

## Editorial Report

This issue is divided into six sections that contain a total of thirteen articles.<sup>1</sup>

In the “Special Articles” section, the first piece is a continuation of “China ‘Asleep’ and ‘Awakening’; A Study in Conceptualizing Asymmetry and Coping with It” by Professor Rudolf G. Wagner of the University of Heidelberg, Germany. Professor Wagner’s article analyzes in depth the metaphors of “sleep” and “awakening” in China from the 19th century on, investigating the relationship between political concepts, metaphors, and images. He outlines the interlingual and intercultural flow of political metaphors and images and the asymmetrical power relationships associated with them, as well as the dynamic ways people deal with this asymmetry. At the conclusion of his article, Professor Wagner makes a series of points about the three areas he analyzes that reveal a new research perspective and a new way of thinking about the history of ideas in East Asia.

The theme of this issue’s Feature Articles section—*guomin*, *guoyu*, *guoti* (nation, national language, national body)—was planned and presided over by Professor Huang Mei-e of the Graduate Institute of Taiwan

---

<sup>1</sup> For this issue we received a total of seventeen submissions: five from Taiwan and twelve from abroad. Besides the the three special articles, which were recommended by at least two members of the editorial committee, along with a short book review and two new translations of old articles that did not need to be reviewed, the other eleven submissions were sent to two to three external reviewers. The reviewers approved eight of them, a ratio of 73%. Of the thirteen articles published in this issue (including two already approved for publication but unable to be included in the previous issue), three were internal manuscripts, a ratio of 23%. A manuscript is considered internal if (1) its author is an editor or regular reviewer at the *Journal*, or (2) in the case of multiple authors, at least one of them is an editor or regular reviewer at the *Journal*.

---

Literature at National Taiwan University. By examining how the concept of “national language” has evolved over time, the four articles in this section aim to show how countries in early modern East Asia embraced the idea of *guoyu* as power struggle battleground, how “national language” and “nation” reinforced each other, and how they stimulated identification with the new “national body.” The first article, “Early Modern Japanese *Kokugo*” by Yasuda Toshiaki, associate professor at the Hitotsubashi University Graduate School of Language and Society, traces how the concept of “national language” (*kokugo*) took shape in Japan, from Mori Arimori’s claim that Japanese was an impoverished language that ought to be replaced by English to Ueda Kazutoshi’s assertion that national language, nation (*kokumin*), and people (*minzoku*) were one. Professor Yasuda explains the process by which nationalism elevated Japanese to “mother tongue” status and outlines how *kokugo* was historicized, standardized, spread to all classes, and used for colonial education. The second article is “‘National Writing’ in Enlightenment-Era Korea and the Conflict between Chinese Characters and Chinese Writing” by Mitsui Takashi, associate professor at the University of Tokyo’s Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Professor Mitsui outlines the evolving relationship between Joseon Korea and Qing China, from the “tributary period” to the “non-tributary period” following the First Sino-Japanese War, showing how the Korean movement to write mainly with Hangul (“national writing”) instead of Chinese characters (which played a merely auxiliary role) that began after the war was a way of repudiating the dominant-subordinate relationship between China and Korea and raising Koreans’ identification with their own “national body.” The third article is “People of History in Zhang Taiyan’s *Guogu Lunheng*” by Wang Feng, associate professor in the Department of Chinese Language and Literature at Peking University. This article reveals Zhang Taiyan’s

