Since the founding of the People’s Republic of China (PRC), there have been economic and demographic transformations that are now reflected in the Uyghur language. The modernization, industrialization, and urbanization of Xinjiang brought about considerable contact between Uyghurs and Hans in urban areas, especially in the public space. The importance of the Chinese language increased after China embraced a market economy in the late 1970s. A private sector emerged and gradually became a major source of employment, which resulted in the state sector no longer being the only employment generator. As private sector jobs were mostly created by Chinese-speaking entrepreneurs and businesspersons, the Chinese language became increasingly important for employment and the acquisition of Chinese became necessary for many Uyghurs. Politically, the state is interested in converting the population into a linguistically homogenous group in order to achieve symbolic domination. With the implementation of “bilingual education” (双语教育) reform in 2000, Chinese became the language of education and an important resource in the public sphere, education, media, and administration. The language policy expanded the use of standard Chinese in the public sphere. Culturally, the penetration of private homes through TV programs and serials in Chinese helped raise the Chinese language competence of Uyghur speakers. These economic, political, and cultural factors together created a sociolinguistic situation in which code-switching became rather spontaneous among many urban Uyghurs. However, the diffusion of Chinese words and terminology and code-switching was not a smooth process. Since many Uyghurs see language as a symbol of their ethnic identity, they made efforts not only to preserve the purity of the language but also to protect this identity.

Giulia Cabras’ book *Alternance codique entre le ouïghours et le chinois: Une étude de cas sur la communauté linguistique ouïghoure de Ürümqi* is an important contribution to the study of the sociolinguistic situation in modern Xinjiang. In this book, Cabras analyzes Uyghur-Chinese code-switching in Xinjiang as the product of an interaction between linguistic and non-linguistic factors, and of the tension between the necessity of learning Chinese and a desire by Uyghurs to preserve the purity of their language. She describes a linguistic community in Urumchi and examines the structural, interactional, sociocultural, and ideological aspects of code-switching between the Uyghur and Chinese languages. In describing the complexity of a code-switching situation that made it necessary to learn Chinese and created a spontaneous use of Chinese among Uyghurs in everyday life, Cabras challenges Myers-Sotton’s idea that the existence of borrowed basic forms in a language is a sign of acceptance and identification with the borrowed language. Despite the existence of Uyghur-Chinese code-switching in daily life, the actual interethnic relations in Xinjiang do not seem to corroborate Myers-Sotton’s hypothesis (p. 93).

Cabras’ study was based on ethnographic, linguistic, and conversational data collected through field research in 2013 (May–June) and 2014 (Feb–July) in Urumchi city, in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region (XUAR). Her consultants represented four different demographies ranging from 25 to 50 in age: (1) migrants who are Uyghur monolinguals; (2) minkaomin (民考民), “Uyghurs schooled in Uyghur,” who speak Chinese at work and Uyghur at home; (3) minkaohan (民考汉), “Uyghurs schooled in Chinese,” who speak Chinese at work and Uyghur at home; and (4) minkaohan, who speak Chinese both at work and at home.
In Chapter 2, she situates her research in the various geographic locations in Urumchi.

In Chapter 3, Cabras analyzes two types of Uyghur-Chinese code-switching: (1) in discourse or intra-sentential (interphrastique) code-switching; (2) the use of Uyghur as matrix, with the insertion of Chinese. Uyghur imposes itself as the matrix language in many cases of code-switching and keeps its distinctive traits. In intra-sentential code-switching Uyghur keeps its structural integrity even when Chinese words are inserted. Several transformations occur in Chinese words when they enter Uyghur. Chinese words lose tones, diphthongs, and triphthongs and become simplified. The phonetic realization varies according to the level of mastery of Chinese by Uyghur speakers.

Cabras observes three phases in the simplification of Chinese words: (1) loss of tones of words; (2) transformation of sounds absent in Chinese to sounds close to Uyghur consonant and vowel inventories; (3) modification of syllable structure. Since functional elements of Chinese such as interjection, conjunction, and adverbs do not require inflection, they can be easily inserted into Uyghur sentences. In code-switching, the modal particle -iken, emphatic particle he, and the emphatic clitic =Gu of the Uyghur are attached to Chinese words. Cabras argues that since these particles mark functions such as evidentiality or confirmation, their resistance to code-switching has a pragmatic value.

In a code-switching example, piàoliangghu? “Indeed pretty, isn’t it?” the emphatic clitic =Gu was added to the Chinese word piàoliang (漂亮), “beautiful.”

