“One Part in Concert, and One Part Repellence”: Liu Waitong, Cao Shuying, and the Question of Hong Kong and Mainland Chinese Sinophones

Lucas Klein

Candle glow that half encircles a golden kingfisher
Musk partly permeating hibiscus embroidery
蠟照半籠金翡翠
麝熏微度繡芙蓉
(Li Shangyin 1988: 4:1632–1651)

How many people today live in a language that is not their own? Or no longer, or not yet, even know their own and know poorly the major language that they are forced to serve? This is the problem of immigrants, and especially of their children, the problem of minorities, the problem of a minor literature, but also a problem for all of us: how to tear a minor literature away from its own language, allowing it to challenge the language and making it follow a sober revolutionary path? How to become a nomad and an immigrant and a gypsy in relation to one’s own language?
(Deleuze/Guattari 1986: 19)

Is Hong Kong literature Chinese literature, literature in Chinese, Sinophone literature, or something else? For that matter, is Sinophone literature Chinese literature? Is Chinese literature the same as literature in Chinese? And what does it mean to believe these questions can be answered in English?

When I first moved to Hong Kong, I would see notices in the Mass Transit Railway alerting children not to be too rambunctious on the escalators: a cartoon penguin warned, in Chinese, 握扶手 企定定. I could understand only what the first three characters meant, but fortunately the penguin was bilingual: "Hold the handrail and stand still! You can make it a safe journey." I should correct myself and specify that the penguin was bilingual in Cantonese and Hong Kong English, rather than in *Chinese* and *English* tout court. When in Shenzhen, I saw the same penguin I knew from Hong Kong's MTR, but it was telling kids to 扶好站稳 (the English remained the same).[1] The change in written Chinese from that representing Cantonese to Mandarin underscores the difference between these two languages, which I define as linguistic systems that are mutually unintelligible without concerted study: not only is the *aak fu sau, kei ding ding* in Cantonese unintelligible to a Mandarin-only speaker, the written words 企定定 are also unclear to that speaker. But the sign's translation from Cantonese to Mandarin also highlights an aspect of literary language, namely, the tight bind between form and content in their representational and associative dimensions: there is no reason for the figure telling Shenzhen children to *zhan wen* to be a penguin (*qi'e*), but in Hong Kong it plays on the pun in Cantonese of being told to "stand still" by a "standing goose" (*kei'ngo* 企鵝), or penguin.

That Cantonese is a language, rather than a dialect (or, as is often implied, "just a dialect"), has significant implications for both the study of Hong Kong literature and the question of the *-phone* in Sinophone studies. For Shu-mei Shih, the Sinophone is "polyphonic and multilingual," comprising "literatures of the Sinitic language family, to denote the

[1] **Whereas most scholars citing Chinese material when writing in English pick either traditional characters (*fanti zi*) or simplified characters (*jianti zi*) and remain consistent, I follow the character set from the publication I am quoting. When I could go either way, I'll tend toward *fanti zi*.**

multiplicity of languages within the family, not [only] . . . literature written in standard Mandarin"—as long as the writing is from "*Sinitic-language communities and cultures outside China*" or from "*ethnic minority communities and cultures within China where Mandarin is adopted or imposed*."[2] Hong Kong is outside China proper, but is writing from Hong Kong Sinophone? That is, if writing from Hong Kong is to be pronounced in Cantonese, and Cantonese is not a branch of a "language family" but a *language* in and of itself, to what extent can literature in Cantonese still be part of the Sinophone?

What is a language, anyway? Contrary to the popular saw that "a language is a dialect with an army and a navy," Alexander Beecroft (2015: 6) proposes that we should instead define a language as "a dialect with a literature." Beecroft's division does not clear away all our definitional troubles—can "a literature" be defined a priori, and are its contours the same regardless of the culture in which it is embedded?—but although he makes admirable moves to clear political overdetermination from literature and language, he does not so much *depoliticize* these categories as *repoliticize* them. Cantonese in Hong Kong does not have an army or a navy (although it sure has a police force), but it does have a literature: Beecroft's redefinition, then, would argue for distinguishing Hong Kong literature or literature in Cantonese from Chinese literature as such. And although the strongest definitions of the Sinophone, such as Shih's, categorically distinguish it from writing by ethnic majority writers in the People's Republic of China (PRC), the fact that it's both oppositional to a Sinocentric definition of Chinese literature and by nature multilingual would suggest resistance to the further separation of dialect and language as implied by Beecroft's redefinition.

Clearly, the politics of literary studies get into complicated intricacies when up against the geopolitics of nations, nation-states, and nationalities. The goal of this essay is to look at the notion of the Sinophone alongside Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's "minor literature," which often

[2] Shih 2013: 9–11. The quotation I've abridged reads, in full, "Sinophone literature should be translated in Mandarin as *Huayu yuxi wenxue* [華語語系文學], literatures of the Sinitic language family, to denote the multiplicity of languages within the family, not *Huayu wenxue* [華語文學] or *Huawen wenxue* [華文文學], literature written in standard Mandarin." Arif Dirlik explains that the "distinguishing feature of Shih's use of 'Sinophone' in this discursive field is the exclusion of PRC literary products from the Sinophone. Her deployment of the term was inspired initially by her colleague and collaborator Françoise Lionnet's [2009] interventions in debates on French and Francophone that were entangled in issues of nationalism, colonialism, and diversity in the identity of literature" (Dirlik 2013).

underpins it, through a reading of poems by Hong Kong–based writers Liu Waitong (Liao Weitang) (b. 1975) and Cao Shuying (b. 1979). As two mainland-raised poets writing in Hong Kong in engagement with Hong Kong issues, they serve as test cases for several of the contested concepts surrounding the Sinophone, from the relationship between Cantonese and other definitions of "Chinese" language and literature to the place of writing by mainlanders in the purview of Sinophone studies. Although I have earlier said that the strict segregation of mainland China from theories of the Sinophone threatens to leave "China proper off the hook, its own Chineseness never needing to be questioned" and "broker[ing] no conflict between the Sinophone and Chinese literary studies in its Sinocentric versions" (Klein 2014: 219), I also see the benefits, both theoretical and practical, of keeping the two separate. More important, perhaps, I expect that a solely theoretical or abstractly political discussion of how the Sinophone and Chinese should relate to each other would generate more heat than light, and so base my discussion on close contextualized readings of poems by Liu and Cao. I end with a consideration of the Sinophone vis-à-vis another of Deleuze and Guattari's influential concepts, but arrive there through close readings of specific texts by writers situated in between "Sinophone" and "Chinese" articulations.

"They See by Self-Reflection"

What does it mean to be from Hong Kong, and is Hong Kong literature—from Xu Xu (1908–1980) to Xi Xi (b. 1938) to Xu Xi (b. 1954)—always written by writers from Hong Kong? In most cases, a writer can be affiliated with a place and its literature without always having been *from* there: about as many New York School poets grew up in Oklahoma as in Manhattan or Brooklyn (Diggory 2009: 480), and the *Oxford Companion to New Zealand Literature* includes entries on "writers born in New Zealand . . . or who lived there for a while . . . or who paid a memorable visit . . . or whose work has some place, however indirect, in New Zealand's literary history."[3]

[3] Wattie/Robinson 1999. Thanks to Hilary Chung for the *Oxford Companion to New Zealand Literature* citation.

But despite the importance of locale to Chinese senses of identity over the centuries, the specifics of Hong Kong as a Cantonese-speaking former colony and Special Administrative Region make the version of the language one speaks at least as important as simply being "from" Hong Kong. Anglophone writers from Timothy Mo (b. 1950) to Tammy Ho Lai-ming (b. 1980s) present a different case, but for those who write in Chinese, being part of the Cantonese-speaking community anchors one's consideration within the literary identity (some, such as Dung Kai-cheung [b. 1967], have turned to writing in Cantonese as opposed to the Mandarin-based standard Chinese to further this principle). For this reason, poets who grew up speaking Cantonese, whether born in Guangdong (e.g., Leung Ping-kwan [Yasi, 1949–2013], Chris Zijiang Song [b. 1985], or Hong Kong [e.g., Yam Gong, aka Lau Yee-ching, b. 1949], Lok Fung [Natalia Sui-hung Chan, b. 1964], Yip Fai [Yip Tak Fai, b. 1952], and countless others) are more secure in their identities than poets from other parts of the mainland (e.g., Bei Dao [Zhao Zhenkai, b. 1949], Meng Lang [Meng Junliang, b. 1961], Zheng Danyi [b. 1963], and Huang Canran [b. 1963]). This social background makes the case of Cao Shuying and her husband, Liu Waitong, particularly interesting for examining the relationship of the Sinophone and Hong Kong poetry to the idea of "Chinese" literature.