opposition to the hegemonic “new international language” of Esperanto, which he rejected because it contravened his belief in cultural diversity, the idea that even unequal cultures deserved equal treatment. With specific details and a deep understanding of historical context, Professor Wang explains how Zhang Taiyan saw language, both written and spoken, as a symbol of the rise and fall of a culture, and why he therefore saw the need to defend the Chinese language. The fourth and last article in this section is “Sound, Writing, National Body: The *Guoyu* Movement and Taiwan Literature in the Early Postwar Period, 1945-1949” by Professor Huang Mei-e of the Graduate Institute of Taiwan Literature at National Taiwan University. Taking Wei Jiangong as her subject, she outlines his advocacy for using Taiwanese dialect as a methodology for learning Mandarin (*guoyu*, or “national language”) and the various interactions between Taiwanese and Chinese literature that took place with that as a backdrop. As Professor Huang explains Wei’s desire to lead the people of early postwar Taiwan to re-evaluate the meaning of spoken and written Chinese by illuminating the cultural and political power behind them, she investigates the nationwide spread of the *guoyu* movement in early modern Taiwan. Together, the feature articles of this issue outline for the reader how the concept of “national language” changes according to the degree to which a nation identifies with itself (or another nation) and the evolution of a nation’s power structure. Hence, by examining the historical development of a country’s conception of “national language,” one can not only see traces of the mutual reinforcement of “nation” and “national language,” but can also observe East Asian countries’ sometimes competitive, sometimes cooperative relationship with modernity as well as how each nation defines the place of its own “national body” in the international order.

In the Research Articles section of this issue are two submissions.

---

First is “The Modernizing Process of the Circulation of Literary Conception: A Study on the Entry ‘Literature’ in the 19<sup>th</sup> and Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century English-Chinese Dictionaries” by Assistant Professor Tsai Chu-ching of the Department of Chinese Literature at National Taiwan University. By studying the compiling of Chinese-English dictionaries in the late Qing, Professor Tsai describes in rough terms the trend toward standardization of new academic and specialized terms and, with this as a foundation, explores the modernization of the notion of “literature.” The focus is on Chinese-English dictionaries compiled by Chinese intellectuals, particularly the 1908 *Ying-Hua Da Cidian* (“Comprehensive English-Chinese Dictionary”) edited by Yan Hui-qing. Professor Tsai observes how the system of knowledge dominated by the British Empire—as represented by the *Nuttall’s Standard Dictionary of the English Language*—entered late Qing China and, using the formation of the concept of “literature” as an example, explains the overall trend of new academic terms moving toward Western interpretations, forming a fundamental basis for early modern concepts. The second article is “The Concepts and Knowledge Pedigree of Oriental Studies in Prewar Japan” by Shao Hsuan-lei of the Department of East Asian Studies at National Taiwan Normal University. Employing genealogical methods, Professor Shao summarizes the evolution of the concepts and methods in the field, discussing how the construction of *tōyōgaku* (“Oriental studies”) enabled Japan to study China empirically. In addition, he points out that one of the qualities of Oriental studies as set up by Japan was to “other-ize” China, rendering it either an “object” of analysis or a “contrast” with Japan, two “idea pedigrees” that persisted after the war.

Two articles are featured in the Research Notes on Keywords section. First is “The Origins of ‘Imperialism’” by Chen Li-wei of Seijo University, Japan, which investigates the formation and spread of the concepts of

“empire” and “imperialism.” As Professor Chen points out, the classical Chinese word *diguo* was removed from its Chinese historical context and viewed as a translation of the Western word “empire” in early modern Japan. This was when the concept of “imperialism” was emerging; it spread to China almost immediately after reaching Japan, integrating China with world geopolitics. The second article is “The Origins of *Yeman*” by Professor Shen Guo-wei of the University of Kansai, Japan. He investigates the process by which the word *yeman* (“barbaric”) acquired its meaning and the related exchanges between Japan and China. As Professor Shen points out, *yeman* developed in the context of Western civilization and its view of history; when it spread to Japan, enlightenment thinkers like Fukuzawa Yukichi treated it as a concept opposed to “civilization,” a meaning the word retained. Later, it was exported to China, where it became a common Chinese word. The two terms touch on important topics like the “transfer” or “exchange” of early modern epistemological concepts between China and Japan. Beginning with the third issue of this journal, the Research Notes on Keywords section has been planned and presided over by Shen Guo-wei of Kansai University. Besides focusing on the formation of keywords and the conceptual meanings they encompass, the section will continue to publish “Origins” articles, mostly centered around written evidence, that investigate the process by which words are established. We hope that uncovering the origins of important early modern words will serve as a basis for further research in conceptual history.

