

## ГЕОКУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ПРОСТРАНСТВА И КОДЫ КУЛЬТУР СТРАН АЗИИ И АФРИКИ

UDC 811.581.12

### Written at the Service of Oral: Topolect Literature Movement in Hong Kong\*

Yu. A. Dreyzis

Lomonosov Moscow State University,  
1, Leninskie gory, Moscow, 119991, Russian Federation

**For citation:** Dreyzis Yu. A. Written at the Service of Oral: Topolect Literature Movement in Hong Kong. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Asian and African Studies*, 2020, vol. 12, issue 3, pp. 415–425. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu13.2020.307>

The article describes the history of the Topolect Literature Movement (TLM), which developed in Hong Kong in the 1940s, and analyzes its typological features. TLM was one of the most radical projects implemented to replace writing in the national standard language based on northern dialects with writing in the local language variety (Cantonese / Yue). This variety was a non-northern idiom that performed the function of the L-language in diglossia. TLM authors did not try to break the connection between the written language and its oral form: many, primarily poetic, texts were somehow intended for public performance; in other types of texts, a close connection with the spoken language was supported by the strong presence of a narrator. Texts were recorded using Chinese characters (a standard character with an identical / similar reading was used to write down a topolect morpheme, or a character using it as a phonetic element indicating reading was created). The final failure of TLM, in addition to purely political factors, can be explained by a shift in attention from the urban literate audience to peasants. This resulted from the attitudes of the Chinese Communist Party that functioned in a rural environment, very different from the urban one, where TLM writers who sympathized with leftist ideas actually lived and worked. The prevalence of traditional poetic forms reflected a bias towards the traditional culture of the rural community. The willingness to focus on a local audience, even to the detriment of the national language unity, created a potential conflict with the aspirations of most of the Chinese intellectual elite who were determined to solve the problem of nation-building. Nevertheless, TLM serves as a unique

---

\* This research was conducted at the Institute of Linguistics RAS through a grant from the Russian Science Foundation (project No. 19-18-00429).

example of the rapid development of writing in one of the Chinese topolects in the checkered twentieth century.

*Keywords:* Cantonese (Yue), Chinese language, Chinese poetry, written language, spoken language, vernacular.

Discrepancies between the main Chinese “dialects” in terms of phonology, vocabulary, spelling and grammar are so great that a native speaker of one of them cannot understand the meaning of texts written in the other [1]. For this reason and to avoid the dialect-bound variant, sinologists suggest new versions of translating the Chinese term *fangyan* 方言 that describes local lects; for instance, John DeFrancis constructs the term *regionalect* in his book “The Chinese Language: Fact and Fantasy” [2, p. 57]. However, we suppose that Victor Mair’s term *topolect* is more appropriate and represents the most neutral and accurate translation of the Chinese *fangyan* (literally, “speech of different areas”) [3]<sup>1</sup>.

That is not to say that throughout their history, Chinese topolects were completely deprived of written forms. But they have always been the languages for certain types of local literature, traditionally non-prestigious among the Chinese literati. Obviously, there was not a single case of using a written non-standard language in governance or commerce. Even during the periods when China was separated, no attempts were made to create a regional literary language based on one of the local topolects. Starting from the mid-XIXth century, Christian missionaries recorded local lects, usually in Latinized form, as part of their efforts for the Evangelization of ordinary Chinese. Some of these written forms, particularly, the system developed for the Amoy dialect, were somewhat popular among converted Christians, but the Chinese authorities generally treated them with hostility [4]. For most of China’s history, there existed only two forms of written Chinese: the classical literary language based on the prose of the late Zhou and Han (Vth century BCE — IIIrd century CE) (*wenyan* 文言) and a vernacular<sup>2</sup>-based literary language that first appeared in the Tang period (*baihua* 白话).