Liu is a renowned public intellectual in Hong Kong, and as a poet writes some of his poems in Cantonese and others in Mandarin; raised as a Cantonese speaker in Zhuhai, Guangdong province, he is incontrovertibly and uncontroversially a Hong Kong poet (his father was from Hong Kong, as well). Is his wife, born and raised in Harbin, a different matter? I first look at one of Liu's poems in the context of Hong Kong identity vis-à-vis China both as a fulcrum of current events and as a repository for tradition, and then reengage with the contestations around Sinophone studies—and the ways Deleuze and Guattari open up questions within its formulation—by looking at a poem by Cao. At issue is the definition of the term "Sinophone" and the place of writing from the PRC in that definition. Does the Sinophone

include writing from China, the way Anglophone literature includes writing from the United Kingdom and the United States? Or does it separate, like the Francophone, the regions where the language in question dominates (France) from those where it is a minority or implanted language (e.g., Quebec)? Or is it something else?

The case of Hong Kong poetry in its relationship to contemporary Chinese poetry is not unlike that of Chinese literature considered as or against Sinophone literature, although a crucial difference hinges on that local language. When the local language is an accented and accentuated version of the national language, the local and national will be configured as concentric circles: responding to Stephen Owen's (1990: 31) question about whether Bei Dao writes "Chinese literature, or literature that began in the Chinese language?" Leo Lee reads Bei Dao's line "Home country is a local accent" 祖國是一種鄉音 and writes, "Bei Dao's own local accent is not simply Chinese, but rather the Beijing dialect sweetened with 'a little' sugar'" 北島的鄉音非但是中文，而且是加了「點兒」糖的北京話.[4] For all of Bei Dao's proposed globality, Lee says, his writing roots him in the sounds of Beijing speech, and therefore he is all the more Chinese (of course, the dynamic changes now that Bei Dao lives in Hong Kong, where he is an important member of the poetry community but does not speak the majority language). With Hong Kong and Cantonese, by contrast, the city's conspicuous noncentrality to China means that to be more local does not make it more national.[5] Cantonese allows the local to stand *outside*, rather than *for*, the national.

But it was not always this way. That Mandarin (now known less officiously as the "common speech," *putonghua*) has been the official version of Chinese for so long—that, indeed, it even stands in for the "Chinese" language in most cases—may elide the fact that we might not even have modern Chinese poetry if not for Cantonese. Certainly the language is at the formative prehistorical moment of the vernacular "poetic revolution" 詩界革命: when Guangdong-born Huang Zunxian

[4] L. Lee 1992: 203–204. Lee's article is likely easier to find reprinted in L. Lee 1993: 87–91. Owen was reviewing Bei Dao's (1990) *The August Sleepwalker*, translated by Bonnie McDougall. Lee is writing about Bei Dao's poem "A Local Accent" 鄉音, translated by McDougall and Chen Maiping (see Bei Dao 2010: 80–81); Lee's allusion in the phrase I've cited is to Bei Dao's line 'I add a little sugar' 我加了點兒糖 from the poem. Whereas Owen's criticism is that Bei Dao's "poems translate themselves" (Owen 1990: 31), Lee says that such a poem, which begins with the poet "speak[ing] Chinese to the mirror" 我對鏡子說中文, "when translated into English ends up belonging nowhere" 譯成英文就不倫不類 (L. Lee 1992: 203). Interestingly, as I've written elsewhere, the use of one Beijing dialect term has snagged two translators of two Bei Dao poems, David Hinton's translation of "Year's End" 歲末 and Eliot Weinberger's translation of "Swivel Chair" 轉椅 (in Bei Dao 2010: 94–95 and 240–241; see Klein 2003).

[5] Some have insisted, of course, that Hong Kong is somehow more Chinese than China, a claim Chin Wan (2015) recently made in his *New York Times* op. ed. piece: "Hong Kong's culture today is both more modern and more authentically Chinese—or more rooted in ancient traditions—than the culture of mainland China." And we hear echoes of that when people claim, simplistically and reductively, that Tang poetry sounds better when recited in Cantonese because Cantonese is somehow truer or closer to middle Chinese.

(1848–1905) wrote "My hand writes what my mouth says / how could the ancients restrain me?" 我手寫我口, 古豈能拘牽 (Huang Zunxian 1981: 1: 42), he likely voiced those words in Cantonese.[6] Of course, as Gregory Lee points out, this couplet's "failure to be modern at the linguistic level" demonstrates "the difficulty scholar-poets had in breaking free of the classical idiom," eventually saying "more about the good intentions of its author than it does of his success in crafting a malleable poetic style responsive both to modern society and to modern speech" (G. Lee 1996: 66). Nevertheless, its modern intention motivated the literary revolution that twentieth-century language reform would later make good on.[7] Yet although Huang's poetics expose, in Chen Jianhua's (2003: 338) words, "an incompatibility or disturbance within traditional poetic structure, which can be attributed to the use of translated terms from Western sources," when it came to looking at Hong Kong, whatever anticolonialism Huang expressed was filtered through and into a Qing dynastic loyalism. In "Reaching Hong Kong" 到香港, Huang wrote:

水是堯時日夏時	The water is from the time of Yao, the sun is from the Xia
衣冠又是漢官儀	The clothes and caps as well look like official Chinese dress
登樓四望真吾土	From atop a tower I look around and all truly is my land
不見黃龍上大旗	Yet I do not see the imperial dragon flying on the flag (Huang Zunxian 1981: 2: 401–402)

"Radical dissatisfaction with the classical tradition had its beginnings," says Gregory Lee (1996: 68), "in the recognition that China was powerless

[6] Also consider Xiaofei Tian's (2009: 3) point that lines Huang wrote on his voyage to the US ("I wish to convey a message by way of birds' talk, / but then again I fear that you do not understand Chinese" 欲憑鳥語時通訊 又恐華言汝未知), while seeming to operate on the discrepancy between foreign language as for the birds whereas Chinese is human, the irony "is that Huang Zunxian, coming from a Guangdong Hakka family, would have been considered a *niaoyu* speaker himself by the northern Chinese who hailed from the heartland of China."

[7] Alternatively, Tian (2009: 15–16) writes, "To familiarize the unfamiliar was a primary motivation that drove many twentieth-century poets to continue to work in old poetic forms . . . for Huang Zunxian, writing poetry in old forms was a way of dealing with and making sense of the radical changes China was undergoing in the late Qing and early Republican eras."

to repel foreign colonialist aggression, in particular British imperialist ambitions" as embodied in the Opium Wars. Yet in the case of Huang Zunxian, antipathy to the British empire was met only with an antithetical doubling-down of fealty to Manchu rule, without any synthesis between opposition to colonialism and distrust of Chineseness as defined from above.