In the “Old Articles, New Translations” section are two submissions, recommended by Professor Wagner at the University of Heidelberg. Because the first, “The Chinese Origin of a Romanticism” by Arthur O. Lovejoy, quotes the second, “A Note on Sharawadgi” by Y.Z. Chang (“Sharawadgi” was an important aesthetic principle of Chinese gardening during the

---

17th- and 18th-century cultural exchange with the West), we have chosen to publish both translations to help readers understand the relationship that scholars of the 1940s saw between European Romantic literature and Chinese gardening aesthetics. The first translation is by Assistant Professor Chen Shuo-win of the Department of Chinese Literature at National Chung Hsing University and Assistant Professor Yang Yin-hsuan of the Department of History at National Cheng Kung University, who jointly translated Arthur O. Lovejoy's "The Chinese Origin of a Romanticism" into Chinese. The article points out how the aesthetics of Chinese gardening and architecture may have inspired European romantics and morphed into a new aesthetic style of English romanticism. It would seem that this style revealed a different quality and higher level of beauty whose mystery lay in its irregularity, concealment of obvious construction, and sense of surprise. The second translation is a reworking of Y.Z. Chang's "A Note on Sharawadgi" by Professor Yang Yin-hsuan of National Cheng Kung University. It views the "Sharawadgi" mentioned in "Up in the Gardens of Epicurus," an early article by Sir William Temple (1628-1699), as a Chinese descriptive word or phrase distorted to some degree, concluding that *sa-luo-gui-qi* ("scattered, wonderful, strange") is the most likely origin.

Two articles are included in this issue's Research Newsletters section. The first is "Reconstructing the Historical Reality of Images in Conceptual History: A New Paradigm for Research in Early Modern Chinese Conceptual History" by Yu Hongliang of the Institute of History at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. He analyzes research on the Xinhai Revolution and the word *minzhu* ("democracy"), highlighting which new fields of inquiry, new techniques, and new methods are effective ways of reconstructing the historical reality depicted in images of conceptual history and can open up a new paradigm in the field. The next article is "Research

Trends in the Conceptual History of *Gukeo* in Korea” by Professor Lee Byeong-gi of the Department of Korean Language and Literature at Hallym University in Korea. Mainly it surveys the current state of research on *gukeo* (“national language”) in Korean conceptual history and points out the inextricable link between *gukeo* and Korean modernization. First it looks back at the way the modern concept of *gukeo* has been used in Korea, then it compares the characteristics and directions of “national language” research in Korea and China. Because *gukeo* developed in a unique historical context, the author concludes by suggesting that future research on the subject ought to aim for comprehensive explanation and interpretation.

It is our honor to announce that, as of Dec. 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012 this journal is the recipient of the “Grant for International Co-publishing Projects” by the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange (CCKF) with the maximum subsidy of the year. This grant, which in the past has been primarily awarded to book publications, is the greatest accolade yet awarded to the Journal of the History of Ideas in East Asia. We will continue to promote the advancement in the study of the history of idea in East Asia, thereby laying the groundwork for further breakthroughs in this field.

The publication of this issue owes much to the support of the scholars who contributed articles, the reviewers who took the time to comment on submissions, and the assistance of the entire editorial board. This issue’s Feature Articles section was planned and presided over by Professor Huang Mei-E of the Graduate Institute of Taiwan Literature at National Taiwan University; funding was provided in part by the Office of Research and Development and the Center for Humanities Research at National Chengchi University. To all of those involved, we offer our most heartfelt thanks.

*JHIEA* Editors 2012.12

(Translated by Nicholas Hawkins)