

Frederick Winslow Taylor and Norbert Wiener. Based on a strong knowledge of early modern East Asian materials, Woodside develops his argument through the concerns of the earlier literati and the foci of modern scholars. Yet, as he follows the historical development of meritocratic bureaucracy in the three mandarinates, he might have paid more attention to the strong administrative formation of the early Ming and its direct impact on Chosen Korea and Le Vietnam.

As Woodside discusses the textual and intellectual basis for the activities of the earlier scholar-officials, we see how strongly they felt they could influence human society, working as the state's agents to improve the lives and welfare of the population. But, through the centuries, they also recognized the problems that the system brought with it – first, the potential gap between bookish and real; second, following from the first, the difficulty of mobilizing the population; third, the maintenance of esteem among officials in their competitive world. Over the past millennium, scholars across East Asia continued to write on and discuss the vulnerabilities they perceived therein.

The central message Woodside delivers so well in his inimitable style is: It is surely time to recognize, and to examine closely, what these scholar-officials have been saying to us, their “centuries of critical self-consciousness” (p. 86). The problems that worried them, members of their meritocratic bureaucracies, shed light as well on modern concerns. As Woodside notes, it is “a past with unmistakable echoes of the present” (p. 112), and from it we must consider “the multiple sources of the modern” (p. 115). And so the three mandarinates have much to teach us.

*The Dao of Muhammad: A Cultural History of Muslims in Late Imperial China.*

By Zvi Ben-Dor Benite. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005. Pp. 400, 8 figures. ISBN 0-674-01774-9.

**Reviewed by Takashi Kuroiwa, Musashi University, Tokyo**

E-mail [cookie-1@lily.ocn.ne.jp](mailto:cookie-1@lily.ocn.ne.jp)

doi:10.1017/S1479591407000605

Focusing on the period between the seventeenth and eighteenth century in China, Zvi Ben-Dor Benite discusses the identity of Chinese Muslims through an analysis of the Islamic education of Chinese Muslims held in mosques (*jingtang jiaoyu* 經堂教育) and of the *Han kitab* (Islamic writings in traditional Chinese) written and published by Chinese Muslim Scholars. The core analysis indicates that Chinese Muslim identity was established simultaneously as both Muslim and Chinese and this simultaneity was the result of “the extended understanding” of the category “literati” and of the cultural elements of being Chinese. Based on this analysis, the author examines the flexibility of Chinese cultural categories of the time and questions the meaning of being Chinese in late imperial China. In this regard, this book follows the “genealogy” of the historiography cultivated by the scholars listed in the introduction – Pamela Crossley, Evelyn Rawski, and Mark Elliott.

The first chapter reviews the formation of the Islamic Educational Network consisting of various elements, depending mainly on the descriptions given in the *Genealogy of Classical Learning* (*Jingxue xi chuanpu* 經學系傳譜) written by Zhao Can. Examples of these elements show a strong degree of overlap between kinship and discipleship in the master–pupil relationship, the standardization of texts, the participants’ consciousness of being members of an established educational tradition and genealogy, and various sorts of constituency of the network. The author points out that as the network, which originated in Shaanxi, expanded east during the seventeenth century, its center moved from northwestern cities like Xi’an to eastern regions such as Shangdong and Jiangnan. The author also indicates that the network took its final shape especially in Jiangnan, where it flourished in terms of numbers of students and teachers. The author’s analysis thus implies that the formation

of the network itself as well as participation in the network provided the core constituents of Chinese Muslim identity.

The first half of the second chapter reviews the roles of Chinese Muslim scholars. Among those roles, that of a translator – not just a literary translator of specific Islamic classical works but also a translator of Islam itself into Chinese society – was crucial. Furthermore, the author stresses that the activity of translation created a new Chinese Muslim body of knowledge, a form of local knowledge that was simultaneously both Muslim and Chinese. Quoting anecdotal descriptions from *Genealogy*, the author also examines the values required of scholars in the Chinese Muslim literati society – erudition, humility, pedagogy, community-mindedness and skills such as a powerful memory. Through his examination, the author underscores the functional importance of memorization: “Chinese Muslim identity as simultaneously Chinese and Muslim was forged in part through memorization of large chunks of material from both the Chinese and the Islamic settings.” The latter part of the chapter analyzes the contents and form of the *Genealogy* of Zhao Can. Here, the author examines the self-perception of Chinese Muslim scholars of Zhao’s period, saying that Muslim scholars understood themselves as belonging to the social category of “literati” or *shi* 士, and that this understanding was a result of their reinterpretation of the word “literati” into the more general terms, as “learned man.” The author also suggests that Zhao’s decision to write his work in the form of a genealogy, which was originally the exclusive instrument of Han Confucian elites for legitimating orthodoxy, corroborates the expanded understanding of the category “literati” and those cultural elements which determined being Chinese.

Chapter Three focuses on key figures in each of the three groups associated with the *Han Kitab*, the translator, the original author and the supporters (broadly speaking, patrons, editor and publisher). In the author’s view, the *Han Kitab* “were the result of conscious and intensive cooperation and correspondence” and that “all *Han Kitab* were based on dialogues with other *Han Kitab* and its author and were published with some sort of legitimation or support from the broader Chinese Muslim Literati community.” The author also points out that they were not isolated from non-Muslim intellectual surroundings. This interconnectedness of Chinese Muslim scholarship, he holds, arose from both physical and mental levels and in each case, the instrument of consolidation was the Chinese Muslim educational networks. As a result, interaction within the educational network became a manifestation of Muslim identity “as that identity was understood and propagated by Chinese Muslim intellectuals.”

