The Expansion of Cantonese Over the Last Two Centuries

Hilário de Sousa

Contents

Abstract

Cantonese is the representative variety of Yue Chinese. Since the end of the First Opium War (1839–1842), a large number of Cantonese people have emigrated from the heart of the Pearl River Delta, thereby creating many "enclave" varieties of Cantonese elsewhere in far southern China and overseas. This chapter, descriptive in nature, looks into the formation of these enclave Cantonese varieties, concentrating on Nanning Cantonese and Hong Kong Cantonese. The primary factor that caused the variation among the Cantonese varieties is the difference in their language contact environments. Being spoken in so many different countries and territories has also increased the variation among the Cantonese varieties, with the difference in language policy being one of the factors. Also discussed in this chapter is Written Cantonese; in the Cantonese world, one finds a continuum of written registers from Standard Written Chinese to Written Cantonese. Being used in different jurisdictions also means that Written Cantonese has evolved slightly differently in the different jurisdictions.

H. de Sousa (✉)
EHESS – CRLAO, Paris, France
e-mail: hilario@bambooradical.com

Z. Ye (ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Chinese Language Studies*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6844-8_35-2

Keywords

Cantonese · Yue Chinese · Guangzhou · Hong Kong · Macau · Nanning · Overseas Chinese · Language contact

Introduction

Cantonese, the representative variety of Yue Chinese, is one of the better-known Sinitic languages. In this chapter, some aspects of the development of Cantonese will be discussed. The chapter is not so much about the linguistic changes in Standard Cantonese; it is mainly about the development of the various Cantonese varieties away from the heart of the Pearl River Delta, i.e., the Guangzhou area, where Cantonese originated. This chapter is primarily descriptive in nature.

Despite not being particularly widely spoken within China, outside China Cantonese is one of the best-known Chinese varieties besides Mandarin. What has contributed to the prominence of Cantonese? Part of it is due to its diversity: massive emigration by Cantonese people from the heart of the Pearl River Delta since the 1840s created many enclaves of Cantonese speakers elsewhere, both within far southern China and overseas, causing Cantonese to be spoken in many different countries and territories. Cantonese has received favorable treatment with the language policies in some of them. These varieties of Cantonese spoken outside the heart of the Pearl River Delta are referred as "enclave Cantonese" varieties in this chapter.

One important theme, from as early as the formation of Yue Chinese to the emergence of the modern Cantonese varieties, is language contact. While Standard Cantonese in Guangzhou and the enclave Cantonese varieties elsewhere have remained highly mutually intelligible, there are some variations. The variations among the Cantonese varieties are often the result of the differences in their language contact environments. Some of the enclave Cantonese varieties are still very close to the Cantonese of Guangzhou, e.g., Hong Kong Cantonese (e.g., Zhān et al. 2002: 213–218; Cheung 2007; Cheng 1999). Others have become more divergent from Guangzhou Cantonese. In this chapter, as an illustration of a more divergent enclave Cantonese variety, the case of Nanning Cantonese will be discussed.

Data on Standard Cantonese are drawn from both literature and the present author's first-language knowledge. Data on Nanning Cantonese are primarily drawn from Lín and Qín (2008), and also from knowledge acquired by the present author based on his fieldwork on Nanning Pinghua (e.g., de Sousa 2013, 2017, forthcoming-a; Lǐ 2000; Qín 2000, 2007), another Sinitic language spoken in Nanning.

This chapter follows the English linguistic convention of treating speech varieties that are not mutually intelligible as separate languages. (See Mair (1991) on the Western linguistic concept of *language* versus *dialect*, and the Chinese concept of *yǔyán* 语言 versus *fāngyán* 方言, which are not identical. The Western and Chinese approaches are simply two different ways of classifying speech varieties; both have

their merits and limitations. See also Cheng and Tang (2014) on the issue of languagehood from the perspective of Hong Kong Cantonese.) Based on this English convention, Cantonese, Hakka (Kejia 客家), Teochew (Chaozhou 潮州), Mandarin, etc. are separate languages, and the family of languages that descend from Old Chinese is called the Sinitic language family (e.g., Mair 2013; Chappell 2015a; Handel 2015).

Earlier History of Yue Chinese

Cantonese is the representative variety of the Yue dialect group. Having an understanding of what "Cantonese" is and of what "Yue dialect group" is are each essential in understanding what the other is. When speakers of Sinitic languages talk about *Yuèyǔ* (粵语 *jyt*^{2} *jy*^{13}), "the Yue language," they are most usually referring to Standard Cantonese. However, the notion of the "Yue dialect group" is much wider than the notion of "Cantonese." There are many Yue dialects which are of very low intelligibility to speakers of Standard Cantonese without pre-exposure. (However, due to exposure to Cantonese media, many speakers of other Yue dialects understand Standard Cantonese.) Here the earlier history of the Yue dialect group will be briefly outlined, before the notion of "Cantonese" is discussed in the next section.

The Yue dialects are primarily spoken in the Pearl River basin, plus the many small river basins in Guangdong and Guangxi, south of the Pearl River basin between Macau and the border with Vietnam. The Pearl River basin is situated to the south of the Yangtze River basin. The Yangtze and Pearl River basins are separated by the Nanling 南岭 mountains. The following is a summary of Lǐ (2002: 121–134) on the migration history of Yue speakers, and the interaction that Yue speakers had with indigenous people in the Pearl River basin (see also de Sousa (forthcoming-b)). During the Qin Dynasty (221–206 BCE), the Lingqu 灵渠 Canal was built (in modern day Xing'an 兴安 County in Guangxi near Hunan), linking the Yangtze River system and the Pearl River system. Before then, Chinese political structures existed only in the Yangtze, Huai, and Yellow River regions to the north. With the opening of the Lingqu Canal, for the first time Chinese political structures were set up in the Pearl River region. For the next millennium or so, the number of Han people in the Pearl River region was small in relation to the indigenous population. In the eighth century CE, during the Tang Dynasty (618–690, 705–907 CE), the Plum Pass Road (*Méiguāndào* 梅关道) was built (in modern day Nanxiong 南雄 City in Guangdong near Jiangxi), greatly improving the accessibility of the Pearl River delta from the Yangtze region to the north. That sped up the migration of Han people from the north into Guangdong. Within decades of the opening of the Plum Pass Road, the number of Han people (preexisting population and new migrants) in the Pearl River Delta was so great that reports of indigenous people in the Pearl River Delta had become infrequent. Within Guangdong, Han people gradually spread from the Pearl River Delta, primarily in a westward direction (as the west was relatively lightly populated), forming the Yue dialect group.

(The areas north and east of the Pearl River Delta were already relatively heavily populated by Han settlers; later on, these areas became primarily Hakka speaking.) On the way, they encountered indigenous people, and also pockets of other Han Chinese people who had settled in the region earlier. During the Northern Song Dynasty (960–1127 CE), there were still many reports of indigenous people in western Guangdong. However, by the Yuan Dynasty (1271–1368 CE), there were already very few reports of indigenous people in western Guangdong; most indigenous people had assimilated into the Yue-speaking Han communities. Yue language continued to spread westward from western Guangdong to eastern Guangxi. By the eighteenth century, in the middle of the Qing dynasty (1636–1912 CE), there were already few reports of indigenous people in the southeastern third of Guangxi. The history of Cantonese since the middle of the eighteenth century will be discussed in the next section. See also Yóu (2000: 106) on Northern Chinese migration to Guangdong around the Northern Song Dynasty, and Wáng (2009) for a model of the formation of the various Sinitic dialects groups from a historical phonological perspective.

Linguistically, the most significant influence on Yue was the Middle Chinese introduced by Northern Chinese migrants in about tenth-century CE (during later parts of the Tang Dynasty (618–907) and the Five Dynasties period (907–979); Wáng 2009) and Early Mandarin in the thirteenth-century CE (towards the end of the Song Dynasty (960–1279); Lau 2001). Other influences include the earlier Sinitic varieties in the Pearl River region (e.g., Kwok 2004), and also the indigenous languages in the region. The indigenous languages that Yue was in contact with were primarily Kra-Dai languages (also known as Tai-Kadai, or *Dòng-Tái* 侗台 or *Zhuàng-Dòng* 壮侗 in Chinese). Yue has a strong Kra-Dai substratum; some Kra-Dai influences are present throughout the Yue area, while others are more restricted towards the west, where contact between Yue and Kra-Dai languages lasted till more recently, or is still ongoing. There have been many studies on the Kra-Dai influence on Yue; some examples are Bái (2009), Bauer (1996), Chappell (2017), Huang (1997), Huang and Wu (2018), Lǐ (2002), Liú (2006), Matthews (2006), Peyraube (1996), de Sousa (2015, forthcoming-b), and Yue-Hashimoto (1991). See also discussions below on "Nanning Cantonese and ▶ Contact-Induced Change in the Languages of Southern China."

Cantonese Since the First Opium War, and the Notion of "Cantonese"

Looking at the distribution of the subtypes of Yue dialects, it is clear that their distribution is not entirely caused by a gradual spread of population from the Pearl River Delta towards the west (as described in the preceding section); the Yue dialects do not simply form an east-west dialect chain along the Pearl River. There are many enclaves of Cantonese in far southern China and overseas that have remained linguistically quite close to Standard Cantonese. In the context of the Yue area in western Guangdong and eastern Guangxi, these Cantonese dialects are noticeably

different from the pre-established Yue dialects that surround them. What has caused this pattern?

A major starting point for this new pattern is the cessation of the centuries-long maritime prohibitions (*hǎijìn* 海禁), after which a large number of Cantonese speakers started migrating by boats directly from the heart of the Pearl River to further away places along the waterways and coast of far southern China, and also overseas. Between the fourteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century (spanning the Yuan, Ming, and the first half of Qing Dynasty), most of the time there were restrictions on civilian maritime traffic; civilian seafaring was prohibited, and navigation on domestic rivers was not totally free. (There were already some Yue migrants overseas, legally or illegally, before the First Opium War; many were in foreign lands, for instance dealing with financial transactions between China and foreign countries.) After the First Opium War (1839–1842), however, China was forced to end its centuries-long maritime prohibitions; there were no longer restrictions on civilian watercraft ownership and maritime movements. From the heart of the Pearl River Delta, a large number of Cantonese people, especially merchants, migrated by boats in all sorts of directions, bringing with them the Cantonese language to new places. (There were also speakers of other Yue dialects, and other southern Sinitic languages, that migrated at around the same time, but they are outside of the scope of this chapter.) Some Cantonese speakers went up the Pearl River system to localities across Guangdong and Guangxi. Others went along the coast to Hong Kong, Macau, west along the Guangdong and Guangxi coasts, and then to Vietnam and further. Many went across the ocean to the other continents. The emigration has not stopped since, with the number of emigrants spiking during turbulent times. Often, through the commercial prowess of the Cantonese people, Cantonese became the dominant Sinitic variety in many cities and towns. There are many of these "enclave" varieties of Cantonese scattered across far southern China and overseas. These Cantonese varieties are inevitably in contact with the languages that surround them. The level of influence that these enclave Cantonese varieties receive from their surrounding languages varies. Some factors involved are the number of Cantonese migrants versus the other linguistic groups, the socioeconomic power that each language group has, the level of multilingualism, and language shift. Another factor which influences the linguistic features that an enclave Cantonese variety has is the type of Cantonese spoken by the initial settlers: Which part of the Pearl River Delta did they come from? or whether they spoke yet another enclave Cantonese variety to start off with. (For example, the Cantonese of Hekou 河口 in Yunnan was mostly formed by speakers from Cantonese enclaves in Guangxi like Baise 百色 and Nanning 南宁, plus some later Cantonese migrants who moved up the Red River from Northern Vietnam (Lǐ 2002: 132–133).) Some enclave Cantonese varieties remain highly similar to the Cantonese spoken in Guangzhou; Hong Kong Cantonese is an example. Others have been more strongly influenced by the surrounding languages. In the next section, the case of Nanning Cantonese will be discussed.

Before continuing, the notion of "Cantonese" has to be defined first. There is Standard Cantonese, and the other Cantonese varieties. Standard Cantonese in this

chapter refers to the language of Canton, a Western name for Guangzhou (广州 *kʷɔŋ*^{35} *tsɐu*^{53}), the capital of Guangdong province. (A competing standard is Hong Kong Cantonese, but Hong Kong Cantonese is minimally different from Guangzhou Cantonese.) Beyond the speech of Guangzhou, the speech varieties that descended from the Cantonese spoken by people who emigrated from the Guangzhou area since the First Opium War (1839–1842) are also considered Cantonese in this chapter. "Guangzhou area" is the area traditionally referred to as Sanyi (三邑 *sam*^{55} *jɐp*^{5}) "three counties": the historical counties of Nanhai 南海, Panyu 番禺, and Shunde 顺德. (The historical Panyu County included the central districts of Guangzhou.) Away from the Guangzhou area, some examples of enclave Cantonese varieties within China are Hong Kong 香港, Macau 澳门, Shaoguan 韶关, Wuzhou 梧州, Beihai 北海, and Nanning 南宁. As for the overseas distribution of Yue dialects, map B-16 in the first edition of the Language Atlas of China (Wurm et al. 1987/1989) classifies overseas Yue dialects into three groups: Sanyi 三邑 "three counties," Siyi 四邑 "four counties" (the historical counties of Taishan 台山, Kaiping 开平, Enping 恩平, and Xinhui 新会), and Zhongshan 中山. "Cantonese" here corresponds with Sanyi Yue. Some examples of Chinatowns overseas that are traditionally Cantonese dominant are Hanoi, Kuala Lumpur, Sydney, Vancouver, and London. There are some vocabulary differences among these various Cantonese varieties, but their phonologies are minimally different from that of Guangzhou Cantonese. A phonologically oriented definition of this notion of Cantonese is presented below.

