkoku, and from that point forward it seemed to carry the special sense of "contemporary China."⁶

In the early Meiji period, elementary school textbooks and newspapers often glossed the two Chinese characters now pronounced "Shina" with a variety of furigana expressions: Chaina ヂャイナ, Kara から , Nankin ナンキン , and Shina しな . This would indicate that there was still no fixed reading for the Chinese characters, but, as the term Nis-Shi 日支 (Sino-Japanese) came into currency, Shina became the preferred reading.

Satō examines four kinds of written materials for the early and mid-Meiji era. First, in official government documents, Shina was used, but so too were "Kando" 漢土 , Tōkoku, and Shinkoku. Gradually, Shina and Shinkoku became the general terms and were often used in the same documents. Second, diaries and letters also preserved the dual usage of Shina and Shinkoku. Third, newspapers were using Shina widely by the second decade of Meiji (1877-1886); through an analysis of articles from selected years, he shows that Shina predominates and that the only other name used for China was Shin (with Shinkoku as a variant). Finally, as noted above, the Chinese characters for "Shina" were in wide use in textbooks, though not always glossed with the pronunciation Shina.

These four genres of writings demonstrate that Shina had already become entrenched in popular Japanese usage by the mid-1880s, certainly well before the Sino-Japanese War. Satō thus successfully supersedes the argument made some years ago by Sanetō Keishū 実藤 惠秀 (1896-1985) that Shina came into general use only after the first Sino-Japanese War.⁷ Until the end of the Meiji era, which happened to coincide with the end of the Qing dynasty, the official Japanese designation for China remained dai Shin teikoku 大清帝国

(great Qing empire), and this usage is reflected in the Japanese names for such major events of the day as Nis-Shin sensō 日清戦争 (Sino-Japanese War) and Hoku-Shin jihen 北清事変 (North China Incident, namely the Boxer Uprising). From 1912, however, "Shin" ceased to have meaning as a generic designation for China, and Shina finally attained complete dominance, which it held until 1945. The official Chinese designation for the Republic, Zhonghua minquo never came into wide use in Japan, as even official Japanese documents usually used the expressions Shina or Shina kyōwakoku 支那共和国 (Republic of China).

Before looking at Satō's discussion of the debate over the nuances of the term Shina, let me add a few historical observations to its background. The national renewal in Japan occasioned by the return of the symbol of the emperor to center stage brought a concomitant decrease in respect for China in many quarters. If Japan had been able to withstand the pressures of Western encroachment, why had China apparently failed so miserably? How could such a country still consider itself the "Central Kingdom?" The earliest Japanese allowed to travel to China after the lifting of the sakoku ban returned with mixed reports, but the overall picture was not pretty, even if the Chinese people were not blamed for the obvious decline of their country. The growing disrespect for Japan's former teacher in the ways of civilization found popular expression in Fukuzawa Yukichi's 福沢諭吉 (1834-1901) particularly derisive term, datsu-A 脱亜 or "get out of Asia" (literally, 'shed Asia,' as a snake sheds its skin). At the same time, popular expressions of derogation for the Chinese people, "Chan chan bōzu" チャンチャン坊主 and the like, began to come into frequency in Japan and to be used with respect to the Chinese living in Japan's larger cities.⁸

Let us now take a closer look at the elusive problem of the nuances that accrued to the expression Shina as used by Japanese. Through the third decade of the Meiji era, Chinese scholars were feted whenever they visited Japan by their counterparts in Kangaku 漢学 or scholarly Chinese studies; they exchanged Chinese-style poems (Kanshi 漢詩) and engaged in countless "pen conversations" (hitsudan 筆談, or Ch. bitan). At least through these years and in these circles, Shina retained its positive connotations. Meanwhile, a continued spread in use of the term Shina from the bakumatsu and early Meiji eras forward coincided with great tumult on the Asian mainland and increasing Japanese intellectual fascination with Western civilization. From these sources, the negative connotations of filth, ineptitude, laziness, and weakness seemed to agglutinate to the term "Shina." This perspective on Shina, though, remained latent until after the humiliating Japanese defeat of China in 1895. Her victory transformed the view of Japan held by a generation of Chinese intellectuals and spurred thousands to go study there. The first group of thirteen Chinese students arrived in March 1897, and by April four of them were already back in Japan, victims of bad food

and the ridicule of Japanese school children, they claimed.