In Chapter Four, the author discusses how Chinese Muslim scholars realized their identity of being simultaneously Chinese and Muslim as they deployed their strategy to connect the Chinese Muslim tradition to Chinese culture. The author compares strategies of “self-inclusion” of Chinese Muslims with those of their Chinese Christian contemporaries. Recognizing the similarity between Chinese Muslims and Chinese Christians in the way they negotiated their identity *vis-à-vis* Confucian intellectual culture, the author emphasizes that Chinese Muslims went one step further than their Christian counterparts. “Muslims aimed to show their teaching was a part of” Confucian tradition whereas “Christians aimed to show that their teaching was not contradictory to” that tradition. The substance of the strategy deployed by Chinese Muslim scholars, the author suggests, was best displayed in the way they read Muhammad into the Chinese tradition. Muslim Chinese scholars defined Muhammad as a “sage” (*shengren* 聖人), which is the central category of Confucian scholarship, and argued that Muhammad was the first link in the chain of the transmission of knowledge. Through this extended understanding, they successfully put their Islam within the Confucian tradition.

This book is truly unique in that it not only clearly demonstrates that Chinese Muslims were an essential part of Chinese society through its examination of Chinese Muslim identity, but also gives a new perspective on what being Chinese meant in late imperial China. But there are also several points which cannot be easily accepted, which I would like to outline. First, the author

argues that the center of the Chinese Muslim educational network moved from the Shaanxi area to the east. But, as Gao Zhanfu has pointed out, Shaanxi maintained its status as the center of Muslim education (*jingtang jiaoyu*) until the middle of the nineteenth century and it was only after this time that it relinquished its status to Huzhou.<sup>1</sup> Gao's contention is corroborated by documents concerning Chinese Muslim communities between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries.<sup>2</sup> The author also mentions Yunnan and Canton were cut off from the Chinese Muslim educational network. Nevertheless, an examination of inscriptions from the same period indicates that the author has not fully taken into account the distinctive character of the *Genealogy* as historical material. As Tatsuya Nakanishi has pointed out, the *Genealogy* was written, and supported by, certain scholar groups such as the one established by Chang Zhimei 常志美 in Shangdong (The school of Zhao and his teacher She Qiling 舍起靈 belonged to, or at least stemmed from, this group) and has the characteristic of illuminating the conduct of renowned scholars (*mingshi* 名師) within the groups.<sup>3</sup> Thus, there is no guarantee that the *Genealogy* has covered Chinese Muslim scholars in detail and there is every likelihood that opposing groups could have been excluded. Moreover, the scholars listed in the *Genealogy* are limited to those whose whereabouts were all well known to She or Zhao, so it is not surprising that many entries concern scholars in the Eastern Chinese coastal area where they were active.<sup>4</sup>

It is also a matter of regret that the author has overlooked the fact that within the areas where the Muslim education network had spread, the writing and publishing of *Han Kitab* was an extremely distinctive phenomenon limited to the urban cultural environment of the Eastern Chinese coastal area. In Shaanxi and Gansu, other areas where the educational network also flourished, Muslim intellectuals tended to avoid learning classical Chinese and since they did not actively write *Han Kitab*, the specific notation of *xiao-er-jing* 小兒錦 or *xiao-jing* 小經 began to form. An approach that attempts to understand the inner psychological world of Chinese Muslims by examining the *Han Kitabs* on Islamic thought and philosophy can further develop the author's analysis. I look forward to his next work.

*Understanding Canton. Rethinking Popular Culture in the Republican Period.*

By Virgil Ho. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. Pp. 528 pages, 16 pp. halftone plates. ISBN-10 0-19-928271-4; ISBN-13 978-0-19-928271-5.

**Reviewed by Xavier Paulès, University of Tokyo**

E-mail [lingnan99@hotmail.com](mailto:lingnan99@hotmail.com)

doi:10.1017/S1479591407000617

Cantonese social history during the Republican period has until recently clearly been a field overshadowed by studies devoted to politics (such as those by Chan Ming Kou and Michael Tsin). Yet Canton was not only the “cradle of Revolution” but also, as Virgil Ho points out at the beginning of

- 
- 1 Gao Zhanfu. “Yisilan Jingtangjiaoyu yu huizuishhui de Guanxi” (The Relationship between Islamic Mosque Education and Hui Society). Xian Islamic Culture Studies Society, ed., *Islamic Culture Studies*. Ningxia, 1998, p. 105.
  - 2 Takashi, Kuroiwa. “Gaku to kyō: kaimin hōki ni miru Shindar musurimu shakai to chiikisō” (Xue and Jiao: The Diversity of Chinese Muslim Societies Observed in the Muslim Rebellion 1862–1878). *Tōyō gaku* 86:4 (2004), pp. 105–08.
  - 3 Nakanishi, Tatsuya. (The Discourse on the Shaykh in Chinese Islamic Literature and its Background). *Tōyōshi kenkyū: the Journal of Oriental Researches* 61:3 (2002), pp. 8–18.
  - 4 Nakanishi, Tatsuya. “Shohyō: Zvi Ben-Dor Benite cho The Daot Muhammad” *Chūgoku isuramu shisō kenkyō* 2 (2006): 21–22.