maned lion, Maňjuśri bodhisattva in disguise accompanying Kşitigarbha who instructs him to propagate their images. The Poisonless Demon King originated in the Scripture of the Original Vows of Kşitigarbha bodhisattva (*Dizang pusa benyuanjing*) attributed to the Khotanese monk Śikşānanda (652–710). The story emphasizes filial piety of a Brahman woman towards her mother and makes a vow to be reborn as Kşitigarbha to save all fallen souls in the dark places after death. The pairing of Daoming and the Poisonless Demon King is unique to Korea and continued to be represented well in the following Chosŏn period (1392–1910).

12. Chung Woothaek 2010, ibid.

YiXi LaMuCuo. *Becoming Bilingual in School and Home in Tibetan Areas of China: Stories of Struggle*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2019. 183 pp. Paperback $119.99, ISBN 978-3-030-14667-2.

This study from the Tibetan communities of China is a welcome contribution to the field of language learning and language loss, considering the scarcity of information in recent years coming out of these same communities on the relevant questions. Precisely, what concerned observers have today are many questions. Following a survey of previous work internationally and of basic concepts in the study of bilingualism, the chapters present a series of five in-depth interviews recorded by the author on-site. The participants document their experience from three of the principal stages of bilingual contact between Tibetan and Chinese:

- the early post-1949 government policy that promoted the Tibetan language along with a generation of native speaking cadre to administer the newly incorporated region;
- reaction against Tibetan language promotion beginning in 1959, to be taken up again during the ferocious suppression through the years of the Cultural Revolution; and
- a period of relative opening, beginning in 1977.

The central concept that is developed throughout the chapters is the distinction between additive and subtractive bilingualism. Interested readers should consult the study on a parallel language research problem in East Asia that addresses this key concept. For Hokkien (Southern Min), subtractive, or Replacing Language, bilingualism already characterizes its subordinate relationship with Mandarin Chinese. The critical age bracket for language

© 2020 *by University of Hawai'i Press*

erosion, according to the Hokkien study, is the elementary school-age population.[1] The additive-subtractive distinction is closely related to the two language education options for learners: *záng wéi zhǔ* 藏為主 and *hàn wéi zhǔ* 漢為主, respectively, Tibetan-medium and Chinese-medium of instruction. A current debate in Tibetan-Chinese bilingual education specifically turns on how the increasing shift toward the Chinese-medium option is being implemented; that in its progressively Chinese-biased implementation, school programs appear to be leaning toward the subtractive outcome for Tibetan. Over time, the option of Tibetan-medium instruction appears to have been transitioning to instruction of Tibetan as a school subject, with its concomitant reduction in hours of instruction, learning materials and effective teaching methodology.[2] Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge, as professor YiXi would concur, that it is too early to make a definitive assessment of actual student learning outcomes regarding school-related Tibetan language proficiency, for example in the domain of literacy. There is simply not enough pertinent information on student achievement available that can broadly inform this research problem.

Based on current research models and descriptive accounts of language contact in the Tibetan region (including now the interview text samples of chapters 4–6), two logical possibilities on the related question of linguistic competence[3] can be considered:

(1) that language shift toward modern standard Chinese has not advanced to any significant degree, individual cases aside; and that family-based native-speaker competence in Tibetan communities (including urban centers) remains fundamentally intact in the school-age population.
(2) a minority of young bilinguals, in daily contact with monolingual speakers of Chinese and electronic media, has shifted toward dominance in Chinese accompanied by a measurable erosion of competence in Tibetan (i.e., Replacement Language development).

Given the deficit of reliable and confirmed empirical data, neither scenario can yet be discounted. In fact, a careful reading of chapters 4–6, correlated with partial results from recent linguistic/ethnographic surveys does not allow us to exclude either (1) or (2) at this time. The distribution of Tibetan speakers over an immense geographical expanse, divided among numerous dialects, both linguistically close and distant, and variants not mutually intelligible, complicates enormously the fieldwork evaluation of verifiable cases of outright erosion (shift of the speech community to Chinese), convergence between dialects or variants, bilingual mixing and preservation.

An interesting analysis of the interview material focuses on spontaneous alternation, switching between Tibetan and Chinese, by participants. A number of features of this kind of bilingual speech present themselves for further study:

- Overall preponderant use of one language over the other or a balanced alternation related perhaps to situational context factors;
- whether switches are clearly motivated by a deliberate, often subtle, stylistic choice (sometimes termed "metaphoric" in the literature) to suggest a given meaning or change of meaning;
- evidence in bilingual passages of stronger ability in one language over the other, sometimes being topic-specific, or strictly grammatical code-switching by speakers whose bilingual competence is balanced.

