

Project Title: **Negotiating Modern Sino-Muslim (Hui) Subjectivities, 1900-1960: Reforming Islam in China**

Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Hubert Seiwert and PD Dr. Markus Dreßler, Universität Leipzig

1. State of the art and preliminary work

This project focuses on negotiations of Chinese Muslim subjectivities from the last years of the Qing dynasty to the first decade of the People's Republic of China (PRC). While scholars of Islamic studies have considered the impact of political and religious projects such as colonialism, nationalism, religious reformism, and traditionalism on the formation of modern Muslim subjectivities in general, the formation of Chinese Muslim subjectivities has been granted little attention. Equally, empirically grounded attempts to integrate the case of Chinese Muslims into the debate on Islamic responses to and appropriations of modernity are scarce. To start filling this gap, which is of both historical and political interest, this project focuses on the ways in which Sinophone Muslims responded to domestic political pressures and globalizing identity projects as they formed modern Sino-Muslim subjectivities during the first half of the twentieth century. In this period, Chinese Muslims were not only affected by political and intellectual transformations in China, but were also influenced through transnational Muslim networks by political developments and intellectual debates in other Muslim regions. It is this tension between local Islamic traditions and reinvigorated claims of Islamic uniformity and universalism that was a driving force in the articulation of modern Muslim subjectivities.

Sino-Muslim debates in the period in question were intimately related to political discourses among Chinese intellectuals about the modernization of Chinese religions, the integration of non-Han minorities, and the Kuomintang's (National People's Party, KMT) assimilationist tendencies. The Sino-Muslim debates constitute an early yet formative response to a disciplining agenda that in recent years has gained new political significance with the Communist government's policy of "Sinicization of Religions" (*zongjiao zhongguohua*), which involves maintaining strict control over religions, including restrictions on many Muslim symbols and expressions of Muslim identity (Vermander 2019). While Western observers have paid particular attention to the policing of Uighurs in Xinjiang, this is just one extreme manifestation of the Chinese state's management of Muslims in modern China and its associated involvement in the negotiation of modern Muslim subjectivities, which also affects Muslims of other ethnicities. Sinophone Muslims (hereafter "Sino-Muslims") constitute the largest Muslim ethnicity in China, where they are identified as *Huihui minzu* (or, abbreviated: *Huizu*), i.e., Hui ethnic-nationality.

Unlike the Uighurs in the far-western region of Xinjiang, Sinophone Muslims have been an integral part of Chinese society for centuries. As they are dispersed over the whole country, they are rather heterogeneous in terms of dialect, social and cultural background, and affiliation with different strands of Islam. While Sino-Muslims have maintained their religious confession, they have also assimilated into Han-Chinese culture in many respects. Some Sino-Muslims held high offices in the imperial administration or made significant contributions to Chinese philosophy and literature. From the late nineteenth century, Sino-Muslims were increasingly affected by certain modern forces that began to make an impression on China, such as nation-building, minority identification, secularism, civilizational competition, and the domination of scientific rationality and market economy. In the twentieth century, these modern challenges engendered intense debates on the position of Chinese Muslims in the new nation state and the question of how to adapt Islam to the modern condition.

Existing scholarship focuses on negotiations of Hui *identity* and ethnic-cultural boundaries in debates shaped by modern categories such as “religion” and “ethnic-nationality” (*minzu*), and their political effects at the level of the state (Cieciura 2016; 2014a; Lipman 1998; Gladney 1996; 2004; Wang 2017). This project will build on these foundations by analyzing Sino-Muslim debates on the reform of Muslim *subjectivities* as advocated by Hui elites in their print culture during the first half of the twentieth century.

Sino-Muslim subjectivities

We have chosen the notion of Muslim subjectivity as analytical key term for this study. Our interest in subjectivity as an analytical category was influenced by the work of Michel Foucault, who has, in successive works, paradigmatically elaborated on the interplay between “technologies of domination” and “technologies of the self” as key aspects of “governmentality” and the formation of modern subject positions (Foucault 1983; 1990; Jung and Sinclair 2020a, 96; also Kelly 2013). It has been argued that the disciplining of the subject (mind, affect, and habitus) was central to modernization projects and a global phenomenon (Asad 1993; Pernau et al. 2015). Subjectivity can thus be understood as the disposition of the social subject to relate and respond to others, including coercive forces, through episteme, sensibilities, and habitus.

In the last two decades, in the wake of postcolonial and poststructural approaches, scholars of Islam began to discover subjectivity as a useful tool to address the intersection of political and social constraints with individual agency in the negotiation of identity and selfhood. New and alternative approaches to research on Islam in the modern context were advanced (Mahmood 2012; Schielke 2009; Amir-Moazami, Jacobsen and Malik 2011; Mittermaier 2012; Jung, Petersen and Sparre 2014; Jung and Sinclair 2020b), which unsettled earlier, more static epistemologies based on Eurocentric and modernist assumptions. These new theoretical perspectives help us understand that the formation of modern Sino-Muslim subjectivities was driven both by external political pressure and internal motives of self-reform. Modern Sino-Muslim subjectivities had to reconcile commitment to Islam with the demands of the modern state.

Assimilating Sinophone Muslims

State attempts to discipline the “mind, affect, and habitus” of Chinese Muslims have recently become salient with the full-fledged “Sinicization of Religion” policy that was initiated by the current Chinese Communist Party (CCP) leadership in May 2015 (Xinhua 2016). As part of this policy, the concept of *zongjiao* (religion) has been narrowed down to a supposedly stable core of basic Islamic doctrines and practices. Anything beyond that religious core, including that which was previously seen as *minzu* culture, is susceptible to being “sinicized,” that is, nationalized and thus homogenized (Pittman 2020). The Islamic Association of China issued a Five-Year Action Plan for the “Sinicization of Islam” (*yisilanjiao zhongguo hua*) in 2019 (see Zhongguo yisilan xiehui 2019). This includes directives to entirely reshape Muslim identity in line with national modernist needs: foreign intellectual influences are to be removed as far as possible, a modern national aesthetics and ethos enforced in relation to bodily practices and architecture, and linguistic practices monitored to the detriment of the use of Arabic script and the languages that depend on it – especially Arabic, Persian, and Uighur. These policies assume a unidirectional adjustment of Islam to contemporary Chinese society, taking the view

that certain modern “Islamic” values – patriotism, equality, inclusivity, thirst for knowledge, balance of the immanent and the transcendent, and respect for women – can be translated into Chinese socialist modernity.

While the present disciplining of Muslim subjects by the state and the CCP’s repressive policy towards religions in general are quite evident, it is easy to overlook the fact that the endeavor to produce modern Muslim subjects is not a recent development, nor is it confined to the Communist state. The values selected by China’s Islamic Association, the concepts involved, and the disciplinary methods proposed are not unprecedented. Indeed, some are genealogically linked to policies and Sino-Muslim reformist discourses in the first half of the twentieth century. Transforming the mind and body of nationals was fundamental to the modern Chinese civilizing project (Messner 2015). Despite this, academic literature has barely touched upon the contested creation of a modern Sino-Muslim minority subjectivity. So far, scholarship that addresses important aspects of what we conceive of as Sino-Muslim subjectivity focuses mostly on either late-imperial normative Islamic practices (Brown 2019; Frankel 2017; Tontini 2016) or entails contemporary ethnographies on various aspects of Hui culture (Erie 2016; Jaschok and Chan 2009; Gillette 2000; Allès 2000).

