

on offer is an extremely (and perhaps, given its argument, excessively) detailed history of some aspects of the official functioning of a few figures within the Burma Railway during the first few months of 1942. Their tale is competently and clearly told. But one may wish for a railway history with more steam, and for a military history without all the expletives deleted.

doi:10.1017/S1479591420000534

The Way of the Barbarians: Redrawing Ethnic Boundaries in Tang and Song China

By Shao-yun Yang. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2019. Pp. 241. ISBN 9780295746029 (cloth); 9780295746036 (paper)

Yoshinobu Shino

Meiji University Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan, E-mail: shinoy@meiji.ac.jp

(Received 6 September 2020; accepted 6 September 2020)

The Way of the Barbarians elucidates the Chinese-barbarian dichotomy that prevailed during the reigns of the late Tang and Northern Song dynasties. The author, Shao-yun Yang, references numerous historical documents such as Han Yu's 韓愈 'Tracing the Way' (Yuandao 原道), commentaries such as the *Analects* (*Lunyu* 論語) and the *Annals* (*Chunqiu* 春秋) and other short manuscripts to describe the historical transformation of public opinion vis-à-vis barbarians. After Ge Zhaoguang 葛兆光 published a recent series of research results to which this book also alludes, defining China and describing the Chinese identity have become topics of robust scholarly debate. Yang's inquiry through the perspective of intellectual history enables readers to more accurately grasp such discourses about Chineseness.

In the first chapter, Yang asserts that Han Yu's "Tracing the Way" adopted an innovative manner of instituting an ethnicized orthodoxy by labelling Buddhism as a barbarian philosophy. It also inspired an ethnocentric moralism by indicating the possibility of barbarians being transformed into Chinese. According to Yang, annal commentators of the Tang dynasties such as Dan Zhu 啖助, Zhao Kuang 趙匡 and Lu Chun 陸淳 also suggested that customs and rites could transform barbarians into Chinese and vice-versa. However, Yang is doubtful of the direct influence exerted by these commentators on Han Yu.

The second chapter is devoted to a comparison of Han Yu and Liu Zongyuan's 柳宗元 texts in relation to their evaluation of Buddhism. Han Yu subscribed to the conventional critique that regarded Buddhism as a barbarian worldview. Liu Zongyuan censured Han Yu for assessing Buddhism solely by its traces (*ji* 迹) or appearances (*ming* 名) without contemplating its essence (*shi* 實). Yang complements this discussion with an allusion to a letter Wang Ling 王令 wrote in support of Han Yu's contentions. According to Wang Ling, Han Yu should have asserted that Buddhism was fundamentally incompatible with the very nature of Chineseness.

Yang next examines two short texts from the late Tang period to track the development of the discourse on the Chinese-barbarian dichotomy: Chen An's 陳黯 "Chinese at Heart" (Huaxin 華心) and Cheng Yan's 程晏 "A Call to Arms against the Inner Barbarian" (Neiyi xi 內夷檄). These two essays employ the rhetoric of appearances and hearts (essences) or the form-heart discrepancy to iterate that some people may be Chinese in physical form but barbarians at heart, and that others may be barbarians in name but Chinese at heart. According to Yang, moral barbarians are hence essentially Chinese and therefore "[t]his is an argument for moral universalism that is, paradoxically, couched in the

language of ethnocentrism” (p. 66). Yang implies that apart from borrowing the rhetoric from Liu Zongyuan, Han Yu also employed this argument in a few essays besides “Tracing the Way.”

Yang explains in Chapter 4 that Han Yu’s successors in Northern Song, such as Liu Kai 柳開, Shi Jie 石介 and Sun Fu 孫復 totally ethnicized Classicist orthodoxy and condemned both Buddhism and Daoism as heresy. Conversely, Ouyang Xiu 歐陽脩 and Li Gou 李覲 were categorized as “Guwen 古文 moderates” because scholars rejected ethnicized orthodoxy and preferred a revival of classical rites and customs over the repudiation of Buddhism.

In Chapter 5, Yang describes the decline of ethnicized orthodoxy after Han Yu and the ascendancy of ethnic moralism in the eleventh century. Liu Chang 劉敞 and Su Shi 蘇軾 exemplified this shift in the predominant viewpoint, which was more acceptable to Buddhists. The monk Qisong 契嵩, a contemporary of Ouyang Xiu, believed that the presence of morals determined whether individuals could be termed Chinese or barbarian. According to Yang, no eleventh-century *Annals* commentary employed anti-Buddhist rhetoric or made allegations of barbarianism against the religion.

Chapter 6 primarily explicates Cheng Yi’s 程頤 conception of Chineseness and barbarianism. Yang notes Cheng Yi’s interpretation of *Analects* 3.5 that was followed by Zhu Xi 朱熹 and thereafter became the standard perspective. Cheng Yi interpreted the article as follows: “The barbarians still have rulers, unlike the Chinese states that do not” instead of pronouncing the inferior status of barbarian states. Cheng’s concerns were not vested in the capacity of barbarians to become fully human but in the moral decline of the Chinese. In conclusion, Yang declares that “Daoxue’s rise to intellectual hegemony and orthodoxy in the South Song (...) did not encourage the development of a truly universal Classicist identity that placed the fundamental moral unity of human beings above ethnic differences”; instead, it strengthened “the myth of Chinese superiority” (p. 152).