Although originally derived from Chinese Buddhist texts and probably a term of praise, Shina never caught on as a general designation for China among the ordinary Chinese population. Huang Zunxian 黄遵宪 (1848-1905) arrived in Japan in late 1877 to help open the first Chinese Legation in Japan and soon became extremely interested in Japan. In his Riben zashi shi 日本雜事詩 [Poems about Various Events in Japan], which caused a sensation in Japan, he offered an explanation for the Japanese reading of the Chinese characters for "Shina," arguing that this pronunciation came to Japanese from renderings for "China" in European languages. This assertion would seem to imply that Huang had never heard the expression before coming to Japan.

In modern China, the use of Shina--or Zhina--dates primarily to the years just after the Sino-Japanese War when large numbers of Chinese came to Japan as students. In the many books about the West and China that they translated from Japanese into Chinese, "Shina" was often rendered "Zhongguo" and sometimes left as "Zhina," as in a volume translated by Liang Qichao. The Tōkyō Asahi shinbun of July 30, 1905 carried a notice of a Chinese journal, Ershi shiji zhi Zhina 二十世紀之支那 [Twentieth-Century China], the revolutionary organ of students from Hunan and Hubei provinces, which was extremely critical of Japan.

What about the Chinese opposition to the use of Shina? Anti-Japanese feelings were on the rise among Chinese as a result of events in the 1910s and 1920s. Some claimed that, while "Shina" may have shared its roots with English "China" and French "Chine," in the mouths of Japanese there was something else that was missing from European enunciations. In his piece (mentioned above) of September 1936, Guo Moruo (who knew Japanese well) argued that the expression Shina was not evil in and of itself, nor did it have pernicious origins. But, when used by Japanese, it was comparable, indeed worse, than the derogatory way in which Europeans often spoke the word "Jew" (or "Juif" or "Jude"). In a less convincing argument, he added that in all Japanese binational designations, the element for China came last. (Has anyone ever thought the latter element in the term "Sino-Japanese" belittled Japan? Have the Chinese ever placed the Chinese element in binational designations anywhere but first? While we're at it, should someone have mentioned to Guo how abhorrent and denigrating the Chinese term for "Jew" is?) Yu Dafu 郁達夫, who spent a number of allegedly unhappy years in Japan, expressed similar sentiments in several of his novels.⁹

Several other Chinese arguments against the use of Shina, noted by Satō and others, are even more far-fetched. Wang Gongbi 王拱璧 claimed that "Shina" was homophonous with Japanese expressions implying "imminent demise" 將死 and "thing" 品. Others claimed that the first syllable of Shina implied the Japanese expression shihai 支配 or 'control,' while the second syllable implied (this time, only in

Chinese) a third person; hence, the term belittled the Chinese people in the sense of "control them." Some even suggested that the shi element in Shina implied the idea of "branch store" (shiten 支店) with Japan as the "main store" (honten 本店). These arguments are, frankly, specious. They stretch the limits of the linguistic imagination.

In June 1930 the Tōkyō nichinichi shinbun 東京日々新聞 editorialized against the use of the Chinese expression for the Republic of China, Zhonghua minguo, because both of the elements of the first term, Zhong and Hua, contained outdated conceptions of the Chinese as civilized and the others as, implicitly, barbarians. With "Shina," all people stood on an equal footing, the newspaper argued, and there was no room for self-flattery. To the alleged Chinese claim that Zhonghua minguo was a Chinese translation of the English expression "National Republic of China," the Japanese newspaper retorted that Shina was just as much "China." The next day, the newspaper ran an anonymous rebuttal (later demonstrated to be the work of Sanetō Keishū) which put the problem simply: If the Chinese want to be called Zhonghua or Zhongguo, then that is their business. It is no different from a personal name, chosen by the person who bears it. (There is a problem here, for how many of us actually chose our personal names? They are given to us at birth by others, usually parents, and for reasons reflecting many different ethnic and religious traditions.) The term Nihon 日本 also, he argued, carried self-aggrandizing connotations when viewed from abroad. Agreed, Shina has no intrinsically negative sense, but it is simply not the name the Chinese have chosen for themselves.¹⁰

In October of 1930, the Japanese government decided to change its position and adopt Zhonghua minguo (J. Chūka minkoku) as its official designation for the Republic of China. "Shina" remained far and away the popular favorite, and the war that began several years later was euphemistically dubbed the Shina jihen 支那事變 or "China Incident." During the allied occupation of Japan in which China participated, the Chinese demanded an official end to Japanese use of the term Shina. The demand was accepted by the Japanese on June 7, 1946.