Identity politics from a historical perspective

In his discussion of Sino-Muslim identities, Lipman points to the gap between etic representations within the hegemonic discourse on nation and ethnicity (*minzu*) on the one hand and the more multifaceted emic “expressions of identity” resulting from “individual and collective decisions” (Lipman 1998, 224) on the other. Identity is a key term that permeates contemporary Western scholarship exploring plurality in the history of Sino-Muslims. In his foundational works on Sino-Muslim history, Lipman highlights diverse adaptive responses that Sino-Muslims developed when dealing with assimilationist forces in various contexts (1996; 1998). In their respective accounts on the Panthay Rebellion 1856-1873, Atwill (2006) and Ma (2017) argue that Yunnan Sino-Muslim identity was based on an ethnic consciousness that was distinct from their religiosity, and that no similar expressions of Sino-Muslim identity were found among Hui of other parts of China. Yao (2004), on the other hand, argues that an “ethnic consciousness” emerged among Sino-Muslims already prior to the Panthay Rebellion, encapsulated in the concept of *Huihui zuguo* (native land of Huihui). Ben-Dor Benite (2005) historicizes the *Han kitab* tradition, which connects an Islamic with a Chinese literary identity, by pointing to the scholarly networks and culture that enabled it. Elsewhere, he demonstrates how this Chinese, yet distinctly Islamic identity of Sino-Muslims was made possible in the pluralist context of the Qing era (Ben-Dor Benite 2017). Most recently, by drawing attention to conceptual and social differentiations, Lee (2019) highlights the break between late and post-imperial identifications of the Hui in China.

The rise of secular nation-state politics brought a paradigm shift to the identity politics of Sino-Muslims. A nationwide field of identity politics emerged, where Sino-Muslim elites were able to negotiate their identity with non-Muslims, the Chinese state, also reacting to global discourses and powerful Western concepts that reshaped the field. The debate about the religious and ethnic character of Muslims in China as a whole and Sino-Muslims in particular was enabled and mediated through the modern concepts of *zongjiao* and *minzu*, which had been adopted from Japanese as translations of Western concepts (cf. Meyer 2013). Chinese intellectuals considered the distinction between politics and religion as essential for the survival of the nation in a world dominated by imperialism. Such propositions can be found in the first

modern Sino-Muslim journal, *Islamic Awakening (Xinghui pian)* (Yu, Lei and Li 1992 [1908]), that was published by students in Japan four years prior to the establishment of the Republic of China.

After the Republic was established, the debate on Chinese Muslim identity was connected to the central government's attempt to consolidate control over China's western frontier, including Xinjiang/East Turkistan. More and more non-Muslim Chinese intellectuals saw a need to produce knowledge about frontier populations, including Muslims (Jenco 2019). At the same time, many Sino-Muslims were arguing that they constituted a unique group distinct from both the Turkic Muslims and non-Muslim Han people. Progressive Sino-Muslim elites rejected the KMT's assimilationist discourse and argued in favor of granting the Hui communal rights. The CCP recognized the Hui's ethnic-national status in 1943 in an attempt to gain support from Muslims after its experiences in the northwestern region during the Long March (Cieciura 2014b). In her discussion of Sino-Muslim identity during the early republic, Eroglu Sager (2020) highlights the post-war constitutional crisis of 1946, during which Sino-Muslims, even the previously conservative pro-KMT religious elites, developed a strong voice advocating a *minzu* status or at least the rights attached to it – such as educational subsidies and a parliamentary quota.

Negotiating their place within Chinese society, Sino-Muslims had to clarify their relationship with the secular state and non-Muslims, and find ways to accommodate their internal heterogeneity. From the late nineteenth century, printing press and steam travel allowed Sino-Muslims to participate in global Muslim networks. They were thus familiar with the knowledge production of Muslims abroad and engaged with Orientalist discourses (Chen 2018; Mao 2011). Chinese Muslims travelled as pilgrims to the holy places of Islam (Tsai 2017), and as students to Egypt, Turkey, the Indian subcontinent, and Southeast Asia, where they were exposed to a dizzying variety of interpretations of Islam. The influx of knowledge from the external Muslim world influenced Sino-Muslims' views of themselves as a community and in relation to the outside world (the state, other communities, other Muslims). For instance, Kemalist secular nationalism was interpreted by some Sino-Muslims as a form of modern Islamic reformism that should be adopted in China to strengthen nation-building and the modernization of China (Eroglu Sager 2016; Mao 2016).

Despite its transnational perspective, existing scholarship largely confines discussions of Sino-Muslim identity politics to the areas of Chinese nation-building, the formation of religious and ethnic institutions, and their relation to state modernization. With our analytical focus on subjectivity, we want to deepen the analysis of Sino-Muslims not primarily as objects, but as agents of various competing modernization projects, including that of Islamic reform in the larger context of local/national religious reforms in China. It is imperative to situate new articulations of Sino-Muslim subjectivities in the context of the reshaping of the religious field of modern China. As Goossaert and Palmer (2011) briefly discussed, the innovations in Chinese Islam during the first half of the twentieth century have parallels in other Chinese religious communities. All of them were under the influence of global processes such as the circulation of knowledge on “comparative religion” (Jansen, Klein and Meyer 2014) and an emerging consciousness of global interconnections due to increased international travel (Chia 2020). However, beyond pointing to general parallels with developments in other religions in China, our knowledge of the role of Sino-Muslims as agents within modern Chinese discourses on religion is still rather limited.

1.1 Project-related publications

1.1.1 Articles published by outlets with scientific quality assurance, book publications, and works accepted for publication but not yet published

- Dressler, M. 2015. "Historical Trajectories and Ambivalences of Turkish Minority Discourse." *New Diversities* 17 (1): 3-20.
- . 2013. *Writing Religion: The Making of Turkish Alevi Islam*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Dressler, M., M. Wohlrab-Sahr, and A. Salvatore, eds. 2019. "Islamicate Secularities in Past and Present", special issue *Historical Social Research* 44 (3).
- Seiwert, H. 2017. "Wilde Religionen: religiöser Nonkonformismus, kulturelle Dynamik und Säkularisierung in China". In *Religiöse Minderheiten und gesellschaftlicher Wandel*, ed. E. Franke, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 11-27..
- . 2016. "Ancestor Worship and State Rituals in Contemporary China: Fading Boundaries between Religious and Secular." *Zeitschrift Für Religionswissenschaft* 24 (2): 127–52.
- . 2015. "Religiöser Nonkonformismus in säkularen Gesellschaften." *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 23 (1): 35-66.
- . 1987. "On the Religions of National Minorities in Context of China's Religious History." In *Ethnic Minorities in China: Tradition and Transform*, ed. T. Herberer. Aachen: Rader, 41-51.
- . 1987. "Religion und kulturelle Integration in China: Die Sinisierung Fujians und die Integration der chinesischen Nationalkultur." *Saeculum* 38 (2-3): 225-65.
- . 1981. "Religious Response to Modernization in Taiwan: The Case of I-Kuan Tao." *Journal of the Hong Kong Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 2: 43–70.