The definition of Cantonese outlined above is perhaps a somewhat narrow definition of Cantonese. Ideas vary about the range of Yue dialects that is encompassed by the label of Cantonese. In the widest sense, the term Cantonese is sometimes applied to the entire Yue dialect group. However, this wide approach is not recommended: there are many Yue dialects that are of rather low intelligibility to speakers of Standard Cantonese without prior exposure. This is often the case with the Yue dialects that are not spoken in the Pearl River basin, for instance the Yue dialects of Taishan 台山 and Yangjiang 阳江 in Guangdong, and Bobai 博白 (Dilao dialect 地佬话) and Hepu 合浦 (Lianzhou dialect 廉州话) in Guangxi. "Cantonese" is literally the language of Canton/Guangzhou city: applying the term Cantonese to the entire Yue dialect group is akin to applying the term "Shanghainese" or "Suzhounese" to the entire Wu dialect group, including highly divergent Wu varieties like Wenzhou 温州. Just as it would be misleading to call Wenzhou Wu "Shanghainese," it would conjure up the wrong impression if the term "Cantonese" were applied to Yue dialects as divergent as, e.g., the Lianzhou dialect of Hepu.

(Also notice that the definition of "Cantonese" cannot simply be the language spoken by descendents of people from the Guangzhou area, because they have not necessarily maintained the Cantonese language. For instance, there was a significant Cantonese community in Liuzhou 柳州. While Cantonese had a strong influence on the Southwestern Mandarin of Liuzhou (e.g., Liú 1995; Táng 2012), most Cantonese speakers have shifted to Liuzhou Mandarin.)

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to present a detailed study of the features of the various Cantonese varieties, or the internal classification of the Yue dialects more generally. Given the brief history of migration out of the heart of the Pearl River

Table 1 Tones in Guangzhou Cantonese (Zhān et al. 2002: 292)

	*A	*B	*C	*DL	*DS
*voiceless	55 ~ 53	35	33		55
*voiced	21	13	22		

Table 2 Tones in Hong Kong Cantonese (Matthews and Yip 1994: 22)

	*A	*B	*C	*DL	*DS
*voiceless	55	35 ~ 25	33		55
*voiced	21 ~ 11	13 ~ 23	22		

Table 3 Tones in Beihai Cantonese (Chén and Chén 2005: 7)

	*A	*B	*C	*DL	*DS
*voiceless	55	35	33	3	5
*voiced	21	13	22	2	

Delta, the phonologies of the various Cantonese varieties (as per the definition of Cantonese adopted in this chapter) have remained very similar to each other. There are some slight segmental differences (i.e., differences in the consonants and vowels), but the tones have remained remarkably similar. As a quick demonstration of the uniformity of the phonological systems, only the tonal systems of some Cantonese varieties are shown here. Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 show the tonal systems in four Cantonese varieties: Guangzhou, Hong Kong, Beihai, and Nanning. In the tables: *A/B/C/D are the tonal categories of *píng* 平/*shǎng* 上/*qù* 去/*rù* 入 in Middle Chinese, L/S refer to the "long" and "short" vowels in the modern Yue dialects, and *voiceless/*voiced refer to the voicing of the initial consonant of a syllable in Middle Chinese (i.e., "Yin"/"Yang" tones, respectively, in Chinese historical linguistics). The cells in the middle show the pitch values of the tones: 5 is highest pitch and 1 is lowest pitch. (The tilde "~" indicates free variations.) As can be seen in the tables, the tones are basically the same across these Cantonese varieties; the variation shown here can be viewed as mere notational differences.

Table 4 Tones in Nanning Cantonese (Lín and Qín 2008: 14)

	*A	*B	*C	*DL	*DS
*voiceless	55	35	33	3	5
*voiced	21	24	22	2	

Table 5 Tones in Zhongshan Yue (Zhān et al. 2002: 294)

	*A	*B	*C	*DL	*DS
*voiceless	55	213	33		55
*voiced	51				

Table 6 Tones in Dongguan Yue (Zhān et al. 2002: 295)

	*A	*B	*C	*DL	*DS
*voiceless	213	35	32	22 / 224	44
*voiced	21	13		22	

Macau Cantonese also has the same tones as Guangzhou and Hong Kong, except that some people do not, or cannot easily, distinguish the two rising tones (the two tone B's) (Bauer and Benedict 1997), probably a trait related to the Zhongshan-type of Yue that used to be spoken in Macau. See also, e.g., Bauer, Cheung, and Cheung (2003), and Zhang (2019), on recent tone mergers in Hong Kong and Macau. In Beihai, Xiǎn (2018 ms), and Chén and Lín (2009: 3) report that among younger speakers, *voiced A and *voiced C have merged to become [21], and the two tones *B's have merged to become [13].

Based on the definition of Cantonese adopted in this chapter, some Yue varieties geographically close to Guangzhou are not considered Cantonese here. Examples are Zhongshan 中山 Yue and Dongguan 东莞 Yue. (Before the arrival of Cantonese, Macau Yue was similar to Zhongshan Yue (Zhān et al. 2002: 196–202), while the majority of indigenous Yue varieties in Hong Kong are similar to Dongguan Yue (Zhān et al. 2002: 188–195; Chang et al. 1999).) As can be seen in Tables 5 and 6, the tones in Zhongshan and Dongguan are noticeably different from those in Cantonese.

Table 7 Tones in Nanning Cantonese (Lín and Qín 2008: 14; repeated from Table 4)

	*A	*B	*C	*DL	*DS
*voiceless	55	35	33	3	5
*voiced	21	24	22	2	

Nanning Cantonese

To give an example of a more divergent Cantonese variety, some features of Nanning Cantonese will be discussed below. Most of these are the results of the language contact environment in the Nanning area.

Nanning is the capital of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region. The city is divided into a northern and southern half by the Yong River 邕江, a tributary of the West branch of the Pearl River (i.e., upriver from and west of Guangzhou). The city center lies on the northern bank, and is dominated by Nanning Cantonese. In the surrounding suburbs, Nanning Pinghua is spoken. In the surrounding rural areas, the indigenous Zhuang languages are spoken: roughly speaking, Northern Zhuang north of the river and Southern Zhuang south of the river. There are also two types of Mandarin in Nanning: Old Nanning Mandarin and New Nanning Mandarin. Old Nanning Mandarin (*Yōngzhōu Guānhuà* 邕州官话) is a type of Southwestern Mandarin that used be spoken across a few blocks in the city center. Old Nanning Mandarin is now moribund in the city center, but it is still spoken in several villages south of the river. New Nanning Mandarin (*Nánníng Pǔtōnghuà* 南宁普通话, or *NánPǔ* 南普) is Nanning's version of modern Standard Mandarin, strongly influenced by the local languages. The indigenous Zhuang languages are Tai languages (the branch of the Kra-Dai language family that also includes major languages like Thai and Lao), while Pinghua, Cantonese, and Mandarin are Sinitic. (Today, few young people under 20 speak anything other than New Nanning Mandarin.)

Cantonese first arrived in Nanning in the middle of the nineteenth century. During the early days of the Republic of China (the 1910s), Old Nanning Mandarin was still spoken by half of the population in Nanning's city center (Zhōu et al. 2006). However, as more Cantonese people arrived, Cantonese gradually replaced Old Nanning Mandarin as the dominant language in the city center. Nanning Cantonese has been heavily influenced by the local languages, especially from the indigenous Zhuang languages. So much so that Nanning Cantonese, which has been spoken in Nanning for less than 200 years, is at times even more Zhuang influenced than Nanning Pinghua is, despite Pinghua having been spoken in the area for more than one millennium (see de Sousa 2013, 2015).

The phonology of Nanning Cantonese is recognizably Cantonese. The tones are the same as Standard Cantonese. Table 7 below lists the tones in Nanning Cantonese

Table 8 Tones in Nanning Weizilu Pinghua (de Sousa forthcoming-a)

	*A	*B	*C	*D
*voiceless aspirated	53	33	35	3
*voiceless unaspirated			55	
*voiced sonorant	21	13	22	23
*voiced obstruent				2

Table 9 Tones in Old Nanning Mandarin (Zhōu et al. 2006)

	*A	*B	*C	*D
*voiceless	35	54	13	31
*voiced sonorant	31			
*voiced obstruent				

(repeated from Table 4 above); compare this with the inventory of tones in the other Cantonese varieties shown above (Tables 1, 2 and 3).

Nanning Cantonese is noticeably different from the surrounding languages. Tables 8 and 9 illustrate the tonal systems of the surrounding Sinitic languages.

(There are different accents of Pinghua in the various suburbs of Nanning; their tones, and their phonologies in general, differ slightly. Southern Pinghua, of which Nanning Pinghua is a dialect, is on a dialect continuum with the non-Cantonese Yue dialects in Guangxi. The migration of Cantonese speakers from the Guangzhou area to the Nanning area was, roughly speaking, the migration of people directly from the eastern end of the dialect continuum to the western end of the dialect continuum along the Pearl River. See de Sousa (2015, forthcoming-a, forthcoming-b).)

The segments of Nanning Cantonese are largely the same as Standard Cantonese. Some features of earlier Cantonese (as seen in the eighteenth and nineteenth century Cantonese sources, e.g., the rime book *Fēnyùn Cuōyào* (分韵撮要 *fɐn*^{55} *wɐn*^{13} *tsʰyt*^{3} *jiu*^{33}) and Western documentations of Cantonese) can still be seen in Nanning Cantonese. For instance, the diphthongization of high vowels is absent in Nanning Cantonese, e.g., 机 *jī* "machine,", Nanning Cantonese *ki*^{55}, Standard Cantonese *kei*^{55}. In the earlier Western documentations of Cantonese, for the affricates and fricatives, there were two coronal places of articulation: alveolar and post-alveolar, rendered <ts/ts‘/s> vs. <ch/ch‘/sh> or the like (a distinction that is preserved to a degree by the British spelling of Hong Kong place names; see, e.g., Bauer 2005;

Kataoka and Lee 2008). Standard Cantonese merged these two series within the last century. In Nanning Cantonese, while the two sets of affricates have merged more recently (vestiges are still maintained by some of its oldest speakers (Lín and Qín 2008: 11)), the two fricatives are still largely distinct. The articulation of the two fricatives is notable: *ɬ* and *ʃ*. The lateral fricative *ɬ* (or dental fricative *θ* in some areas) is an areal feature in Guangxi and parts of Guangdong. One possibility is that Cantonese speakers acquired the lateral fricative after arriving in Guangxi; looking at other Sinitic languages in the region, most Guangxi Hakka and Southern Min varieties also arrived in Guangxi within the last two hundred years or so, and many have also acquired the lateral fricative within this short period of time. Another possibility is that the ancestors of Nanning Cantonese started off having the lateral fricative in the Pearl River Delta. Although there is no evidence that the lateral fricative existed in Guangzhou, at present the lateral fricative is still found in some Yue dialects not too far away from Guangzhou: in the Siyi 四邑 region to the southwest of Guangzhou, e.g., Taishan 台山, and also in Fogang 佛冈 to the north of Guangzhou (Mài 2010).

Zhuang, Nanning Pinghua, and Cantonese have the same consonantal codas of *-m -n -ŋ -p -t -k*; these languages are usually rather conservative with them. Old Nanning Mandarin has fewer codas: *-n -ŋ*, plus a few cases of *-m -p -t -k* in loanwords. Interestingly, there are some cases in Nanning Cantonese, and sometimes also in Nanning Pinghua, where certain syllables ended up having the "wrong" coda. This is probably caused by speakers of Old Nanning Mandarin hypercorrecting when they speak Cantonese, and then shifting en masse to Cantonese, causing these "errors" to become mainstream. Nanning Cantonese has subsequently influenced Nanning Pinghua. In particular, cases of **-n > -m* are extraordinarily rare in Chinese historical phonology (the overwhelmingly dominant direction of change is **-m > -n*). Some examples are:

- 典 "scripture," Middle Chinese ten^{B}:
  - Old Nanning Mandarin $tien^{54}$, Standard Mandarin *diǎn*, Standard Cantonese tin^{35}; but
  - Nanning Cantonese tim^{35}, Nanning Pinghua tim^{33};
- 演 "act," Middle Chinese jen^{B}:
  - Old Nanning Mandarin ien^{54}, Standard Mandarin *yǎn*, Standard Cantonese jin^{35}; but
  - Nanning Cantonese jim^{35}, Nanning Pinghua im^{33};
- 建 "build," Middle Chinese $kjon^{C}$:
  - Old Nanning Mandarin $kien^{13}$, Standard Mandarin *jiàn*, Standard Cantonese kin^{33}; but
  - Nanning Cantonese kim^{33}, Nanning Pinghua kim^{55}.

