

Turfan Basin.⁵ One might add that to a certain degree Uyghurs inherited the administrative systems brought by the Tang Dynasty to Turfan.⁶ Also, the city Solmī, identified by the author as Sayram (p. 100), is actually a Turkic name for 焉耆 Yanqi (= Qarašahr).⁷

It was regrettable to find quite a few misunderstandings of historical fact and misinterpretations of Chinese texts, examples being: (p. 66) the Uyghur kingdom of 甘州 Ganzhou was in fact conquered by the Xixia 西夏 Kingdom; (p. 70) the Uyghur Empire *did* defeat the Tibetans at Beiting around 790 AD to put the Tianshan area including Gaochang under their control until their westward migration⁸; the author's translation of a sentence from Dashi's biography, 有謀略, 爲國人所信服 as, "Dashi had a plan to make his fellow countrymen submit [to the Mongols]" (p. 86) should be corrected to "Possessing rich wisdom and strategies, Dashi had been trusted by the countrymen"; (p. 110) Liaowang 遼王, whom Sergius 撒吉斯 served as a tutor, was not a Qara-Qitay king but Temüge-Otçigin, whose descendants were given the title Liaowang; (p. 174) the author's translation of a phrase from Qara-Buqa's eulogy, 少有志, as "[Qara-Buqa] has seldom been written about" should be corrected into "[Qara-Buqa] was high-spirited in his boyhood", and 延祐設科今六舉, 公六孫舉輒中一人 should be rendered as "since the civil-service exam system was established in the Yanyou era until now the exam has been carried out six times, and in every exam one of his six grandsons passed"; and *Gan-er-han* 幹耳汗 is a typo for *wo-er-han* 斡耳汗 < Mong. *Orqon* "the Orkhon River" (p. 187). Even though most of these oversights are not serious, collectively they might reduce the reliability of the work.

The author also might have benefitted from referring to a work by Umemura Hiroshi⁹ and a recent one by Hsiao Ch'i-ch'ing.¹⁰ Umemura clarifies the marital connections between the Uyghur families, suggesting they made efforts to retain Uyghur identity. Hsiao treats many more *semuren* families whose members attained the *jinsi* degree while introducing their cultural background.

Contrary to the author's modest self-declaration that his volume is merely a case study, in fact it abounds with intriguing arguments. I expect that it will draw a response from researchers working in a variety of disciplines such as the cultural history of the Turkic, Mongolian and Chinese peoples, diaspora studies, and sociology.

Situating the Uyghurs Between China and Central Asia.

By Ildikó Bellér-Hann, M. Cristina Cesàro, Rachel Harris and Joanne Smith Finley, eds. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007. Pp. 276. ISBN 10: 0754670414; 13: 9780754670414.

Reviewed by Masami Hamada, Kyoto University

E-mail masami.hamada@bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp

doi:10.1017/S147959140900028X

Until the early 1980s, Xinjiang/East Turkestan studies were isolated and unpopular, and the number of specialists very limited. The "open-door policy" of China changed that situation drastically. Many

-
- 5 See, e.g., Moriyasu Takao, *Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße*, Wiesbaden, 2004, pp. 149–51.
 - 6 Matsui Dai 松井太, in *Tulufanxue yanjiu: di er jie Tulufanxue guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* 吐魯番學研究：第二屆吐魯番學國際學術研討會論文集, Shanghai, 2006, pp. 196–202.
 - 7 Geng Shimin 耿世民 and Zhang Guangda 張廣達, in *Lishi yanjiu* 歷史研究 1980–2, pp. 147–59.
 - 8 Moriyasu, *Geschichte d. uig. Manichäismus*, op. cit., pp. 33–34, fn. 94.
 - 9 Umemura Hiroshi 梅村坦, in Y. Nagata and M. Matsubara, eds., *Isuramu sekai no hitobito 3: bokuchikumin* イスラム世界の人々 3・牧畜民. Tokyo, 1984, pp. 109–49.
 - 10 Hsiao Ch'i-ch'ing 蕭啓慶, in *Han-hsüeh yan-ch'iu* 漢學研究 [Chinese Studies] 18:1 (2000), pp. 101–28.

young students who were attracted to this region were able to enjoy study sojourns on sites that had been closed to foreigners not just since the “Great Cultural Revolution” but, ironically, also from the time of that region’s “liberation” in 1949. Since the 1990s these researchers have begun to publish the results of their fieldwork-based studies, thus inaugurating a major shift in research trends from historical approaches toward orientations anthropological and sociological.

This volume, one of the recent titles in the series of *Anthropology and Cultural History in Asia and the Indo-Pacific*, is comprised of a preface by the series editors, an introduction, and twelve articles originally presented at a conference held at SOAS in November 2004. Invited speakers each were asked to respond to four questions, one might say, by “substituting oneself for the Uyghurs”: (1) To what extent can the Uyghur population be described as part of China and/or part of Central Asia? (2) How far has successive Chinese rule succeeded in extricating the Uyghurs from the Central Asian cultural context and integrating them into China? (3) Have the Uyghurs now developed characteristics that render them “culturally autonomous” from both Central Asia and the People’s Republic? (4) To what extent may Uyghurs be described as “culturally hybrid”? Or, rather, do they negotiate dual or multiple identities that shift and change according to social and political contexts? Reasonable questions all, except that the notion of researchers somehow speaking “on behalf” of the Uyghurs might come off as orientalist. The questions also posit a primarily tripartite scheme of the Uyghurs being caught between Central Asia and China.