1.1.2 Other publications

- Dreßler, M. 2019. "Modes of Religionization: A Constructivist Approach to Secularity." 7. Working Paper, HCAS "Multiple Secularities - Beyond the West, Beyond Modernities." Leipzig.

2 Objectives and work program

2.1 Anticipated total duration of the project

Expected total duration of the project: 3 years (36 months). Project commencement: April 2021.

2.2 Objectives

General objectives

To bridge the gap between scholarship on late-imperial and contemporary Sino-Muslim subjectivities, this project examines four early twentieth-century domains in relation to which modern Sino-Muslim subjectivities were formed and negotiated. The four domains are as follows: 1) shifts in religious sensibility from Sufi knowledge and speculative philosophies towards rational scripturalism accompanied by ritual minimalism and standardization; 2) the creation of a modern habitus and episteme through modern education; 3) gendered piety and bio-medical bodily knowledge; 4) material and commercial relations in the context of the modern market economy. We consider these four domains to be particularly illustrative of the endeavor to form modern Chinese Muslim subjects.

The primary aim of the project is to reconstruct the evolution of debates in the Republic of China (1912-49) related to these four domains in order to achieve a better understanding of the formation of modern Sino-Muslim subjectivities and the agency of Sino-Muslims in this process. As a side product, we will gain new perspectives on current conflicts between the PRC and Chinese Muslims. With this in mind, the project will analyze the four domains through three major sets of questions:

1. Semantics: What were the guiding arguments that structured the four domains and what were the stakes that shaped them? How were they related to transnational conceptual developments and intellectual currents on the one hand, and sociopolitical contexts in early twentieth-century China on the other?
2. Networks: How widely and continuously were certain prescriptive discourses on subjectivity transmitted throughout Sino-Muslim print networks and non-Muslim intellectual discussions? Were there regional differences, for instance, between different coastal hubs

and intellectual centers in western China? How did regional specificities affect negotiations of the four domains?

3. Impact: Did the novel discourses and subjectivities developed by Sino-Muslims inform other Muslim, non-Muslim, or state discourses and (institutional) repertoires?

By engaging with the historical discursive formulation of modern Sino-Muslim subjects, this research links to scholarship on religious-ethnic minority politics, secular sensibilities, episteme, and embodiment in the early stages of nation-state formation within and outside China (Dressler 2013; 2015; Goossaert and Palmer 2011; Van der Veer 2014). In particular, it relates to scholarship on modern reformist discourses of Muslim minorities on the periphery of the “Muslim world,” such as those in Russia and the Balkans (Meyer 2014; Davies, Wessel and Brenner 2015; Dierks 2020). The aim is to situate the Chinese case in a transnational comparative framework.

While there is increasing international criticism of China’s recent treatment of Uighur Muslims, and, by extension, other Muslims and religious adherents, our knowledge of the role of Sino-Muslims in Chinese modernity is still rather limited. Given the importance of China as an international power that maintains important economic, technological, social, and political ties with the EU and Germany, improving our understanding of the historical role of Muslims in the modern Chinese context is not only of academic concern, but also highly relevant for informed and effective engagement with China on human rights issues as highlighted in *EU-China – A Strategic Outlook* (2019).

Specific objectives

The four domains listed above translate directly into the structure of the project:

Domain 1: Shifts in Religious Sensibilities

Based on examination of the Sino-Muslim journal *Yuehua* and fieldwork in northeastern China, Matsumoto (2006; 2016) suggests a shift from Sufi philosophies to scripturalism that related to rationalization and secularization in the early twentieth century. Through minimization and standardization of rituals across communities, twentieth-century Sino-Muslim reformers argued for reforms of embodied religiosity (Ma 2014, 223-32; Zhong 2013; Wang 2011). Reformist attempts to intervene in rituals generated different responses among various segments within Sino-Muslim communities, such as locally trained traditional imams on the one hand and politically active Hui youth with a secular education on the other. In the context of increased inter-religious dialogue, mostly at venues or occasions initiated by Christians, with representatives from other Chinese religions, doctrinal discourses on Islam flourished (Ma 2014, 338-67; Liu 2011; Ma 2009). In this context, we would like to investigate how newly formed modern subjectivities were understood in relation to traditional religious dispositions and practices. Which mechanisms of “secular translation” (Asad 2018) informed the adaptation of modern concepts such as religion (*zongjiao*), culture (*wenhua*), or customs (*xisu*)? To which extent were these new discourses and semantics apologetic reactions to Christian missionary influences, secularist attacks on “superstition,” Chinese nation-building, and transnational Islamic revivalism? How were they related to simultaneous developments among other Chinese religions?

Domain 2: Toward a Modern Habitus and Episteme

Education and socialization are crucial sites for the formulation of Muslim subjectivities (Bowen 2012). Early twentieth-century Sino-Muslim elites strongly advocated educational reforms (Ma 2014, 232-58). However, scholarly discussions of the period focus more on the creation of new educational institutions than on the reform of the subjects taught in those institutions (Allès 2003; Allès, Chérif-Chebbi and Halfon 2003; Aubin 2006). Sino-Muslim reformers, the Chinese state, and non-Muslim intellectuals treated education as an area for producing modern Muslim subjects that were good Chinese citizens. Educational philosophy pertaining to subject formation was a frequent topic in Sino-Muslim print texts of this period. Although there were not many disputes among Hui reformist elites with regard to the idea that modern education was the only way to position Sino-Muslims as agents within the nation-building projects of China, educational reforms were still discussed fervently. Sino-Muslim elites tried to convince the broader Muslim population and traditionally trained Islamic clerics that modern education was not blasphemous and Chinese national consciousness not a contradiction to Islam. Following the May Fourth Movement of 1919, anti-religious sentiment dominated the Chinese intellectual scene, and tension increased between Islamic reformists on the one side and secularly educated Hui and state officials on the other on the need for Muslim religious knowledge to be included in modern schools. One example of a complaint levied against secular schools can be found in the important Islamic journal *Yuehua*: how, the writer asks, can a pupil understand the truth of science without understanding the truth of religion (An 1931)? Another major issue of educational reform was language education. Sino-Muslim writers – negotiating with the KMT and the Japanese occupation government – had a wide range of views on this subject from entirely rejecting Chinese to demanding that Chinese replace Arabic and Persian, with more moderate positions demanding use of both of Chinese and Arabic (Ding 2006; Hammond 2015). We need a better understanding of the pedagogical and didactic knowledge available to the activists of this period. How did pedagogical discourses conceptualize the formation or disciplining of modern Muslim subjects in relation to institutional innovations? How did non-Muslim and Muslim discourses on education relate?