One example of the more common sound change of **-m > -n* is:

- 镰 "sickle," Middle Chinese *ljem*^{A}:
  - Standard Cantonese *lim*^{21}, Nanning Pinghua *lim*^{21}; but
  - Nanning Cantonese *lin*^{21} (cf. the regular reflexes in Old Nanning Mandarin *lien*^{31}, and Standard Mandarin *lián*).

There are also some synchronic phonetic loans from Mandarin, i.e., direct loaning through contemporary phonetics and not through historical sound correspondences. For instance, for the verb "give," in Nanning Cantonese there is the native Cantonese verb 畀 *pi*^{35} (Standard Cantonese *pei*^{35}), and also the Mandarin phonetic loan 给 *kɐi*^{55} (< Liuzhou Mandarin 给 *kɐi*^{54}, Old Nanning Mandarin *kei*^{54}; the regular pronunciation of 给 in Cantonese is *kʰɐp*^{5}, from Middle Chinese *kip*^{D}). The traditional term for "corn" 包粟 *pɛu*^{55} *łuk*^{5} ~ *pau*^{55} *łuk*^{5} in Nanning Cantonese (Standard Cantonese 粟米 *sʊk*^{5} *mɐi*^{13}) has been replaced by the term 玉米 *jy*^{22} *mɐi*^{24}, which is a partial loan from Mandarin: the whole word is in Mandarin (cf. Old Nanning Mandarin 玉米 *iu*^{31} *mi*^{54}, Liuzhou Mandarin *y*^{24} *mi*^{54}, Standard Mandarin *yùmǐ*), the segments of the first syllable are Mandarin like, while the tone is in Cantonese (cf. Cantonese 玉 *juk*^{2} "jade"); the second syllable 米 *mɐi*^{24} is in Cantonese. Nanning Cantonese *jy*^{22} *mɐi*^{24} has in turn been loaned via normal sound correspondences into Nanning Pinghua as *ɲəi*^{22} *mɐi*^{13}.

Standard Cantonese already has a noticeable number of lexical items from Kra-Dai language, and Nanning Cantonese has even more Zhuang loanwords. Examples of Zhuang words that are found in Nanning Cantonese but not in Standard Cantonese include *mɐp*^{2} "hit with thing," *nɐm*^{55} "unsophisticated," *kʰɐm*^{21} "concave," cf. Northern Zhuang *moeb [mop*^{3}*]* "hit," *numq [num*^{35}*]* "slow," and *gumz [kum*^{31}*]* "concave."

One also sees transfer of Zhuang grammatical patterns into Nanning Cantonese. When comparing the grammars of Nanning Cantonese and Nanning Pinghua, sometimes there is a curious case of Nanning Cantonese, or sometimes even Standard Cantonese, resembling the indigenous Zhuang more than Nanning Pinghua does. This is despite Pinghua having been spoken in Nanning for at least one millennium, whereas Cantonese has only been in Nanning for less than 200 years. This can perhaps be explained by a general lack of social inhibitions among Cantonese people when it comes to intermarrying and interacting with Zhuang people (as well as the socioeconomic power of Cantonese speakers), causing a huge number of Zhuang people to shift to Cantonese, to the extent that many second-language Cantonese features among Zhuang speakers have become mainstream in Nanning Cantonese (see, e.g., Kwok 2019, on Zhuang-like grammatical patterns in Nanning Cantonese). Pinghua has also been strongly influenced by Zhuang. However, until recently, there was some social distance between Pinghua and Zhuang speakers, leading to fewer opportunities for mainstream Pinghua to be influenced by the variety of Pinghua spoken by Zhuang people. Possibly yet another factor is how Nanning Pinghua people, who strongly identify with their Northern Chinese origin, might have been more receptive to the linguistic influences of Old Nanning Mandarin or Guangxi Mandarin in general, or to any influence from Hunan or further north. These points are discussed in more detail in de Sousa (2015,

forthcoming-b). Here, the following grammatical features of Nanning Cantonese, Nanning Pinghua, and Northern Zhuang are briefly discussed: negation, the degree modifier "too," attributive possession, [ADJ + CLF + N] phrases, lone classifiers, the position of resultative complements, and the grammaticalization of "go" as an imperative marker.

Sinitic languages differ in the way that they express negation. Mandarin has two commonly used negators: 不 *bù* and 没 *méi* ~ 没有 *méiyǒu*. The differences between these two are complex (M. Li 1999; Hsieh 2001; Lin 2003; Xiao and McEnery 2008, among others); here, in an oversimplified manner, 不 *bù* is called a nonperfective negator, and 没 *méi* ~ 没有 *méiyǒu* is called a perfective negator. An example of the nonperfective 不 *bù* is 明天我不去 *míngtiān wǒ bú qù* (tomorrow I NEG.NPFV go) "tomorrow I will not go," and an example of the perfective 没 *méi* ~ 没有 *méiyǒu* is 昨天我没去 *zuótiān wǒ méi qù* (yesterday I NEG.PFV go) "yesterday I did not go." The verb of existence 有 *yǒu* (e.g. "there is X"), which also indicates predicative possession (e.g. "I have X"), calls for special attention: in Mandarin, the negative form of 有 *yǒu* is always the perfective 没 *méi* ~ 没有 *méiyǒu*, e.g., 我没钱 *wǒ méi qiǎn* (I NEG.have money) "I have no money."

Standard Cantonese functions similarly; there are the nonperfective negator 唔 m^{21}, and the perfective negator 冇 mou^{13}: e.g., 听日我唔去 $t^{h}ɪŋ^{55}jɐt^{2}$ $ŋɔ^{13}$ m^{21} $hɔy^{33}$ (tomorrow I NEG.NPFV go) "tomorrow I will not go," versus 琴日我冇去 $k^{h}ɐm^{21}jɐt^{2}$ $ŋɔ^{13}$ mou^{13} $hɔy^{33}$ (yesterday I NEG.PFV go) "yesterday I did not go." Existence and possession are similarly negated by the perfective 冇 mou^{13}, e.g., 我冇钱 $ŋɔ^{13}$ mou^{13} $ts^{h}in^{35}$ (I NEG.have money) "I have no money" (See also Law 2014 on Guangdong Yue negation.).

On the other hand, the Sinitic languages in Nanning follow a pattern that is used in most modern Tai languages: not distinguishing nonperfective and perfective negation, and using an analytic expression for "not exist/have." For instance, in contrast to the 唔 m^{21}/冇 mou^{13} distinction in Standard Cantonese, Nanning Cantonese uses 冇 mu^{24} for both: 听日我冇去 $t^{h}eŋ^{55}jɐt^{2}$ $ŋɔ^{24}$ mu^{24} hy^{33} (tomorrow I NEG go) "tomorrow I will not go," and 琴日我冇去 $k^{h}ɐm^{21}mɐt^{2}$ $ŋɔ^{24}$ mu^{24} hy^{33} (yesterday I NEG go) "yesterday I did not go." In contrast to Standard Cantonese where "not exist/have" is simply 冇 mou^{13}, the same meaning in Nanning Cantonese has to be formed analytically by a negator 冇 mu^{24} followed by the verb 有 $jɐu^{24}$ "exist/have": 我冇有钱 $ŋɔ^{24}$ mu^{24} $jɐu^{24}$ $tʃ^{h}in^{21}$ (I NEG have money) "I have no money." (As the analytic construction "negator + have" is also found in Standard Cantonese as late as the nineteenth century (Law 2014), it is most likely a retention in Nanning Cantonese. The retention of this construction in in the Zhuang Language may have also influenced its retention in Nanning Cantonese.) Nanning Pinghua similarly uses 冇 mi^{13} (NEG) and 冇有 mi^{13} $jɔu^{13}$ (NEG have) in the same manner. This is the pattern that most modern Tai languages have; for instance Northern Zhuang uses *mboux* (NEG) and *mboux miz* (NEG have) (e.g., Wéi and Qín 2006), and Thai has ไม่ *mâi* and ไม่มี *mâi mīi* (e.g., Smyth 2002: 138–152). (Pittayaporn, Iamdanush, and Jampathip (2014) reconstruct a Mandarin-type 不 *bù* versus 没 *méi* negator distinction for Proto-Tai, but the distinction is kept in only one Tai variety in Vietnam among the 64 modern Tai varieties in their survey, about two-thirds of which are Zhuang varieties in China. Attestation of

this distinction is also found in Thai documentations from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.)

In Standard Cantonese, the degree modifier "too" is expressed by a normal Sinitic pre-adjectival 太 *tʰai*^{33} (cf. Mandarin 太 *tài*), e.g., 太热 *tʰai*^{33} *jit*^{2} (too hot) "too hot," 太冻 *tʰai*^{33} *tʊŋ*^{33} (too cold) "too cold" (ambient temperature). On the other hand, Northern Zhuang has a post-adjectival *lai* "many/much" for this function, e.g., *hwngq lai* (hot much) "too hot," *nit lai* (cold much) "too cold." Nanning Pinghua has calqued this post-adjectival "much." In Nanning Weizilu 位子渌 Pinghua (data collected by the present author), either the Sinitic pre-verbal "too" or the Tai post-verbal "much", or both, can be used, e.g. 太热/○ *tʰai*^{25} *ɲit*^{23} / *jən*^{53} (too hot/cold), 热/○多 *ɲit*^{23} / *jən*^{53} *tɔ*^{53} (hot/cold much), 太热/○多 *tʰai*^{25} *ɲit*^{23} / *jən*^{53} *tɔ*^{53} (too hot/cold much) "too hot/cold." On the other hand, Nanning Cantonese and some Nanning Pinghua varieties like Tingzi 亭子 (Qín et al. 1997: 71) only have the post-adjectival "much" construction from Zhuang, e.g., Nanning Cantonese 热多 *jit*^{2} *tɔ*^{55} (hot much) "too hot," 冻多 *tuŋ*^{33} *tɔ*^{55} (cold much) "too cold." They do not use the Sinitic pre-adjectival degree marker.

Attributive possession is usually conveyed in Mandarin and Nanning Pinghua through a modifier marker (MOD; i.e., 的 *de* in Mandarin). A modifier marker marks the preceding constituent as a noun modifier. For example, in Mandarin "my pig" and "my book" are expressed as 我的猪 *wǒ de zhū* (1SG MOD pig) "my pig," 我的书 *wǒ de shū* (1SG MOD book) "my book." In Nanning Pinghua, the two expressions are 我个猪 *ŋa*^{13} *kə*^{55} *tʃəi*^{53} (1SG MOD pig) "my pig," 我个书 *ŋa*^{13} *kə*^{55} *łəi*^{53} (1SG MOD book) "my book." Cantonese (both Standard and Nanning Cantonese) also has a modifier marker 嘅 *kɛ*^{33} that can be used in this environment. However, a more common strategy (for nonabstract possessums) is to use the classifier of the possessum instead, e.g., Nanning Cantonese 我只猪 *ŋɔ*^{24} *tʃɛk*^{3} *tʃy*^{55} (1SG CLF pig) "my pig," 我本书 *ŋɔ*^{24} *pun*^{35} *ʃy*^{55} (1SG CLF book) "my book." Northern Zhuang is similar: it also has a possessive marker *duh* (Wéi and Qín 2006: 203–204; functionally narrower than the Sinitic modifier marker), but the more common strategy is to use the classifier of the possessum. However, unlike the possessor–possessum word order in Sinitic languages, most Zhuang varieties have the possessum–possessor word order: *duz mou gou* (CLF pig 1SG) "my pig," *bonj saw gou* (CLF book 1SG) "my book."

Continuing on the syntax of classifiers, there are some classifier constructions in Nanning Cantonese that are reminiscent of Zhuang, but are not found in either Standard Cantonese or Nanning Pinghua. One such construction is the adjective + classifier + noun [ADJ + CLF + N] construction. In Standard Cantonese and Nanning Pinghua, the only adjectives that can immediately precede a classifier are the size adjectives, e.g., Standard Cantonese 大间屋 *tai*^{22} *kan*^{55} *ʊk*^{5} (big CLF house) "big house," Nanning Pinghua 大间屋 *tai*^{22} *kan*^{53} *ʊk*^{3} (big CLF house) "big house." It is ungrammatical with other types of adjective (e.g., Standard Cantonese *空间屋 **hʊŋ*^{55} *kan*^{55} *ʊk*^{5} (empty CLF house) and Nanning Pinghua *空间屋 **hʊŋ*^{53} *kan*^{53} *ʊk*^{3} (empty CLF house) are ungrammatical). One can instead have the adjective between the classifier and the noun [CLF + ADJ + N], e.g., Standard Cantonese 间空屋 *kan*^{55} *hʊŋ*^{55} *ʊk*^{5} (CLF empty house) "the empty house," Nanning Pinghua 个间空

屋 *kə*^{55} *kan*^{53} *hʊŋ*^{53} *ʊk*^{3} (this CLF empty house) "this empty house." (Cantonese allows classifier-initial noun phrases; Nanning Pinghua does not allow classifier-initial noun phrases except when the noun phrase is after a verb, similar to Mandarin.) Alternatively, one can put the adjective into a relative clause, e.g., Standard Cantonese 空嗰间屋 *hʊŋ*^{55} *kɔ*^{35} *kan*^{55} *ʊk*^{5} (empty that CLF house) "the house that is empty," Nanning Pinghua 空个间屋 *hʊŋ*^{53} *kə*^{55} *kan*^{53} *ʊk*^{3} (empty this CLF house) "the house that is empty."