In Chapter 4, Cabras explains that there is a diglossic situation in Xinjiang, that language constitutes a symbol of identity for communities separated from each other, and that there exists a we-code/they-code dichotomy. As in her examples, in some code-switching situations speakers used Uyghur as a secret code and sometimes they used Chinese words to make a message clearer. Sometimes Chinese phrases were inserted into Uyghur sentences to serve as we-code and to express closeness between the interlocutors. In some examples from conversations in the private sphere, speakers emphasized the use of Uyghur as a we-code, which led to speakers correcting themselves after they realized that they had switched to Chinese subconsciously. The Chinese language has a strong presence in the public sphere, where subjects related to modern life occur more in Chinese than in Uyghur. Chinese is used in speech and writing, in the public and urban space, shop signs, TV broadcasts, and radio, as well as in the sphere of work, administration, and education. Frequent exposure to Chinese in the public sphere has naturally increased the familiarity of many Uyghurs with the Chinese language. But the private sphere did not remain insulated. The presence of standard Chinese in the media has contributed to the familiarity of many Uyghurs with Chinese in the private sphere. Even if Til Yeziq Komte-ti, “the committee of speech and writing,” was responsible for creating new words and terminology for new items and concepts in Uyghur, by the time those terminologies were offered to the public many Uyghurs were already familiar with their Chinese equivalents. The existence of basic forms such as huowezhan (火车站), “train station” and cidian (词典), “dictionary” attests to the diffusion of Chinese terms in everyday conversation. Besides the presence of Chinese in the public and private spheres, the language has some features that made the adoption of its terminology preferable among many Uyghurs. The pronunciation of numbers in Chinese is much more concise than in Uyghur, which led to many Uyghurs giving their phone numbers in Chinese. The concision and the ease of abbreviation of many terms in Chinese made them preferable for some Uyghur speakers over their longer and more complex Uyghur equivalents.
Uyghurs referring to the institution Til Yeziq Komteti as *yuweihui* (语委会) and “Xinjiang University” (新疆大学) as *Xinda* (新大).

However, the spread of the Chinese language in the public and private spheres did not proceed without resistance. Many Uyghurs see their language as a symbol of their identity and the purity of the Uyghur language as fundamental to its integrity. Some authors published articles that emphasized the importance of speaking Uyghur and were critical of code-switching among younger generation Uyghurs. The reaction to code-switching among Uyghurs gave rise to a *sap Uyghur* (ouïghour purifié, pur ouïghour) “pure Uyghur” language ideology (p. 107). As Cabras discusses in Chapter 5, many Uyghurs treated the *sap uyghurche* or *heqiqiy uyghurche,* “authentic Uyghur” as an idealized norm in their effort to purify their language. According to her, the ideology of *sap Uyghur* emerged as a response to code-switching and to the strong influence of Chinese on the Uyghur lexicon (ibid.). The *sap Uyghur* was contrasted with *qalaymiqan,* “messy” Uyghur (ouïghour désordonné) or, as I used to hear when I was in Urumchi, *ebjesh Uyghur,* “mixed Uyghur.” While the *sap Uyghur* served as an imagined pure language, *qalaymiqan* Uyghur was seen as a deviation. Some of Cabras’ data includes examples of speakers censoring and correcting themselves or each other after they found themselves code-switching. She concludes that it was an indication that Chinese words became so familiar and spontaneous that the frequency of their Uyghur equivalents decreased (p. 109).

Many Uyghurs, including intellectuals, deliberately created words and expressions to make Uyghur competitive with the Chinese language (p. 110). However, for the proponents of *sap Uyghur,* words from Russian, Arabic, and Persian were not problematic; their effort was mainly concerned with Chinese phonetic borrowings (l’emprunt phonétique) (p. 112).

At the end of Chapter 5, Cabras analyzes a popular Uyghur *ëtôt,* “comedy” titled *chüşhemidim,* “I don’t understand,” a cultural repre-
aspirant, maqale yezishing kerek (p. 109), “You are a graduate student, you must write a paper,” should be correctly harmonized as maqale yezishingiz kerek, etc.

In this book, Cabras describes a complex sociolinguistic environment in Xinjiang and analyzes how linguistic and extralinguistic factors such as ideology, politics, economy, and culture are intertwined to influence the language habits of Uyghurs in Xinjiang and how the reaction to code-switching took on not just a linguistic but also an ideological character. She tests some well-known theories of linguistic contact on the data she collected from Xinjiang and points out where those theories are insufficient to illuminate the sociolinguistic situation there. I fully recommend this book to anyone interested in modern Uyghur, language contact, or sociolinguistics, and to those who specialize in China and Xinjiang and who wish to understand the cultural and sociolinguistic situation in China.
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