Domain 3: Gendered Piety and the Body

Sino-Muslim print culture was dominated by men. Nevertheless, the issue of female piety and the role of family in creating modern Muslim subjects became key issues in Sino-Muslim writers' responses to the increasing secularization of Chinese society, challenges by Christian missionaries, and Han prejudices against Muslims. Some of the Sino-Muslim journals, including *Yuehua* (China Crescent) and *Tianfang xueli yuekan* (Islamic Thoughts Monthly) published special issues devoted to topics such as female piety, marital practices (Liu 2013b), and youth education. In debates about female piety, for instance, positions ranged from emphasizing the traditional female role of housewife to advocating liberation from “feudal” Islamic gender oppression (Liu 2013a). We are interested in how different understandings of Sino-Muslim piety, especially female and youth piety, were articulated in relation to China's modernization project. How did Sino-Muslim conceptualizations of gender and family issues respond to state policies on gender, family, and the body? The body, as a site where scientific knowledge translates religious purity into modern hygiene, was crucial for the formulation of a modern Sino-Muslim subjectivity. Chen (2018, 195-227) shows that bio-medical narratives played an important role in the ethnicization of twentieth-century Sino-Muslims. The project will build on this perspective and ask how such narratives, against the background of the role of public health as a key factor

in the modernization of China (Bu 2017), informed discourses on the modern disciplining of the Muslim body.

Domain 4: Material and Commercial Relations

The emergence of the modern market economy in late-Qing and Republican China (Faure 2016) significantly altered social relationships. Chinese Muslims were actively involved in trade and business and accordingly affected by economic changes (Peng 1993, Yang 2013). Tracing the changing meanings of *qingzhen* (“pure” or “halal”) on advertisements, Brown (2014) argues that an increasingly homogenous (ethnic) understanding of Sino-Muslims emerged within the republican market. This does not mean that the economic perspectives of Sino-Muslims were unaffected by the outside world, however. In 1930, for example, Egyptian Islamic reformer Rashid Rida issued a fatwa at the request of a Guangzhou Muslim, in which he addressed the problem of Muslim engagement with the modern capitalist market and its reliance on interest (Halevi 2019). The Japanese authorities imagined Muslim international trade networks and markets as potential means to subvert the global capitalist market and, therefore, supported the development of Sino-Muslims’ business, educational and other institutions (Hammond 2015; 2020). How did Sino-Muslim elites articulate their relationship with capital, commodity, the market, the national and international economy in the early twentieth century? What challenges (prohibition of interest, obligation to charity) and responses did the establishment of a modern market economy create and how did it affect Sino-Muslim subjectivities?

Exploring these four domains and using primarily Sino-Muslim journals and newspapers, the project will explore Sino-Muslim elites’ conceptualizations of modern Muslim subjectivity. The project will contribute to our understanding of how Sino-Muslims responded to the dynamics of modernization, especially dynamics associated with the powerful processes of nationalization, ethnicization, rationalization, secularization, and “religionization” (Dreßler 2019).

As this project requires cooperation between Chinese and Islamic Studies within a religious studies framework, we are making a joint application bringing the necessary fields of expertise together. We will cooperate closely throughout the project and in the supervision of the researcher.

2.3 Work program incl. proposed research methods

Historical discourse analysis method and network analysis

The project will apply the sociology of knowledge approach to discourse (SKAD) (Keller 2006; 2012) to explore the development of Sino-Muslims’ modern subjectivities and analyze them in connection with meso-institutional and macro-social changes. It will also use social network analysis informed by reference theory (Mulsow 2017) to map out connections between actors and ideas on subjectivities in early twentieth-century Sino-Muslim print culture.

The project has three stages: (1) in-depth reading of major source materials, namely early twentieth-century Sino-Muslim periodicals; (2) mapping out the connections between various discourses on subjectivities, and circulation patterns of the respective texts and ideas; and (3) establishing the impact of the new discourses developed by Sino-Muslims on other Muslim, non-Muslim, or state discourses.

We will go through the tables of contents of periodicals published between 1906, the beginning of Sino-Muslim print culture, and 1960, when the official periodical of the Islamic Association of China (*China Muslim*) ceased to be published due to political mobilization in the PRC. We will collect articles with content that is relevant to the four domains specified above. Our

analysis will involve four steps: (i) Through in-depth reading, we will first identify interpretative schemes (*Deutungsmuster*), that is “socially typified historically embedded interpretation devices for occurring events, urgencies of action, etc.” (Keller 2006, 236). Sequence analysis will be applied to find out which master interpretative frames governed discourses related to Sino-Muslim subjectivities. Exploratory research using secondary sources as well as some preliminary reading of primary sources by Y.L. E. Lee (who we anticipate will be the researcher for this project) has resulted in a hypothesis that progress, patriotism, rationality, and submission will surface as key concepts. (ii) We will code and organize interventions affecting Sino-Muslim subjectivities through various classificatory markers, such as “religion (*zongjiao*)-secular (*fei zongjiao*; *shisu*)”, “ethnic-national (*minzu*)”, “race (*zhongzu*)”, “history (*lishi*)”, “culture (*wenhua*)/custom (*xisu*)/civilization (*wenming*)”, “science (*kexue*)”, “politics (*zhengzhi*)”, “hygiene (*weisheng*)”, “East (*dongfang*)-West (*xifang*)”, etc. Many of these classifications are integral part of modernization programs. (iii) The identification of interpretative schemes and classificatory markers will lead us to detect what Keller terms “phenomenal structures”. These are basically epistemic structures and their reflection in concepts as well as concrete practices (ibid., 237) and can be codified. (iv) Lastly, attention will be paid to the narrative structure of the analyzed texts. Identification of the narrative structures of our selected texts will be crucial for explaining the intentions behind interventions in relation to the four specified domains for the negotiation of Sino-Muslim subjectivities.

To map out the discourses, the project will adopt reference theory as developed in *longue durée* studies, which takes into account historically false references: “Reference here is not meant in the sense of active referral or intentionality, but in the sense of a mark of origin, a characteristic which reveals something of the source of the idea or form of knowledge” (Mulsow 2017, 70). Accordingly, we recognize various markers of reference apart from direct citation. Modifying Mulsow’s triangulation approach (ibid., 72-4), we will include specific locations (e.g., from personal addresses to larger geographical entities like counties and continents), social institutions (such as public associations, political parties, religious communities, states), and semantic signifiers (sayings, concepts, quotes from other texts like the Quran, etc.). We will create (‘edge and node’) lists of five reference markers (author, text title, location, social institution, and semantic signifiers) of texts participating in discourses on the four domains of Sino-Muslim subjectivities.

The empirical field

During the period from 1906 to 1952, more than 200 Sino-Muslim periodicals were published (Ma 2008). To be feasible, the analysis will be selective, focusing on periodicals that contain relevant contents with regard to the specified four domains. A first selection will be accomplished by searching for keywords in titles of articles using the digital archive *Quanguo baokan suoyin* (China National Periodical Index),¹ carefully reading relevant secondary literature, and locating periodicals published by associations that specialized in topics of particular interest to us, such as female Sino-Muslims, Hui youth, and education.² Our project does not attempt a general and linear historical survey of Sino-Muslim reformist discourses from a perspective

¹ *Quanguo baokan suoyin* (<https://www.cnbkxy.com>) is developed by Shanghai Library, where most physical copies of the digitalized Sino-Muslim periodicals are held.