On the other hand, in Nanning Cantonese, [ADJ + CLF + N] noun phrases are very common, and any adjective can go into the ADJ slot, e.g., 空间屋 *huŋ*^{55} *kan*^{55} *uk*^{5} (empty CLF house) "the empty house." The following are some other examples. (In Chinese linguistics, a distinction is often made between *xíngróngcí* 形容词, for the "verby" type of adjectives, as in 高 *ku*^{55} "tall" in 2 below, and *fēnbiécí* 分别词, for the "nouny" type of adjectives, as in 黄色 *wɔŋ*^{21} *ʃek*^{5} "yellow" in 1 below. This distinction is ignored here.)

Nanning Cantonese

1. 黄色支笔冇写得哂, 黑色支重得。
   wɔŋ^{21} *ʃek*^{5} *tʃi*^{55} *pɐt*^{5} *mu*^{24} *ɬɛ*^{35} *tɐk*^{5} *ɬai*^{33}, *hɐk*^{5} *ʃek*^{5} *tʃi*^{55} *tʃuŋ*^{22} *tɐk*^{5}.
   yellow color CLF pen NEG write can PRF black color CLF still can
   "The yellow pen is unusable, the black one can still be used." (Lín and Qín 2008: 278)
2. 妈糊高只男崽好呖嘅。
   ma^{55}*wu*^{21} *ku*^{55} *tʃɛk*^{3} *nam*^{21} *tʃɐi*^{35} *hu*^{35} *lɛk*^{5} *kɛ*^{33}.
   quite tall CLF male child very capable MOD
   "The rather tall boy is very capable." (Lín and Qín 2008: 277)

The [ADJ + CLF + N] construction in Nanning Cantonese is analogous to the [CLF + N + ADJ] construction in Zhuang, with [ADJ] and [CLF + N] reordered following the head-initial noun phrase order in Zhuang.

Northern Zhuang

3. *Diuz[-]buh moq gou deng nou haeb baenz congh.*
   CLF-clothes new 1SG PASS mouse bite complete hole
   "My new shirt was ruined by a mouse." (Wéi and Qín 2006: 242)

In Nanning Cantonese, a lone classifier can be used as an anaphor. This usage is not found in Nanning Pinghua or Standard Cantonese (or Standard Mandarin). In example 4 below from Nanning Cantonese, the classifier 只 *tʃɛk*^{3} (the general classifier for animals) on its own functions as an anaphor. In each instance the classifier refers to one dog, and the referent is determined by the context (in this case probably by pointing). Example 5 below in Standard Cantonese is a translation

of example 4; Standard Cantonese requires at least a demonstrative in front of the classifier in this case.

Nanning Cantonese

4. 啲狗我中意只, 冇中意只, 只难睇多。
ti^{55} *kɐu*^{35} *ŋɔ*^{24} *tʃuŋ*^{55}*ji*^{33} *tʃɛk*^{3}, *mu*^{24} *tʃuŋ*^{55}*ji*^{33} *tʃɛk*^{3}, *tʃɛk*^{3} *nan*^{21}*tʰɐi*^{35} *tɔ*^{55}.
CLF.mass dog 1SG like CLF NEG like CLF CLF ugly too
"The dogs, I like (this) one, I do not like (that) one, (that) one is too ugly." (Lín and Qín 2008: 277)

Standard Cantonese

5. 啲狗我中意呢只, 唔中意嗰只, 嗰只太难睇。
ti^{55} *kɐu*^{35} *ŋɔ*^{13} *tsʊŋ*^{55}*ji*^{33} *ni*^{55} *tsɛk*^{3}, *m*^{21} *tsʊŋ*^{55}*ji*^{33} *kɔ*^{35} *tsɛk*^{3},
CLF.mass dog 1SG like this CLF NEG like that CLF
kɔ^{35} *tsɛk*^{3} *tʰai*^{33} *nan*^{21}*tʰɐi*^{35}.
that CLF too ugly
"The dogs, I like this one, I do not like that one, that one is too ugly."

The lone classifier construction is also found in Zhuang, also functioning as an anaphor.

Northern Zhuang

6. *mwngz dawz duz ma de daeuj hawj gou, gou cawz duz*.
2SG take CLF dog that come give 1SG 1SG buy CLF
"[Y]ou bring that dog to me, I'll buy it[.]" (Sio and Sybesma 2008: 191; Qín 1995: 83)
7. *mwngz bi bi ndaem faex, go baenzlawz ha*?
2SG year year plant tree CLF how Q
"[Y]ou plant trees every year, how are they doing?" (Sio and Sybesma 2008: 191; Qín 1995: 83)

With verb phrase syntax, the Sinitic languages in the Nanning area have also calqued many patterns from the Zhuang languages. For instance, Nanning Cantonese has the word order [verb + object + resultative complement], e.g., 食饭饱 *ʃek*^{2} *fan*^{22} *pɛu*^{35} (eat rice be.full) "having eaten and being full." This [verb + object + resultative complement] order is more common than the normal Sinitic word order of [verb + resultative complement + object], e.g., Standard Cantonese 食饱饭 *sɪk*^{2} *pau*^{35} *fan*^{22} (eat be.full rice), Mandarin 吃饱饭 *chī bǎo fàn* (eat be.full rice) "having eaten and

being full" (Kwok 2010). The Nanning Cantonese pattern is a Tai pattern, cf. Northern Zhuang *gwn haeux imq* (eat rice be.full) (Wéi and Qín 2006: 203), Lao *khòòj5 kin3 makø-muang1 qiim1 lèèw4* (I eat CLF-mango be.full PRF) "I've eaten my fill of mangoes" (Enfield 2008: 412). (Nonetheless, see also Qín, Qín, and Tián 2016: 385–391 on their critique of Kwok 2010; they argue that the pattern in Nanning Cantonese is from Pinghua and not Zhuang.)

Another example is the grammaticalization of the verb "go" to an imperative marker. ("Go" also has a range of other grammaticalized meanings in this region.) This is a development led by Zhuang, and subsequently calqued into the Sinitic languages (see, e.g., Kwok 2014, 2019; Huang and Wu 2018: 115–118; see also [Wu and Huang's chapter in this volume or whatever is appropriate].

Nanning Cantonese

8. 拧铰剪剪断蒐绳去。
   neŋ^{55} *kɛu*^{33}*tʃin*^{35} *tʃin*^{35} *tʰyn*^{24} *tɐu*^{55} *ʃeŋ*^{21} *hy*^{33}.
   take scissors cut be.severed CLF string IMP (<go)
   "Take scissors and cut the string!" (Lín and Qín 2008: 340)

Northern Zhuang

9. *Rumz baek rem lai, gven aen[-]cueng bae.*
   wind north strong much close CLF-window IMP (<go)
   "The north wind is too strong, close the window!" (Wéi and Qín 2006: 208)
10. *Gwn vanj haeux liux bae,*
    eat bowl rice finish IMP (<go)
    "Eat up the bowl of rice!" (Wéi and Qín 2006: 208)

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to present a detailed account on the language contact situation in Nanning. In this section we have seen some examples of an enclave Cantonese variety: Nanning Cantonese. All varieties of Cantonese, including Standard Cantonese in Guangzhou, are affected by their local language contact environments to some degree. Nanning Cantonese is a Cantonese variety that has diverged relatively strongly from Standard Cantonese. Its lexicon and grammar have been strongly influenced by the other languages in the Nanning area. Nonetheless, its phonology is still recognizably Cantonese, and Nanning Cantonese is still quite highly intelligible to speakers of Standard Cantonese.

Cantonese Under Different Jurisdictions

When we look at the variation among the Cantonese varieties, there is one sociopolitical aspect of Cantonese that makes it stand out among the Sinitic languages: Cantonese is one of the few Sinitic languages that are spoken in large numbers across many different jurisdictions. What has caused Cantonese to be spoken in so many different jurisdictions? Another question is that, with Cantonese easily being one of the best-known Sinitic languages in the West, what caused its prominence, especially when we consider that it is – relatively speaking – not widely spoken in China?

Both of these questions can be answered through a number of interrelated factors: the prosperity of the Port of Guangzhou, the dominance of the Hong Kong entertainment industry, Cantonese being used in an official capacity in Hong Kong and Macau, and the dominance of Cantonese in many Chinatowns overseas. In what follows, each of these factors will be briefly discussed.

The prominence of Cantonese began with the prosperity of the Port of Guangzhou. During the time of the maritime prohibitions, Guangzhou and Macau were some of the very few ports in China where foreign traders were allowed to conduct business. Between 1757 and the end of the First Opium War in 1842, Guangzhou was the only port in China where international trading was allowed. The intermediaries were mostly Cantonese speakers. Macanese Creole developed in Macau (e.g., Batalha 1985; de Senna Fernandes and Baxter 2004; Wong 2007), and Chinese Pidgin English developed around the Guangzhou area (e.g., Baker and Mülhäusler 1990; Ansaldo et al. 2010). Both Macanese Creole and Chinese Pidgin English contain many Cantonese/Yue elements, and both are products of the language contact that occurred in the Pearl River Delta between Cantonese and European languages.

The commercial importance of Guangzhou attracted European colonization on the coast of Guangdong. The Portuguese arrived in Macau in 1557; Britain-annexed Hong Kong in 1842; and France-annexed Kouang-Tchéou-Wan 广州湾 (i.e., Zhanjiang 湛江/Fort-Bayard) in 1898. Hong Kong, in particular, and also Macau, to a smaller degree, formed a link between Mainland China and the foreign world. The intermediaries were mostly Cantonese speakers. After European colonization, many people from the Guangzhou area migrated to Hong Kong, Macau, and Zhanjiang. Cantonese became the dominant language in those places.

The second factor has to do with the dominance of the Hong Kong entertainment industry. In the earlier decades of the twentieth century, the Chinese entertainment industry was centered in Shanghai. During the wars of the 1940s, many people who were involved in the entertainment industry fled from Shanghai to Hong Kong, which significantly enriched the Hong Kong entertainment industry. In the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, the Hong Kong entertainment industry was cut off from the Mainland Chinese market, as Mainland China closed itself off from the rest of the world. The Hong Kong entertainment industry remolded itself to suit Chinese audiences overseas, thereby pushing Hong Kong Cantonese popular culture to the world, with the largest market being the Chinese diaspora in Southeast Asia. Hong Kong's popular culture had influence in general in many parts of Southeast Asia

(e.g., Thomas 2002; Heryanto 2013). The Hong Kong entertainment industry continued to flourish. Today, in consideration of the dominance of the Cantonese television media from Hong Kong, Mainland China has one Cantonese satellite television channel, TVS2 (of Guangdong Radio and Television), one of the very few satellite television channels in Mainland China that broadcast exclusively in a language other than Mandarin.

The third factor is the use of Cantonese in an official capacity in Hong Kong and Macau. The Hong Kong and Macau SAR governments primarily function in Cantonese, making Cantonese one of the very few Sinitic languages with official status. Officials speak Cantonese at all sorts of occasions, including the most formal. This has given Cantonese exposure to the world unmatched by other Sinitic languages except Mandarin.

The fourth factor is the spread of Cantonese speakers around the world. Since the end of the First Opium War (1839–1842), a large number of Cantonese (and other Yue) people migrated overseas. Wǔ (2007) estimates that there are more than 8.5 million Yue speakers outside China. Yue is not as prominent as Min and Hakka in many parts of Southeast Asia. However, Yue dominates many Chinatowns in Europe, Africa, the Americas, and Oceania (see, e.g., T'sou and Yóu 2003). Hence, traditionally, the Chinese culture that people in the West are familiar with is often Yue culture, and the Chinese language that they hear is often Cantonese. This is another factor which has contributed to the prominence of Cantonese outside China.

How has being spoken in many different jurisdictions affected the development of the various Cantonese varieties? Some issues related to the development of Cantonese across different jurisdictions will be discussed below. Two common themes are the difference in the language contact environments, and the difference in the language policies of the various countries and territories.

