EDITOR'S WORDS

As the editor of the Journal, I would like to make two notes on the “form” and “content” of the current issue, both of which are related to some distinguishing features of the Journal. As for its “form”, this issue consists only of two research articles together with one essay on recent work. Since the formal establishment of the Journal via its debut issue earlier this year, we have received a substantial amount of submissions. As the journal quality is top concern, and as a strict peer-review procedure has thus been implemented whether a submission is unsolicited or not, only few have been accepted. As a non-profit academic journal not published by a commercial press with paid subscription, the Journal does not have a commitment to quantity; the Editorial team is free to publish as few articles as are judged to meet a high standard of quality. However, on the other hand, this procedure does not just mean the negative harshness to authors who submit their work; rather, the Journal has endeavored to have the review procedure constructive and positive: we have tried our best to provide constructive feedback and useful concrete comments to the authors of all those submissions that passed the pre-review inspection and went into the peer-review procedure, whether or not they were accepted. With consideration that all the relevant work is based on editorial team members’ and referees’ voluntary work without financial compensation due to the non-profit nature of the Journal, this is not easy but we strive to contribute to the healthy development of the profession through this kind of constructive service to our colleagues.

As for its “content”, the two research articles in this issue are respectively concerning philosophy in Islam and early Buddhist/Indian logic; one essay is on recent work on Confucianism and virtue ethics. One prominent feature of the essays appearing in the Journal lies in their philosophical relevance in view of their emphasis on constructive engagement of distinct approaches. Indeed, one *prima facie* reaction to articles whose topics are outside a scholar’s own “focus” tradition (whether it is Western philosophy, Chinese philosophy or some other) is a sort of “it is irrelevant to my research”. Such an attitude might be appropriate if the articles’ basic emphasis is merely on history instead of philosophy, and when the researcher’s primary interest is in historical description instead of doing philosophy. However, one of the shared features of the articles included in this journal lies in its philosophical-relevance emphasis and thus they are intrinsically relevant to the philosophical interest and inquiry of philosophy scholars and students, no matter which specific traditions they study (e.g., Chinese or Indian philosophy) and no matter which style of philosophy they instantiate (e.g., analytic or “Continental” philosophy), given that they work on issues and topics under examination in the journal articles. For a philosopher would

be intrinsically interested in distinct approaches to the issues and topics under her philosophical (instead of merely historical) examination and in their reflective relation to her current working approach, whether or not she takes some other distinct approach also as her (current) working approach, which may be related to her training/specialty background, personal research interest or the need of the current study. In this sense, and to this extent, the Journal via its published articles is to distinguish itself both by its a “global” concern with comparative philosophy and constructive engagement of all philosophical traditions, which is neither limited to the East-West dialogue nor to the analytic-“Continental” engagement nor to the Greek-style *nous* alone (or the Chinese-style *dao* alone), and by its foregoing “local” concern with the published articles’ significance and relevance to *philosophical* studies of any *ad hoc* philosophical tradition, due to its emphasis on philosophical engagement on a series of issues and topics that can be jointly concerned via appropriate philosophical interpretation. Indeed, the two concerns are so closely related and thus jointly addressed in the Journal.

Bo Mou
June 2010