

**** From the Editor ****

With this issue of *Sino-Japanese Studies*, the second number of our tenth anniversary issue appears in print, just as our tenth year of publication comes to a close. The impact of this journal may not be overwhelming, but it has nonetheless been significant. Every month or two another young graduate student writes the editor about a newfound interest in a topic of Sino-Japanese content, asking for leads, scholars of similar interests, or potential resources. What we do is no longer as odd as some may once have perceived it to be. Numerous topics remain scholarly desiderata, and the annual AAS meeting remains another important focal point for the exchange of ideas.

In this issue of *SJS* we present four pieces of work, two original articles and two seminal translations. The first essay, by Benjamin Wai-ming Ng, concerns a little known Chinese scholar of things Japanese from the late nineteenth century, Yao Wendong. Ng describes Yao's relationship to the Chinese consular missions in early- and mid-Meiji Japan, and he analyzes many of the works Yao left about Japan. Although Yao's compatriot Huang Zunxian, about whom Professor Ng published a piece in these pages several years ago, is much better known, Yao was far more prolific. Interestingly, neither Yao nor Huang ever learned Japanese, according to Ng.

The next essay by J. Timothy Wixted has a bit more of a polemical ring to it. He asks the penetratingly question: Why has the enormous corpus of Japanese writings in literary Chinese (*Kanbun*)--what he suggests we call "Sino-Japanese"--been relatively ignored in Japanese literary studies? He, of courses, provides some answers as he catalogues what little work has been done in this field in the West. As with Professor Wixted's earlier essay in these pages some years ago, this essay serves both as a scholarly essay and as a challenging thought piece.

We then move to Luke S. Roberts's translation of the "Introduction" to Watanabe Hiroshi's new book, *Higashi Ajia no ôken to shisô* (Tokyo University Press, 1997). Professor Watanabe conclusively demonstrates that much of the language that we use to discuss Japanese political institutions in the Edo period is anachronistic. Although the Sino-Japanese content of this piece is not immediately evident, further reflection will show that we have tended to impose a Chinese-style bureaucratic state onto Japan in our efforts to understand Edo-period institutions. According to Watanabe, it doesn't work.

Finally, we have the sixth installment of the ongoing translation of Ôba Osamu's major work, *Edo jidai no Nit-Chû hiwa*. This installment picks up where the previous one left off. It looks at the close attention Tokugawa Yoshimune paid to legal texts from China, the intense effort he had his house scholars put into translating and interpreting them, the coming of the *Da Qing huidian* to Japan, and a variety of related topics.