Hong Kong Cantonese is the best-known enclave Cantonese variety. Cantonese is not indigenous to Hong Kong: before the arrival of Cantonese, indigenous Hong Kongers spoke a number of different Yue, Hakka, and Southern Min varieties. The majority spoke a Yue variety that was similar to the indigenous Yue varieties in nearby Shenzhen and Dongguan. (Many of these varieties are now moribund; see Chang, Wán, and Zhuāng (1999) for a survey of the indigenous speech varieties in the New Territories of Hong Kong.) In the 1950s, the Cantonese-speaking population had not yet surpassed 50% of the population in Hong Kong, and Cantonese speakers were concentrated in the urban areas in Hong Kong Island and Kowloon Peninsula. However, with the socioeconomic dominance of Cantonese, there was a massive shift towards Cantonese by indigenous and nonindigenous Hong Kongers who spoke other speech varieties. Prominent groups of non-Cantonese-speaking migrants to Hong Kong include Hoishanese (Taishan and other Siyi Yue varieties), Hakka (Kejia), Teochew (Chaozhou), Hokkien (Southern Min), Shanghainese, and various South Asian groups. Apart from other groups shifting to Cantonese, there was also a large number of newer Cantonese-speaking migrants from the Guangzhou area. Since the 1970s, the percentage of Cantonese speakers in Hong Kong has risen to about 90%, while the percentage of other Sinitic varieties has continuously

dropped, except for Mandarin. (See, T'sou and Yóu 2003; Lau 2004a, b on the formation of Hong Kong Cantonese and the changes in the linguistic demographics in Hong Kong. See Ding 2010 on the influences that the other Sinitic varieties and English have on the phonology of Hong Kong Cantonese.) The situation in Macau was similar; Macau also had Yue, Hakka, and Southern Min speakers; the majority spoke a Yue variety that was similar to that of nearby Zhongshan (Zhān et al. 2002: 196). However, the old Yue of Macau was supplanted by Cantonese, with only some traces of the former variety of Yue left. (See, e.g., Wong 2007, on the linguistic situation in Macau.)

Hong Kong Cantonese is known to have many English loanwords, and Hong Kongers often code mix or code switch between Cantonese and English (e.g., D. Li 1999; Wong et al. 2009; Chan 2019). With English being an official language of Hong Kong, and with the history of colonization by Britain, English is well established in Hong Kong society. As an illustration of how unaware Hong Kongers can be of their use of English loanwords, there is a memeified phrase in Hong Kong: *tʰʊŋ*^{21} *tsɐm*^{22} *tʃʰɛk*^{5}*-ha*^{13}, uttered in a (serious) television period drama by the role of the last Ming Emperor Chongzheng 崇禎 (seventeenth century). English loanwords sound so natural to Hong Kongers that no one noticed the anachronism during the entire production process of the drama: the "Ming Emperor" said 同朕再 check 吓 *tʰʊŋ*^{21} *tsɐm*^{22} *tsɔi*^{33} *tʃʰɛk*^{5}*-ha*^{13} (for 1SG.emperor again check-DELIMITATIVE) "check for me again," with an English loanword included.

Macau, heavily influenced by Hong Kong, follows Hong Kong in most respects, including having basically the same set of English loanwords. Portuguese remains one of the official languages of Macau SAR. However, Portuguese has never had the same level of penetration among the general public in Macau as English has in Hong Kong. Some Portuguese loanwords are still used in Macau Cantonese, but many such loanwords and words in Macau Cantonese, in general, are being replaced by words from Hong Kong Cantonese. For example, in Macau, "tuna" is traditionally 亚东 *a*^{33} *tʊŋ*^{55} (< Portuguese *atum*), but this has largely been replaced by 吞拿 *tʰɐn*^{55} *na*^{21} (< English *tuna*). Similarly, 阿刁 *a*^{33} *tiu*^{55} "uncle" (< Portuguese *tio* "uncle") and 阿窩 *a*^{33} *wɔ*^{55} "grandmother/old woman" (< Portuguese *avó* "grandmother") are no longer commonly used; these days people usually say 阿叔 *a*^{33} *sʊk*^{5} "uncle" in Cantonese, or even *uncle* in English, and 阿婆 *a*^{33} *pʰɔ*^{21} "grandmother/old woman" in Cantonese.

In contrast to the prevalence of English loanwords in Hong Kong and Macau, many expressions in Guangzhou Cantonese are cognates of those found in Mandarin, the official language. For instance, the verb for sending things electronically is often *sɛn*^{55} in spoken Hong Kong Cantonese (< English *send*), whereas it is 发 *fat*^{3} in Guangzhou (< Mandarin 发 *fā* "distribute") (an alternative for both is 寄 *kei*^{33} "send (letter)"). Lexical semantics in Guangzhou Cantonese is also more observably affected by Mandarin. For instance, the verbs 闩 *san*^{55} "close (door/window)" and 熄 *sɪk*^{5} "switch off (lights/electrical appliances)" are both often replaced by 关 *kʷan*^{55} in Guangzhou (< Mandarin 关 *guān*). Similarly, 截的士 *tsit*^{2} *tɪk*^{5}*si*^{35} "hail taxi" and 搭的士 *tap*^{3} *tɪk*^{5}*si*^{35} "ride taxi" are both commonly replaced by 打的 *ta*^{35} *tɪk*^{5} in Guangzhou (< Mandarin 打的 *dǎ dī*. While the noun 的士 *tɪk*^{5}*si*^{35} was loaned

from Cantonese to Mandarin as *díshì*, the phrase 打的 *dǎ dī* was loaned back from Mandarin to Cantonese as *ta*^{35} *tɪk*^{5}; traditionally Cantonese did not use the verb 打 *ta*^{35} "hit" for means of transportation). (Not all European loanwords are gone in Guangzhou; Guangzhou has kept many of the older European loanwords, e.g., 波 *pɔ*^{55} "ball" (< English *ball*), 麻甩 *ma*^{21}*lɐt*^{5} "pervert" (< French *malade* "sick").)

In Southeast Asia, Cantonese is on the whole less prominent than other Sinitic languages such as Hokkien, Teochew, and Hakka. Nonetheless, a few larger Chinatowns are Cantonese dominant, e.g., Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh City, and Kuala Lumpur. (Kuala Lumpur in particular has an active Cantonese television industry.) Even in non-Cantonese dominant areas, Chinese people often have some familiarity with Cantonese from Hong Kong popular culture, and/or having lived in the big cities with Cantonese-dominant Chinatowns. Naturally, these overseas Cantonese varieties are also influenced by their local linguistic environments. For instance, Malayan Cantonese (e.g., Chén 2003; Sin 2009) has many linguistic elements from English and Malay, e.g., in Kuala Lumpur Cantonese *sɪk*^{3}*nə*^{55} "signal" (< English *signal*), *kɐm*^{33}*pɔŋ*^{55} "village" (< Malay *kampung*), 食风 *sɪk*^{2} *fɔŋ*^{55} (eat wind) "travel" (< Malay *makan angin* (eat wind) "travel"). There are also loans from other Sinitic languages that are commonly encountered in Malaysia, e.g., Malayan Cantonese *tsʰin*^{55}*tsʰai*^{55} "any/whatever," from Hokkien 清彩 *tɕʰin*^{53}*tsʰaɪ*^{53} (the equivalent in Standard Cantonese is 求其 *kʰɐu*^{21}*kʰei*^{21} or 是但 *si*^{22}*tan*^{22}). See Chén (2013) on borrowings among the various Sinitic languages in Southeast Asia, and Tan (this volume) on the contact among the Sinitic languages and English in Malaysia.

Cantonese varieties in different Anglophone countries have many English loan words. Nonetheless, their forms are not necessarily the same in different countries. For instance, "apartment" is 雅柏文 *ŋa*^{13}*pʰak*^{3}*mɐn*^{21} in Australia and New Zealand (see Chén 2012 on Sydney Cantonese). On the other hand, this term has evolved to just 柏文 *pʰak*^{3}*mɐn*^{21} is US and Canada.

Not all differences are due to language contact; for instance, many words are simply coined differently in different countries and territories. For instance, "social housing" is 组屋 *tsou*^{35} *ʊk*^{5} (combination house) in Singapore, 人民组屋 *jɐn*^{21}*mɐn*^{21} *tsou*^{35} *ʊk*^{5} (people combination house) in Malaysia, 社屋 *sɛ*^{13} *ʊk*^{5} (social house) in Macau, 公屋 *kʊŋ*^{55} *ʊk*^{5} (public house) in Hong Kong, and 经适房 *kɪŋ*^{55} *sɪk*^{5} *fɔŋ*^{21} (economy suitable house) in Mainland China. (Also notice the use of 屋 *ʊk*^{5} for "house," which is more common in Cantonese and Hakka, versus 房 *fáng* for "house," which is more common in Mandarin.) In another example, a power bank (USB external battery) is 充电宝 *tsʰʊŋ*^{55} *tin*^{22} *pou*^{35} (charge electricity treasure) in Guangzhou (< Mainland Mandarin 充电宝 *chōng diàn bǎo*), but commonly 尿袋 *niu*^{22} *tɔi*^{35} (urine bag, i.e., urostomy bag) in Hong Kong (a metaphor of people walking around with cables/tubes leading out of their bodies). Macau often sides with Hong Kong when it comes to lexical choices, but in some cases it sides with Guangzhou. For instance, an eraser is 胶擦 *kau*^{55} *tsʰat*^{3} (rubber scrub) in Guangzhou and Macau, but 擦胶 *tsʰat*^{3} *kau*^{55} (scrub rubber) in Hong Kong.

There are huge differences among the legal systems of Hong Kong, Macau, and Mainland China. Legal practitioners in Hong Kong and Macau often coin legal terms

in Chinese that bear a stronger resemblance to Classical Chinese than the ones in Mainland China. For instance, "property tax" is 差餉 *tsʰai*^{55} *hœŋ*^{35} (police wage) in Hong Kong Cantonese, and 業鈔 *jip*^{2} *tsʰau*^{55} (property banknote) in Macau Cantonese, both more classical sounding and less semantically transparent than the term 房产税 *fɔŋ*^{21} *tsʰan*^{35} *sɵy*^{33}/*fáng chǎn shuì* (house estate tax) used in Mainland China. Another example is the Classical Chinese-sounding term 入稟 *jɐp*^{2} *pɐn*^{35} (*rù bǐng*, enter report): in Hong Kong 入稟 *jɐp*^{2} *pɐn*^{35} is to file a lawsuit; in Macau 入稟 *jɐp*^{2} *pɐn*^{35} is to file a lawsuit, or to submit an application for driving test. Ho (2012) discusses some differences in the Chinese legalese in Macau, Hong Kong, Mainland China, and Taiwan.

Written Cantonese

The culture of writing also varies in different parts of the Cantonese world. One obvious difference is the use of Simplified versus Traditional Chinese characters. In Mainland China, Simplified Chinese is near-universal. Simplified Chinese is also more common in Malaysia and Singapore. In Hong Kong, Macau, and most other Cantonese communities overseas, Traditional Chinese is dominant. (Although currently, with the increased mobility of people from Mainland China, Simplified Chinese has become more commonly seen in Hong Kong, Macau, and overseas).

In addition, there are the different registers of writing, on a continuum from Modern Standard Written Chinese to Written Cantonese. Formal written communications are mostly conducted in Standard Written Chinese, which is based on Standard Mandarin. However, what people consider "Standard Written Chinese" differs slightly in different parts of the Sinitic world (similar to how Standard Written English differs slightly in different parts of the Anglophone world). In Cantonese societies, there can be conscious or subconscious admixtures of Cantonese linguistic features in people's Standard Written Chinese. For instance, instead of using the "compare" comparative construction (e.g., 甲比乙好 *kap*^{3} *pei*^{35} *jyt*^{2} *hou*^{35} (A compare B good) "A is better than B"), which is the construction used in Standard Written Chinese, Cantonese-influenced Standard Written Chinese might use the "surpass" comparative construction (e.g., 甲好过乙 *kap*^{3} *hou*^{35} *kʷɔ*^{33} *jyt*^{2} (A good surpass B) "A is better than B"), which is the dominant pattern in Cantonese (see Chappell 2015b on comparative constructions among Sinitic languages). Scholarly discussions on written *Gǎngshì Zhōngwén* 港式中文 "Hong Kong-style Chinese," or the broader *Yuèshì Zhōngwén* 粵式中文 "Yue-style Chinese," include Shí (2006), Shí, Shào, and Chu (2014), and Tin (2008).