In both cases, the prestige of the established norms was apparently enough to block the development of any regional competitors. This stratification is directly related to the problem of why discussing literature in topolects is so complicated. However, when the modernization project was initiated at the threshold between the XIX<sup>th</sup> and XX<sup>th</sup> centuries, it brought the idea of writing in the spoken language, separated from the standard. A special role in the process of shaping applicable models to create a written language for essentially oral topolects was given to Cantonese (*yue* 粵). Its unique position lies in the fact that within the Yue area, the gap between the written standard and oral speech was very large; at the same time, the dominating local cultural center in the region was British

---

<sup>1</sup> The gist of the problem is that *fangyan* is identified in Chinese linguistics by the following main criteria 1) Commonality of the standard used in the areas of distribution 2) Commonality of writing in use, i.e., the described entity is not a dialect in general terms of linguistics and Chinese as such should be considered as a family of languages.

<sup>2</sup> The term “vernacular” is meant hereinafter as an idiom used for everyday contacts by a certain group of native speakers; it is attributed a status lower than that of standardized linguistic forms [5, p. 261]. A vernacular language is a language that failed to develop a standardized form, was not codified, or has no established literary tradition. In the context of language standardization, the terms “vernacular” and “vernacular dialect” are also used in modern linguistics as alternative names for “non-standard/ non-literary dialect”.

Hong Kong, where no strict language policy was pursued for transition to a uniform form of Chinese.

At an early stage of the development of written Yue in the Guangdong region, its use was limited to certain prosopoetic formats intended for recitation and singing (*shuōchàng wénxué* 说唱文学). In the first half of the XXth century, Yue was gradually infiltrated into other types of texts, including those of high prestige among the educated elite. We will examine in detail the implementation of a radical project for the transition from H-language (standard) to L-language, viz. the Hong Kong *Topolect Literature Movement* (TLM, *fāngyán wényì yùndòng* 方言文艺运动 / *fāngyán wénxué yùndòng* 方言文学运动), which developed in the mid-XXth century.

TLM was initiated in 1947 with a series of newspaper articles, where pro-Communist and left-wing writers (many of them actually did not live in Hong Kong) discussed what should be done to make literature greatly influential on “the masses”. TLM structure was soon formalized and the Guangdong Dialect Literature and Art Research Group (*Guǎngdōng fāngyán wényì yánjiū zǔ* 广东方言文艺研究组) was organized. Three sectors were formed within this research group — for the Yue, Hakka, and Chaozhou 潮州 dialects [6].

TLM efforts in Hong Kong were supported by well-known Chinese writers Mao Dun 茅盾 (1896–1981) and Guo Moruo 郭沫若 (1892–1978), who were both unfamiliar to Yue. In 1948, Mao Dun published several articles, in which he argued that the discussion of dialect literature taking place in Hong Kong had significance far beyond the scope of the local South Chinese problems [7, p. 129]. However, most of the TLM authors who were actively involved in the project came from Guangdong. Hua Jia 华嘉 (1915–1996), a leading editor, theorist and fiction writer of the movement, originated from Nanhai County near Guangzhou and participated in the left-wing movement since 1933. The list of active contributors also included Lou Qi 楼棲 (1912–1997) who wrote songs and narrative poetry in Hakka and Xue Shan 薛汕 (1915–1999), a theorist and novelist from Chaozhou. We cannot determine exactly, how many writers were involved in TLM, but their number was decidedly over twenty. Since most of these authors have not become widely known, very little biographical information is available for most of them [8, p. 106]. However, based on the volume of materials published in Yue, it comes obvious that Yue-speaking authors dominated.

In 1947 and 1948, most of the theoretical articles and literary works of TLM were published in two newspapers: “Zheng Bao” *Chin pao* 正报 and “Hua Shang Bao” *Wa xiong sen pao* 华商报 (Hua Jia worked at editorial offices for supplements of both newspapers). “Zheng Bao” published mostly poetry in traditional formats, while “Hua Shang Bao” published prose.