For example, participant Gegan exhibited an unambiguously purposeful metaphoric alternation, in line with his publicly attested balanced competence as university professor of Tibetan—"one language represents the new changing world . . . the mother tongue [in turn] used to talk about his culture" (p. 94). Being the only participant with memory of the pre-revolutionary period, his reflections are instructive on the important historical linkage between monastery-based education and Tibetan language learning, on the one hand, and secular education and Chinese, on the other. A modern version of this linkage, and the associated conflict carried forward, is relevant today.

The interview with Dawa evidenced a possible preference for Chinese across all topics. At the same time the analysis was cautious in the end in not drawing a conclusion, from the limited speech sample, of an imbalance in actual competence in favor of Chinese. Here, a difference in dialect between interviewer and interviewee was the intervening consideration. In stark contrast, Dawa's age mate, Manlatso, showed the strongest preference for Tibetan during the interview in addition to a notable ethnolinguistic awareness and loyalty, including the conscious avoidance of common Chinese loanwords. This last striking observation apparently correlates with equally notable common daily practice in Manlatso's home community in the Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture of Qinghai.

The one child participant, 13 year old Chamba, provided an example of bilingual lexical knowledge where some entries may be exclusively from Chinese, without translation equivalent, due to the social domain in which the terms were learned. Nevertheless, his Tibetan showed all the signs of complete mother-tongue mastery, aside from a personal preference for Tibetan, in addition to advanced Chinese speaking ability. In other words, even extensive lexical borrowing does not necessarily indicate a loss of linguistic competence in the host language.

The interview with A Ji stands out as she was witness-participant during the Cultural Revolution (documented in her diary, lent to the author). Predominantly in Tibetan, the text switches to Chinese when describing events, for example of the many "criticism rallies . . . We were told these were bad people who were the people of anti-revolution. I always wondered what anti-revolution meant" (p. 126). More systematic even than Gegan's metaphoric use

of alternation, A Ji strictly compartmentalized her accounts of the Red Guard period and the subsequent restoration of Tibetan in school when she recovered her own commitment, now academically motivated, to the language. The former was given all in Chinese, the latter narrated in Tibetan.

Readers will take special note of the uncensored accounts of the effects of the Cultural Revolution on use of the Tibetan language and on other aspects of Tibetan culture during the ten year upheaval, for the language and culture approaching a "destruction" (p. 127) and "unprecedented catastrophe" (p. 116)—words of the author in her commentary on A Ji's testimony. Parenthetically, recent foreign visitors to Chinese universities have confirmed instances of the relative, or partial, lifting of the veto on similar frank discussion of the years 1966–1976.

An interesting theme that all five interview samples share is an expressed instrumental motivation to learn and master Chinese, including on the part of the child participant. In none of the examples, as was reported by all participants, did this practical learning objective present itself as contradicting the need to maintain and improve ability in Tibetan, in particular skill in literacy. Skeptical readers may take this expressed posture as being in line with official correct thinking, to conform with perceived expectations of the interviewer. But reading the passages a second time, this was not my impression, aside from the logic and plausibility of the point of view of language learners of a society that has become bilingual in a new way. This view, by the way, might be controversial in some respects among commentators and researchers interested in Tibetan culture and politics, a discussion that we must defer to another occasion. The recurring topic of Tibetan language improvement deserves follow-up research to delve deeper into the circumstances, case by case. Do participants (when they report it) actually lose knowledge of their mother-tongue during the years in school, to later recover the knowledge, or is their competence preserved during periods of exclusive or near exclusive Chinese-medium instruction?

To the author's credit, and great benefit to readers, she takes responsibility for explicitly steering interviewees away from discussing difficult topics. Where this comes up is in a reference, by participant Chamba, to the recent widespread mass protests following the week of March 14, 2008:

> I used . . . to get help with my Chinese from the owner of the shop. He was always helpful to me when I was having difficulty with my Chinese homework. I heard he was a teacher in a primary school in mainland China. His shop was burned on 3.14, and he went back to China after 3.14. (p. 138)

"I stopped him from talking further about this because it is a very sensitive topic" (p. 139). In the section of final remarks, the conclusion acknowledges that discussion of other sensitive topics related to the theme of Tibetan

language learning and subtractive bilingualism should be limited as well (p. 173). Here again, readers will appreciate the author's candor because these two passages allow us to better understand which topics (once highly sensitive, virtually prohibited, in China) are now permitted, and which still await a new opening. A future revised edition of this interesting book will then be able to incorporate recent developments into its ongoing analysis.