Recent PRC policy toward Hong Kong and its democracy activism has been similarly strategized: the central government has tried to portray all moves against it as contaminated by a lingering colonization of the mind and nostalgia for being a Dependent Territory—and in fact even directly spawned and spurred on by "foreign powers." In this light, Liu Waitong's poem "Over the Counter-Revolution" 鳩鳴之詩, from *Umtopia* 傘托邦, his bilingual collection of poems and photographs documenting the 2014 Occupy Central 佔領中環 movement, takes on an interesting appearance:

關關之鳩	
翼彼新苗	Cheap, cheap, cries the sparrow
亞皆老街	With the little one under wing
與子偕老	Free from guile on old Argyle
在豉油街	In Ladies' Market hear her sing
自在自由	With her friends it's ooh and ahh
鳴其鳴矣	But getting a deal won't set her free
求其友聲	Will she find joy by standing on Soy
革命就是	When a revolution *is* a dinner party?
請客吃飯	
關關之鳩	
嗚嗚其鳴	Cheap, cheap, cry the sparrows
不哭警棍	Amid the sound of moans and groans
胡椒紅眼	From the clubs and cop batons
鱷魚淚彈	But they do not stand alone
嗟彼獨立	Crocodile tear gas and pepper-red eyes
於暗角者	But they see by self-reflection
自知是光	Even in all darkened corners
嘻彼小星	Stars unite through constellation
可以興群	

關關之鳩
碩鼠畏之　　Cheap, cheap, cry the sparrows
既見君子　　Making fat rats flee the town
嘯之聚之　　I stand guard with you at night
既已下流　　And shout for them to step down
水銀瀉地　　Mercury is spilled over the street
肅肅宵征　　Downward mobility, but we have a plan
與子同飛　　I will fly with you into the night
嗚嗚鳩嗚　　And gobble ghosts just like Pac-Man
食鬼一車　　(Liu 2015: 180–181)

Liu is one of the more prominent poets and intellectuals in Hong Kong today; as an all-around critic, he is known for his opinions at least as well as for his poems. In neither is he a stranger to controversy. Beijing-based poet Zang Di (b. 1964)—indicating that he neither has as much faith as Liu in readers' intelligence nor quite understands the role of allusion, homage, translation, or context in poetry—has accused Liu of plagiarizing a Federico García Lorca poem as translated by Dai Wangshu (1905–1950) (Zang 2013). Liu's response was to explain that his poem was a "salutatory parody" 戲仿並包含致敬 of a "common reference" 熟典 (Liu 2013*b*), and then say, literally, *sue me*—"Anyone who thinks that I, Liu Waitong, have plagiarized Lorca, please take me to court" 任何人如認為我廖偉棠的詩是抄襲洛爾迦的，請向法院控告我 (Liu 2013*a*). Liu Waitong is one of the poetry editors of the journal *Jintian*, and Zang Di's criticism of Liu is but one more hit against that journal's core writers that climaxed with Zang's twelve-part, nearly ninety-thousand-character-long interview disingenuously titled "Bei Dao, It's Not that I'm Criticizing You" 北岛, 不是我批评你 (Zang 2011). The controversy is interesting, considering that both Zang and the *Jintian* circle are largely on the same side when it comes to other splits in contemporary Chinese poetry, such as the "elevated" and "earthly" polarity described by Maghiel van Crevel (2008).

Neither is Liu a stranger to controversy in local politics. When Chin Wan (Horace Chin Wan-kan, b. 1961), leader of the Hong Kong Autonomy

Movement 香港自治運動, posted a photo on social media of a boy squatting to charge a smartphone in an MTR station with the overlaid caption "Youngsters from the Powerful Country—playing games on electricity stolen from the Hong Kong Mass Transit" 強國出少年, 港鐵偷電打機, Liu responded with an editorial in the *Ming Pao*: the lack of a power adapter on the outlet suggested that the child might not be from the mainland, Liu wrote, and at any rate Chin's rhetoric, slurring all mainlanders as "bandits" 全國皆匪, was not only inflammatory, it was discriminatory; are Liu Xiaobo (1955–2017), Ai Weiwei (b. 1957), and Tan Zuoren (b. 1954) "all bandits, too?" 也是匪嗎, Liu asked (Liu 2012). Chin replied that he would henceforth "rend the mat" 自此割席 with Liu—in short, he unfriended him (Wong 2012). Liu's critique of Chin Wan reflects the idea that despite what the PRC government wants people to believe, advocacy for democracy in Hong Kong does not have to rely on the demonization of all people from mainland China. Both controversies, between Liu and Zang and between Liu and Chin, reflect not only the contentious arena of politics and poetics that Liu inhabits, but also the nonbinary multifacetedness of these contentions.

That the poetry field and the struggle for democracy in Hong Kong are both multifaceted underpins any reading of Liu's "Over the Counter-Revolution." Written in the style of the *Shijing* (詩經)—its first line echoes the anthology's first line, *guan guan ju jiu*, translated by Arthur Waley (1937: 81) as "Fair, fair, cry the ospreys" and Ezra Pound (1954: 2) as "'Hid! Hid!' the fish-hawk saith"—it also refers in its title to current events surrounding Occupy Central. The term in question was popularized after a young woman from mainland China, bused to Hong Kong to be part of a loyalist counterprotest, said in a televised interview that she attended the demonstration not out of any political ideals or devotion to nation, but rather because she wanted to have fun. Although her other answers were in Cantonese, she responded to the reporter's question about how specifically she would have fun in clear, loud Mandarin: "go shopping" *gouwu* 購物 (in Cantonese this would be pronounced *gaumat*). Her answer

immediately became mockingly rewritten as *gau wu* 鳩嗚 in Hong Kong; hence my translation, "Cheap, cheap." A Google search yields any number of popular extensions of that mockery in speech and song, but Liu's poem is to my knowledge the only literary treatment of the term, which is to say the only treatment that moves beyond the simply mocking toward imagination and investigation in a text that rewards rereading.

But Liu's imaginative investigation of the text and context of *gouwu* and *gau wu* also implies an imaginative investigation of itself and its own possibilities and relationships to its contexts. "A revolution *is* a dinner party," Liu writes, referring to Chairman Mao's famous quotation, recited often during the Cultural Revolution, "A revolution is not a dinner party, or writing an essay, or painting a picture, or doing embroidery; it cannot be so refined, so leisurely and gentle, so temperate, kind, courteous, restrained and magnanimous. A revolution is an insurrection, an act of violence by which one class overthrows another" 革命不是請客吃飯，不是做文章，不是繪畫繡花，不能那樣雅致，那樣從容不迫，文質彬彬，那樣溫良恭儉讓。革命是暴動，是一個階級推翻一個階級的暴烈的行動 (Mao 1927*a*; 1927*b*). Liu's line playing on Mao draws the political multifacetedness of his arguments and engagements with his contemporaries into the poem itself. It is at once a mockery of the kind of political engagement prevalent in the mainland, exposing the hollowness of its nationalism by indicating both its descent and dissent from Mao-era views of consumerism as counterrevolutionary (thus my translation of the title), and an interrogation of the aims and methods of Occupy Central: are we willing, it asks, to commit to violent insurrection? Is Mao's definition of revolution correct? Are we one class trying to overthrow another, or is there a more temperate, kind, and magnanimous possibility for revolution that we might be able to imagine? (Reports on how Occupy Central gained moral leverage by "putting the 'civil' in 'civil disobedience'" [Grundy 2014] back up such conjectures. And the title of Liu's collection, *Umtopia*, clearly refers to such civility, too, with respect to aspirations toward a *utopia* 烏托邦.) Questions such as these

indicate that dreams of independence from the mainland are bound to remain unfulfilled, because mainland Chinese contexts are inextricable not only from the politics but also from the epistemologies of Hong Kong.

But insofar as mainland Chinese contexts are inseparable from Hong Kong's problems, these contexts may also offer a way forward. This is where the *Shijing*-style of the poem's form takes on a political significance, and also helps answer the question about what the Sinophone is if Mandarin and Cantonese are two separate languages. In saying that revolution is a dinner party refers to Mao and place names such as Argyle Street 亞皆老街 and Soy Street 豉油街 (which to fit the meter I've translated as Ladies' Market 女人街, more properly Tung Choi Street 通菜街, which it intersects) place the action in Mong Kok—the location of one of the Occupied zones, but also one of Hong Kong's main shopping districts—the form of the poem shows it latching onto an older, and other, definition of China. In contrast with earlier iterations of Communist Party policy, which for a time advocated smashing anything old, today mainland officials are more likely to lay claim to the imperial past through its "one China" cultural policy (the naming of the Confucius Institutes is the most prominent example); Liu's poem both acknowledges and refutes that claim, offering a formal vision of China and Chineseness based in a tradition that may have branched into the contemporary state of China, but that cannot be reduced to such teleology. The form of "Over the Counter-Revolution" calls on and draws from an association with moral rectitude, allegorical significance, and authoritative influence in Chinese poetry, expressed in such statements as "'Airs' are 'Influence'; it is 'to teach.' By influence it stirs them; by teaching it transforms them" 風也, 教也. 風以動之. 教以化之 from the "Great Preface" to the *Shijing* 毛詩大序 (Owen 1992: 38). As writer and critic Hong Wai (2015) says in her review of *Umtopia*, "Classical rhetoric is the bridge through which the Umbrella Movement not only faces Hong Kong politics in its current state, but moreover echoes the drive of Chinese society since the pre-Qin era toward its ideals." The poem's form holds the policies of the

People's Republic to an older standard of Chineseness and finds it lacking.[8]

In finding the Chineseness of China lacking, then, Liu's poem does not itself back away from its own Chineseness. That it draws on the *Shijing* means also that it cannot beg off its own belonging to "Chinese literature."[9] As it explores the Chinese literary tradition, the poem remains legible to the breadth of readings informed by that tradition, to the point that it counters the limitations "Chinese" would place on it—and ends up in the Sinophone. The poem is a text of Sinophone literature not because it rejects the Chinese but because it encompasses the Chinese.