On the other side of the spectrum is Written Cantonese. The distinguishing feature of Written Cantonese is the use of Cantonese grammatical words like 系 *hɐi*^{22} "be," 佢哋 *kʰɵy*^{13}*tei*^{22} "they," the negators 唔 *m*^{21} and 冇 *mou*^{13} (see section on "Nanning Cantonese" above), instead of Written Chinese equivalents like 是 *si*^{22} "be," 他们 *tʰa*^{55}*mun*^{21} "they," the negators 不 *pɐt*^{5} and 沒 *mut*^{2} (< Mandarin 是 *shì*, 他们 *tāmén*, 不 *bù*, 沒 *méi*). Within Written Cantonese, there is a continuum between what can be called "high" Cantonese and "low" Cantonese. While Cantonese grammatical

words are used in both types, "high" Cantonese utilizes more words that are reminiscent of Literary Chinese, and Mandarin-like grammatical constructions. The formal Spoken Cantonese used in high school Cantonese oral exams in Hong Kong (e.g., Lee and Leung 2012), and in news broadcasts, can be considered the spoken equivalent of "high" Written Cantonese. In Cantonese oral exams, pupils would be instructed to use literary-sounding lexical items like 认为 *jɪŋ*^{22}*wɐi*^{21} "consider" (Mandarin 认为 *rènwéi*) instead of colloquial Cantonese equivalents like 谂 *nɐm*^{35} "think." Traditionally, newscasters receive their texts in Written Chinese, and they translate them orally into "high" Spoken Cantonese. (Translational errors are sometimes heard during news broadcasts. For instance, the modifier marker 的 *tɪk*^{5} in Written Chinese (Mandarin 的 *de*) has to be translated into Colloquial Cantonese 嘅 *kɛ*^{33}. However, there were unfortunate instances where newscasters misapplied this rule to cases where 的 *tɪk*^{5} was *not* a modifier marker, and ended up saying, e.g., 波羅嘅海 *pɔ*^{55}*lɔ*^{21} *kɛ*^{33} *hɔi*^{35} (pineapple MOD sea) "Sea of Pineapple" when they saw the text 波羅的海 *pɔ*^{55}*lɔ*^{21}*tɪk*^{5} *hɔi*^{35} "Baltic Sea.")

Written Cantonese is stigmatized to a degree. For instance, Written Cantonese is heavily suppressed by the education systems in all jurisdictions. Chinese written works are expected to be in Standard Written Chinese, and Cantonese influences in students' Chinese writings are considered inappropriate in an education setting (even in schools where the teaching medium is Spoken Cantonese, and even when there are Cantonese oral exams in Hong Kong). Nonetheless, Written Cantonese can be easily found in Hong Kong and Macau, for instance in advertisements, and in the "gossipy" sections of mainstream newspapers and magazines. In their "serious" sections, some newspapers leave the direct quotes in Written Cantonese instead of translating them into Modern Written Chinese. Online discussions by younger people are primarily in Written Cantonese. Headlines of (less formal) government public announcements are sometimes in Written Cantonese. There is also the interesting case of news.gov.hk, the Hong Kong SAR government's news outlet: the Chinese press releases on their website are in Standard Written Chinese, but the posts on their social media accounts are entirely in Written Cantonese. Recently, there has been a slight decrease in the stigma towards Written Cantonese in Hong Kong and Macau.

Despite the stigma, the tradition of vernacular Cantonese literature has never been broken since the first written representation of colloquial Cantonese in the seventeenth century (towards the end of the Ming Dynasty). Written Cantonese has never been standardized; people sometimes find ad hoc ways to represent Cantonese-specific words, including using Roman characters. For instance, the mass classifier *ti*^{55} is written 啲, or sometimes with the Roman letter *D*. (The mass classifier denotes a mass, whereas a normal classifier denotes an individual; for instance, compare 啲狗 *ti*^{55} *kɐu*^{35} (CLF.mass dog) "the dogs," 啲沙 *ti*^{55} *sa*^{55} (CLF.mass sand) "the sand," versus 只狗 *tsɛk*^{3} *kɐu*^{35} (CLF dog) "the dog," 粒沙 *nɐp*^{5} *sa*^{55} (CLF sand) "the grain of sand.") In another illustration of this ad-hoc-ness, in days before Unicode, Hong Kong and Macau computer users used the Big-5 Chinese character encoding standard developed in Taiwan (instead of the GB standard of Mainland China). However, the Chinese character sets developed in Taiwan did not have most of the

Cantonese-specific characters in them. (The Hong Kong and Macau governments did publish extended character sets for the Cantonese characters, but not all users bothered installing them. In addition, the Chinese input methods from Taiwan could not necessarily handle these extended character sets.) The informal solution in Hong Kong and Macau for rendering the mass classifier 啲 *ti*^{55} was "o的," with the Roman letter *o* substituting the mouth radical 口, followed by the normal Chinese character 的. Similarly, other Cantonese characters with the mouth radical like 唔 *m*^{21} (NEG) and 嘅 *kɛ*^{33} (MOD) were rendered "o吾" and "o既" respectively.

In addition to the aforementioned written registers, since the early nineteenth century, there has been a register called Saam Kap Dai 三及第 *sam*^{55} *kʰɐp*^{2} *tɐi*^{35}, which is a mixture of Classical Chinese, Modern Standard Chinese, and Written Cantonese (Wong 2002; Snow 2004: 127). In the middle of the twentieth century this register was popular in the newspapers in Hong Kong and Macau. Earlier it was also popular in Guangzhou. While it is still possible to find younger people who can write reasonable Classical Chinese, the art of mixing Classical Chinese, Standard Written Chinese, and Written Cantonese is now moribund.

In addition to the issues outlined above, there is yet another issue that caused a difference in how Cantonese is written in different places: the differences in the development of computing culture. In the early days of computing, Hong Kong and Macau looked towards Taiwan for Chinese language computing. The education systems in Hong Kong and Macau are relatively poor when it comes to teaching the phonological principles of Mandarin and English, and even poorer for Cantonese. Hence, instead of the pronunciation-based input methods that are popular in Taiwan and Mainland China, Hong Kong and Macau have mostly gravitated towards the shape-based input methods of Chinese Characters, e.g., Cangjie 仓颉, "Stroke" method 笔划. Each key on a keyboard corresponds to a shape component of a Chinese character. With these shape-based input methods, (for competent typists) there is – especially now with Unicode – no problem in rendering the traditional Cantonese characters that were used across the Cantonese world.

Computing culture evolved separately in Mainland China. While there are also shape-based input methods in Mainland China (e.g., Wangma Wubi 王码五笔), the vast majority of people in Mainland China uses Mandarin Pinyin-based input methods. When people in Mainland China type in Cantonese, most of them use Mandarin Pinyin-based input methods to come up with Cantonese-specific characters. Cantonese characters are often replaced by characters that are quicker to type with Mandarin-based input methods. Sometimes these Cantonese-specific characters do not appear in Mandarin-based input methods. At other times, they do appear, but appear at the "bottom of the list" when a particular Mandarin syllable is typed in, and these lists of characters can be very long, as there are many homophones in Mandarin. People are thus more inclined to use a character that appears earlier in the list as a substitute, instead of scrolling to the bottom of the list for the "correct" Cantonese character. Also, sometimes people do not know the pronunciation of the Mandarin cognate of these Cantonese characters, if a cognate exists at all. An example is the rendition of the modifier marker *kɛ*^{33} in Cantonese (functionally similar to 的 *de* in Mandarin; it marks the preceding constituent as a nominal

modifier). Traditionally, the most common way of rendering *kɛ*^{33} is 嘅; the character 嘅 *kɛ*^{33} has a "mouth" radical 口 indicating that it is "colloquial," and 既 *kei*^{33} as the phonological component. The character 嘅 is still commonly used in Hong Kong and Macau. The following is an example of 嘅 from Macao Daily News, the best-selling newspaper in Macau. (News articles there are mostly written in Standard Written Chinese; this sentence in Written Cantonese is a direct quote from a member of the Legislative Assembly of Macau.)

Macau Written Cantonese

11. 睇唔到有人講嘅解決唔到嘅嘢。
tʰɐi^{35} *m*^{21} *tou*^{35} *jɐu*^{13} *jɐn*^{21} *kɔŋ*^{35} *kɛ*^{33} *kai*^{35} *kʰyt*^{3} *m*^{21} *tou*^{35} *kɛ*^{33} *jɛ*^{13}.
cannot:see exist people say MOD solve NEG can MOD thing
"(I) cannot see the things that some people say that cannot be solved."
(www.macaodaily.com/html/2018-08/05/content_1285391.htm; accessed 11 Feb 2020)

In Mainland China, on the other hand, *kɛ*^{33} is nowadays often rendered 噶: the traditional 嘅 is not, or not easily, typable with Mandarin-based input methods, whereas 噶 is easily typable using Mandarin-based input methods with its Mandarin pronunciation *gé*, which sound somewhat like Cantonese *kɛ*^{33}. (This usage of 噶 is not formed through Cantonese phonology: the phonological component 葛 is *kɔt*^{3} in Cantonese, rather divergent from *kɛ*^{33}.) The following is an example of 噶 from the official Xinhua news website, in an article about learning Cantonese.

Guangzhou Written Cantonese

12. 你咁论尽嘎, 咁重要噶嘢都可以整唔见。
nei^{13} *kɐm*^{33} *lɔn*^{22} *tsɔn*^{22} *ka*^{33}, *kɐm*^{33} *tsʊŋ*^{22} *jiu*^{33} *kɛ*^{33} *jɛ*^{13} *tou*^{55} *hɔ*^{35} *ji*^{13} *tsɪŋ*^{35} *m*^{21} *kin*^{33}
2SG so clumsy SFP such important MOD thing even can make be.lost
"You are so careless, you even manage to lose such an important thing."
(www.gd.xinhuanet.com/newscenter/2018-02/02/c_1122346832.htm; accessed 6 Aug 2018)
[SFP: sentence final particle]
(嘎 *ka*^{33} is another character that Hong Kong and Macau readers might be less familiar with; *ka*^{33} is usually rendered 㗎 in Hong Kong and Macau.)

Conclusion

Cantonese is the representative variety of Yue Chinese. People's definitions of "Cantonese" vary; in this chapter, Cantonese is the language of Canton/Guangzhou, and also the Yue varieties that descended from the ones spoken by migrants from the Guangzhou area since the end of the First Opium War (1839–1842). Throughout its history, the development of Yue Chinese has been intimately tied to language contact, from the interactions with the indigenous languages in the Pearl River basin (which is still ongoing on the western edge of the Yue-speaking area), to the interactions with the European merchants, missionaries, and colonizers (Portuguese, British, and French) that arrived in Guangdong in the last few centuries, as well as the myriad of languages that Cantonese migrants encounter in the many Chinatowns overseas that they find themselves in.

This chapter is primarily descriptive in nature; some aspects of the development of selected Cantonese varieties were discussed in this chapter. Guangzhou has been a prosperous city for more than one millennium; before the maritime restrictions ended at the end of the First Opium War, Guangzhou was one of the very few ports, or at times the only port, where foreign traders could conduct business in China. Since the lifting of the maritime restrictions, millions of Cantonese people emigrated from the heart of the Pearl River Delta. Some went up the Pearl River to places like Wuzhou and Nanning, while others went out towards the sea to places like Hong Kong, Macau, Fort Bayard (Zhanjiang), and further to many foreign countries. Cantonese dominates many Chinatowns overseas. Cantonese enclaves can be found in many parts of Far Southern China and around the world.

One enclave Cantonese variety discussed in this chapter is Nanning Cantonese. Nanning is the capital of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region. Nanning Cantonese started taking shape less than 200 years ago. Within these 200 years, Nanning Cantonese has acquired a great deal of linguistic influence from the other languages in Nanning: Old Nanning Mandarin, Nanning Pinghua, Northern Zhuang, and Southern Zhuang. While Nanning Cantonese is still largely intelligible to speakers of Standard Cantonese, many second-language features from speakers of the other Nanning languages have become mainstream in Nanning Cantonese. With Zhuang being the most divergent from Cantonese, features from Zhuang are especially observable in all areas of Nanning Cantonese, from phonetics and morphosyntax to discourse practice, lexical forms, and semantics. The greater social engagement between Cantonese and Zhuang speakers (in contrast to the slight distance that Pinghua and Zhuang speakers kept with each other in the past) means that occasionally Nanning Cantonese resembles Zhuang more than Nanning Pinghua does, despite Pinghua having been spoken in the Nanning area for about one millennium, whereas Cantonese has been spoken in the area for less than two centuries.

Another enclave Cantonese variety discussed in this chapter is Hong Kong Cantonese. Cantonese is not indigenous to Hong Kong SAR; indigenous Hong Kongers spoke a range of other Yue dialects, and also some Hakka and Southern Min varieties. The special status of Hong Kong and Macau, and the commercial success of the Cantonese migrants, resulted in Cantonese being favored in the

language policies there, and Cantonese being used at an official capacity in the two SARs. The dominance of Hong Kong media and popular culture helped spread Cantonese worldwide. All Cantonese varieties are influenced by their local linguistic environments. For instance, the Cantonese varieties spoken in Hong Kong and in many Anglophone countries contain many English loanwords. The Cantonese of Kuala Lumpur and other places in Malaya has calqued many Malay expressions (in addition to English expressions), and also loanwords from other Sinitic languages commonly encountered in Malaya (See Siew Imm Tan's chapter in this Handbook).

In the Cantonese world, there is a continuum of written registers from Standard Written Chinese to Written Cantonese. While stigmatized, the tradition of Written Cantonese has never been broken, and its stigma has slightly decreased recently. The separate evolvement of computing culture in Hong Kong/Macau and Mainland China has created differences in the choice of characters used in rendering Cantonese words, beyond the distinction of Traditional versus Simplified Chinese characters.

All Sinitic languages are important components of the Chinese heritage. Research on Cantonese not only enhances people's understanding of Cantonese and the wider Yue dialect group, it also enriches studies of the other Sinitic languages. Research on Cantonese provides a similar, yet nonidentical, perspective with which one could compare and contrast research on the other languages in China and Southeast Asia.