In the postwar period, when scholars of Chinese history and culture in Japan were trying to atone for the sins of the prewar period and any complicity for which their profession may have been responsible in the war effort on the mainland, considerable scrutiny was focused on this issue of toponyms for China. It has become second-nature now to refer to the expression Shina as a derisive prewar designation for China; that is, by not accepting the Chinese term Zhongguo, the Japanese are alleged to have committed an act of intellectual or cultural imperialism no different in their realm from the military actions of others in other realms.

I have no intention of becoming involved in the exculpating

process, nor of offering advice to Japanese colleagues. However, the postwar mass mea culpa has tended toward a rejection of many of the finest achievements of prewar Sinology, because of the political views of the authors or simply the connotations of their language. Let me address several further points concerning "Shina."

First, Mr. Liu Shengguang was wrong; Japanese were not the only ones to use it. Such politically different Chinese figures as Liang Qichao, Zhang Binglin 章炳麟 (1868-1936), and Wu Zhihui 吳稚暉 (1865-1953) all had occasion to use its Chinese correlate, Zhina. All three men were among those intellectuals at the turn of the century who were involved in China's effort to reassess its place in the world, a world in which China was no longer realistically the Central Kingdom and had no business so advertising itself. All spent a period of time in Japan. While Liang became, for awhile, an open Japanophile, Zhang's nationalism served to make him considerably less respectful of his Japanese hosts; Wu's intellectual peregrinations are too complex to trace here. Nonetheless, all adopted the use of the Japanese expression for China, a term whose ultimate etymon is, as noted, a Sanskrit rendering from Buddhist texts. For all the well-known scholarly and political differences between Liang and Zhang, both men opted for the more neutral Zhina, albeit not permanently.

Second, there is a certain naturally temporal quality to the designations used in naming. Of course, the power to establish a name that sticks presupposes the authority of enforcement. Many terms have been offered as names for countries and ethnic groups (the two thorniest and most easily offended groupings) that have simply not withstood the pressures of time and have, accordingly, changed. Before the mid-1960s, virtually every liberal American, black or white, referred to blacks as "Negroes" with no intention of offense or slight. It was simply the respectful name in use, and it was superior to the openly reviled and offensive term "colored," still in legal use by Southern bigots (to say nothing of the term in colloquial use by this group). Use of "Negro" thus carried with it the self-proclamation of liberal. By the late 1960s, few if any liberals were still using "Negro" but had shifted to "black," because that was declared the ethnonym of choice by the group so named. Did that mean that people who had used the term "Negro" prior to the late 1960s were all racists, as it was clearly indicated it did for those who continued to use it after the late 1960s? The new ethnonyms, "Afro-American" or "African-American" (sometimes without a hyphen) have recently been put forth as candidates to replace "black," but as yet have not caught on. We may witness yet another name shift in the not-too-distant future, and "black" may fall out of currency in certain quarters.

Of course, in the prewar period most Chinese used Zhongguo (not Zhina) as a designation for their country, while most Japanese used Shina. However, the use of Shina, I would argue, was not a conscious

choice on the part of those Japanese, nor was it a way of taking a peculiarly anti-Chinese stance. In the postwar period, Japanese have all moved to adopt Chūgoku in imitation of the Chinese. The logical extension of the argument that Shina is offensive would be for Japanese to go one step further and use the Chinese term Zhongguo (pronounced in Chinese). That would be inconceivable, though. And, yet, one of the oft-heard arguments in the United States (and elsewhere perhaps) for adopting the pinyin Romanization scheme and abandoning the Wade-Giles system is that the former aims at pronouncing the names of Chinese places "the way the Chinese do." Anyone who has ever studied Chinese knows how bogus this argument is.

A more interesting avenue for future research in this area, but beyond the scope of this essay (and, indeed, beyond the designated scope of this serial publication) would be to sort out the various nuances of the Japanese names for Korea (Chōsen, Kankoku, and the like). When were these terms coined? Who coined them? Did they originate in Korean use of Chinese characters or are they Japanese neologisms? What are the senses of the terms in the prewar and postwar eras? What has the postwar divisions of Korea done to confuse this problem? Which do the two Koreas prefer?