In 1948, the works in topolect began to appear in other print publications such as “Wényì shēnghuó”, *Manngai sunwut* 文艺生活, and even the newspapers unrelated directly to left-wing forces, such as “Xing dǎo rìbào” *Xintou yatpao* 星島日報 and “Huáqiáo rìbào” *Wakhio yatpao* 华僑日報, published some literary texts in Yue or articles on dialect scripts. In 1949, the movement reached its peak. “Dà gōng bào” *Ta kung pao* 大公报, a left-wing newspaper widely read by intellectuals, launched a biweekly section entitled “Topolect literature” *Fongchin manhok* / *Fangyan wenxue* 方言文学. “Hua Shang Bao”, in addition to regular publications of dialect works in the supplement, also included at times a similar section dedicated entirely to the Yue literature. Several works were published as

separate books in 1949, e.g., Xue Shan's novel "Meeting of Monks" *Wosen wui / Héshàng huì* 和尚会, Lu Qi's poem "Loving couple" *Yunenchi / Yuānyāngzi* 鸳鸯子, and Ou Wen's 欧文 play "Today is not the same as yesterday" *Kamsi m thun wongyat / Jīnshí wú tóng wǎngri* 今时唔同往日 [6]. Two collections were also published. "Literature in topolect" *Fonchin manhok / Fangyan wenxue* 方言文学 represented a single-volume anthology of articles, stories, and poems written by various TLM authors. The second book was a collection of theoretical and literary works by Hua Jia "On the art of writing in topolect" *Len fongchin manngai / Lùn fāngyán wényì* 论方言文艺.

The movement went down markedly by the end of 1949, when the PRC was founded on the mainland. The last issue of "Hua Shang Bao" was published on October 15, the day Guangzhou was captured by the People's Liberation Army; "Zheng Bao" ceased its publishing soon. Newspapers that continued in Hong Kong stopped publishing TLM works; the last text in Yue appeared on October 12, 1949, in "Da Gong Bao". By the end of the year, most of the TLM writers returned to China.

The majority of TLM works addressed the formats with the already accepted use of written Cantonese. In 1949, Huáng Níngyīng 黄宁婴 (1915–1979) noted that of the 94 TLM works that he managed to collect about 90 percent were in poetic form [9, p. 34]. TLM authors generally avoided the "southern songs" format, *namyam* (*nanyin*, 南音), largely because most of TLM works used a more colloquial language than that of *namyam*. Fu Gongwang 符公望 (1911–1977) also notes that *namyam* were associated with the higher strata; he defends the use of *longchau* (*longzhou*, 龙舟, literally "dragon boats") as a format associated more closely with the grassroots culture [10, p. 50].

Let us review "Willow-thin hand" *Ko lau sau / Gè liǔ shǒu* 个柳手 by Fu Gongwan as an example. The poem tells the story of a hungry boy who steals some food. He is spotted by a corrupt policeman and therefore the main character is recruited into the army. The unambiguous purpose of the work is to arouse the reader's sympathy for the poor boy and anger against the police. The fact that the boy steals beef brisket noodles (a Guangzhou specialty) suggests relatedness to Guangzhou and many other movement texts are obviously set in the capital of Guangdong, Hong Kong, or surrounding areas. Here is the initial text fragment<sup>3</sup>:

一個細佬哥，跔响街頭嗌肚餓。  
有担牛腩粉，向佢身邊過。  
拒<sup>4</sup> 順手偷左的咁多。  
有過<sup>5</sup> 警察啱行過，一手執住隨街拖。  
第個警察睇見左，走到眼前指鼻哥。  
佢話“今日拉丁真倒運，我吼左成日未拉過。  
你賣呢個勤務兵，一定分番一份我。”

**a boy was sitting on haunches in** the street, **screaming** he was hungry.  
[a man] carrying a yoke of noodles with beef brisket passed **him** by.  
**the boy stole some** [noodles] meanwhile.

<sup>3</sup> Original spelling is preserved, Yue lexical units marked bold in the text, translation made by the author of this article.

<sup>4</sup> Most likely, this is a typo of 佢 *khei/ tsui* — "he/ she".

<sup>5</sup> Here is also a probable typo of 個 *ko/ ge* — an uncertainty marker.

and a policeman was walking along *just in time*, [he] grabbed the boy and dragged [him] down the street.

*another* policeman *saw* [this], came up and booping the *first one*,

*he said*: “today I was unlucky with recruits, *I watched out* [for them] *all day*, but didn’t catch anyone.

when you sell off *this* batman, do not forget to give me a share” [11, p. 28].

