NAMES, Vol. 59 No. 4, December, 2011, 204–13

Disambiguating the Term "Chinese": An Analysis of Chinese American Surname Naming Practices

GENEVIEVE Y LEUNG
University of Pennsylvania, USA

The term "Chinese" can refer to an ethnicity, a group of people, or language(s). This conflation makes disentanglement especially difficult, yet not disambiguating perpetuates an oversimplification of a nation, languages, peoples, and cultures. While this blanket term collapses plurality into a monolithic entity, the converse seems to hold when looking at Romanized naming practices of Chinese Americans. The alphabetic rendition of Chinese American names draws relatively clear boundaries of country of origin and general time of arrival to the United States. This paper problematizes the term "Chinese" and looks at the Chineses like Cantonese and *Hoisan-wa*, which have long overlooked histories in the United States and hold critical clues to disambiguating the cultural and linguistic pluralities of what many would lump together as an immutable term. These findings have implications for using this naming phenomenon to raise linguistic awareness and for the teaching of Chinese American history.

KEYWORDS Toishanese/*Hoisan-wa*, Cantonese, names, Chinese American history

Introduction

While present trends of US immigration show a vast spread of ethnic Chinese immigrants of various language backgrounds, most Americans and even Chinese Americans may not know that nearly all Chinese immigrants from the 1800s to 1970s spoke some variety of "Cantonese" originating in the Szeyap (四邑, literally: 'Four Districts') region. As explained by McCoy (1966), the Szeyap region is an area in Guangdong (廣東) province in mainland China which consists of four districts: Taishan (台山), Kaiping (開平), Enping (恩平), and Xinhui (新會). Because of the proximity of the Szeyap region to various seaports, it is no surprise that much of the early ethnic Chinese immigration to the US came from these four districts, with Taishan sending off the largest population of people, mostly as laborers. Speakers

 DOI 10.1179/002777311X13082331190038

from the Taishan region of the Four Districts spoke *Hoisan-wa* (台山話), also known as "Toisanese" or "Toishanese," as it is called in Standard Cantonese, and "Taishanese," as it is called in Modern Standard Mandarin.[1] While there are obvious regional differences to the varieties spoken in these four districts, these varieties are largely lumped together as "Cantonese." Thus it would not be uncommon to hear *Hoisan-wa* speakers call themselves "Cantonese" speakers, qualified with a phrase to the effect of, "But I speak a rural form of Cantonese." The need to both explicitly distinguish *Hoisan-wa* from "Cantonese" and refute the idea that *Hoisan-wa* is merely "a rural form of Cantonese" will become evident as this section progresses.

Chinese Americans who can trace their ancestors' arrival back to the US to the nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries come from a shared Szeyap ancestral heritage language that differs greatly linguistically, culturally, and historically from Mandarin, the current standard language of China and Taiwan. This particular population encompasses a sizable proportion of third-generation Chinese Americans and nearly all fourth-generation-plus Chinese Americans. From the 1800s to 1930, up to nearly two-thirds of the Chinese in America came from the Szeyap region of Southern China (Chan and Lee, 1981). Nonetheless, the exponential rise in the status of Mandarin today has resulted in the heightened demand for and consumption of Mandarin-language classes and bilingual enrichment programs. For all Chinese Americans of these various "Cantonese" backgrounds, then, this shift in the political economy of language involves the negotiation and (re)alignment of language backgrounds.

Hoisan-wa, then, can be characterized as a marginalized language variety of tremendous historical consequence that has been caught in the crossfire of the aforementioned "Chinese confusion" over language and dialect. Those of *Hoisan-wa* backgrounds can neither claim full participation as being users of "standard Cantonese" (from Hong Kong) or "standard Mandarin" (from mainland China or Taiwan), the two Chinese languages with most prestige in the US (Wiley, 2008). In addition, due to recent esteem for China and Mandarin Chinese, the current folk mapping of "Chinese" as only being Standard Mandarin has caused an inordinate spike in educational research studies dealing singularly with Chinese in the form of Mandarin. The situation is no different in discourse projected by the mass media. As Stubbs (1998) notes of text and corpus analyses, looking at semantic prosody, which is a type of collocational phenomenon where co-occurrence of words shift towards predominantly positive or negative semantic values, can help researchers understand and clearly present, through large bodies of written text as data, words' intuitive cultural significance (176). A simple corpus analysis of US newspapers of the last twenty-two years show clear semantic prosody for the word "Mandarin" with "language," "Chinese," and "fluency" (Leung, 2009). Conversely, for the word "Cantonese," which appears more than half as frequently in the corpora, there is semantic prosody with the words "dialect," "Chinatown," and "restaurant."