Salt Crystals into Drug

If Liu's poem belongs to the Sinophone because it encompasses the Chinese rather than rejects it, then it must do so at some sacrifice of a more circumscribed Hong Kong identity that is in opposition to being Chinese. So, what of a poem that encompasses, or half-encompasses, the Hong Kong?

As Jing Tsu and David Wang (2010) point out, the Sinophone should involve no ready-made reference to Anglophone, Francophone, or Lusophone conceptualizations; those domains carry their own historical imperatives and "ought not be drawn together in the same way that postcolonialism had previously rallied different experiences of oppression to its platform" (1). Not that Tsu and Wang refuse to consider the question of whether the Sinophone "excludes or includes mainland China as a focus of analysis": in the case of exclusion, they say, "the priority of analysis lies with developing a critical network of minority discourses," whereas inclusion "entails a reworking of the lineage of modern Chinese literature as a solely mainland phenomenon. Both approaches seek to dismantle the hegemonic focus of a 'national' Chinese literature and perhaps of a 'national literature' at all" (6). They are referring to Shu-mei Shih's statement that "Sinophone studies takes as its objects of study *the Sinitic-language communities and cultures outside China as well as ethnic minority communities and cultures within China where Mandarin is adopted or imposed*," as well

[8] Other poems of Liu's also extend, or assert and insert themselves within, the longer tradition of Chinese literature. Zhang Songjian says of his "New Biography of the Tang and Song Luminaries" 新唐宋才子傳, "In the process of artistically rendering his personal experiences, Liu employs 'individualizing history' as the primary technique to convey profound, subtle connotations: the transition of China from tradition to modernity, to the profit myth of commercial capitalism, to the steady loss of indigenous experiences, to the disappearance of the agility of traditional cultural symbols, and to the tensions between individuals and the times as the structural hallmark of the modern world" (Zhang 2011: 195).

[9] Consider in this light also P. K. Leung's "*Shijing* Exercises" 詩經練習in his aptly titled book, *Chinese Poetry from Provence* 普羅旺斯的漢詩 (Leung 2012: 121–140).

as the opposing view, voiced for instance by Sheldon Lu, that although the exclusion of China "from the domain of the Sinophone may seem liberating and progressive at first glance . . . this is unsound theoretically and inaccurate empirically," because the concept "loses its critical edge in this exclusionary approach to China and the Chinese diaspora" (Lu 2008; 2012: 21–24). David Wang takes Lu's point further: to exert its full potential, he says, Sinophone studies must be tested "*within* the nation-state of China. . . . As a matter of fact, to truly subvert the foundation of Chinese national literature, we should no longer consider it apart from the Sinophone literary system" (D. Wang 2015: 8). This debate may be just another instance of what Jing Tsu (2010: 2) calls "literary governance," which produces "national literature as a common interest as well as a source of strife." Nevertheless, I believe it is worth asking what the theoretical roots of Sinophone studies tell us about this dilemma.

By "theoretical roots," I am referring to Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's (1986) notion of "minor literature" (*littérature mineure*), which they coined as part of their study of Franz Kafka and as a loose translation of Kafka's *kleine Literatur*. Deleuze and Guattari define minor literature according to three characteristics: "the deterritorialization of language, the connection of the individual to the political immediacy, and the collective assemblage of enunciation." In looking for "the revolutionary conditions for every literature within the heart of what is called great (or established) literature," their sense of the minor is that it can constitute a revolution within the major literature—major here understood as dominant, as the notion of Germanness came to dominate German literature in Kafka's day and the politics of the PRC's Chineseness dominates Chinese literature today (Deleuze/Guattari 1986: 18). Many writers studying the Sinophone have cited Deleuze and Guattari as supporting their understandings and definitions of the term, starting from Shu-mei Shih's discussion of the Sinophone as a "minor articulation" through which "the major language is contested and appropriated for various constructive and deconstructive

purposes."[10] But other Sinophone studies scholars have demanded more specificity. Andrea Bachner talks about the "facile cooptation" of minor literature in Sinophone studies: for Deleuze and Guattari, she explains, minor literature "meant the possibility to phrase literary resistance in the face of linguistic hegemony," contesting "the dominant system of inscription that occurs inevitably in and with that which it contests" (Bachner 2014: 117). She is referring to the spoken version of the Sinophone in question. Noting that Deleuze and Guattari "privilege orality by way of buccal metaphors," Bachner argues that many "uses of the term 'minor literature' often disregard the oral bias of the concept," and if we are going to focus on writers whose spoken version of Chinese is, for instance, Cantonese, then "the differences these writers straddle lie not only between a 'minor' versus a 'major' literature, but also between spoken and written expressions"—attention to which, Bachner (2014: 118–119) hopes, could heal "the blindness at the center of minor literature as a concept." In other words, if the language of Hong Kong literature is Cantonese, rather than Mandarin, then it may constitute literature in a minor language, but not "minor literature" ("A minor literature doesn't come from a minor language; it is rather that which a minority constructs within a major language"[11]).

Such a claim should contravene my earlier statement about Liu's poem being Sinophone. If Sinophone literature is by definition a minor literature (as the number of citations in the previous paragraph attests), and Deleuze and Guattari define minor literature according to the spoken language in which its writing is to be pronounced, then Liu's poem's rootedness in Chinese literary traditions such as the *Shijing* should not distract from the question of how to pronounce it now (rather than in, say, the bronze age). And yet this question in itself may point to a difference between the configuration of the Sinophone and the Anglophone or Francophone cases: whereas Samuel Beckett can write in English or French and have his works immediately recognized as (Irish-) English or French, if someone thinks to

[10] Shih 2007: 31. See also: Shih 2013: 12; Lionnet/Shih 2005; Chow 2013: 215; Tsu 2010: 19–20; Szeto 2013; Y. Wang 2014: 28; Rojas 2015: 76; and Groppe 2013: 96.

[11] Deleuze/Guattari 1986: 16. An early version of what would later grow into an important awareness for Sinophone Studies can be found in K. C. Lo's MPhil thesis, where he relies in part on Deleuze and Guattari to propose Hong Kong fiction as a "minor literature" that should not be subordinated into understandings of (mainland) Chinese writing (Lo 1990). Although reports are that Deleuze and Guattari did not mind their ideas changing shape when put to use by others, Lo's point nevertheless suggests a departure from their statement that a "minor literature doesn't come from a minor language" such as Cantonese.

himself in Cantonese while writing Chinese, what is written can generally still be read and pronounced in Mandarin. This is where a writer such as Liu's claiming some of his work as Cantonese and some as Mandarin takes on a broader political significance. Pressing on the *-phone* of the Sinophone, we might suggest that, as Beecroft implies, a Cantonese literature would be independent from a Sinophone literature pronounced primarily in *putonghua*. But Liu's poem is not necessarily pronounced in any vocalization of Chinese at all. The poem ends with "Pac-Man" 食鬼 (as named in Hong Kong; in Taiwan he is called *xiao jingling* 小精靈, and in the mainland either *chidou ren* 吃豆人 or *chidou zi* 吃豆子), but the preceding line's 嗚嗚鳩鳴 can be pronounced either *wu wu gau ming* or *wuwu jiuming* to fill in the onomatopoetic link with the Pac-Man reference.[12] In other words, its various possible pronunciations do not need to compete with each other to determine the poem's identity; Cantonese and Mandarin can (indeed, should) exist as dual possibilities in the reading of the poem, but they do not need to be limited by each other. We can see how, via principles "of connection and heterogeneity," Deleuze and Guattari's "minor literature" leads quickly to their concept of rhizome: "any point of a rhizome can be connected to anything other, and must be."[13] At any rate, in allowing that the poem can be pronounced in either Mandarin or Cantonese, it once again finds its place in the Sinophone.