Almost all of the participant authors modulate their discourses so respectfully to harmonize with this scheme that I dare say (echoing what Laura Newby says about her article) many take a sledgehammer to crack a nut. For example, after due consideration of the danger of providing apologists of Chinese cultural and political hegemony with new material, Ildikó Bellér-Hann (“Situating Uyghur Life Cycle Rituals Between China and Central Asia”) discusses the beliefs and ritual practices of the ancestor cult among Uyghurs, other Central Asians and the Chinese. The result of her studies, that “The similarities between Uyghur and Chinese are of general sort . . . Much more striking is the congruence of Uyghur and Central Asian practices,” may come as a comfort to some, but for those already somewhat familiar with the history of Islam in Central Asia this insight will not arrive as big news.

As to the motive behind “situating Uyghurs,” the editors of the volume explain that it “seeks to bridge a perceived gap in our (their) understanding of this group, which too often has fallen between two regional traditions of scholarship on Central Asia and China.” This assertion of a “gap” may cause readers a little disquietude, in that Xinjiang/East Turkistan studies by their very nature require a bi-/multi-disciplinary formation of specialists. Judging from their references, the volume’s contributors, with the exception of two native Uyghur scholars and Rachel Harris, are clearly divided into two groups, Chinese language users and Uyghur language users. Even a historian whose concerns lie exclusively with pre-Qing times would be recommended to acquire competence not only in Turko-Persian philology but also basic knowledge about the Chinese sources. This would apply even more to those who want to embark upon the periods on and after the conquest by Qing. Put more broadly, works accumulated over the last several decades in this field, chiefly concerned with history (many fine volumes among them) aptly demonstrate that multi-disciplinarity is the axiom of Xinjiang studies. The gap perceived by the editors might be bridged tentatively by collaboration between, for example, the two groups of conference participants, but striving for a vantage point that offers a panoramic view of all available materials remains essentially the task of each individual researcher.

Laura J. Newby (“Us and Them” in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Xinjiang) shows persuasively that in spite of the absence of an ethnonym, the people of Altä Shähär during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in fact shared a sense of community. Although her discussions based on the concrete Chinese documents are highly appreciated, she still might be able to find more eloquent

materials in sources written by the Turki-speaking Muslims, who, after all, are the more appropriate ones to be discussing their identity. According to these materials, the notion of the territory *Moghul kishwar wa Kashghar zamin* existed firmly, and a sense of community was closely related to affiliation with local sufi orders. Among the inhabitants of this region, sometimes the sense of community was rather more diverse than universal. The famous ‘Abd al-Qādir Dāmullā, for example, recognized his neighbors in the East, the people of Aksu, as “strongly influenced by Chinese civilization,” and excluded them from being counted among his people, who were influenced by the authentic Islamic civilization of the Farghana valley.¹

Hereafter I will have to be brief with each article. Ablet Kamalov (“The Uyghurs as a Part of Central Asian Commonality: Soviet Historiography on the Uyghurs”) offers a very useful general view on the development of *uigrovedenie* in Russia and the Soviet Union, placing emphasis on the issue on ethnogenesis. As the title of his article indicates, he pays no attention to the tripartite scheme.

Nathan Light (“Cultural Politics and the Pragmatics of Resistance: Reflexive Discourses on Culture and History”) relies on the analysis of some individual cases to demonstrate the ticklish negotiations that take place between the traditional artists, mainly musicians and local political powers, such as Säypidin Äzizi, who, in turn, must negotiate with the tough authorities superior to them. I hope the author will continue to study the activities of Säypidin, who was willing to invent the history intended to defend and canonize an ethnic culture.

Through detailed comparison, Rachel Harris (“Situating the Twelve Muqam: Between the Arab World and the Tang Court”) argues decisively that various Central Asian *maqām* traditions are primarily local, oral traditions, and, further, that claims of the long continuity with the music of the Western Region lack evidence. She also observes that applied Arabic terminology caused the original modal meaning to be lost. In spite of its title, her article rises above the tripartite scheme and dispels the foregone, fanciful arguments on the origin of the Uyghur twelve *muqām*.

Michael Friedrich (“Uyghur Literary Representation of Xinjiang Realities”) investigates modern Uyghur poetry, a topic rarely taken up even by those interested in Uyghur culture. He introduces his chapter with pieces from two poets, a panegyrist of the actual régime – Foucault’s complicitous subaltern? – and an anti-establishment/individualist refugee. He well observes that the poets’ respective styles – the former’s traditional fixed form and latter’s prose poetry – match the realities that each conceived. In the last part of the chapter the author argues that the Uyghur’s historical westward orientation has been replaced by a circuitous propagation of European influences via Beijing. In order to deepen analysis of this very interesting issue, one inevitably must examine the nature of the “Chinese lens” through which Uyghur intellectuals view European literature. In this case again, competence in more than one discipline is required.

