Politics?" (*Daedalus*, 1973). It is not cited and does not appear in the bibliography. Nor is there a single reference to Mardin in the chapter titled "Islamic Revivalism," an area of inquiry that he almost singlehandedly created. *The Politicization of Islam* treats my *The Well Protected Domains* (1998) similarly, using it exhaustively without reference. Karpat's discussions of decorations (*nişan*), the coat of arms (*arma-i Osmani*), the repair of Ertugrul's tomb as a *lieu de mémoire*, the use of official music, the presence in the World Fairs, the effort to prevent the acquisition of property in the Hicaz by non–Ottoman Muslims, and the effort to control the distribution and sale of the Qur'an appeared four years ago in *The Well Protected Domains*. He even repeats my mistakes, as in the reference to the cover of the Ka'aba, the *setre-i şerif*, (p. 230), misread as *sitare-i şerif* in both my first edition (although corrected in the paperback version) and in *Politicization of Islam*.

Another disturbing pattern is that a work often appears in the bibliography but is not addressed in the relevant section, or is summarily and inexplicably dismissed. In the section referring to Fuad Köprülü and his contribution to the development of Ottoman Turkish historiography, particularly his study of the early Ottoman state (p. 399), Cemal Kafadar's pathbreaking study *Between Two Worlds* is dismissed as a "summary" of the origins debate. When the author deals with the life and times of Ahçi Dede Ibrahim Halil (p. 313) there is no reference to Carter Findley's extensive treatment of him in *Ottoman Civil Officialdom*. For that matter, the author ignores Findley's work entirely in the section dealing with the reform of the bureaucracy, and his seminal *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire* does not even appear in the bibliography. Similarly, in the discussions of the rise of a national bourgeoisie and the accumulation of capital in the hands of the new middle class, Zafer Toprak's study *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat* is not engaged in any way, although he, too, appears in the bibliography.

The central point in Karpats' conclusion—that the "community" emerged as a "people" or *millet*—is extremely important. Nevertheless, even this point is not new. Much of what is presented as new in the book in fact derives from scholars such as Doğan Avcıoğlu and Mustafa Akdağ, who worked forty years ago. Other central points were already made by Şerif Mardin, Engin Akarli, Ilber Ortayli, and Ahmet Yasar Ocak, to name just a few. In short, a sense of *déjà vu*, perceptible perhaps only to those who know the literature, pervades the whole book.

SACHIKO MURATA, *Chinese Gleams of Sufi Light: Wang Tai-yu's Great Learning of the Pure and Real and Liu Chih's Displaying the Concealment of the Real Realm* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000). Pp. 278. $72.50 cloth; $24.95 paper.

REVIEWED BY ZVI AZIZ BEN-DOR, Department of History, Boston University

Sachiko Murata has given the growing field of Chinese Islamic studies a great gift and has made a major contribution to its future development. For the most part, scholars of Chinese Islam are trained in East Asian studies or Chinese history and at best have only secondary knowledge of Islam or of Islamic languages such as Arabic and Persian. Similarly, scholars of Islam generally have little interest in or knowledge of China. This is despite the fact that from as early as the late 7th century the two civilizations, the Chinese and the Islamic, have maintained vibrant economic, political, scientific, and cultural ties. Muslim settlements in China can be traced back to the 8th century, and the Muslim Chinese—the *Hui*—are today one of the largest "national" minorities in China.

Murata, a scholar of Sufism and Islam, is a real pioneer in this sense. She is commendable not only because she is one of the first scholars of Islam to venture into "Chinese" waters, however, but also because of the kinds of materials she studies. In *Chinese Gleams of Sufi Light*, Murata provides a translation of two works produced by Chinese Muslim scholars dating

or is there
quiry that
*Protected*
s of deco-
a *lieu de*
revent the
ontrol the
*mains*. He
*şerif*, (p.
paperback

is not ad-
e section
h histori-
athbreak-
When the
reference
at matter,
e bureau-
appear in
and the
*ürkiye'de*

eople" or
f what is
I Mustafa
f Mardin,
sense of
e book.

*the Pure*
ny: State

and has
Chinese
econdary
iolars of
hat from
ve main-
hina can
e of the

iendable
waters,
of *Sufi*
s dating

from the Late Ming and Early Qing dynasties (roughly 1640–1720), a period during which Chinese Muslim scholarship was particularly complex, informed as it was by multiple cultural strands. Chinese Muslim authors of the time were trained in the Confucian classics and used classical Chinese as their main form of expression. They were also, however, well versed in the major works of Sufi thought and Islamic jurisprudence that were available in China at the time (most had been brought to China from the Islamic west by their ancestors centuries earlier). As a result, Chinese Muslim writing of the period came to reflect an interesting, thoughtful, and wholly unique reworking of Islamic vocabulary in Chinese.

To appreciate the weighty problem of translating Western religious, theological, and philosophical terms into Chinese, one need only consider that Jesuit and later Christian missionaries in China spent more than 300 years trying to translate the word "God" into Chinese. Chinese Muslim scholars of the pre-modern period, and their modern translators, must tackle the same vexing problems. Murata's translation of two Chinese Islamic works, undertaken with the advice and assistance of Tu Weiming, a leading scholar of Confucianism, and with that of William Chittick, primarily a scholar of Persian Sufism, shows remarkable sensitivity and innovation in this regard.