² The latter include various publications by Chengda Normal School, as well as *Yisilan funü zazhi* (Islamic Female Magazine), *Huijiao funü* (Muslim Women), *Qingzhen yuekan* (Islamic Monthly), *Huijiao qingnian yuebao* (Muslim Youth Monthly), *Yisilan qingnian* (Youth of Islam), *Huizu qingnian* (Huizu Youth), and *Huijiao qingnian yuebao* (Islamic Youth Monthly).

that focuses on notable intellectuals or political centers - this has been done in some Chinese scholarship (e.g., Ding and Zhang 2002; Hong 2017; Ma 2013). Instead, it focuses on exploring the networked production and circulation of Sino-Muslims' reformist knowledge and thus selects its materials accordingly.

The initial focus will be on one of the most significant clusters of Sino-Muslim print networks: the Pearl River Delta (PRD), which connects Guangzhou with Hong Kong (and Macau to a lesser extent). Although the region was not considered a traditional hub of Sino-Muslim intellectual tradition in the late-imperial period, a print network emerged there in the mid-1920s. Previous research has shown that prominent reformist rhetoric from other Sino-Muslim hubs was also present in the PRD regional network (Ma 2003; Wang 2016), underscoring the national connectedness of Sino-Muslim print culture. In the period from the mid-1920s to the late 1940s, the PRD region produced around a dozen Hui periodicals, of which seven have survived with relatively intact collections in local libraries.³ Apart from the common rhetoric on religious reform and education, family, youth, female piety, and hygiene are recurring themes in articles found in journals from the PRD region. This PRD cluster is a meaningful starting point as it provides us with a manageable regional sample of texts directly related to the major domains of interest for our project. Other important clusters⁴ and prominent periodicals by or on Sino-Muslims⁵ will be integrated in cases where there is a need for comparison or for elucidating certain debates and positions.

We will pay comparatively more attention to the time before and after the “golden period” of Sino-Muslim cultural revival between the 1920s and the 1940s. Despite their historical significance, these periods have not yet been the subject of detailed scholarly investigation. Before 1912, Sino-Muslims were under considerable influence from Japan and the West, while in the early Republic, they were more strongly influenced by the discourses of Muslims in the Middle East and the Indian Subcontinent. These shifts will need to be laid out more clearly as background for highlighting conceptual changes that resulted from later entanglements. Developments after 1949 also deserve greater attention. Communist ideology shifted the discourse of Sino-Muslims toward economic relations. A particular focus on *Zhongguo musulin* (*China Muslim*), the official publication of the Islamic Association of China (1957-1960) and comparison with the KMT-endorsed China Muslim Association's journal *Zhongguo huijiao* (*China Islam*, 1952-1960) will help us elucidate negotiations of Muslim subjectivity in relation to the materialist philosophy of the state as well as other aspects of national interest in a crucial period of nation-building.

To access the relevant materials, the researcher will have to travel to China twice (see timetable below) to visit relevant libraries and archives. In preparation for this, a catalogue has

³ Among these, the most interesting for our project are *Tianfang xueli yuekan* (Islamic Thoughts Monthly), *Musulin* (Muslim), *Mumin* (Believer), *Taguang* (Lighthouse), *Huaisheng* (Remembrance of the Prophet), *Huijiao qingnianhuikan* (Journal of the Young Muslims Association).

⁴ They are 1) Beijing and Tianjin, 2) the lower Yangzi River, mainly Shanghai and Nanjing, 3) southwestern China in Chengdu, Chongqing, Kunming, and Guilin, as well as 4) northwestern China in Xian, Lanzhou, Linxia, and Xining.

⁵ Prominent modern Sino-Muslim reformist journals include *Xinghui pian* (Islamic Awakening), *Yuehua*, *Zhongguo huijiao xuehui yuekan* (China Muslim Literary Society Monthly), *Zhengdao* (Justice), *Chenxi* (Dawn), *Tuejue* (Sudden Rise), *Yiguang* (Light of Islam), *Yisilan* (Islam) etc. The most important non-Muslim journal that showed a strong interest in the issue of Muslims in China and had frequent correspondence with Sino-Muslim elites was Gu Jiegang's *Yugong* (The Chinese Historical Geography). After a series of discriminatory publications that emerged nationwide in the mid-1920s, Gu made a statement on the need to understand Chinese Muslims and their “*wenhua*” (culture). These discriminatory incidents stimulated a wide range of apologetic discourses from Sino-Muslims, as well as discourses on “cultural” and educational reform.

been compiled that details the holdings of Sino-Muslim periodicals with content that is relevant to this project. Part of the catalogue containing major sources that are mentioned in this proposal can be found in Appendix I.

The main results of the project will be published as a monograph by the doctoral researcher Y.L.E. Lee who has prepared most of the preliminary research and will conduct the fieldwork. The applicants will publish articles that relate the results to wider theoretical and historical research agendas, including comparative aspects of the formation of modern Muslim secularities, culturalization of religions in modern China, religious agency and secularity, and the formation of Muslim minorities under secularist conditions.

Year	Month	Project Procedures
2021	4	Identify, collect, and organize relevant source materials that are available through digital archives; review contemporary PRC-authorized discourses on the management of Muslims to establish genealogical background for the project.
	5	
	6	
	7	Preliminary analysis of data gathered online and through digital archives; develop suitable theoretical framework and methods.
	8	
	9	
	10	Preparation of fieldwork I
	11	
2022	12	Fieldwork I: Visiting national and local archives in coastal China, e.g., National Library of China (Beijing), Shanghai Library, Sun Yat-sen Library of Guangzhou, and Hong Kong Central Library for relevant materials that are not available online; exchange with scholars in China to locate and collect lesser known materials.
	1	
	2	Organize data collected during fieldwork I: (a) in-depth reading of collected materials; (b) preparation and coding of data on coastal Sino-Muslim print networks for network mapping; analysis of regional networks and connections between coastal networks; (c) contextualization of discourses identified in gathered source materials.
	3-9	
	10	
	11	Preparation of fieldwork II
	12	Fieldwork II: Visiting national and local archives in western China, e.g., Ningxia Academy of Social Sciences, Sichuan Provincial Library, and Yunnan Provincial Library for relevant materials that are not available online; exchange with scholars in China to locate and collect materials that are lesser known.
1		
2023 / 2024	2	Organize data collected during fieldwork II; analysis (a), (b), and (c) as defined above for data collected during fieldwork II.
	3-6	
	7-12	Finishing of monograph
	1-3	

2.4. Data handling

We will strictly adhere to DFG and Leipzig University guidelines on managing and handling research data. We plan to cooperate with two Specialised Information Services (*Fachinformationsdienste*, FID): FID Asia (CrossAsia) and FID Religionswissenschaft. We intend to publish all research results in open-access format.