The language of the poem is colloquial, closer to a typical *lungchau* song than the language of other poetic formats. The percentage of unambiguous Cantonese characters is very high (28 percent). The text has no obvious traces of the standard and therefore no evidence of the confusion of literary norm and topolect, which is so typical of most early literary works in Yue.

Characteristically, TLM members, as a rule, did not try to break the association between the written language and the oral form. In texts such as poems and plays, the connection with the spoken form is obvious, since the piece was intended for public performance in one way or another. In fact, many of the works under the movement were written with the idea that they would be read aloud to the audience [12, p. 22]. In other types of text, close association with the oral form was supported by the strong presence of the narrator — virtually all the TLM prose was written first-person.

Apart from the history of the TLM project, discussions of the member authors on the attempts to create literature in Chinese topolect (Yue, Hakka, etc.) present even more interest. While these debates do not seem to have had a direct impact on the subsequent development of written Yue, they show us what was going on among the writers who were concerned about the problem of creating a written standard and its role in Chinese culture. These debates are particularly noteworthy because they were held among the authors committed to the idea of uniting China under the Communist Party but felt, at the same time, the attraction of their native region and its language. In a sense, TLM authors were faced with a dilemma. The success of their enterprise depended, at least in part, on the identification of Guangdong residents with the topolect rather than the national language. Given the capacity of language to act as a unifying force in the linguistic community, TLM was almost bound to promote stronger regional, centrifugal attitudes. Nevertheless, TLM authors worked in support of the national party and at least some of them were its members. They were supposed to be interested in promoting the national unity, rather than devotion to local traditions. The balance between these two conflicting forces was complex and the authors’ debates usually forced them to choose between regional or national language policies.

When the desire to write in topolect came into conflict with the need to support the unity of Chinese written language, most authors were ready to sacrifice the unity, at least temporarily. Ultimately, their readiness to abandon the common standard may have doomed the movement when the Communists gained control of Southeast China. Many of TLM writers did not essentially oppose a united written language — they just disagreed that this language should be *Baihua* based on the Northern lects or its modifications. Their reasoning relied on the assertion that many people in Guangdong have difficulties in understanding *Baihua* because it is no closer to their native language than classical Chinese. The authors often stated that *Baihua* should include elements from various topolects since this language does not represent entire China. Incorporating Cantonese vocabulary

into *Baihua* would not make it much easier to learn but would give Yue speakers a stronger feeling of belonging to the national language.

Almost all TLM members agreed that topolect was capable of reaching the consciousness of “the masses” in the areas of its distribution to the extent, which the standard could not. They believed that the vernacular seemed more “intimate” (*qīnqiè* 亲切) than the standard and people would respond to it more favorably and more readily accept the material written in topolect [13, p. 7; 12, p. 40].

As proof of the appeal of material written in topolect, the authors from Guangdong often wrote about the success of those they called the “urban writers” *siman chokka / shīmín zuòjiā* 市民作家 and even the “porn writers” *wonsiq chokka / huángsè zuòjiā* 黄色作家; their texts were published in the Hong Kong print media *xiupao* (*xiǎobào* 小报)<sup>6</sup> [15, p. 46]. Hua Jia stated that the works written by “urban writers” were sold by over 10,000 copies — a rather impressive figure at that time (op. cit. [16, p. 16]).

Referring to the problems related to the selection of methods for recording speech in dialect, TLM authors were largely unanimous. While writers in the CPC-controlled areas of China experimented with various ways of writing dialect words including the use of Latinization and the national phonetic alphabet (*zhùyīn zìmǔ* 注音字母) [17, p. 13], texts from Hong Kong unambiguously reflected the long achieved unity — topolect was recorded in character form exclusively. Apparently, it was extremely important for the Guangdong tradition to rely on the characters, which were and still are perceived “as a carrier of Chinese civilization and a guarantee of preserving national identity” [18, p. 13].