At this moment of aporia and indecision, we can turn to a poem that in fact operates on such indecisiveness, indeed builds its poetic potency out of such mixed emotions, Cao Shuying's 2012 "Hong Kong" 香港:

我同這城市的一部分搭調， 同另一部分排斥。	This city and I are one part in concert, and one part repellence
我同它一半陽光一 半陰影， 一半海面一半海底。	It and I are half sunlight half shadow, half sea surface half ocean floor.
我同它沒有過渡，	Without transition,

[12] Likewise, although the penguin example with which I began this essay shows that written Cantonese does indeed exist (if you read only Mandarin, you might have a hard time with a sentence such as "What are they reading?" 佢哋睇緊乜嘢?), standard written Cantonese nevertheless is based on, effectively *is*, standard written Mandarin (see Snow 2004). With the exceptions of those writers who exploit the vernacular difference between written Cantonese and Mandarin, the only reliable way to be sure of the literature's placement in the Cantonese or Mandarin camps of the Sino-"phone" may be to ask the author.

[13] Deleuze/Guattari 2004: 7. They continue: "There is no mother tongue, only a power takeover by a dominant language within a political multiplicity. Language stabilizes around a parish, a bishopric, a capital. It forms a bulb. . . . It is always possible to break a language down into internal structural elements, an undertaking not fundamentally different from a search for roots. . . . A method of the rhizome type, on the contrary, can analyze language only by decentering it onto other dimensions and other registers. A language is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence" (Deleuze/Guattari 2004: 7–8). And later: "minor languages . . . are not simply sublanguages, idiolects, or dialects, but potential agents of the major language's entering into a becoming-minoritarian of all of its dimensions and elements" (117).

直接進入 生死相 纏	it and I enter a life-death tangle
莫名一處空間。	a space of no description.
我同它一起藏身	It and I hide together
鳥喙之下，	under bird bills,
山石之裡，	in mountain rocks,
多孔玻璃管	many-holed glass clarinets
循環往復之音，	circulating sounds,
音之淵，	an abyss of sound,
淵之頂，	the peak of an abyss,
頂之花。	the flower of the peak.
然後經年，	And then for years,
不見，	invisible,
兩下裡擱置，	momentarily set aside,
鹽出丹，	salt crystals into drug,
竟然都覺無 恙。	yet I end up feeling all right.
我同它一口白蜜	It and I a mouthful of white honey,
一口絕情，	a mouthful of heartlessness,
——終是絕情了吧，	—heartlessness, after all,
厭倦了	tired of
海霧華燈，	the bright lights in the sea spray,
鯉缸樓廈。	goldfish bowl skyscrapers.
且漱玉，	And rinsing jade,
吹球，開顱，	blowing balloons, opening skulls,
耗氧……	expending oxygen…
香港。	Hong Kong.

(Cao 2013*a*: 56–57)

Reading a poem by a wife in the context of a poem by her husband might rub against some of our preferences: feminism scorns the tying of

a woman's writing to a man's so that it can be given "proper" value and understanding. No analysis of Frida Kahlo or Mary Shelley can overcome patriarchal epistemology if they are forever understood in terms of Diego Rivera or Percy Bysshe Shelley, respectively. Then again, such an urge to decontextualize, at its extremes, will run into the problem of undefining women's writing altogether. If we take out of consideration the social and contextual facts of a writer's life, such as where she lives and to whom she is married, before long we will overlook her social and contextual identity as a woman, and what she writes will only be disembodied and deracinated écriture (in Barthes's sense of writing as intransitive). Much valuable scholarship has been done from such a point of view, but it's not what I'm interested in here. Nevertheless, I should underline that I am not hooking Cao Shuying's poetry onto Liu Waitong's in a bid to boost her reputation. Rather, I consider her position and positionality vis-à-vis Hong Kong and mainland poetries, and in turn think through how these considerations build up the notion of the Sinophone.

That Cao Shuying is married to Liu Waitong, in other words, adds to the intricacy and complexity of her work in general and this poem in particular. As the example of Huang Zunxian shows, any mainlander can visit Hong Kong and write about it in a poem. A mainlander poet can even live in Hong Kong for a number of years and still have her or his Hong Kong-ness an open question. Discussing Zheng Danyi's "ambivalent relationship with Hong Kong," for instance, translator Luo Hui (2014: 79) finds "a vision of Hong Kong not as an 'indigenous' culture that needs vigilant protection from British colonial or China-centric domination, but as a porous site of cultural production that does not so much resist as critically engage with the Chinese mainland in the transnational formation of Chinese cultures," an "open and constructive view of Hong Kong [that] is only possible when the poet no longer sees Hong Kong as a place of exile but as an adopted home." Not that such a vision is limited only to those who come to Hong Kong later in life: Luo also mentions Huang Canran's

Anthology of Contemporary Hong Kong Writers 香港當代作家作品合集選, which "divides Hong Kong poets into two categories: the local (本土, bentu) and the immigrant (移民, yimin)," saying Huang "emphasizes the mutual influence between the two categories and acknowledges a certain level of overlap between the two—most Hong Kong poets relate to both the local and the immigrant to some degree."[14] In Cao's case, however, her marriage to a noted figure on the Hong Kong cultural and intellectual scene adds intricacy to the already present question of the relationship between her writing and a Hong Kong identity. Furthermore, it opens the possibility of deepening investigations into the Sinophone.

So far, the Sinophone seems not to have made it into discussions of how Cao's move to Hong Kong has involved changes in her writing. Beijing-based poet and critic Zhou Zan (b. 1968) has noted that after moving to Hong Kong, Cao's "rhythm shortened, wording condensed, and the scope of the poems tended toward the severe and desolate" 节奏短促了, 用词更精简了, 诗的意境也倾向于冷峻, 萧瑟 (Zhou 2013). Hong Kong writer Tang Siu Wa has blogged that Cao told her she "usually tosses off her work on the long subway ride between home and work. This is the predicament of Hong Kong poets, lacking a *third place*, cleansing their souls while commuting" 往往都是在往返家裡與工作地點的長途地鐵上揮成. 這真是香港詩人的苦處, 欠缺第三空間(the third place), 往往都是在交通工具上洗滌心靈 (Tang 2013). But it is exactly this third place that Hong Kong becomes in Cao Shuying's poem, even as that third place itself is what Cao describes as "a space of no description" 莫名一處空間. Moreover, this third place can grow beyond Hong Kong to reconfigure our understanding of the Sinophone. In the poem, Hong Kong is a place of both concert 搭調 and repellence 排斥, "half sea surface half ocean floor" 一半海面一半海底, both images defining the relationship a mainland writer has to the notion of the Sinophone as a minor literature. The poem begins straightforwardly, although contradictorily, then submerges into the surreal and psychological, of glass clarinets, white honey, and skulls and oxygen. Some lines refer,

[14] Luo 2014: 71–72. For Huang's anthology, see Huang Canran 2011. Luo's argument that "the curious effect of being in exile in a culturally and linguistically related, and yet ideologically removed, environment . . . complicates the notion of 'Chinese literature' and calls for fresh critical frameworks for the discussion of Chinese-language literary production" also broaches the Sinophone, although in my opinion he sells it short: "'Sinophone articulations' as a means to critique a deep-rooted China-centrism . . . while critically and socially progressive, is more applicable to second- or third-generation Chinese immigrants or diasporic Chinese communities that have long intermingled with various local cultures to such an extent that their relationships with China have evolved into one of cultural heritage or a form of mutual 'otherness.' Shih's 'Sinophone articulations' does not take into consideration a growing number of first-generation writers who live outside China as immigrants or in exile, but continue to have deeply engaged relationships with China both personally and publicly" (Luo 2014: 70). This does not consider what Jacob Edmond (2013) says about Yang Lian as potentially a New Zealand or English Sinophone writer, or what Andrea Bachner (2013) says about Gao Xingjian as a French Sinophone author.