3 Bibliography

Allès, E. 2000. *Musulmans de Chine. Une anthropologie des Hui du Henan*. Paris: Éditions de l'EHESS.
 –. 2003. "Muslim Religious Education in China." *China Perspectives* 45: 21–33.

- Allès, E., L. Chérif-Chebbi, and C. Halfon. 2003. "Chinese Islam: Unity and Fragmentation." *Religion, State and Society* 31 (1): 7–36.
- Amir-Moazami, S., C.M. Jacobsen, and M. Malik, eds. 2011. *Special Issue "Islam in Europe."* *Feminist Review*. Vol. 98.
- An, Q. 安慶瀾. 1931. "回教青年的信仰問題." *Yuehua* 3 (27): 12–13.
- Asad, T. 1993. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- . 2018. *Secular Translations: Nation-State, Modern Self, and Calculative Reason*. New York: Columbia UP.
- Atwill, D.G. 2006. *The Chinese Sultanate: Islam, Ethnicity, and the Panthay Rebellion in Southwest China, 1856–1873*. Stanford: Stanford UP.
- Aubin, F. 2006. "Islam on the Wings of Nationalism: The Case of Muslim Intellectuals in Republican China." In *Intellectuals in the Modern Islamic World: Transmission, Transformation, Communication*, ed. S.A. Dudoignon, K. Hisao, and K. Yasushi, 241–72. London: Routledge.
- Ben-Dor Benite, Z. 2005. *The Dao of Muhammad: A Cultural History of Muslims in Late Imperial China*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- . 2017. "Hijra and Exile Islam and Dual Sovereignty in Qing China." In *The Scaffolding of Sovereignty: Global and Aesthetic Perspectives on the History of a Concept*, ed. Z. Ben-Dor Benite, S. Geroulanos, and N. Jerr, 279–302. New York: Columbia UP.
- Bowen, J.R. 2012. *A New Anthropology of Islam*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Brown, T.G. 2014. "Imagining Consumers: Print Culture and Muslim Advertising in Early Twentieth Century China." *Muslim World* 104 (3): 336–53.
- . 2019. *A Mountain of Saints and Sages: Muslims in the Landscape of Popular Religion in Late Imperial China*. *T'oung Pao*. Vol. 105.
- Bu, L. 2017. *Public Health and the Modernization of China, 1865–2015*. London: Routledge.
- Chen, J. 2018. "Islamic Modernism in China: Chinese Muslim Elites, Guomindang Nation-Building, and the Limits of the Global Umma, 1900–1960." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.
- Chia, J.M. 2020. *Monks in Motion: Buddhism and Modernity Across the South China Sea*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Cieciura, W. 2014a. *Muzułmanie Chińscy. Historia. Religia. Tożsamość*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uni. Warszawskiego.
- . 2014b. "The Crescent and the Red Star: Hui Muslims and Chinese Communism in a Historical Perspective." *Dálný Východ (Far East)* 4 (1): 6–21.
- . 2016. "Ethnicity or Religion? Republican-Era Chinese Debates on Islam and Muslims." In *Islamic Thought in China: Sino-Muslim Intellectual Evolution from the 17th to the 21st Century*, ed. J.N. Lipman, 107–46. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.
- Davies, F., M.S. Wessel, and M. Brenner, eds. 2015. *Jews and Muslims in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Dierks, D. 2020. "Scripting, Translating, and Narrating Reform. Making Muslim Reformism in the European Peripheries of the Muslim World at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century." In *Knowledge on the Move in a Transoceanic Perspective: Dynamics of Intellectual Exchange from the Fifteenth to the Early Twentieth Century*, ed. E. Dierauff et al. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ding, H. 丁宏, and G. Zhang 张国杰. 2002. 《百年中國穆斯林》. Yinchuan: Ningxia renmin chubanshe.
- Ding, J. 丁俊. 2006. 《中國阿拉伯語教育史綱》. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe.
- Dressler, M. 2013. *Writing Religion: The Making of Turkish Alevi Islam*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- . 2015. "Historical Trajectories and Ambivalences of Turkish Minority Discourse." *New Diversities* 17 (1): 9–26.
- Dreßler, M. 2019. "Modes of Religionization: A Constructivist Approach to Secularity." 7. Working Paper, HCAS "Multiple Secularities - Beyond the West, Beyond Modernities." Leipzig.
- Erie, M.S. 2016. *China and Islam: The Prophet, the Party, and Law*. New York: Cambridge UP.
- Eroglu Sager, Z.H. 2016. "Islam in Translation: Muslim Reform and Transnational Networks in Modern China, 1908–1957." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
- . 2020. "A Place under the Sun: Chinese Muslim (Hui) Identity and the Constitutional Movement in Republican China." *Modern China*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0097700420915430>.
- European Commission, and High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. 2019. "EU-China – A Strategic Outlook." Strasbourg.
- Faure, D. 2016. "The Introduction of Economics in China, 1850–2010." In *Modern Chinese Religion II, 1850–2015*, ed. V. Goossaert, J. Kiely, and J. Lagerwey, 65–88. Leiden: Brill.
- Foucault, M. 1983. "The Subject and Power." In *Michel Foucault. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, ed. H.L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow, 208–26. Chicago: U. of Chicago P.
- . *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Frankel, J.D. 2017. "Sharia in China: Compromising Perceptions." In *Sharia Dynamics: Islamic Law and Sociopolitical Processes*, ed. T.P. Daniels, 119–39. Cham: Springer International.
- Gillette, M.B. 2000. *Between Mecca and Beijing: Modernization and Consumption among Urban Chinese Muslims*. Stanford: Stanford UP.
- Gladney, D.C. 1996. *Muslim Chinese: Ethnic Nationalism in the People's Republic*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- . 2004. *Dislocating China: Muslims, Minorities, and Other Subaltern Subjects*. Chicago: U. of Chicago P.
- Goossaert, V., and D.A. Palmer. 2011. *The Religious Question in Modern China*. Chicago: U. of Chicago P.
- Halevi, L. 2019. "Is China a House of Islam? Chinese Questions, Arabic Answers, and the Translation of Salafism from Cairo to Canton, 1930–1932." *Welt des Islams* 59 (1): 33–69.