Although TLM authors opened new vistas for using topolect in various literary texts, the majority clearly believed that its written application was appropriate in some formats, but far less acceptable in others. In particular, they experimented with formats that not necessarily have a strong connection with the spoken language (e. g., novels and essays), but the main body of TLM literary production was yet issued in formats intended for oral performance. To some extent, this came from a practical need: fractional amount of available data on the success of the movement’s works indicates that the texts that could be sung were the most popular [10, p. 22]. Poetry written in the tradition of *mukyushu* (*mùyúshū* 木鱼书, lit. “books of the wooden beater”<sup>7</sup>) was greater by an order of magnitude. Even among the prose works (plays and short stories) issued in TLM’s publications, the use of topolect was acceptable primarily because of its close connection with the colloquial speech. For instance, many of the stories were written in the style of traditional Chinese small-form prose (with the narrator’s figure speaking in the first person).

---

<sup>6</sup> *Xiupao* were inexpensive and moderate-size (usually, a single folded sheet, i.e., four pages) newspapers widely read by workers and urban lower middle class (“burghers”, *xiǎoshīmín* 小市民). This print media was intended for entertainment rather than information, so *xiupao* editorial offices had no newsrooms; instead they mostly contained fiction, reports, and stories about movie and opera stars. The easy content style of these newspapers facilitated the authorized use of topolect [14, p. 118].

<sup>7</sup> A wooden beater shaped as a fish or apodal crab was used in Buddhist temples to beat time when reading prayers. *Mukyushu* are somewhat related to the Buddhist tradition. These were inexpensive xylographic prints that began to appear in the Guangdong region at least in the late Ming, when Foshan and Guangzhou became important centers of the printing industry (see [19, p. 6], and [20, p. 6, 116–117]). Until the 1950s, *mukyushu* remained popular in the Guangzhou area. Most of the *mukyushu* texts are poetic works in various formats, popular in Guangdong. They evolved from both local folk songs and song narratives of the lower Yangtze River region (*táncí* 弹词), which often contained traces of local lects in their original format. Actually, *mukyushu* represent songbooks available for semi-literate audience, who often knew fragments of texts by rote.

We cannot say, how many people actually read the works of TLM; the available data indicate that their audience was small. The two newspapers that published most of TLM works, “Hua Shang Bao” and “Zheng Bao” were Communist Party bodies with minor circulation. The largest circulation was shared by “Huaqiao Zhibao” and “Gōng Shāng Bào” (*Gong syung pao* 工商報), but these newspapers included the smallest volume of topolect works in their issues [8, p. 117]. “Da Gong Bao” was probably the most important in publishing TLM material — it issued a significant number of both theoretical articles and literary works between March 9, 1949, and August 24, 1949. However, these texts were read mostly by intellectuals, rather than the workers and peasants whose consciousness was targeted by TLM authors. Since no newspaper specialized exclusively in publishing their texts, the only way to estimate the sales success of TLM is to look at the number of copies sold for separate non-periodicals published by its authors. Their sales did not exceed a few thousand copies at best [8, p. 117]. Even the writers themselves acknowledged that TLM was not a great success. In particular, Huang Sheng argued that TLM achieved significant success in theorizing, but the actual results were insignificant [13, p. 12].

Another factor that may have contributed to TLM’s failure was the increased attention paid to the peasant audience, whom the writers’ works seldom reached [12, p. 34–35]. This attitude to the peasant audience was part of the Communist Party general program for the entire China; hence such an attitude in TLM authors is quite understandable. The idea of peasantry priority could have originated mostly from party members involved in partisan war over the border, in Guangdong province. For example, Lou Qi wrote his works at the direct request of cadres from Guangdong [8, p. 118]. Lou’s case is not quite typical, but it shows that the movement did not function in isolation from the Communist Party in big China and the party working in rural areas represented one of the forces making the authors focus on the peasant audience, whereas those conditions were very different from the urban environment in which the writers actually lived and worked. One of the main reasons why TLM authors most often wrote in traditional verse forms was undoubtedly the existence of genre conventions. Also, the writers were possibly influenced by their target audience and they decided to work in genres already popular among the Guangdong peasants. The Hong Kong audience was not left without attention either — there were literary works about the life of the lower classes in Hong Kong and notably about the refugees who came to the city from rural areas. However, the prevailing traditional poetic forms reflected a shift towards the culture that prevailed in the rural space, rather than the culture in Hong Kong of 1940s. Unfortunately, poems that were popular in Guangdong were gradually losing their appeal in Hong Kong, where a specific urban culture was under development [12, p. 62]. The Hong Kong population got used to reading *siupao*, where gossips about the theatre and cinema stars were the centerpiece. The forms of traditional *mukyushu* often reproduced by TLM authors were no longer popular in Hong Kong.

