the construction of a cable bridge in Sichuan. These sources would indicate that at least in the eyes of the Chinese historian, the Rites Controversy was a "marginal affair". All in all, the publication of primary sources up to the date of the conference has added relatively few elements to earlier publications. The recent translation of Manchu memorials (with Kangxi's comments), however, informs us much better about the reaction of the Qing administration.

The volume includes several contributions treating the "other" side of the story: the Dominican mission in Fu’an (J.E. Wills), the Figurist approach of J. Prémare (K. Lundback), the attempt to eliminate misunderstandings by A. de Beauvollier (J. Witek). They all show the variety of reactions and the complexity of the problem. Other contributions show the influence of the Controversy on the modern debate in the beginning of this century (J.D. Young) or problems similar in present day Catholicism in China (R. Madsen).

This volume and the conference devoted to the "Significance of the Rites Controversy" on which it was based do not render the final judgment on the Controversy, but open the way to a more fundamental reexamination of these issues in the future (p. 303).
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Bryna Goodman’s book has the express intent to highlight the role of native-place organizations in the build-up of modern Shanghai. She does so with all the skills of a social historian, drawing on a great variety of official and private Chinese and Western

---

7 E.g. the Kangxi chao hanwen zhupi zouze huibian 當朝漢文諸批奏折彙編, Beijing: Dang'an chubanshe, 1984–1985 (used by P. Rule, pp. 252, 254, 262) in comparison with Chen Yuan, op. cit.; see also the very few references (not based on official sources) for the same period in Fu, Lo-shu, A Documentary Chronicle of Sino-Western Relations (1644–1820), Tucson: Univ. of Arizona Press, 1966.

8 Kangxi chao manwen zhupi zouze quanyi 當朝漢文諸批奏折全譯, Beijing: Zhang-guo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1996; on de Tournon, see p. 418 ff.
sources. Generally, her arguments are fully convincing, not the least because of her thorough and elegant presentation. Distinctive native-place cultures brought in by immigrants were reproduced through a variety of social institutions and practices. They established *huiguan* to create a supportive environment in an alien city, as well as to assert symbolically the importance of their sojourning community. In many trades, there was an ethnic division of labour, in which native-place ties were decisive in recruitment of labour and the supply of raw materials and products. For that reason, there was little if any distinction between *gongsuo* or *huiguan*. The merchant-dominated *huiguan* built and operated cemeteries (particularly for the poor), halls and gardens for meetings and trade, hostels, temples, theaters and schools, all for their fellow-natives. Each native group cultivated its own cuisine, prostitutes, religion and theatrical performances. Goodman argues that for these reasons, other than what Rowe described for Hankow, a common Shanghai urban identity or ‘urban sphere’ did not arise until well after the turn of the century, and even then it was still dominated by native-place divisions. In any case, she finds a distinction between ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’ activities or duties in the *huiguan* somewhat misleading.

Goodman distinguishes several formative periods of Shanghai. In the decade after its opening up to foreign trade, Guangdong officials and merchants quickly rose to prominence as the intermediary group between the British and locals, and became (for a short time) the most powerful group. This was the ‘frontier’ period, characterized by a virtual absence of shared norms and effective rules, by opium and violence. 130,000 immigrants flocked in from Guangdong and Fujian, constituting half of Shanghai’s population. The period ended in the ‘Small Swords’ Society uprising, successful at first, but when the Fujianese and Cantonese rebels did not know how to consolidate their victory and the Fujianese wanted to go home, the rebels and the city became an easy prey for the Qing armies. In the second period, till the nationalist revolution, the *huiguan* were elite-run associations. They strove at representation of the interests of their communities. In the 1870s, a system of mutual accommodation developed between merchant groups and government officials by which *huiguan* and *gongsuo* gradually took on tax collection. This, in turn, increased their power to promote their own interests and exclude outside competition. Goodman’s perspective is rather one-sided; she does