- Hammond, K.A. 2015. *The Conundrum of Collaboration: Japanese Involvement with Muslims in North China, 1931-1945*. Ph.D. dissertation, Georgetown University.
- . 2020. *China's Muslims and Japan's Empire: Centering Islam in World War II*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina Press.
- Hong, W. 洪伟. 2017. “民國時期南京回族社會活動中的對話嘗試.” *China Muslim*, no. 5: 36–40.
- Jansen, T., T. Klein, and C. Meyer, eds. 2014. *Globalization and the Making of Religious Modernity in China: Transnational Religions, Local Agents, and the Study of Religion, 1800–Present*. Leiden: Brill.
- Jaschok, M., and H.M.V. Chan. 2009. “Education, Gender and Islam in China: The Place of Religious Education in Challenging and Sustaining ‘undisputed Traditions’ among Chinese Muslim Women.” *International Journal of Educational Development* 29 (5): 487–94.
- Jenco, L.K. 2019. “Can the Chinese Nation Be One? Gu Jiegang, Chinese Muslims, and the Reworking of Culturalism.” *Modern China* 45 (6): 595–628.
- Jung, D., M.J. Petersen, and S.L. Sparre. 2014. *Politics of Modern Muslim Subjectivities: Islam, Youth, and Social Activism in the Middle East*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jung, D., and K. Sinclair. 2020a. “Religious Governmentality.” *Temenos - Nordic Journal of Comparative Religion* 56 (1): 95–118.
- , eds. 2020b. *Muslim Subjectivities in Global Modernity: Islamic Traditions and the Construction of Modern Muslim Identities*. Leiden: Brill.
- Keller, R. 2006. “Analysing Discourse. An Approach from the Sociology of Knowledge.” *Historical Social Research* 31 (2): 223–42.
- . “Entering Discourses: A New Agenda for Qualitative Research and Sociology of Knowledge.” *Qualitative Sociology Review* 8 (2): 46–75.
- Kelly, M.G.E. 2013. “Foucault, Subjectivity, and Technologies of the Self.” In *A Companion to Foucault*, edited by C. Falzon, T. O’Leary, and J. Sawicki, 510–25. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lee, Y.L.E. 2019. “Muslims as ‘Hui’ in Late Imperial and Republican China. A Historical Reconsideration of Social Differentiation and Identity Construction.” *Historical Social Research* 44 (3): 226–63.
- Lipman, J.N. 1996. “Hyphenated Chinese: Sino-Muslim Identity in Modern China.” In *Remapping China: Fissures in Historical Terrain*, ed. G. Hershatter, E. Honig, J.N. Lipman, and R. Stross, 97–112. Stanford: Stanford UP.
- . 1998. *Familiar Strangers: A History of Muslims in Northwest China*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong UP.
- Liu, J. 劉家峰. 2011. “近代中國基督教與伊斯蘭互動關係的研究與前瞻.” *Shijie zhongjiao wenhua*, no. 3: 77–82.
- Liu, L. 劉莉. 2013a. “不同性別話語體系下回族女子教育宗旨的論爭—以民國回族報刊為中心.” *Huizu yanjiu*, no. 4: 17–22.
- . 2013b. “民國時期回族報刊關於回族婚俗問題的討論.” *Beifang minzu daxue xuebao*, no. 6: 33–37.
- Ma, B. 马博忠. 2008. “民国时期中国穆斯林报刊统计表.” *Huizu yanjiu* 72 (4): 48–63.
- Ma, C. 马超. 2013. “民国河南伊斯兰教教师与经学.” *Shijie zhongjiao yanjiu*, no. 5: 136–51.
- Ma, J. 馬健雄. 2017. “杜文秀與清末咸同年間雲南大理“白旗”政權的“清真教門”與“民族”論述.” In 《“文化、历史与国家形构:近代中国族群边界与少数民族的建构历程”国际学术研讨会》, 1–19. Taipei.
- Ma, J. 马景. 2009. “宗教對話中的馬善亭阿訇.” *Shijie zhongjiao wenhua*, no. 1: 14–17.
- . 2014. 《民國時期伊斯蘭教漢文譯著研究(1912-1949)》. Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe.
- Ma, Q. 马强. 2003. “民国时期广州穆斯林文人的忧患意识.” *Xibei minzu yanjiu* 39 (4): 95–102.
- Mahmood, S. 2012. *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Mao, Y. 2011. “A Muslim Vision for the Chinese Nation: Chinese Pilgrimage Missions to Mecca during World War II.” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 70 (2): 373–95.
- . 2016. “Selective Learning from the Middle East: The Case of Sino-Muslim Students at Al-Azhar University.” In *Islamic Thought in China: Sino-Muslim Intellectual Evolution from the 17th to the 21st Century*, ed. J.N. Lipman, 147–70. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.
- Matsumoto, M. 2006. “Rationalizing Patriotism among Muslim Chinese: The Impact of the Middle East on the Yuehua Journal.” In *Intellectuals in the Modern Islamic World: Transmission, Transformation, Communication*, ed. S.A. Dudoignon, K. Hisao, K. Yasushi, 117–42. London: Routledge.
- . 2016. “Secularisation and Modernisation of Islam in China: Educational Reform, Japanese Occupation and the Disappearance of Persian Learning.” In *Islamic Thought in China: Sino-Muslim Intellectual Evolution from the 17th to the 21st Century*, ed. J.N. Lipman, 171–96. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.
- Messner, A.C. 2015. “Transforming Chinese Hearts, Minds, and Bodies in the Name of Progress, Civility, and Civilization.” In *Civilizing Emotions: Concepts in Nineteenth-Century Asia and Europe*, ed. M. Pernau et al., 231–49. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Meyer, C. 2013. “Der Moderne Chinesische ‚Religionsbegriff‘ Zongjiao als Beispiel Translingualer Praxis. Rezeption Westlicher Religionsbegriffe und -Vorstellungen im China des Frühen 20. Jahrhunderts.” In *Religion in Asien? Studien zur Anwendbarkeit des Religionsbegriffs*, ed. P. Schalk, M. Deeg, O. Freiburger, and C. Kleine, 351–92. Uppsala: Uppsala Uni.
- Meyer, J.H. 2014. *Turks across Empires: Marketing Muslim Identity in the Russian-Ottoman Borderlands, 1856-1914*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Mittermaier, A. 2012. “Dreams from Elsewhere: Muslim Subjectivities beyond the Trope of Self-Cultivation.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 18 (2): 247–65.
- Mulsow, M. 2017. “A Reference Theory of Globalized Ideas.” *Global Intellectual History* 2 (1): 67–87.