Chapters 6–8 outlined how language policy in Tibet showed signs of openness following the outright repression of the language through to the 1970s. However, the story doesn't end there. The current administration, beginning in 2012, has by all (albeit incomplete) reports reacted decisively against initiatives in favor of additive bilingualism for Tibetan. The evidence suggests that the reaction came into force during the prior administration of Hu Jintao, following the 2008 protests, which included students, in 2010, calling attention precisely to the downgrading of Tibetan language instruction. An important component of this downgrading is the increased promotion of boarding schools at great distance from the Tibetan region. The unmistakable evidence of a return to an explicitly subtractive policy was the 2016 arrest, and subsequent conviction, of language promoter Tashi Wangchuk.[4]

No reader of this journal misunderstands what motivated the above omission from the final chapters, and most readers of the book will not question the sincerity of its defense of the Tibetan language. We all look forward to when the current period of restrictive language policy will be open to discussion, as the years of the Cultural Revolution are today to some degree. Lifting the repression on language advocates and educators will allow for the beginning of an objective assessment.

Norbert Francis

*Norbert Francis is Professor Emeritus at Northern Arizona University. His research focuses on problems of bilingual development and literacy in second language learning.*

NOTES

1. The findings of Picus Ding's study, *Southern Min (Hokkien) as a Migrating Language* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), were summarized in *China Review International* 21, no. 2.

2. Nawang Phuntsog, "China's Minority Preferential Policies and the Schooling of Indigenous Tibetan Children: The Weakest Link," *Intercultural Education* 30, no. 1 (2019): 68–82.

3. In this discussion of a shift toward Chinese and away from Tibetan, it is important to keep conceptually separate the domains of mother-tongue linguistic competence and literacy-related language ability, even as each one interacts with the other in the highly complex additive and subtractive scenarios. The distinction is relevant because the two languages possess corresponding writing systems of independent origin and long-standing tradition.

4. As of this writing, Tashi Wangchuk remains in custody (Chris Buckley, "A Tibetan Tried to Save his Language: China Handed him Five Years in Prison," *The New York Times*,

May 22, 2018), https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/22/world/asia/tibetan-activist-tashi-wangchuk-sentenced.html.

Paul Manfredi and Christopher Lupke, editors. *Chinese Poetic Modernisms*. Leiden: Brill, 2019. xi, 403 pp. Hardcover $232.00, ISBN 978-90-04-40288-1.

Many of you will want (and should) own this volume of essays; yet, with a price tag of $232.00, few will be able to afford it—unless you have a very generous research budget. No doubt the essays will have a robust afterlife as individual PDFs circulating the cyber world. That is good for many reasons, but it is also unfortunate. For, although any given essay can be profitably read as a stand-alone piece, each and all are much richer in the dense intratextual environment of this collective volume. Thus, it is odd decision not to include any cross-referencing between the essays themselves. Perhaps the editors thought that such cross-referencing would have been too dense to be useful. But one thing such internal cross-referencing would have done is leave residual traces of the whole admirable, integrated project within the individual essays as they float detached through the PDF ocean: always a reminder of what is missing.

For almost all these essays there is an elephant in the room, sometimes acknowledged, often ignored: that is, the looming shadow of the Chinese classical poem and its language. Paul Manfredi states the problem most clearly:

> Chinese New Poetry, which labored to emerge from under the oppressive weight of its predecessor, classical verse, was not as fortunate as visual art in terms of its ability to change modes of expression without sacrificing its claims to expressive object . . . . Poets therefore confronted a sort of stubborn tabula rasa, a free verse that was, from the point of view of most of the Chinese reading public, indistinguishable from prose. (p. 341)

Lucas Klein backs into the argument through a refutation of Michelle Yeh's refutation of Stephen Owen's now well-known argument that much contemporary Chinese poetry is merely international poetry written for translation. Klein says:

© 2020 *by University of Hawai'i Press*

> But if Chineseness is, for Owen, best located in Chinese poetry's premodern traditions, then in Yeh's intent to rebuff Owen by asserting that "Modern [Chinese] Poetry embodies a new paradigm that is radically different from the