Addendum

A fascinating article on this issue was published in China's leading historical journal a decade ago. It has gone (almost) totally ignored. In a study of the origins of the two-character expression pronounced "Zhina" in Chinese, Su Zhongxiang 蘇仲湘 argues (with immense amounts of supportive evidence) that originally it was indeed an Indian (i.e., Sanskrit) effort to transcribe the name for China. But, although it dates to the Qin era, the term derives not from a reading of "Qin" but from the Chinese rendering for the ancient state of Jing 荊, much revered by those who wrote the documents in which "Zhina" first appeared; in fact, it was emblematic of the entire Chinese mainland itself to them, an ancient synecdoche. Second, it was South China to which the term principally pointed, that part of China with which Indians had had the closest contact. Finally, Su argues on the basis of an analysis of the ancient pronunciations of the Chinese characters involved, Jing is the better candidate. Although Su gets a little carried away at the end of his essay, lauding the greatness and wonders of Sino-foreign contacts even way back when--and concluding "Oh, how this makes our thoughts go back in time!"--still this is the best piece of work on the subject in any language. Also, there is conspicuously no mention of the Japanese reflex "Shina" anywhere in this essay.¹¹

Notes

1. Takeuchi Yoshimi, "Shina to Chūgoku" 支那と中国 ["Shina" and "Chūgoku"], Chūgoku bungaku 64 (August 1940), as reprinted in his Nihon to Chūgoku no aida 日本と中国のあいだ [Between Japan and China] (Tokyo: Bungei shunjū, 1973), pp. 178-183, quotation on p. 185. See also his "Shina o kaku to iu koto" 支那を書くということ [On writing the term "Shina"], Chūgoku bungaku 80 (January 1942), as reprinted in Nihon to Chūgoku no aida, pp. 222-226.

2. For a detailed examination of the etymology of term "Shina," see Uemura Nizaburō 植村仁三郎, "Shina meigi kō" 支那名義考 [A study of the meaning the term "Shina"], Shigaku zasshi 学雑誌 7, furoku 付録 [supplement], attached to 7.11 (November 1896), pp. 1-16; attached to 7.12 (December 1896), pp. 17-40. For an even more thorough and thought-provoking study of this issue, see the "Addendum" above.

3. Aoki Masaru, "'Shina' to iu meishō ni tsuite" '支那' という名称について [On the term "Shina"], Asahi shinbun (December 17, 1952), p. 6.

4. Liu Shengguang, "Chūgoku ni wa nai kotoba, 'Shina' ni tsuite hanron" 中国にはない言葉、'支那' について反論 [A rebuttal concerning Shina, a word that does not exist in China], Asahi shinbun (December 30, 1952), p. 6.

5. Satō Saburō, "Nihon jin ga Chūgoku o Shina to yonda koto ni tsuite no kōsatsu" 日本人が中国を支那と呼んだことについての考察 [A study of the Japanese use of {the term} Shina for China], in Kindai Nit-Chū kōshō shi no kenkyū 近代日中交渉史の研究 [Studies in the History of Modern Sino-Japanese Relations] (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1984), 25-66. Unless otherwise noted, this is my source for the next few paragraphs.

6. Satō mentions the interesting case of one of the earlier shipwrecked Japanese by the name of Hamada Hikozaō 浜田彦蔵 who was picked up by an American ship, taken to the United States, educated and naturalized there. He later returned to Yokohama, with the new name of Joseph Heco, where he inaugurated Japan's first modern newspaper, and he always used the terms Shina and Shina jin in his paper. Satō suggests that the reinforcing influence of the English term "China" on his usage, and perhaps eventually on general Japanese usage.

7. See Sanetō Keishū, Kindai Nit-Chū kōshō shiwa 近代日中交渉史話 [History of Modern Sino-Japanese Relations] (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1973), p. 87.

8. Yamane Yukio 山根幸夫 , "Nihon jin no Chūgoku kan" 日本人の
中国観 [Japanese views of China], Tōkyō joshi daigaku ronshū
東京女子大学論集 19.1 (September 1968), pp. 1-2. On the positive reap-
praisal of Fukuzawa in the newly rising states of East Asia today,
including the People's Republic of China, see Imanaga Seiji 今永
清二, "'Datsu-A ron' to Chūgoku bunkatsuron ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu:
Fukuzawa shisō no gendai teki ishiki o megutte" 「脱亜論」と 中国
分割論に関する一考察：福沢思想の現代的意義をめぐって [A study of
the thesis of "escaping from Asia" and the partition of China: On the
contemporary awareness of Fukuzawa's thought], Kindai Nihon kenkyū
近代日本研究 2 (1985), pp. 261-290.

9. Satō, pp. 46-55.

10. Tōkyō nichinichi shinbun, June 5-6, 1930; and Satō, pp. 55-7.

11. Su Zhongxiang, "Lun 'Zhina' ici de qiyuan yu Jing de lishi he
wenhua" 論“支那”一詞的起源与荆的歷史和文化 [On the origins of
the term "Zhina" and the history and culture of (the state of) Jing],
Lishi yanjiu 歷史研究 4 (April 1979), pp. 34-48.