The historical documents cited in this book are not unfamiliar to specialists. Thus, the preeminent characteristics of Yang’s contribution pertain to his successful and thorough investigation of texts relating to barbarians and his coherent exposition of the examined data. He makes an effective distinction between ethnicized orthodoxy and ethnocentric moralism to facilitate the reader’s comprehension of the historical development of the ideas relating to the Chinese-barbarian dichotomy. In addition, this book offers a substantial cache of information to readers interested in *Annals* exegesis or in the discourse of dynastic legitimacy.

Yang refrains from extending his purview to other scholarly domains to sustain his focal contentions. However, if he paid more attention to Han Yu’s literary ideas, it will enable to more activate the debate. Yang specifies that Han Yu used the form-heart discrepancy rhetoric in the “Valedictory Preface for Monk Wenchang” 送浮屠文暢師序 and in the “Third Miscellaneous Discourse” 雜說三 and that this technique became the model followed by future generations (p. 73). According to the author of this review, this rhetoric also forms the core of Han Yu’s literary methodology. When a disciple called Liu Zhengfu 劉正夫 asked him which literature of the ancient sages should be imitated, Han Yu responded that Liu Zhengfu should emulate the intentions of ancient philosophers, not their words. Han Yu also criticized the imitators of Zhang Xu 張旭, a famous calligrapher, for not comprehending his heart but merely following his traces. These ideas form Han Yu’s principle opinions on the manner in which ancient literature could be emulated. Guo Shaoyu 郭紹虞 has already indicated in his *History of Chinese Literary Criticism* 中國哲學批評史, first published in 1934, that Liu Zhiji’s 劉知幾 (661–721) conception of how to write history preceded Han Yu’s literary methodology. Liu Zhiji rejected the mere imitation of appearance without echoing of the heart of the normative historiographies and recommended that the emulating their essential elements should be favoured over style when describing facts without decorating them. This discipline was also applied to the approach of writing the history of barbarians. According to Liu Zhiji, if historians used traditional elegant expressions to describe events concerning barbarians, they would fail in their task of recording the facts. Instead, historians should adopt the language of barbarians to remain loyal to the traditional spirit of the straightforward recording of history even if the articulation is superficially different from the classical manner of expression. Liu Zhiji’s example indicates that the form-heart discrepancy rhetoric is compatible both to the discourse of ethnocentric moralism and to discussions of ethnicized orthodoxy.

As Yang has demonstrated, the rhetoric of the form-heart discrepancy was even used by Buddhists such as the monk Qisong who severely criticized Han Yu. It is pertinent at this juncture to cite another example of a Buddhist who venerated Han Yu: Zhiyuan 智圓 (976–1022). In his “Discussion on imitating Han Yu” 師韓議, he implicitly adopted Han Yu’s logic to imitate the intentions of sages rather than their words. He iterated that Buddhists who desire to imitate Han Yu should devote themselves to Buddhism just as Han Yu devoted himself to Confucianism. Unlike Liu Zongyuan’s censure of Han Yu or Wang Ling’s cross-examination, Zhiyuan derived from Han Yu’s text the logic that Buddhist belief is congruent with attempts to imitate Han Yu. Therefore, the instance of Zhiyuan evinces that the form-heart discrepancy rhetoric is also an efficient means of reconciling Han Yu and Buddhism. Further research initiatives probing the form-heart discrepancy rhetoric will enrich scholarly discussions on the conceptualization of barbarians, which this book clearly outlines from a historical perspective.

As a final note, apart from its productive historical context, Yan Shao-yun’s study offers valuable exemplars of how communities can accomplish reconciliation with Others.

doi:10.1017/S1479591420000595

Kyoto’s Renaissance: Ancient Capital for Modern Japan.

Edited by John Breen, Maruyama Hiroshi, and Takagi Hiroshi. Folkstone: Renaissance Books, 2020. 254 pages. Hardcover, £65.00. ISBN 978-1-898823-92-6.

Harald Fuess

Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, Germany
E-mail: fuess@hcts.uni-heidelberg.de

Kyoto has come to epitomize authentic Japanese historical culture and is one of the world’s most well-known tourist destinations. Kyoto is now imagined as the place where Japanese tradition is preserved in contrast to modern cosmopolitan conglomerations like Tokyo and Osaka. Kyoto is also not perceived as a marginal historical town like Nara or Takayama. It seems to have found a third path between the destructive vitality of the modern age and the stifling restraints of backward-looking nostalgia. Many tourists come in search of the elegance of a former imperial age. They discover Golden and Silver Pavillions and a park with walled enclaves where emperors once resided. Numerous temples open to visitors also tell the tale of their founding legends, such as their historical support by some emperor or high-ranking court family. Kyoto indeed exudes antiquity. Little is made of the fact that in 1864 a fire devastated most of the town and what we see today as typical for Kyoto has largely been crafted since the Meiji Period. In short, Kyoto not only is a modern construction physically, but may even be so in the very way people have insisted on constructing Kyoto’s antiquity. The contribution of this edited volume is to sketch the early modern to modern transition of Kyoto during the first decades of Meiji when it was in search of a distinctive identity and purpose in the emerging urban landscape of a modernizing state. In the Introduction, the editors give a comprehensive overview of Western scholarship on Kyoto and introduce the most important Japanese urban histories. They show how the overwhelming academic interest in the town has been focused on the times leading up to the Edo period, while few scholars so far have examined modern Kyoto.

In the first part of the book, three seminal scholars of Japanese religion and national ritual ask how Kyoto found its unique place as a site for performing the nation. If anything else, the Meiji Restoration should have benefitted the very location that had hosted the emperor around which the modern nation