

## Editorial

With this issue of *Early China*, we have instituted several changes of format. First of all we have acknowledged that we do not appear in the Fall of every year but rather at the conclusion of the academic year. Thus this number and those which succeed it will be identified with academic years. We have introduced two new sections: "Translations" and "Research Notes." In the first we will publish English versions of articles which are of special interest to our readers but which originally appeared in languages not generally accessible. Our "Research Notes" will be relatively short pieces which represent the most current ideas and methodologies in our field. In earlier issues, works designated "Articles" were of this sort. But articles in *Early China* 3 and this issue are rather lengthier and more thoroughly documented efforts. We plan to continue this trend.

*Early China* 4 demonstrates again that our "newsletter" has become a major forum for the study of pre-Han and Han China. The article on the Han "cosmic board" by Donald Harper is an important contribution to our understanding both of Han cosmology and of the concrete objects and devices used by the ancient Chinese to express their religious and cosmological beliefs. The theme of cosmology is also the subject of Professor Kroll's work on Sang Hung-yang and the Yen T'ieh Lun. It shows amply that one can barely scratch the surface of ancient Chinese political and administrative theories without uncovering fundamental notions of the cosmos. Ancient cosmology and how its study helps us to understand recently excavated artifacts are also the subject of Edward Schafer's note on "A T'ang Taoist Mirror." (It is not the policy of *Early China* to accept for publication scholarship which treats the post-Han period, but we have made an exception in this case. Professor Schafer's observations proved to be so congruent with those made by Messrs. Harper and Kroll, his discussion of the artifact so important to our understanding of similar Han mirrors, and his work was executed with such delightful grace, that it would have been our loss not to have published it.) *Early China's* contribution to the study of Shang oracle-bone inscriptions continues with our publication of the debate between Ken Takashima and David Nivison. Careful reading of Takashima's article (which is a response to one by Nivison published in *Early China* 3) and of Nivison's rejoinder will reveal that we have set out in our pages an important dialogue on fundamentally different approaches to transcribing and deciphering the Shang language. The Research Notes by Chang Tai-ping, Michael Carson, and Robert Henricks are other important contributions to epigraphical studies.

The publication of *Early China* 4 was greatly aided by a generous grant of \$1500 from the Center for Chinese Studies of the University of California at Berkeley. Production and the handling of subscriptions were facilitated by office space given us by the Institute of East Asian Studies at Berkeley. We are, however, far from solvent and are attempting to raise funds for an endowment which will insure the appearance of future issues of our publication. We have already received donations from many of our subscribers. We thank those who have sent us contributions and, quite frankly, we hope to receive more.

For their special efforts toward the publication of this issue we must thank many friends. Ken Takashima's translation of the *Shigaku zasshi* summary of Japanese scholarship remains the backbone of our bibliography section. Donald Harper and David Nivison donated their time in preparing the camera-ready copy. Miko Somers showed exceptional care in typing the manuscript and in gracing its pages with her calligraphy.