- Peng, N. 彭年. 1993. “北京回族的經濟生活變遷.” *Huizu yanjiu*, no. 3: 31–39.
- Pernau, M., H. Jordheim, E. Saada, C. Bailey, E. Wigen, O. Bashkin, M. Kia, et al., eds. 2015. *Civilizing Emotions: Concepts in Nineteenth-Century Asia and Europe*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Pittman, J. 2020. “3 Questions: Sinicization or Chinafication?” *China Source*. 2020. <https://www.chinasource.org/resource-library/chinasource-blog-posts/3-questions-sinicization-or-chinafication/>.
- Schielke, S. 2009. “Being Good in Ramadan: Ambivalence, Fragmentation, and the Moral Self in the Lives of Young Egyptians.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 15 (May): S24–40.
- Tontini, R. 2016. *Muslim Sanzijing: Shifts and Continuities in the Definition of Islam in China (1710-2010)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Tsai, Y. 2017. “Pilgrimage and Hui Muslim Identity in the Republican Era.” In *Religion and Nationalism in Chinese Societies*, ed. C. Kuo, 179–95. Amsterdam: Amsterdam UP.
- Veer, P.v.d. 2014. *The Modern Spirit of Asia: The Spiritual and the Secular in China and India*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Vermander, B. 2019. “Sinicizing Religions, Sinicizing Religious Studies.” *Religions* 10 (2): 137.
- Wang, K. 王柯. 2017. 《消失的「國民」：近代中國的「民族」話語與少數民族的國家認同》. Hong Kong: Chinese UP.
- Wang, X. 王曉霞. 2011. “民國初期回族宗教觀念與社會習俗的改良與適應—以民國回族知識份子報刊文章為例.” *Huizu yanjiu*, no. 4: 114–18.
- Wang, Y. 汪洋. 2016. “民国时期广州回族文化群体与文化心态研究.” *Qinghai minzu yanjiu* 27 (1): 135–39.
- Xinhua. 2016. “习近平：全面提高新形势下宗教工作水平.” *Xinhua.com*, April 23, 2016. http://www.xinhuanet.com/politics/2016-04/23/c_1118716540.htm.
- Yang, R. 楊榮斌. 2013. “民國時期上海回族商人結構的新變化.” *Huizu yanjiu*, no. 2: 52–56.
- Yao, D. 姚大力. 2004. “‘回到祖国’与回族认同的历史变迁.” *Zhongguo xueshu* 17 (1): 90–135.
- Yu, Z. 余振貴, X. Lei 雷晓静 and X. Li 李习文, eds. 1992. 《醒回篇：伊斯蘭》. Yinchuan: Ningxia renmin chubanshe.
- Zhong, Y. 鍾銀梅. 2013. “民國時期回族知識份子社會習俗改良宣傳與實踐.” *Huizu yanjiu*, no. 3: 58–63.
- Zhongguo yisilan xiehui 中国伊斯兰协会. 2019. “堅持我國伊斯蘭教中國化方向五年工作規劃綱要(2018-2022).” *China Muslim* 1: 5–8.

4 Requested modules/Funds

4.1 Basic module

4.1.1 Funding for staff

Applicant Dreßler: Doctoral researcher or comparable

One doctoral researcher (0.75 FTE, TV-L E 13) for 36 months: €153,900.

Applicant Seiwert: Student research assistant

One research assistant for processing relevant literature and facilitation of workshops (20 months, 10h/week): €12,600.

4.1.2 Direct project costs

4.1.2.1 Travel expenses

The researcher will have to travel to China twice for extended research trips. A first trip is planned for December 2021 through February 2022, a second for December 2022 through February 2023. Archival research will take place in Guangzhou (Sun Yat-sen Library of Guangdong Province), Hong Kong (Central Library of Hong Kong), Shanghai (Shanghai Library), Beijing (National Library of China and Peking University), Xining (Qinghai Library), Yinchuan (Ningxia Academy of Social Sciences), Chengdu (Sichuan Library), and Chongqing (Chongqing Library). Additional travel expenses will be incurred for participation at academic conferences. For the researcher, we are applying for two national (ca. €610 each), one European (ca. €1050) and two international/North American (ca. €2100 each) conference participations. For the applicants, we are applying for one European and one international/North American conference participation.

Applicant Seiwert	Total
Travel expenses researcher (Leipzig-China-Leipzig, 2 flights)	€1,600
Travel and accommodation expenses in China, researcher (€75/day + €1500 for domestic flights)	€15,000
Expenses for conference fees, travel, and accommodation, researcher	€4370
Expenses for conference fees, travel, and accommodation, applicants	€3150
Total	€24,120

4.1.2.2 Project-related publication expenses

Applicant Seiwert: For publishing the findings of the project, we are applying for funding of €750 per project year, and thus a total of €2250 for open-access publications.

4.2 Module funding workshops

Applicant Seiwert: To discuss our project with experts from the various fields involved and to facilitate further exchange and networking between German, European, and Chinese scholars we plan to organize two workshops in cooperation with our local and Chinese partners.

The first workshop will be organized in cooperation with the Centre for the Study of Islamic Culture (CSIC) at the Research Institute for the Humanities of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. The workshop with the preliminary title *Secular Citizens, Muslim Minorities* will take place in Hong Kong in 2022. A major aim of the workshop will be to consider the case of Muslims in China from a comparative perspective. We will draw comparisons with the case of Muslim minorities in other regions and with the situation of other religious communities within China. This two to three-day workshop will bring together approximately 10 local and 10 international scholars. The logistics will be in the hands of the CSIC in Hong Kong. We are applying for €10,000 to cover 50% of the projected €20,000 total costs (travel, accommodation, and food expenses).

The second workshop, organized in cooperation with the DFG Centre for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences “Multiple Secularities – Beyond the West, Beyond Modernities” at Leipzig University will take place in Leipzig in 2023. In this international workshop with the preliminary title “Modern Subjectivities, Religion and Secularity,” we want to reflect, based on empirical work, on subjectivity as an analytical category in the study of religion and secularity. We plan for approximately 15 participants (max. 8 national and international guests plus members of the Centre for Advanced Studies as well as our project team). The Centre for Advanced Studies will shoulder the organization of the logistics and cover €5,000 of the total costs. We are applying for €5,000 to cover 50% of the expected total costs of €10,000 (travel, accommodation, and food expenses).

5 Project requirements

5.1 Employment status information

Seiwert, Hubert

Permanent Senior Research Fellow at the DFG Centre for Advanced Studies “Multiple Secularities: Beyond the West, Beyond Modernities” at Leipzig University; Professor Emeritus for General and Comparative Studies of Religion at the Institute for the Study of Religion, University of Leipzig.

Dreßler, Markus

DFG Heisenberg Scholar at the Institute for the Study of Religions, University of Leipzig; received provisional offer (*Ruf*) in October 2020 to become Heisenberg Professor for Modern Turkish Studies at Leipzig University; Associate Member of the DFG Centre for Advanced Studies “Multiple Secularities: Beyond the West, Beyond Modernities” at Leipzig University.

5.2 Co-operation with other researchers

5.2.1 Researchers with whom you have agreed to co-operate on this project

We will collaborate with the Centre for the Study of Islamic Culture (CSIC), headed by Prof. Dr. James D. Frankel, at the Research Institute for the Humanities at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. The CSIC is currently expanding its research in the PRD region. Through this collaboration, we expect to obtain further endorsements from scholars at institutions in mainland China, which will enable us to access local libraries and archives. Intensifying cooperation and networking between academia in Germany and China is one aim of the project. Potential partners are Sun Yat-sen University, Fudan University, Minzu University of China, China Academy of Social Sciences, North Minzu University, Ningxia Academy of Social Sciences, and Southwest Minzu University. In Leipzig, we will cooperate with the DFG Centre for Advanced Studies “Multiple Secularities: Beyond the West, Beyond Modernities”.

5.2.2 Researchers with whom you have collaborated scientifically within the past three years

- Christoph Kleine, Leipzig
- Robert Langer, Munich
- Armando Salvatore, McGill University/Canada
- Bjørn Ola Tafjord, Tromsø/Norway
- Monika Wohlrab-Sahr, Leipzig

Attachment: Shortened List of Project Relevant Republican Hui Periodicals