The willingness of the TLM members to focus on the local audience, even against the unity of the national language, was apparently unsuitable to the government/ party who had to cope with the problem of uniting the nation and it seems unlikely that after 1949 the project could have retained official support as an organized movement. It is not that topolect script disappeared immediately. Plays, poems, and stories in Yue continued to appear in Guangzhou newspapers for two years more. However, the authors of these works seemingly did not belong to the writers originally involved in TLM [8, p. 120];

moreover, no theoretical articles were published. Obviously, TLM authors just went too far in their regionalism and were assigned other tasks upon returning to China. From January to August 1951, many works in Yue appeared in the “Nanfang ribao” supplement, *Namphon yatpao* 南方日报, including several *lungchau* songs, plays, articles, and beer ads. All texts in topolect except advertising were propagandistic in nature and most of them resembled TLM works, since they were written entirely in Yue, rather than a mixture of standard and vernacular. However, such works disappeared by August 1951.

The year of 1949 essentially marked the end not only of the TLM, but also of the unity between Hong Kong and the central/ southern Guangdong as a single Yue-speaking community. Yue was and is still spoken on both sides of the border, but since 1949, the two regions started to separate linguistically: *Putonghua* is promoted on the mainland and English, vernacular (Yue), and Baihua-based written standard act as the dominant languages in Hong Kong until present. The divergence between the two regions is even more pronounced in the development of Yue writing. Written Yue continued to develop in Hong Kong after 1949 but became almost extinct in the PRC.

Since the early 1950s, the general China’s policy consisted in encouraging the use of *Putonghua* and discouraging the use of topolects as much as possible [2, p.226]. In addition to purely pragmatic considerations of linguistic unity, which fueled this practice, there also existed the universal cultural sets, which the authorities relied on to root the chosen language policy model. In Chinese cultural tradition, topolects were invariably associated with barbarism: during the reign of the last dynasty, the term *fangyan* was used by Chinese officials and scholars who compiled bilingual glossaries for such clearly non-Sinitic languages as Korean, Mongolian, Manchu, Vietnamese, etc. [3, p.4]. In some late Qin texts even Western languages are called *fangyan* varieties [1].

The exception to this trend made a brief interlude in 1960, when Guangdong educational institutions promoted topolect-based Latinization systems (*pinyin* 拼音) as “[Guangdong’s] magic weapon in fighting against illiteracy” [21, p.935]. However, the application of these Latinization systems in real life soon encountered problems, because they failed to reflect well the real sounding, as well as because of too many variations within dialect groups.

In recent years, local lects have again gained a more significant role in the publishing life of China, but this occurred primarily due to the works of northern authors such as Feng Jikai 冯骥才 (1942–) and Jia Pingwa 贾平凹 (1952–) [22, p.24]. Southern authors do not often use topolect in their writing. In Guangdong newspapers, words in Yue appear occasionally and they are often marked with quotation marks [23]; topolect plays a minor role in the Guangzhou newspaper cartoons. However, in modern Guangdong, written Yue is not used to the extent close to the language vernacularization in TLM; in this sense, follow-up practices are absent in mainland China.

Despite its very moderate spread and short life, TLM provides a unique example of an attempt to overcome the marginal status of writing in one of the Chinese topolects. There are four main factors that prevent demarginalization of topolect writing. First, it is the fact that Chinese characters are poorly adapted for writing lects that differ greatly in their characteristics from classical Chinese. Under the movement, this limitation is overcome by creating special characters for recording topolect morphemes or using homophonic morphemes with established traditional spellings; the complete rejection of any other forms of writing other than Chinese characters is promoted.