obliquely or opaquely, to Hong Kong: "the peak of an abyss, / the flower of the peak" 淵之頂，/ 頂之花 seems to me to refer to "the peak" 山頂, or Victoria Peak 太平山山頂; the sea spray and skyscrapers are plain enough indicators of a built-up island city, especially as they also narrate the mixed emotions of the poet's own ambivalence. But other, more internal images make little rational sense. When I asked Cao to explain her lines

鹽出丹，	salt crystals into drug,
竟然都覺無恙。	yet I end up feeling all right.

she wrote, "after a long time salt (the foundation of life, minute crystalline structures) will become *crystallized*, and after the crystallization, it might be poisonous, or else medicinal" 我想盐出丹是有盐（生命的基本，细小晶体）很久然后crystalized，结晶，結晶後可以是有毒的，是藥 (Cao 2015). For the translation, I borrow Cao's code-switch verb "crystalized" and call it a "drug," but analytically it reminds me of *pharmakon* in Derrida's (1981: 70) reading of Plato: "this 'medicine,' this philter, which acts as both remedy and poison, already introduc[ing] itself into the body of the discourse with all its ambivalence." This is not to suggest that Cao is referring, consciously or unconsciously, to Derrida's deconstruction, yet I do see her fluctuation invoking the same perspective—or perhaps a perspective equal and opposite. "The leaves of writing" in Plato, Derrida says, "act as a *pharmakon* to push or attract out of the city the one who never wanted to get out" (70). In Cao Shuying's "Hong Kong," the *pharmakon* attracts *into* the city the one who may never have wanted to enter.

This simultaneous duality extends to Cao herself. Cao speaks Cantonese, better than most of the northerners who have settled in Hong Kong. Unlike most mainlanders, her WeChat and Facebook posts are written almost exclusively in traditional characters. Not that this is a full-on rejection of mainland script politics: see how she mixes both character styles in her message to me quoted here. And for how this plays out in her poetry, see her YouTube recording of "Hong Kong" read in northeastern-accented

Mandarin and printed in simplified characters (*fanti zi*) (Cao 2013*b*). Also, like Liu Waitong's use of the *Shijing* style in "Over the Counter-Revolution," Cao's "rinsing jade" 漱玉 at the end of the poem refers to the collection *Jade Rinsing Lyrics* 漱玉詞集 by Li Qingzhao (1084–c. 1151). Cao herself neither confirms nor denies the reference: "I think subconsciously it refers to the elimination of oral filth" 我想我潛意識裡是清除口腔汙穢的意思, adding that she was "led by the subconscious when writing" 潛意識主導, "the vocabulary jumping out almost automatically" 詞語差不多都是自動蹦出來的; and yet, "jade is an object of cleanliness, texturally the same as teeth, indicating resoluteness" 玉是潔淨之物, 和牙齒質地相像, 有有心志之意 (Cao 2015). In a poem that describes internal and external conflict, this resolve to clear away the filth that can accumulate in references to premodern Chinese literature indicates the speaker's balance in the face of her surroundings. What the unconscious memory of a Song dynasty woman's book of poems washes away is the anxiety about the tension, rather than the tension itself. Cao and her poem are still as entangled and undecided about Hong Kong as ever, but, as I read it, at peace with that indecidability. Her sound and script embody the "politics of multiple belonging" (Christiansen/Hedetoft 2004, see also Shih 2017).

How, then, do these multiple belongings, and being at once in concert and repellent, relate to the issue of minor literature? Although Deleuze and Guattari's notion deterritorializes language and connects the individual to political immediacy and to collective enunciation, the Hong Kong poetry of northerner Cao Shuying is perhaps most constitutionally "minor." Deterritorialized by sheer virtue of the fact that it is Mandarin writing in Hong Kong, this deterritorialization redoubles on being read in the context of mainland-centered "Chinese literature." A kind of antiextraterritoritality, this deterritoriality is of course immediately political and politically immediate, complicating the collective enunciation both of Mandarin in Hong Kong and of Hong Kong Cantonese. Her writing can create "the revolutionary conditions for every literature within the heart

of what is called great (or established) literature" (Deleuze/Guattari 1986: 18) not by rejecting its belonging to either category Chinese or Hong Kong, but by being both in concert with and repellent to the calls to these categories. As Deleuze and Guattari write, "There is nothing that is major or revolutionary except the minor. To hate all languages of masters" (Deleuze/Guattari 1986: 26).

No Point of Rest

But what, then, of the Sinophone? If poems such as "Hong Kong" by mainland-cum-Hong Kong writers such as Cao Shuying are paradigmatically "minor" in the sense Deleuze and Guattari introduced to literary study, does that necessarily make them definitively Sinophone? To say so rubs not only against Shu-mei Shih's own definition of the term as being based in writings by Sinitic-language communities and cultures *outside* China, but also against my consideration here of Liu Waitong's Cantonese writing as Sinophone—which in turn jars with Shih's definition of Sinophone as comprising literatures of "the multiplicity of languages within the family, not [only] . . . literature written in standard Mandarin." So what gives?

The "minor literature" of the Sinophone is revealed to be rhizomatic, because it "may be broken," or "shattered at a given spot, but it will start up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines." As Deleuze and Guattari (2004: 10) explain,

> Every rhizome contains lines of segmentarity according to which it is stratified, territorialized, organized, signified, attributed, etc., as well as lines of deterritorialization down which it constantly flees. There is a rupture in the rhizome whenever segmentary lines explode into a line of flight, but the line of flight is part of the rhizome. These lines always tie back to one another. . . . You may make a rupture, draw a line of flight, yet there is still a danger that you will reencounter organizations that restratify everything, formations that restore power to a signifier, attributions that reconstitute a subject—anything you like.

And "at the same time, something else entirely is going on: not imitation at all but a capture of code, surplus value of code, an increase in valence, a veritable becoming, a becoming-wasp of the orchid and a becoming-orchid of the wasp" (Deleuze/Guattari 2004: 10–11). Like their famous example of the wasp and the orchid, the Chinese and the Sinophone constitute a rhizome of mutuality in which the components deterritorialize and reterritorialize each other, forming images of and becoming pieces in each other's reproductive apparatuses.

Even so—to reiterate Tsu and Wang—the Sinophone should *not* be built on the existing notions of Anglophone, Francophone, or Lusophone, as distinct as such conceptualizations may be from each other. The fact of the Chinese character or "sinograph," as Bachner might point out, means that the quirks of literary history that have created European-language literatures are different from those that have created Sino-scriptic literatures, and as such the moves we can make in defining each literature must differ as well. Literature from the UK may count as Anglophone and writing from France may not be Francophone, but that does not make Aimé Césaire's *Une Tempête* Anglophone because it refers to and rewrites Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, any more than LeRoi Jones's (later Amiri Baraka) *The System of Dante's Hell* is Italian literature. But these immediate distinctions do not necessarily apply when we wonder whether Liu Waitong's use of the *Shijing* style or the reappearance of a Li Qingzhao term in a Cao Shuying poem inscribes their respective poems within or outside the Chinese literary tradition. In other words, Chinese writing—which, before the thirteenth, fifteenth, and nineteenth centuries should also include writing now understood as belonging to Korean, Japanese, and Vietnamese, respectively—is perhaps conceptually closer to the notion of European literature as a whole, with the real point of contention being the ways writing in those languages have included or excluded writing from Asia, Africa, and the Americas, and the categories torn down or reconstituted by such acts of inclusion or exclusion. With the Sinophone, we

can tactically decide whether we want to include or exclude, and whether to be included or excluded, or what.