Two Uyghur scholars furnish vivid reports of deplorable difficulties inflicted upon Uyghur culture by Chinese hegemony. Āsād Sulayman (“Hybrid Name Culture in Xinjiang: Problems Surrounding Uyghur Name/Surname Practices and their Reform”) provides a detailed insider view on the debates concerning the reform of Uyghur name and surname practices. The standardized system proposed by Uyghur specialists resembles that of Turkey and would appear to be very reasonable. The reluctance of the central authorities to grant approval to this proposal likely indicates their repugnance to a system that does not adopt Chinese. For Uyghurs as well as for other non-Han minority citizens of the Republic, a crucial difficulty rests upon the Chinese transliteration of their names, the practice of which is compulsory for official documents. Rahilä Dawut (“Shrine Pilgrimage and Sustainable Tourism among the Uyghurs: Central Asian Ritual Traditions in the Context of China’s

1 For a discussion of this topic, see my article, “Le sufisme et ses ‘opposants’ au Turkistan oriental,” in *Islamic Mysticism Contested: Thirteen Centuries of Controversies and Polemics*, ed. F. de Jong and B. Radtke. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 1999, pp. 546–47.

Development Policies”) reports the extent to which the juggernaut of covetous Chinese capitalism exploits Xinjiang resources. In order to turn a profit, Han-Chinese tourism companies and developers have contracted sacred sites or even bought the development rights of whole villages, including the shrines. At the same time, local authorities place restrictions on true religious pilgrimages on the basis that such activities are equivalent with Islamic militancy.

Because the topic of Islamic militancy is squelched by government censorship, we know very little, but Edmund Waite (“The Emergence of Muslim Reformation in Contemporary Xinjiang: Implications for the Uyghurs’ Positioning Between a Central Asian and Chinese Context”) casts some new light. He explains the emergence and the expansion of Islamic reformism, and how its challenges against popular or local religious practices occasionally align with the political authorities’ restraints against those same practices. As Dawut says, the Chinese state does not distinguish militant reformism from local Islam.

M. Cristina Cesàro (“*Polo, Lāghmān, So Sāy*: Situating Uyghur Food Between Central Asia and China”) treats what genuinely can be called hybrid aspects of Uyghur culture, the subject of cuisine. She accurately notes that, “the boundaries of a cuisine, like those of an ethnic group, are not static but constantly shifting and undergoing a process of redefinition.” Thus, her studies of several culinary practices, ranging as they do from concrete recipes to the nostalgic emotions cooking evokes, provide a very interesting portrayal of actual Uyghur culture. On the Uyghur table today side by side appear national dishes and Chinese dishes, the latter of which Uyghurs have adopted through processes of active selection and reinterpretation. To what extent can current Uyghur cuisine be symbolic of Han-Uyghur coexistence?

Sean R. Roberts (“The Dawn of the East”: A Portrait of an Uyghur Community Between China and Kazakhstan”) provides detailed information on the daily life of an Uyghur community of Kazakhstan, a former-kolkhoz named *Zarya Vostoka*. The discussion includes a description of the community’s negotiation for autonomy. The author argues that in the absence of an Uyghur nation state, both national consciousness and national ideal are produced and reproduced in small communities.

A common feature of colonial policies is to educate indigenous children in the suzerain’s language. In Xinjiang, Chinese schooling forced upon the region by Qing local authorities after its re-conquest provoked furious backlash among the Turki-speaking people. They discriminated against schoolboys as apostates.² Joanne Smith Finley (“Ethnic Anomaly or Modern Uyghur Survivor? A Case Study of the *Minkaohan* Hybrid Identity in Xinjiang”) analyzes the problem of Chinese schooling in modern times, presenting a very interesting case of an Uyghur woman who, although herself educated in the Chinese language, sent her daughter to a national school. Despite the fact that she and those, like her, who are educated in Chinese, have been regarded by other Uyghurs as anomalous, the author implies that their choice may be the unique measure needed to survive the current social and political conjuncture. Recently in Xinjiang, the local government decided that higher education must be carried out only in Chinese and that native professors who do not equip themselves with sufficient competence to teach in Chinese must quit their posts. The bilingual project promoted by authorities entails education in Chinese and, secondly, in English, not Uyghur. Given such a scenario, Smith Finley’s implication may be accepted as a possible choice, but only with bitter resignation.

In the conclusion of this volume, the editors recognize that the tripartite scheme carries with it inherent limitations. The scheme may be an efficacious starting point for giving order to complex phenomena, but we must remember that our final goal is to understand holistically the Uyghur realities, diverse or even confused as they may be. Ultimately these are entities that resist efforts to colate them into neat methodological configurations.

2 See my article, “La transmission du mouvement nationaliste au Turkestan oriental (Xinjiang).” *Central Asian Survey* 9:1, pp. 29–32.