The second factor is the lack of a tradition of creating texts in regional vernaculars. Throughout the long maturation period of the national written language, the problem of writing non-standard regional lects did not emerge. In this sense, the Yue topolect is in a winning position: its written records were attempted already in the early works of popular poetry, which spread in the Guangdong region from the XVI<sup>th</sup> till the early XX<sup>th</sup> century. All of them use the phonetic borrowing principle in writing topolect words with Chinese characters (the use of a standard character with an identical/ similar reading, or a character used as a phonetic element indicating reading). The examples of early poetic texts in Yue demonstrate that in most cases the validity of using the written form of topolect is directly related to certain form of correlation between the text and colloquial speech — usually with oral performance (this trend also persists in the works of the topolect literature movement).

The third factor restraining the evolution of regional vernaculars is the strong prejudice against their use. They are invariably labeled rude and vulgar, a permanent refrain in commentaries to the popular culture. Under the movement, this restriction is overcome by a conscious choice in favor of “grassroots”, mass cultural practices supported by the left-wing discourse.

Finally, the fourth factor is a direct political ban on creating texts in regional vernaculars. Strict control over local lects as opposed to the standard is implemented in modern mainland China. As the national standard expands its capacities across the country through education, media, trade, and other channels, the topolect space is inexorably shrinking. In this sense, the Hong Kong Topolect Literature Movement had a rare opportunity to develop in the absence of direct bans and even more, with unofficial support for its ideology. This is exactly what makes the movement uniqueness, which was not replicated later in the history of the Chinese language.

## References

1. Mair V.H. How to Forget Your Mother Tongue and Remember Your National Language. *Pinyin Info*. 2003. Available at: <http://pinyin.info/readings/mair/taiwanese.html> (accessed: 14.08.2019).
2. DeFrancis J. *The Chinese Language: Fact and Fantasy*. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 1986. 330 p.
3. Mair V.H. What Is a Chinese “Dialect/Topolect”? Reflections on Some Key Sino-English Linguistic Terms. *Sino-Platonic Papers*, 1991, no. 29, pp. 1–31.
4. Zheng Liangwei. Han Luo heyongwen shuoming [Explanations for the joint use of Chinese characters and Romanization]. *Lin Zongyuan Taiyu shixuan*, eds Lin Zongyuan, Zheng Liangwei. Taipei, Zili wanbao wenhua chubanshe, 1988, p. 32. (In Chinese)
5. Yule G. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010. 320 p.
6. Jing Wen. Huanan fangyan wenxue yundong de xianzhuang he yiyi [The Current State and Significance of the Topolect Literature Movement in Southern China]. *Da gong bao*, 1949, May 4, pp. 6–7. (In Chinese)
7. Liu Denghan. *Xianggang wenxue shi* [*The history of Hong Kong literature*]. Hong Kong, Xianggang zuojia chubanshe, 1997. 769 p. (In Chinese)
8. Snow D. *Cantonese as Written Language, the Growth of a Written Chinese Vernacular*. Hong Kong, Hong Kong University Press, 2004. 332 p.
9. Huang Ningying. Tan Guangdong de yunwen chuanguozuo [On the creation of poetic texts in Guangdong]. *Fangyan wenxue*. Hong Kong, Xin minzhu chubanshe, 1949, pp. 33–42. (In Chinese)
10. Fu Gongwang. Longzhou he nanyin [Lungzau and naamjam]. *Fangyan wenxue*. Hong Kong, Xin minzhu chubanshe, 1949, pp. 42–61. (In Chinese)
11. Fu Gongwang. Ge liu shou [Willow Hand]. *Zheng bao*, 1947, October 4, p.28. (In Chinese)