The two translated works in *Chinese Gleams* are perfect selections for what one hopes will turn out to be the first in a series of translations of Chinese Islamic writing. The first of Murata's texts is an original treatise on Islam, the *Qingzhen Daxue* (Ch'ing-chen ta-hsueh), written by Wang Daiyu (Wang Tai-yü) probably in the 1650s. The second, the *Zhenjing zhaowei* (Chen-ching chao-wei) is a Chinese translation of the Sufi treatise *Lawā'ih* by 'Abd al-Rahman Jami (1414–92). In addition to the translations themselves, the book includes a Foreword by Tu Weiming and a new translation of the *Lawā'ih* from the Persian by Chittick. This translation is useful for comparison. Murata herself has also added introductions to the works and their authors, which expand on issues pertaining to similarities and differences between the neo–Confucian and Sufi terminology used by Chinese Muslim scholars. When necessary, Murata also refers to Buddhist and Taoist terminology.

The translations open a small window on to the intellectual world of 17th- and 18th-century Chinese Muslim scholars who embraced both the Chinese and Islamic traditions and managed to organize and fuse them in a coherent way. Wang Daiyu's *The Great Learning of the Pure and Real* is one of the founding texts of the Sino-Islamic textual tradition. That the author himself intended for it to be such a central text is clear in his title's reference to the *Great Learning*, a key Confucian text that was among the Four Books considered the most basic canon in the Confucian tradition. Wang's terms continued to be used by later Chinese Muslim scholars.

In this regard, Murata's role as a translator is almost as crucial as the original author's. Her choice of words is likely to be reflected in any future translations of related texts. Murata does a superb job of sticking closely to the text and reflecting many of its subtleties. At times her translations are too schematically close to the Chinese characters and thus seem a bit mechanistic. This is the case, for instance, with the term *Qingzhen* (Ch'ing-chen), "pure and true," which she renders as the "pure and real," a translation that has a somewhat awkward result when the term is used in other combinations. Another example is Wang Daiyu's sobriquet "Chen-hui lao-ren," which she translates as "The old man of the real Hui" and would probably sound better as "Elder of Islam." These, however, are mere minor matters, relevant perhaps to the pleasures and tastes of the eye and the ear but not to the critical brain.

The central text in the book, Jami's *Lawā'ih*, is a fascinating read. Chittick's new translation from the Persian appears page by page alongside Murata's from the Chinese. This format allows the reader to appreciate the work of the original Persian Chinese translator, Liu Chih, to see clearly how he chose to translate key concepts from the Persian into the Chinese, and see how the Chinese world of ideas and words in which he worked affected the translation. Consider,

for example, the third "gleam" (pp. 138–39) of the work. The translation from the Persian runs as follows: "The Real—glory be to him and high indeed is He!—is present everywhere, gazing in each state at the manifest and nonmanifest of all. What a loss—that you have lifted your eyes from His countenance and look at others! You have left the path of contentment with Him and pursue another road." In contrast, the translation from the Chinese, titled "Seeing the Tao," runs as follows: "The Real Lord is timeless and placeless, but He always looks at the inward and outward of the ten thousand things. Alas, you people do not see what he sees, but instead you see other things. You do not walk the Tao of the Real Lord, but instead you walk different paths."

Several differences are instantly evident, some of which have philosophical significance, and all of which stem from the move to the Chinese context. For instance, the omnipresent god of the first translation turns into a "timeless and placeless" divinity in the Chinese text. This probably occurs because the Chinese translator found it most logical to deploy the very common Chinese way of suggesting the nature of a thing by saying what it is not. In Chinese philosophical discourse this is accomplished through the particle 'wu,' first used in Daoist and Buddhist writings and later adopted by neo–Confucian writings. We can also see that the use of the term "placeless" is not a precise equivalent to the Western notion of the "boundless" God (although its meaning could be stretched to "omnipresent") because of the "but" that follows in qualification. Thus, in the Chinese text, God is timeless and placeless *but* always looks at the inward and outward ("manifest and nonmanifest" in the Persian translation to English) of the "ten thousand things." Similarly, the term "ten thousands things," in Chinese a code for "nature," is again borrowed from Daoist philosophical discourse.

Another striking difference between the texts is the substitution of the Persian "You have left the path of contentment with Him and pursue another road" with "You do not walk the Tao of the Real Lord, but instead you walk different paths" in the Chinese. In the latter, the "path of being content with Him" is translated with the much more weighty term "Tao of the Real Lord." Dao indeed means "path" or "way," but it hardly means just that. It refers also to the eternal principle of the universe (in Daoism) and of human conduct (in Confucianism). By using the notion of the "Tao of God," the Chinese translator thus chose both to expand on what was given by the Persian text and to remain intentionally vague and obscure as to what the "Tao of God" really means. These few examples are characteristic of the work as a whole and show that Murata's title, *Chinese Gleams of Sufi Light*, is a clever and appropriate one. The book constantly invites the vigilant and informed reader to engage in thought-provoking comparisons and reflections, and for those who are willing to put in the effort, it offers a fascinating intellectual experience.

ABDELMAJID HANNOUM, *Colonial Histories, Post-Colonial Memories: The Legend of the Kahina, a North African Heroine*, Studies in African Literature (Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2001). Pp. 235. $59.95 cloth.

REVIEWED BY ELLIOTT COLLA, Department of Comparative Literature, Brown University, Providence, R.I.

Abdelmajid Hannoum's *Colonial Histories, Post-Colonial Memories* is a fascinating study of the many inventions of the historical-mythical figure of al-Kahina, the Berber leader who is said to have stopped, for a brief moment, the advance of Muslim armies in the Maghrib during the 1st century A.H. Hannoum's account reviews a long series of debates about the figure of the Kahina, debates that have taken place in Arabic, French, Hebrew, and now English. As Hannoum notes, the Kahina to date has appeared as man, woman, eunuch, sorceress of the