And the only conclusion available about the Sinophone and the ontological relationship between Hong Kong and "Chinese" literature is that the final resting point is no point of rest. Arif Dirlik (2013) writes, "If there is any point to the Sinophone . . . as a criterion for mapping literature and culture, it is to call for a spatiality that enables dialogue between different, place-based, histories in the creation of a new cosmopolitan space of 'Chineseness.'" The call for spatiality is the point, rather than the spatiality itself. Any hope of finding a philosophically tenable statement on which to pin our answer to whether the Sinophone should include literature from mainland China and whether Hong Kong literature is part of Chinese literature will be frustrated by the need for tactical, political positions. As Deleuze and Guattari (2004: 11) put it: "Each of these becomings brings about the deterritorialization of one term and the reterritorialization of the other; the two becomings interlink and form relays in a circulation of intensities pushing the deterritorialization ever further. There is no resemblance, only an exploding of two heterogeneous series on the line of flight composed by a common rhizome that can no longer be attributed to or subjugated by anything signifying." Excluding Chinese from the Sinophone may only reify China as an ethnocentric idea, but allowing writing from China into the notion of the Sinophone may likewise undermine the attempt to promote writing from Malaysia, Indonesia, Taiwan, and Tibet—not to mention Hong Kong. But the option to understand writing from China as potentially part of the Sinophone, and through such understanding undermine sinocentrism, may also be tactically viable, even necessary. Because the move to keep the Sinophone a distinct category from that of the Chinese literature threatening to subsume it will be made by writers writing both in and against it, just as they write in and against the categories of their own place. Liu Waitong and Cao Shuying write in and against China just as they write in and against Hong Kong. We see by self-reflection. One part in concert, and one part repellence.

Epilogue

As of the summer of 2018, Cao Shuying and Liu Waitong have moved with their two children to Taiwan. Although other poets, such as Yu Kwang-chung, Wai-lim Yip, and Meng Lang, have also spent time living in the mainland, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, to my knowledge Cao and Liu are the first of their generation to have lived in all three places. I look forward to reading their future work in light of how they negotiate the cultural and political territories, and for what that world reveals about the rhizomatic definition of the Sinophone.

Glossary

Ai Weiwei	艾未未
Bei Dao (Zhao Zhenkai)	北島 (趙振開)
Cao Shuying	曹疏影
Chen Maiping	陳邁平
Chidou ren	吃豆人
Chidou zi	吃豆子
Chin Wan (Horace Chin Wan-kan)	陳雲 (陳雲根)
Dai Wangshu	戴望舒
Dung Kai-cheung	董啟章
fanti zi	繁體字
gau wu	鳩嗚
gouwu (*gaumat*)	購物
guan guan ju jiu	關關雎鳩
Ho, Tammy Lai-ming	何麗明
Hong Wai	洪慧
Huang Canran	黃燦然
Huang Zunxian	黃遵憲
jianti zi	簡体字
Jintian	今天
Leung Ping-kwan (Yasi)	梁秉鈞 (也斯)
Li Qingzhao	李清照
Li Shangyin	李商隱
Liu Waitong (Liao Weitang)	廖偉棠
Liu Xiaobo	劉曉波
Lo, Kwai Cheung	羅貴祥
Lok Fung (Natalia Sui-hung Chan)	洛楓 (陳少紅)
Meng Lang (Meng Junliang)	孟浪 (孟俊良)
Ming Pao	明報
Mo, Timothy	毛翔青
Mong Kok	旺角
putonghua	普通話
qi'e (*kei'ngo*)	企鵝
Shijing	詩經
Song, Zijiang Chris	宋子江
Tan Zuoren	譚作人
Tang Siu Wa	鄧小樺
WeChat	微信
Xi Xi	西西
Xiao Jingling	小精靈
Xu Xu	徐訏

Yam Gong (Lau Yee-ching)	飲江 (劉以正)
Yip Fai (Yip Tak Fai)	葉輝 (葉德輝)
Yip Wai-lim	葉維廉
Yu Kwang-chung	余光中
Zang Di	臧棣
Zheng Danyi	鄭單衣
Zhou Zan	周瓚

Bibliography

Bachner, Andrea. 2013. "Found in Translation: Gao Xingjian's Multimedial Sinophone." In Shu-mei Shih, Chien-hsin Tsai, and Brian Bernards, eds., *Sinophone Studies: A Critical Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press, 364–375.

———. 2014. *Beyond Sinology: Chinese Writing and the Scripts of Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Beecroft, Alexander. 2015. *An Ecology of World Literature: From Antiquity to the Present Day*. London: Verso.

Bei Dao 北島. 1990. *The August Sleepwalker*. Tr. Bonnie S. McDougall. New York: New Directions.

———. 2010. *The Rose of Time: New and Selected Poems*. New York: New Directions.

Cao Shuying 曹疏影. 2013*a*. *Jin Xue* 金雪 (Gold Snow). Hong Kong: Kubrick.

———. 2013*b*. *Cao Shuying shi: Xianggang* 曹疏影 詩: 香港 (Poem by Cao Shuying: Hong Kong). URL (accessed 8/27/18): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3ScShJXJUOw

———. 2015. "Personal Communication." (Nov. 30).

Chen Jianhua. 2003. "The Late Qing Poetry Revolution: Liang Qichao, Huang Zunxian, and Chinese Literary Modernity." In Joshua S. Mostow, ed., *The Columbia Companion to Modern East Asian Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 333–340.

Chin Wan 陳雲. 2015. "A Federation for Hong Kong and China." *The New York Times*. (June 14). URL (accessed 8/27/18): http://www.nytimes.

com/2015/06/15/opinion/a-federation-for-hong-kong-and-china.html

Chow, Rey. 2013. "Things, Common/Places, Passages of the Port City: On Hong Kong and Hong Kong Author Leung Ping-Kwan." In Shu-mei Shih, Chien-hsin Tsai, and Brian Bernards, eds., *Sinophone Studies: A Critical Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press, 207–226.

Christiansen, Flemming and Ulf Hedetoft, eds. 2004. *The Politics of Multiple Belonging: Ethnicity and Nationalism in Europe and East Asia*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1986. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Tr. Dana Polan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2004. *A Thousand Plateaus*. Tr. Brian Massumi. London: Continuum.

Derrida, Jacques. 1981. *Dissemination*. Tr. Barbara Johnson. London: Athlone Press.

Diggory, Terence. 2009. *Encyclopedia of the New York School Poets*. New York: Infobase.

Dirlik, Arif. 2013. "Literary Identity / Cultural Identity: Being Chinese in the Contemporary World." URL (accessed 8/27/18): http://mclc.osu.edu/rc/pubs/dirlik.htm

Edmond, Jacob. 2013. "Inverted Islands: Sinophone New Zealand Literature." In Shu-mei Shih, Chien-hsin Tsai, and Brian Bernards, eds., *Sinophone Studies: A Critical Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press, 339–352.

Groppe, Alison M. 2013. *Sinophone Malaysian Literature: Not Made in China*. Cambria Sinophone World Series. New York: Cambria Press.

Grundy, Tom. 2014. "How Hong Kong Protesters Put the 'Civil' into 'Civil Disobedience.'" URL (accessed 8/27/18): http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/tom-grundy/hong-kong-protests_b_5956212.html?utm_hp_ref=uk

Hong Wai 洪慧. 2015. "Shige Zuowei Fankang de Fangfa: Du *Santuobang*" 詩歌作為反抗的方法: 讀《傘托邦》(Poetry as a means of opposition: reading *Umtopia*). URL (accessed 8/27/18): http://www.kritik.hk/content/2015/06/30/詩歌作為反抗的方法: 讀《傘托邦》

Huang Canran 黃燦然, ed. 2011. *Xianggang dangdai zuojia zuopin heji xuan: shige juan* 香港當代作家作品合集選. 詩歌卷 (Anthology of contemporary Hong Kong writers: poetry). Hong Kong: Xianggang Mingbao.

Huang Zunxian 黃遵憲. 1981. Renjinglu shicao jianzhu 人境廬詩草箋注 (The annotated hut of the human realm poems). 3 vols. Zhongguo gudian wenxue congshu. Shanghai: Shanghai guji.

Klein, Lucas. 2003. "Alphabets Upside-Down: The Voice of Bei Dao." *Rain Taxi* Online. URL (accessed 8/28/18): http://www.raintaxi.com/alphabets-upside-down-the-voice-of-bei-dao/

———. 2014. "Review of *Sinophone Studies: A Critical Reader*." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 36 (Dec.): 216–219.

