

242 Histoire sociale / Social History

attitudes about sexuality, the body, and women. Finally, Toby Thacker provides an engaging analysis of how music cuts clear dividing lines between inclusion and exclusion.

The final section offers theoretical approaches and reflections that link all of the contributions. Pascal Grosse, Adelaide von Saldern, and Kathleen Canning confirm that “citizenship provides a common denominator that complicates our understanding of the interdependent relationship between politics and culture while enabling a transcendence of hitherto distinct historical fields and perspectives” (pp. 13–14).

In the concluding chapter, Geoff Eley makes a final plea to suggest that citizenship can inform us about the meanings of continuity and rupture in Germany’s past. The contributors cut across the traditional turning points of 1914, 1918, and 1945 to demonstrate that citizenship provides a framework through which the German past can be compared in diverse periods and political contexts (pp. 233–246).

The common thread that binds these contributions is the notion that citizenship is a cultural construction and a process through which the public and the authorities define and compete for inclusion. The book does not come to any firm conclusions; rather, its aim is to suggest new avenues for further investigation. Its arguments are coherent and it offers a solid examination of the negotiation and construction of citizenship. A chapter on the Federal Republic of Germany, or at best a comparison of citizenship construction between the FRG and the German Democratic Republic, would help complete the picture by further exploring the impact of ideological constructions on popular practice in very different political contexts. However, as the editors suggest, they do not pretend to offer a total analysis, but rather a solid starting point. For this, they should be congratulated.

Patryk J. Polec
University of Ottawa

FAURE, David — *Emperor and Ancestor: State and Lineage in South China*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007. Pp. 464.

For some books, reading the review is enough; a brief synopsis and a sense of how the reviewed work fits into the wider scholarly literature are all one has time to absorb anyway. For other books, the review only needs to say one thing: read this book. David Faure’s masterpiece falls into the latter category. A short review cannot do it justice; for a full review, I refer the reader to John Lagerwey’s review essay (“State and Local Society in Late Imperial China” in *T’oung Pao*, vol. 93, 2007, pp. 459–479). Here I only briefly discuss what the book sets out to do and how that contributes to the wider field.

Faure’s argument is deceptively simple. The single-surname village, where all members trace their descent to a common ancestor, was a construct as well as

the functional reality that Maurice Freedman made it out to be, intended to integrate local society and the central state. This construct or “aspiration” (p. 11) appeared as the dominant organizational feature in south China during the Jiajing period (1520s to 1550s) and disappeared again in the twentieth century. The first part of the book charts how this lineage society could come into being. Beginning with the earliest records available for the area of his focus (the Pearl River Delta, and particularly the town of Foshan) in the Tang, Faure demonstrates the slow impact of Neo-Confucianism on the organization of society from the Southern Song and on the introduction of the *lijia*, not so much as the state intended it (as a population record) but as a land registry that facilitated the collection of taxes, especially when the Single Whip reforms converted all levies and corvée duties to a single monetary payment. Here lies the crux of Faure’s contribution: his work shows that the ritual performance of lineage, with its ancestral halls and genealogies, made it possible for the locality to be part of the central state. The representation of lineage in our sources, in other words, reveals the official, legitimizing agenda of the state.

Faure’s work makes a contribution to the field of late imperial history in the widest possible sense, in part through the presentation of meticulous and detailed research at the local level (although at times the level of detail makes it hard for the reader to grasp its link with the overarching argument of the book) and in part by proposing a way of reading the local in the context of the late imperial state and a way of understanding how the local was co-opted for the purposes of the central state. If this study of the Pearl River Delta does not claim to provide a blueprint for all of China, it does offer a way of doing local history: gathering the types of documents he has used here (including steles, privately held genealogies, contracts) and reading them with a critical awareness of the ways in which those sources reflect “the process by which the imperial state was formed” (p. 367).

In Jizhou (or Ji’an, as this part of Jiangxi became known from the Ming dynasty onward), I found Song and Yuan dynasty literati writing about local temples in an attempt to construct a local identity that fit with the imperial vision of the place of local communities. By the fifteenth century, the literati focus shifted away from temples for local gods towards the institutions associated with lineage society such as inscriptions for newly built lineage halls and prefaces for new editions of genealogical compilations. (See *Ji’an Literati and the Local in Song-Yuan-Ming China*, Brill, 2007.) Faure’s work provides a way of fitting such local developments into an empire-wide narrative and recognizing its significance for the integration of Jizhou/Ji’an into the ideological structures of the imperial state. In that sense, Faure’s contribution goes beyond China to offer valuable insights to any historian of localities and regions. Rather than providing the minutiae of a given locality over time for their own sake, leaving to others the work of adjusting the larger picture in accordance with local peculiarities, Faure makes the integration between local and empire his focal point. Local historians have come a long way from describing “communities” as static and unitary entities. Historians have learned from geographers about putting places in temporal and spatial contexts and have begun to see how the ways in which the histories of

places are told reflect relations of power within those communities. The representation of Chinese society as fundamentally shaped by lineage institutions and the narratives of Chinese history that reveal the emergence and growth of this lineage society tell the story not so much of Chinese society and its history, but of the emergence and the extent of literati power. When we heed Faure's call not to be "armchair" historians (p. 368) and head to the field, what we see are lineage institutions. The villages in Ji'an I visited repeatedly between 2000 and 2007 have very few architectural remnants of their illustrious past. Lineage halls abound, however, in all sizes and shapes, many in a state of severe disrepair, some still in use as agricultural storage spaces or thriving community centres for the elderly. The enduring presence of these lineage halls tells us something about the social endurance of literati aspiration in this region.

For local historians of late imperial China, Faure's book is essential reading. It has much to offer anyone with an interest in the political, socio-economic, and cultural formations of the post-Tang period, and it offers new insights for anyone with an interest in the history of the local.

Anne Gerritsen
*Warwick University and Asia Research Center,
 National University of Singapore*

FOLLAIN, Antoine — *Le village sous l'Ancien Régime*, Paris, Fayard, 2008, 607 p.

D'entrée de jeu, disons que ce livre laisse son lecteur perplexe. Les traits de génie y côtoient de basses insultes, les critiques les plus constructives débouchent sur des impasses et les stimulantes questions qui y sont soulevées commandent des chantiers d'une telle ampleur qu'une génération d'historiens français ne suffirait pas à la tâche. Rien ne semble pleinement satisfaire Antoine Follain, même son propre travail. Pourtant, il y a fort à parier que ce livre deviendra une lecture incontournable pour tous les ruralistes, puisque Follain y recadre toutes les thématiques relatives au village en invitant ses collègues à observer les ruraux « dans l'action et en situation », en utilisant d'abord des archives locales et en posant les questions nationales – construction de l'État moderne, lutte entre le pouvoir royal, le pouvoir seigneurial et l'Église – dans un deuxième temps. Cette approche permet, d'une part, d'échapper à la myopie de l'histoire locale et, d'autre part, d'éviter de se laisser enfermer dans la problématique de la capacité d'action des paysans face à des pouvoirs externes, qui ne prend pas suffisamment en compte les dynamiques internes de la vie au village.

Le livre est divisé en six axes, qui comportent chacun deux chapitres. Le premier axe s'intitule « Comparer et relativiser » et passe en revue l'historiographie du sujet, d'abord à l'échelle nationale (chapitre 1) puis dans le cas spécifique de la Normandie, terrain d'enquête de l'auteur pour les vingt dernières années (chapitre 2). Ce premier axe est à l'image de l'entreprise menée par Follain : évaluer les résultats obtenus ailleurs en France et développer l'exemple