12. Hua Jia. *Lun fangyan wenyi [On topolect literature]*. Hong Kong, Renjian shuwu, 1949. 137 p. (In Chinese)
13. Huang Sheng. Fangyan wenyi yundong jige lundian de huigu [A look back at a few arguments of the topolect literature movement]. *Fangyan wenxue*. Hong Kong, Xin minzhu chubanshe, 1949, pp. 3–33. (In Chinese)
14. Link P. *Mandarin Ducks and Butterflies: Popular Fiction in Early Twentieth-Century Chinese Cities*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1981. 313 p.
15. Feng Naichao, Quan Lin. Fangyan wenxue wenti lunzheng zongjie [General results of the polemic about the problems of topolect literature]. *Zheng bao*, 1948, no. 69/70, pp. 30–35. (In Chinese)
16. Mao Dun. Za tan fangyan wenxue [Miscellaneous notes on topolect literature]. *Qunzhong*, 1948, vol. 2 (3), pp. 16–17. (In Chinese)
17. Holm D. L. Local Color and Popularization in the Literature of Wartime Border Regions. *Modern Chinese Literature*, 1986, vol. 2 (1), pp. 7–17.
18. Zavyalova O. I. *The Great World of Chinese Language*. Moscow, Vostochnaya kniga Publ., 2014. 320 p. (In Russian)
19. Hegel R. *Reading Illustrated Fiction in Late Imperial China*. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1998. 489 p.
20. Rawski E. *Education and Popular Literacy in Ch'ing China*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1979. 294 p.
21. Peterson G. The Struggle for Literacy in Post-Revolutionary Rural Guangdong. *China Quarterly*, 1994, vol. 140, pp. 926–943.
22. Dai Zhaoming. Fangyan, tuyu, yuyan fengge he yuyan xiuyang [Topolects, local dialects, language style and culture of speech]. *Yuwen jianshe*, 1987, no. 4, pp. 24–29. (In Chinese)
23. Tang Li, Tu Liangjun. Jinqi Guangzhou diqu bufen de baokan fangyan yongyu diaocha [Overview of the Use of Topolect Words in Some Guangzhou Newspapers and Magazines in Recent Years]. *Diqi jie guoji Yue fangyan yantaohui lunwen*, eds Shan Zhouyao, Lu Jingguang. Beijing, Shangwù yinshuguan, 2000, p. 367. (In Chinese)

Received: January 25, 2020

Accepted: June 29, 2020

#### Author's information:

Yulia A. Dreyzis — PhD in Philology; xiaoyouliya@gmail.com

### Письменное на службе устного: движение за литературу на тополекте в Гонконге

Ю. А. Дрейзис

Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова,  
Российская Федерация, 119991, Москва, Ленинские горы, 1

**Для цитирования:** Dreyzis Yu. A. Written at the Service of Oral: Topolect Literature Movement in Hong Kong // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Востоковедение и африканистика. 2020. Т. 12. Вып. 3. С. 415–425. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu13.2020.307>

Статья посвящена описанию истории, а также анализу типологических особенностей движения за литературу на местном идиоме (кантонском/юэ), которое развивалось в Гонконге в 1940-е годы. Движение представляло собой один из самых радикальных проектов по замещению письма на общенациональном стандартном языке, сформированном на базе северных диалектов, на письмо на местном идиоме. Это был идиом несевверного типа, выполнявший функцию L-языка в условиях диглоссии. Авторы — участники движения не пытались разорвать связь письменного языка с его устной формой: многие, прежде всего стихотворные, тексты так или иначе предназначались

для публичного исполнения; в других типах текстов тесная связь с устным языком поддерживалась сильным присутствием рассказчика. Тексты фиксировались при помощи китайской иероглифики (применялся иероглиф стандарта с идентичным/похожим чтением или иероглиф, использующий его как фонетический элемент, указывающий на чтение). Провал движения, помимо чисто политических причин, объяснялся, на наш взгляд, смещением внимания с городской грамотной аудитории на крестьян. Это происходило под влиянием установок китайской компартии, функционировавшей в сельской местности, весьма отличной от городской среды, в которой писатели, симпатизировавшие левым идеям, действительно жили и работали. Преобладание традиционных стихотворных форм отражало уклон в сторону культуры, бытовавшей в сельском пространстве. Готовность участников движения сосредоточиться на местной аудитории, даже в ущерб единству национального языка, создавала потенциальный конфликт с устремлениями большей части китайской интеллектуальной элиты, которая была настроена решать проблему объединения нации. Тем не менее движение дает уникальный пример быстрого развития письма на одном из китайских тополектов (фанъянь) в XX в.

*Ключевые слова:* вернакуляр, кантонский (юэ), китайская поэзия, китайский язык, письменный язык, устная речь.

Статья поступила в редакцию 25 января 2020 г.,  
рекомендована к печати 29 июня 2020 г.

Контактная информация:

*Дрейзис Юлия Александровна* — канд. филол. наук; xiaoyouliya@gmail.com