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A compilation of the papers from two thematic conferences held in 2007 and 2008 respectively, this two-volume work, *East Asian Studies of the Analects* 東亞論語學, is a significant contribution to the studies of the East Asian commentarial and scholastic traditions on this core Confucian classic. With its first volume dedicated to the Chinese tradition and the second to the Japanese and Korean traditions, this work effectively merges two recent academic streams—the studies of the *Analects* and the transnational, Sinosphere studies—and as a result opens a new vista of “East Asian Studies of the Analects” with its dynamic and interactive dialogues.

Since the beginning of the 21st century, a number of important books focusing on the *Analects* and its commentarial tradition have emerged, but most of them focus on the Chinese tradition alone. Meanwhile, Sinosphere studies have been growing fast, and remarkable works exploring the interaction between East Asian cultures have also sprung up. The editors of this work announce that their goal is “to open up a perspective in East Asian studies of the Analects, in order to demonstrate this classic’s position as the common denominator of East Asian Confucian studies” (Preface, ii), and they indeed go beyond the
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confinement of nationalistic and ethnocentric research by applying the approach of Sinosphere studies to extend the scope of discussion from China to the continual, complex cross-cultural interactions between the Confucian hermeneutical traditions in China, Korea, and Japan.

To achieve this goal, the editors and authors explore a series of well-designed, innovative themes. One of these themes is to describe the historical development, transformation, and implication of Confucian’s image and Confucian ideal character presented in East Asian hermeneutical traditions. For example, in their chapter titled “Confucian Image in Tibetan Culture 西藏文化中的孔子形象,” ZENG Deming 曾德明 and LIN Chunyu 林純瑜 examine plentiful records related to the figure KONG Ze 孔澤 in Tibetan texts of early period, Bön religion, and Buddhism, and describe how the Tibetan people built upon Confucius’ image and story transferred to Tibet and created their own image of the sage. XU Xingwu’s 徐興無 chapter studies Confucius’ image as a mysterious sage and uncrowned king constructed by Han 漢-dynasty apocryphal texts and indicates that this image implies important beliefs of synthesizing official classical learning, common culture, and religious beliefs in the Eastern Han. By answering the question why Neo-Confucian scholars chose YAN Hui 頭恆 and ZENG Dion 曾點 as the ideal characters, YANG Rubin 楊儒賓 chapter reveals the Neo-Confucian values of treasuring human life and humanity. CHEN Lisheng's 陳立勝 chapter examines the discussions on the concept of yong 勇 (courage) as seen in the Analects by Confucian scholars of different historical periods from pre-Qin 秦 to the modern times. PAN Zhaoyang’s 潘朝陽 chapter describes Confucius’ changing fortunes in modern times and the reconstruction of his image by representatives of New Confucians, including XU Fuguan 徐復覲 (1902–1982), TANG Junyi 唐君毅 (1908–1978), MOU Zongsan 牟宗三 (1909–1995), and LAO Sze-Kwang (Lao Siguang) 勞思光 (1927–2012).

Another notable theme and contribution of the two volumes is to discover and use previously overlooked sources either to do new research on East Asian studies of the Analects by well-known Confucian figures such as ZHU Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200), LI Huang 李滉 (1502–1571), ITO Jinsai 伊藤仁斎 (1627–1705), or OGYU Sorai 萩生徂徠 (1666–1728), or to discuss works by previously neglected Confucian scholars, including several Japanese and Korean scholars such as SUZUKI Akira 鈴木一 (1764–1837), KATAYAMA Kenzan 片山兼山 (1730–1782), and KIM In-Jong 金仁存 (d. 1127), who contributed considerably to the annotation of the Analects.

Another refreshing approach of the work under review is that some chapters discuss those works that interpret the Analects from the perspective of religion. For example, GONG Jun 龔俊 examines Zhixu’s 智旭 (1599–1655) commentary on the Sishu 四書 (Four Books), which used Buddhist ideas to interpret the Confucian classics for the purpose of integrating Buddhism into Confucianism. ZHONG Yunying’s 鍾雲鶯 chapter explores how several believers of the Yiguandao 一貫道 interpreted Analects 1.1 from their religious angle, demonstrating the transformative process of religious interpretation of Confucian classics and its implication. In his chapter titled “Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy 正統與異端,” CHANG Kun-chiang (ZHANG Kunjiang) 張崑傑 compares the religious implications in the commentaries to the Analects by two Taiwanese scholars, LI Bingnan 李炳南 (1890–1986) and NAN Huaijin 南懷瑾 (1920–2012). Li tried to integrate Confucian ideas into Buddhist beliefs, while Nan freely used Buddhist and Daoist concepts to interpret the Analects.

In addition to these fresh and important themes, the two volumes also apply comparative and transnational approaches to discuss the similarities and differences among East Asian Confucian scholars, in terms of their elaborations of the ideas and values contained in the Analects. CHEN Zhaoying’s 陳昭瑛 chapter, “Humaneness and