Cross-References

- ▶ Cantonese Particles: Meaning and Culture
- ▶ Chinese Languages and Malaysian English: Contact and Competition
- ▶ Contact-Induced Change in Languages of Southern China
- ▶ Grammatical Studies in Chinese Dialects
- ▶ Interactions of Sinitic Languages in the Philippines: Sinicization, Filipinization, and Sino-Philippine Language Creation
- ▶ Interactions of Sinitic Languages: Section Introduction
- ▶ Linguistic Typology in China
- ▶ New Developments in the Study of Chinese Historical Grammar
- ▶ The Evolution of Chinese Grammar: The Perspective of Language Contact

References

Ansaldo, Umberto, Stephen Matthews, and Geoff Smith. 2010. China coast pidgin: Texts and contexts. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 25 (1): 63–94.

Bái, Yào Tiān 白耀天. 2009. Yuèyǔ yǔ Zhuàngyǔ 粵语与壮语 [Yue and Zhuang]. *Guǎngxī Mínzú Yánjiū* 广西民族研究 2009 (4): 120–126.

Baker, Philip, and Peter Mülhäusler. 1990. From business to pidgin. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 1 (1): 87–115.

Batalha, Graciete Nogueira. 1985. Situação e perspectivas do Português e dos crioulos de origem Portuguesa na Ásia Oriental (Macau, Hong Kong, Malaca, Singapura, Indonésia). *Congresso sobre a Situação Actual da Lingua Portuguesa no Mundo: Actas* 1: 287–304.

Bauer, Robert S. 1996. Identifying the Tai substratum in Cantonese. In *Pan-Asiatic linguistics – Proceedings of the fourth international symposium on languages and linguistics, V*, 1806–1844. Bangkok: Institute of Language and Culture for Rural Development, Mahidol University.

———. 2005. Two 19th century missionaries' contributions to historical Cantonese phonology. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics* 10 (1): 21–46.

Bauer, Robert S., and Paul Benedict. 1997. *Modern Cantonese phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bauer, Robert S., Kwan-hin Cheung, and Pak-man Cheung. 2003. Variation and merger of the rising tones in Hong Kong Cantonese. *Language Variation and Change* 15: 211–215.

Chan, Ka Long Roy. 2019. Trilingual code-switching in Hong Kong. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal* 3 (4): 1–14. https://doi.org/10.14744/alrj.2019.22932.

Chang, Song Hing 張雙慶, Bō Wàn 萬波, and Chū Shēng Zhuāng 莊初昇. 1999. Xiānggǎng Xīnjiè fāngyán diàochá bàogào 香港新界方言調查報告 A study of the geographic distribution of dialects in the New Territories before urbanization. *Journal of Chinese Studies* 中國文化研究所學報 39: 361–396.

Chappell, Hilary M. 2015a. Introduction: Ways of tackling diversity in Sinitic languages. In *Diversity in Sinitic languages*, ed. Hilary M. Chappell, 3–12. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2015b. Linguistic areas in China for differential object marking, passive, and comparative constructions. In *Diversity in Sinitic languages*, ed. Hilary M. Chappell, 13–52. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2017. Languages of China in their East and South-East Asian Context. In *The Cambridge handbook of areal linguistics*, ed. Raymond Hickey, 196–214. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chén, Hǎi Lún 陈海伦, and Yì Lín 林亦 (eds.). 2009. *Yuèyǔ Pínghuà Tǔhuà fāngyīn zìhuì Dì yī biān Guǎngxī Yuèyǔ, Guìnán Pínghuà bùfèn* 粵语平话土话方音字汇第一遍广西粵语、桂南平话部分 *[Dialectal syllabary of Yue, Pinghua, and Tuhua Volume 1 Part on Guangxi Yue, Southern Guangxi Pinghua]*. Guǎngxī Dàxué Yǔyánxué Cóngshū 广西大学语言学丛书 [Guangxi University Linguistics Series]. Shanghai: Shanghai Educational Publishing House 上海教育出版社.

Chén, Xiǎo Jīn 陈晓锦. 2003. *Mǎláixīyà de sāngè Hànyǔ fāngyán* 马来西亚的三个汉语方言 *[Three Chinese dialects of Malaysia]*. Beijing: China Social Science Press 中国社会科学出版社.

——— 陳曉錦. 2012. Xīní Yuèfāngyán Guǎngfǔhuà 悉尼粵方言廣府話 [Sydney Yue Cantonese]. *Estudos de Cantonense* 粵語研究 12: 20–26.

——— 陳曉錦. 2013. Dōngnányà Huárén shèqū xiōngdì Hànyǔ fāngyán de hùjiècí 東南亞華人社區兄弟漢語方言的互借詞 Loan words among Chinese dialects of Chinese Societies at Southeast Asia. *Estudos de Cantonense* 粵語研究 13: 76–82.

Chén, Xiǎo Jīn 陈晓锦, and Tāo Chén 陈滔. 2005. *Guǎngxī Běihǎishì Yuèfāngyán Diàochá Yánjiū* 广西北海市粵方言调查研究 [*Investigative studies of the Yue dialects in Beihai City, Guangxi*]. Beijing: China Social Science Press 中国社会科学出版社.

Cheng, Ting Au 郑定欧. 1999. Xiānggǎng Yuèyǔ yǔ Guǎngzhōu Yuèyǔ zhī bǐjiào 香港粵语与广州粵语之比较 [A comparison of Hong Kong Yue and Guangzhou Yue]. In *Shuāngyǔ shuāngfāngyán yǔ xiàndài Zhōngguó* 双语双方言与现代中国 *[Bilingualism, bidialectalism and modern China]*, ed. Ēn Quán Chén 陈恩泉, 405–415. Beijing: Beijing Language and Culture University Press 北京语言大学出版社.

Cheng, Siu-Pong, and Sze-Wing Tang. 2014. Languagehood of Cantonese: A renewed front in an old debate. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics* 4 (3): 389–398. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2014.43032.

Cheung, Samuel Hung-nin 張洪年. 2007. *Xiānggǎng Yuèyǔ yǔfǎ de yánjiū (zēngdìngbǎn)* 香港粵語語法的研究*(*增訂版*) A grammar of Cantonese as spoken in Hong Kong*, revised ed. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press 中文大學出版社.

de Senna Fernandes, Miguel, and Alan Baxter. 2004. *Maquista Chapado: Vocabulary and expressions in Macao's Portuguese creole*. Macau: Instituto Internacional de Macau.

de Sousa, Hilário 蘇沙. 2013. Nánníng Shàngyáo Pínghuà de yīxiē míngcí duǎnyǔ xiànxiàng duìbǐ yánjiū 南宁上尧平话的一些名词短语现象对比研究 [Comparative studies of some noun phrase phenomena in Nanning Shangyao Pinghua]. In *Hànyǔ fāngyán yǔfǎ yánjiū de xīnshìjiǎo – Dì wǔ jiè Hànyǔ fāngyán yǔfǎ guójì xuéshù yántǎohuì lùnwénjí* 汉语方言语法研究的新视角 – 第五届汉语方言语法国际学术研讨会论文集 [*New viewpoints in the studies of the grammar of the Chinese Dialects – Proceedings of the fifth international conference on the syntax of Chinese dialects*], eds. Dān Qīng Liú 刘丹青, Léi Zhōu 周磊, and Cái Dé Xuē 薛才德, 141–160. Shanghai: Shanghai Educational Publishing House 上海教育出版社.

de Sousa, Hilário. 2015. Language contact in Nanning: Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese. In *Diversity in Sinitic languages*, ed. Hilary M. Chappell, 157–189. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2017. Pínghuà 平話 dialects. In *Encyclopedia of Chinese language and linguistics*, ed. Rint Sybesma, Wolfgang Behr, Yueguo Gu, Zev Handel, C.-T. James Huang, and James Myers, vol. 3, 425–431. Leiden: Brill.

de Sousa, Hilário. forthcoming-a. *A grammar of Nanning Pinghua*. Sinitic Languages of China Series. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

———. forthcoming-b. On Pinghua, and Yue: Some historical and linguistic perspectives. Submitted to *Crossroads: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Asian Interactions*.

Ding, Picus Sizhi. 2010. Phonological change in Hong Kong Cantonese through language contact with Chinese topolects and English over the past century. In *Marginal dialects: Scotland, Ireland and beyond*, ed. Robert McColl Millar, 198–218. Aberdeen: Forum for Research on the Languages of Scotland and Ireland.

Enfield, N.J. 2008. *A grammar of Lao*. De Gruyter Mouton: Berlin/Boston.

Handel, Zev. 2015. The classification of Chinese: Sinitic (The Chinese language family). In *The Oxford handbook of Chinese linguistics*, ed. William S.-Y. Wang and Chaofen Sun, 34–44. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199856336.001.0001.

Heryanto, Ariel. 2013. Popular culture for a new Southeast Asian studies? In *The historical construction of Southeast Asian studies: Korea and beyond*, ed. Victor T. King and Seung Woo Park, 226–262. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Ho, Pan 何斌. 2012. Liǎng'àn sìdì fǎlǜ zhōng de tèyǒu yòngyǔ jǔyú 兩岸四地法律中的特有用語舉隅 [Examples of terms specific to the legal systems in the four jurisdictions across the strait]. In *Àomén yǔyán yánjiū sānshínián: Yǔyán yánjiū huígù jì qìngzhú Chéng Xiánghuī Jiàoshòu Àomén cóngyán cóngjiào sānshínián wénjí* 澳門語言研究三十年:語言研究回顧暨慶祝程祥徽教授澳門從研從教三十周年文集 *Macau language research review*, eds. Jié Xú 徐傑 and Jiàn Zhōu 周荐, 110–130. Macau: Universidade de Macau 澳門大學.

Hsieh, Miao-Ling. 2001. *Form and meaning: Negation and question in Chinese*. PhD dissertation, Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Huang, Yuan Wei. 1997. The interaction between Zhuang and the Yue (Cantonese) dialects. In *Comparative Kadai: The Tai branch*, ed. Jerold A. Edmondson and David B. Solnit, 57–76. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics & the University of Texas at Arlington.

Huang, Yang, and Fuxiang Wu. 2018. Central southern Guangxi as a grammaticalization area. In *New trends in grammaticalization and language change*, ed. Sylvie Hancil, Tine Breban, and José Vicente Lozano, 105–134. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kataoka, Shin, and Cream Yin-Ping Lee. 2008. A system without a system: Cantonese Romanization used in Hong Kong place and personal names. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11 (1): 79–98.

Kwok, Bit-Chee 郭必之. 2004. Cóng Yú Zhī liǎngyùn "tèzì" kàn Yuè fāngyán gēn Gǔ-Jiāngdōng fāngyán de liánxì 從虞支兩韻「特字」看粵方言跟古江東方言的聯繫 Evidence for an Ancient Jiangdong layer in the Yue dialects as revealed in "special words" of the Yu and Zhi rhymes. *Language and Linguistics* 語言暨語言學 5 (3): 583–614.

——— 郭必之. 2010. Yǔyán jiēchù zhōng de yǔfǎ biànhuà: Nánníng Yuèyǔ "shúyǔ + bīnyǔ + búyǔ" jiégòu de láiyuán 語言接觸中的語法變化:南寧粵語「述語 + 賓語 + 補語」結構的來源 [Grammatical change in language contact: On the origin of the "verb + object + complement"

structure in Nanning Yue]. In *Lìshí yǎnbiàn yǔ yǔyán jiēchù: Zhōngguó Dōngnán fāngyán* 歷時演變與語言接觸—中國東南方言 *Diachronic change and language contact: Dialects in South East China*, eds. Hung-nin Samuel Cheung 張洪年 and Song Hing Chang 張雙慶, 201–216. Journal of Chinese Linguistics Monograph Series Number 24. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong 中文大學出版社.

——— 郭必之. 2014. Nánníng dìqū yǔyán 'qù'-yì yǔsù de yǔfǎhuà yǔ jiēchù yǐnfā de "fùzhì" 南寧地區語言「去」義語素的語法化與接觸引發的「複製」 The Morpheme GO in three languages of the Nanning Region: Paths of grammaticalization and contact-induced "replication". *Language and Linguistics* 語言暨語言學 15 (5): 663–697. https://doi.org/10.1177/1606822X14528640.

——— 郭必之. 2019. *Yǔyán jièchū shìjiǎo xià de Nánníng Yuèyǔ yǔfǎ* 語言接觸視角下的南寧粵語語法 *[Grammar of Nanning Cantonese under the viewpoint of language contact]*. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company 中華書局.

Lau, Chun-Fat 刘镇发. 2001. Xiàndài Yuèyǔ yuányú Sòngmò yímín shuō 现代粤语源於宋末移民说 [Theory on the end-of-Song origin of modern Yue]. In *Dìqījiè Guójì Yuè Fāngyán Yántǎohuì lùnwénjí* 第七届国际粤方言研讨会论文集 [*Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Yue Dialects*], eds. Chow Yiu Sin 单周尧 and K.K. Luke 陆镜光, 76–83. Beijing: The Commercial Press 商务印书馆.