Lee, Gregory B. 1996. *Troubadours, Trumpeters, Troubled Makers: Lyricism, Nationalism and Hybridity in China and Its Others*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lee, Leo Ou-fan 李歐梵. 1992. "Huli dong shihua" 狐狸洞詩話 (Poetry talks from the Fox Burrow). *Jintian* 今天 1, 201–204.

———. 1993. *Huli dong huayu* 狐狸洞話語 (Discourses from the Fox Burrow). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Leung Ping-kwan 梁秉鈞. 2012. *Puluowangsi de Hanshi* 普羅旺斯的漢詩 (Chinese poetry from Provence). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Li Shangyin 李商隱. 1988. *Li Shangyin shige jijie* 李商隱詩歌集解 (The collected and explicated poems of Li Shangyin). 5 vols. In Liu Xuekai and Yu Shucheng, eds., *Zhongguo gudian wenxue jiben congshu*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.

Lionnet, Françoise. 2009. "Universalisms and Francophonies." *International Journal of Francophone Studies* 12, no. 2–3: 203–221.

——— and Shu-mei Shih, eds. 2005. *Minor Transnationalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Liu Waitong 廖偉棠 [Liao Weitang]. 2012. "Ditie li de haizi" 地鐵裏的孩子 (The kid in the MTR). *China Digital Times* (blog). (Feb. 29, 2012). URL (ac-

cessed 8/27/18): https://chinadigitaltimes.net/chinese/2012/02/香港雜評-廖偉棠: 地鐵裏的孩子

———. 2013*a*. "Qing xiang fayuan konggao wo" 請向法院控告我 (Please take me to court). URL (accessed 8/27/18): http://tw.weibo.com/1694438127/3597065223227512

———. 2013*b*. "Shuo 'Lugui bo Hu Yaobang'" 說《錄鬼簿胡耀邦》(Explaining 'Hu Yaobang in The Ghost Log'). URL (accessed 8/27/18): http://www.jintian.net/bb/viewthread.php?tid=64298

———. 2015. *Santuobang: Xianggang yusan yundong de ri yu ye* 傘托邦: 香港雨傘運動的日與夜 (Umtopia: days and nights of the Umbrella Movement in Hong Kong). Hong Kong: Spicy Fish Cultural Production.

Lo, Kwai Cheung. 1990. "Crossing Boundaries: A Study of Modern Hong Kong Fiction from the Fifties to the Eighties." M.A. thesis. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong.

Lu, Sheldon. 2008. "Review of *Visuality and Identity: Sinophone Articulations across the Pacific*." URL (accessed 8/27/18): http://u.osu.edu/mclc/book-reviews/visuality-and-identity/

———. 2012. "Notes on Four Major Paradigms in Chinese-Language Film Studies." *Journal of Chinese Cinemas* 6, no. 1: 15–25.

Luo, Hui. 2014. "Beyond Exile: Zheng Danyi's Hong Kong Poems (1999–2004)." *Translation Review* 90, no. 1: 69–81.

Mao Zedong 毛澤東. 1927*a*. "Hunan nongmin yundong kaochao baogao" 湖南農民運動考察報告 (Report on the Hunan Peasant Movement Investigation). Marxists.Org. (March 1927). URL (accessed 8/27/18): https://www.marxists.org/chinese/big5/nonmarxists/mao/19270300.htm

———. 1927*b*. "Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan." Tr. unattributed. 1927. URL (accessed 8/27/18): https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-1/mswv1_2.htm

Owen, Stephen. 1990. "What Is World Poetry? The Anxiety of Global Influence." *New Republic* 203, no. 21: 28–32.

———, ed. 1992. *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.

Pound, Ezra, tr. 1954. *Shih-Ching: The Classic Anthology Defined by Confucius*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rojas, Carlos. 2015. "Writing on the Wall: Benjamin, Kafka, Borges, and the Chinese Imaginary." *452°F* 13: 71–81.

Shih, Shu-mei. 2007. *Visuality and Identity: Sinophone Articulations across the Pacific*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2013. "Introduction: What Is Sinophone Studies?" In Shu-mei Shih, Chien-hsin Tsai, and Brian Bernards, eds., *Sinophone Studies: A Critical Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1–16.

———. 2017. *Fan lisan* 反離散 (Against diaspora). Taipei: Lianjing.

Snow, Don. 2004. *Cantonese as Written Language: The Growth of a Written Chinese Vernacular*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Szeto, Mirana May. 2013. "Intra-Local and Inter-Local Sinophone: Rhizomatic Politics of Hong Kong Writers Saisai and Wong Bik-Wan." In Shu-mei Shih, Chien-hsin Tsai, and Brian Bernards, eds., *Sinophone Studies: A Critical Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press. 191–206.

Tang Siu Wa 鄧小樺. 2013. "Nanyi qiongjin de shaonü: du Cao Shuying de *Jin xue*" 難以窮盡的少女——讀曹疏影《金雪》 (The inexhaustible young woman: reading Cao Shuying's *Gold Snow*). URL (accessed 8/27/18): http://tswtsw.blogspot.hk/2013/05/blog-post_6381.html

Tian, Xiaofei. 2009. "Muffled Dialect Spoken by Green Fruit: An Alternative History of Modern Chinese Poetry." *Modern Chinese Literature and Culture* 21, no. 1: 1–45.

Tsu, Jing. 2010. *Sound and Script in Chinese Diaspora*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

——— and David Der-wei Wang. 2010. "Introduction: Global Chinese Literature." In Jing Tsu and David Der-wei Wang, eds., *Global Chinese Literature: Critical Essays*. Leiden: Brill, 1–13.

van Crevel, Maghiel. 2008. *Chinese Poetry in Times of Mind, Mayhem and Money*. Leiden: Brill.

Waley, Arthur, tr. 1937. *The Book of Songs*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Wang, David Der-wei. 2015. "Sailing to the Sinophone World: On the Geopoetics of Postcolonialism and Postloyalism." Presented at the A Forum on "Sinophone Hong Kong: Issues and Debates," Hung Leung Hau Ling Distinguished Fellow in Humanities Scheme, University of Hong Kong, (Dec. 5).

Wang, Yiman. 2014. "Alter-Centering Sinophone Cinema." In Audrey Yue and Olivia Khoo, eds., *Sinophone Cinemas*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 26–44.

Wattie, Nelson and Roger Robinson, eds. 2006. *The Oxford Companion to New Zealand Literature*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press. Online edition: http://www.oxfordreference.com.eproxy.lib.hku.hk/view/10.1093/acref/9780195583489.001.0001/acref-9780195583489

Wong, W. 2012. "Wei Liao Weitang hecai" 為廖偉棠喝采 (A cheer for Liu Waitong). URL (accessed 8/27/18): http://fishandhappiness.blogspot.hk/2012/02/blog-post_17.html

Zang Di 臧棣. 2011. "Bei Dao, bushi wo piping ni" 北島, 不是我批評你 (Bei Dao, it's not that I'm criticizing you). URL (accessed 8/27/18): http://www.ideobook.com/1189/zang-di-criticize-bei-dao/

———. 2013. "Guanyu Liao Weitang chaoxi piaoqie Luo'erjia de jianding shuoming" 關於廖為黨抄襲剽竊洛爾迦的鑒定説明 (Explaining my accusation that Liu Waitong plagiarized Lorca). Weibo. URL (accessed 8/27/18): http://www.weibo.com/2451603510/zFkBOp67S?type=comment#_rnd1449741270777

Zhang, Songjian. 2011. "One Poet, Four Faces: The Invention of Tu Fu in Modern Chinese Poetry." *Frontiers of Literary Studies in China* 5, no. 2: 179–203.

Zhou Zan 周瓚. 2013. "Youxian de jin xueren guo buchu chuangzhong jing" 游仙的金雪人裹不出窗中景 (The mystic gold snowman can't carry away the scene in the window). URL (accessed 8/27/18): http://mp.weixin.qq.com/mp/appmsg/show?__biz=MjM5MTE0MzUyMQ==&appmsgid=10061799&itemidx=1&sign=eea19ef112f6e7a4a65ec827aeea5873