——— 劉鎮發. 2004a. Xiānggǎng liǎngbǎiniánlái de yǔyán shēnghuó yǎnbiàn 香港兩百年來的語言生活演變 [Changes in the linguistic life in Hong Kong in the last two hundred years]. In *Táiwān yǔ Dōngnányà Huárén dìqū yǔwén shēnghuó yántǎohuì lùnwénjí* 台灣與東南亞華人地區語文生活研討會論文集 [*Proceedings of the conference on the linguistic life in Taiwan and Chinese areas in Southeast Asia*], 128–143. Hong Kong: Oi Ming Publishers 靄明出版社.

——— 劉鎮發. 2004b. Cóng Guǎngzhōuhuà dào Xiānggǎng Yuèyǔ – Xiānggǎng Yuèyǔ de xíngchéng 從廣州話到香港粵語—香港粵語的形成 [From Guangzhou dialect to Hong Kong Yue – The formation of Hong Kong Yue]. In *Táiwān yǔ Dōngnányà Huárén dìqū yǔwén shēnghuó yántǎohuì lùnwénjí* 台灣與東南亞華人地區語文生活研討會論文集 [*Proceedings of the conference on the linguistic life in Taiwan and Chinese areas in Southeast Asia*], 144–165. Hong Kong: Oi Ming Publishers 靄明出版社.

Law, Paul. 2014. The negation mou5 in Guangdong Yue. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 23: 267–305. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10831-013-9116-0.

Lee, Kwai Sang, and Wai Mun Leung. 2012. The status of Cantonese in the education policy of Hong Kong. *Multilingual Education* 2: 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/10.1186/2191-5059-2-2.

D. Li C.S. 1999. Linguistic convergence: Impact of English on Hong Kong Cantonese. *Asian Englishes* 2 (1): 5–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.1999.10801017.

M. Li. 1999. *Negation in Chinese*. PhD thesis, Manchester: University of Manchester.

Lǐ, Lián Jìn 李連進. 2000. *Pínghuà yīnyùn yánjiū* 平話音韻研究 *[Studies in Pinghua phonology]*. Nanning: Guangxi People's Publishing House 廣西人民出版社.

Lǐ, Jīn Fāng 李锦芳. 2002. *Dòng Tái yǔyán yǔ wénhuà* 侗台语言与文化 *[Tai-Kadai language and culture]*. Beijing: The Ethnic Publishing House 民族出版社.

Lin, Jo-Wang. 2003. Aspectual selection and negation in Chinese. *Linguistics* 41 (3): 425–459. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2003.015.

Lín, Yì 林亦, and Fèng Yú Qín 覃风余. 2008. *Guǎngxī Nánníng Báihuà yánjiū* 广西南宁白话研究 *[Studies on Nanning Cantonese of Guangxi]*. Guilin: Guangxi Normal University Press 广西师范大学出版社.

Liú, Cūn Hàn 劉村漢. 1995. *Liǔzhōu fāngyán cídiǎn* 柳州方言詞典 *[Liuzhou dialect dictionary]*. Nanjing: Jiangsu Educational Press 江蘇教育出版社.

Liú, Shū Xīn 刘叔新. 2006. *Yuèyǔ Zhuàngdǎiyǔ wèntí* 粤语壮傣语问题 *[The Yue Zhuangdai question]*. Beijing: The Commercial Press 商务印书馆.

Mài, Yún 麦耘. 2010. Yuèyǔ de xíngchéng, fāzhǎn yǔ Yuèyǔ hé Pínghuà de guānxì 粤语的形成、发展与粤语和平话的关系 [The formation and development of Yue, and the relationship between Yue and Pinghua]. In *Yánjiū zhī lè – Qìngzhú Wáng Shìyuán Xiānshēng qīshíwǔ shòuchén xuéshù lùnwénjí* 研究之乐 – 庆祝王士元先生七十五寿辰学术论文集 *The joy of*

research II – A festschrift in honor of Professor William S-Y. Wang on his seventy-fifth birthday, eds. Wù Yún Pān 潘悟云 and Zhōng Wěi Shěn 沈钟伟, 227–243. Shanghai: Shanghai Educational Publishing House 上海教育出版社.

Mair, Victor H. 1991. What is a Chinese "dialect/topolect"? Reflections on some key Sino-English linguistic terms. *Sino-Platonic Papers* 29: 1–31.

———. 2013. The classification of Sinitic languages: What is "Chinese"? In *Breaking down the barriers: Interdisciplinary studies in Chinese linguistics and beyond*, ed. Guangshun Cao, Hilary M. Chappell, Redouane Djamouri, and Thekla Wiebusch, 735–754. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Matthews, Stephen. 2006. Cantonese grammar in areal perspective. In *Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic typology*, eds. A.Y. Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon, 220–236. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matthews, Stephen, and Virginia Yip. 1994. *Cantonese: A comprehensive grammar*. London/New York: Routledge.

Peyraube, Alain. 1996. Le Cantonais est-il du Chinois ? *Perspectives Chinoises* 34: 26–29.

Pittayaporn, Pittayawat, Jakrabhop Iamdanush, and Nida Jampathip. 2014. Reconstruction of Proto-Tai negators. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 37 (2): 151–180.

Qín, Fèng Yú 覃风余, Dōng Shēng Qín 覃东生, and Chūn Lái Tián 田春来. 2016. Xiàpiān: Pínghuà de yǔfǎ yánjiū 下篇平话的语法研究 [Lower section: Grammatical studies of Pinghua]. In *Guǎngxī Pínghuà yánjiū* 广西平话研究 [*Studies on Guangxi Pinghua*], ed. Jīn Yú 余瑾, 281–426. Beijing: China Social Science Press 中国社会科学出版社.

Qín, Xiǎo Háng 覃晓航. 1995. *Zhuàngyǔ tèshū yǔfǎ xiànxiàng yánjiū* 壮语特殊语法现象研究 *[Studies of special syntactic phenomena in Zhuang]*. Beijing: The Ethnic Publishing House 民族出版社.

Qín, Yuǎn Xióng 覃远雄. 2000. *Guìnán Pínghuà yánjiū* 桂南平话研究 [*Studies on Southern Guangxi Pinghua*]. PhD thesis, Guangzhou: Jinan University 暨南大学.

——— 覃远雄. 2007. Pínghuà he Tǔhuà 平话和土话 [Pinghua and Patois]. *Fāngyán* 方言 2007 (2): 177–189.

Qín, Yuǎn Xióng 覃遠雄, Shù Guān Wéi 韋樹關, and Chéng Lín Biàn 卞成林. eds. 1997. *Nánníng Pínghuà cídiǎn* 南寧平話詞典 [*Nanning Pinghua dictionary*]. Nanjing: Jiangsu Educational Press 江蘇教育出版社.

Shí, Dìng Xǔ 石定栩. 2006. *Gǎngshì Zhōngwén liǎngmiàn dì* 港式中文兩面睇 [*Looking at Hong Kong style Chinese bothways*]. Hong Kong: Sing Tao Publishing Ltd 星島出版.

Shí, Dìng Xǔ 石定栩, Jìng Mǐn Shào 邵敬敏, and Chi Yu Chu 朱志瑜. 2014. *Gǎngshì Zhōngwén yǔ Biāozhǔn Zhōngwén de bǐjiào* 港式中文與標準中文的比較 [*Comparison of Hong Kong Chinese and Standard Chinese*], 2nd ed. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Educational Publishing Company 香港教育圖書有限公司.

Sin, Ka Lin 冼偉國. 2009. "Mǎláixīyà de sāngè Hànyǔ fāngyán" zhōng zhī Jílóngpō Guǎngdōnghuà yuètán《馬來西亞的三個漢語方言》中之吉隆坡廣東話閱譚 A review on Kuala Lumpur's Cantonese in part of the three Chinese dialects in Malaysia. *New Era College Academic Journal* 新纪元学院学报 6: 83–131.

Sio, Joanna Ut-Seong 蕭月嫦, and Rint Sybesma 司馬翎. 2008. The nominal phrase in Northern Zhuang – A descriptive study. *Bulletin of Chinese Linguistics* 中國語言學集刊 3 (1): 175–225.

Smyth, David. 2002. *Thai: An essential grammar*. London/New York: Routledge.

Snow, Don. 2004. *Cantonese as written language – The growth of a written Chinese vernacular*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

T'sou, Benjamin K. Y. 鄒嘉彥, and Rǔ Jié Yóu 游汝杰. 2003. *Hànyǔ yǔ Huárén shèhuì* 漢語與華人社會 *Chinese language and society*. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press 香港城市大學出版社.

Táng, Qī Yuán 唐七元. 2012. Cóng cíhuì jiǎodù kàn Yuè fāngyán duì Liǔzhōu fāngyán de yǐngxiǎng 从词汇角度看粤方言对柳州方言的影响 [Looking at the influence of Yue dialect on Liuzhou dialect from a lexical viewpoint]. *Journal of Changchun University* 长春大学学报 2012 (7): 815–818.

Thomas, Mandy. 2002. Re-orientations: East Asian popular cultures in contemporary Vietnam. *Asian Studies Review* 26 (2): 189–204. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8403.00022.

Tin, Siu-lam 田小琳. 2008. Gǎngshì Zhōngwén jí qí tèdiǎn 港式中文及其特点 Hong Kong Chinese and its characteristics. *Journal of College of Chinese Language and Culture of Jinan University* 暨南大学华文学院学报 2008 (3): 68–79.

Wáng, Hóng Jūn 王洪君. 2009. Jiān'gù yǎnbiàn, tuīpíng hé céngcì de Hànyǔ fāngyán lìshǐ guānxì móxíng 兼顾演变、推平和层次的汉语方言历史关系模型 A historial relation model of Chinese dialects with multiple perspectives of evolution, level and stratum. *Fāngyán* 方言 2009 (3): 204–218.

Wéi, Jǐng Yún 韦景云, and Xiǎo Háng Qín 覃晓航. 2006. *Zhuàngyǔ tōnglùn* 壮语通论 [*General studies of Zhuang*]. Beijing: Central University for Nationalities Press 中央民族大学出版社.

Wong, Chung Ming 黃仲鳴. 2002. *Xiānggǎng Sānjídì wéntǐ liúbiànshǐ* 香港三及第文體流變史 [*Evolutionary history of the Saam Kap Dai literary style in Hong Kong*]. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Writers Association 香港作家協會.

Wong, Yee 黃翊. 2007. *Àomén yǔyán yánjiū* 澳门语言研究 [*Studies on Macau languages*]. Beijing: The Commercial Press 商务印书馆.

Wong, Cathy Sin Ping, Robert S. Bauer, and Zoe Wai Man Lam. 2009. The integration of English loanwords in Hong Kong Cantonese. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 1: 251–266.

Wǔ, Wèi 伍巍. 2007. Yuèyǔ 粵语 On Yue group. *Fāngyán* 方言 2007 (2): 167–176.

Wurm, S.A., Rong Li, et al., eds. 1987/1989. *Language atlas of China*. 1st ed. Hong Kong: Longman Group (Far East) Ltd.

Xiǎn, Yáng 冼洋. 2018ms. Běihǎi Báihuà cídiǎn 北海白话词典 [Dictionary of Beihai Cantonese]. Beihai.

Xiao, Richard 肖忠华, and Tony McEnery. 2008. Negation in Chinese: A corpus-based study 汉语中的否定:基于语料库的研究. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 中国语言学报 36 (2): 274–330.

Yóu, Rǔ Jié 游汝杰. 2000. *Hànyǔ fāngyánxué dǎolùn* 汉语方言学导论 [*Introduction to Chinese dialectology*], Revised ed. 修订本. Shanghai: Shanghai Educational Publishing House 上海教育出版社.

Yue-Hashimoto, Anne. 1991. The Yue dialect. In *Languages and dialects of China*, ed. William S.Y. Wang, 292–322. Journal of Chinese Linguistics Monograph Series Number 3.

Zhān, Bó Huì 詹伯慧, Xiǎo Yàn Fāng 方小燕, Yū Ēn Gān 甘于恩, Xué Qiáng Qiū 丘学强, Choi Lan Tong 汤翠兰, Jiàn Shè Wáng 王建设, and Qí Zhōng 钟奇, eds. 2002. *Guǎngdōng Yuè fāngyán gàiyào* 广东粤方言概要 *An outline of Yue dialects in Guangdong*. Guangzhou: Jinan University Press 暨南大学出版社.

Zhang, Jingwei. 2019. Tone mergers in Cantonese: Evidence from Hong Kong, Macao, and Zhuhai. *Regional Chinese in Contact* 5 (1): 28–49.

Zhōu, Běn Liáng 周本良, Xiáng Hé Shěn 沈祥和, Píng Lí 黎平, and Yù Juān Wéi 韦玉娟. 2006. Nánníng Xiàguójiē Guānhuà tóngyīn zìhuì 南宁下郭街官话同音字汇 A list of homonyms of Xiaguo street dialect in Nanning. *Journal of Guilin Normal College* 桂林师范高等专科学校学报 20 (2): 1–8.