The current metalinguistic and metapragmatic commentary about "Chinese," that is, the "talkings about" what "Chinese" is, having been reappropriated and changed over time, has both explicitly and implicitly propelled Mandarin over all other Chineses. Put in anther way, the Saussurian notions of the relationship between the signifier and the signified, also relevant in onomastics, has shifted over time, thereby

impacting how varieties like *Hoisan-wa* are thought of and talked about. What little work is done on non-Mandarin language acquisition and maintenance in the US hardly ever distinguishes Cantonese from *Hoisan-wa*; as such, *Hoisan-wa* as a language background is muddled in the sense that people know the background exists (e.g. "in Chinatown") but nothing more, which mystifies people of *Hoisan* heritage and clouds the historical significance of these early immigrants.

On the other hand, this is not to say that such discourses have completely blotted out *Hoisan-wa*. Resilient traces of *Hoisan-wa* manifest themselves in literary works by such renowned pioneers of Asian American literature as Maxine Hong Kingston, Fae Myenne Ng, Lawrence Yep, and David Wong Louie, though the variety is almost always just called "Cantonese" or, at most, "the village dialect" (though "Toishan" as a place name is sometimes mentioned). *Hoisan-wa* can also be seen in "Chinese" word borrowings into English such as *chop-suey* and *chow mein*.[2] It should come as no surprise that many of these words are related to food, as discrimination faced by early Chinese immigrants confined them to professions such as restaurant work and laundering clothes. Thus the continued, reconstituted circulation of *Hoisan-wa* necessitates a diachronic viewing of this variety over time.

The need to distinguish *Hoisan-wa* from standard Cantonese is a necessary distinction when tracing the shifting language ideologies of the varieties of Chinese in the US as well as understanding the contributions of Chinese Americans to US history by recognizing and celebrating their language varieties. Through disambiguating the term "Chinese," this paper aims to raise awareness about the diversity of Chinese American history and specifically highlight *Hoisan-wa* heritage through Chinese American naming practices.

Historical background and "Chinese" confusion

In order to understand the interrelationships between *Hoisan-wa*, standard Cantonese and other Chineses and ultimately how they relate to Chinese American naming practices, due explanation of the macro-level processes of how the term "Chinese" came to be singular is necessary; not critically problematizing this issue directly impacts minority Chineses like *Hoisan-wa*. Through the linguistic lens of mutual unintelligibility, Cantonese is a separate language from Mandarin, but enough overlap in phonology, intonation, and particularly grammar and script allow for the translating of Cantonese knowledge into assets for Mandarin learning. Yet these elephant-in-the-room factors are largely quashed because from a more sociolinguistic lens, "we usually do not speak of Chinese in the plural" (Ramsey, 1987: 17). This ideology is bolstered by the fact that standard written Chinese, matching most closely to spoken Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM), overrides all oral varieties of Chinese because it is (more or less) the shared writing system of speakers of all varieties of Chinese.

In addition, the name for these varieties of Chinese, called 方言 (MSM: *fangyan*), has long been erroneously translated as "dialect." The meaning is better captured with "topolect" (Mair, 1991), referring to language groups (Sinitic or otherwise) by topographic distribution; the mistranslation and linguistically irresponsible perpetuation of "dialect" without cultural and historical prefacing further solidifies the ideology that "[t]he language variety that has the higher social value is called a

'Language', and the language variety with the lower social value is called a 'dialect'" (Roy, 1987: 234). Li (2004) puts forth the idea that geography plays a major role in determining linguistic "likeness" in another way, using a hypothetical "Chinese layman":

> [T]he western language-dialect distinction cuts through traditional Chinese regional groupings of language. The Chinese layman, reasoning from historic-geographical proximity, would group Taiwan Mandarin with Taiwanese, and Shanghai Mandarin with Shanghainese, concluding that both varieties are distant from and thus unintelligible with northern or Beijing Mandarin, when in fact similarities between the Mandarin varieties of Taiwan, Beijing and Shanghai are in fact far greater than those between Taiwan Mandarin and Taiwanese, or between Shanghai Mandarin and Shanghainese. (112)

Along a more diachronic vein, Keeler (2008) reminds us of the long-standing translingual practices of cross-cultural and cross-linguistic parlance of meaning:

> The notion of 'dialect' as understood by some Chinese speakers today is part of a way of thinking about language change and language relatedness that was elaborated by European and American linguists in the nineteenth century. Any discussion of the translation into 'Western' languages of the Chinese words for 'dialect' or 'language' must make clear that the Chinese words themselves are palimpsests of over a century of events of translation and cross-cultural negotiation. (345)

This metaphor of translingual naming practices as palimpsests, where parts of a document are written over more than once or erased, often incompletely, to make room for more text, helps to characterize the current state of the "Chinese" confusion, and why disentanglement is dutifully and duly required.

Understanding *Hoisan-wa* in linguistic and sociolinguistic terms

One of the reasons why people typify *Hoisan-wa* as sounding "harsh" is because it has a voiceless lateral fricative [ɬ], often Romanized as "thl" or "tl," a sound not found in the sound inventories of either standard Cantonese or Mandarin but one common to the neighboring Zhuang minority group (Yue-Hashimoto, 2005). As this is a sound that requires forcing the breath through a partially obstructed passage in the vocal tract while pulling the tongue back to the alveolar ridge, it is not uncommon for Cantonese speakers to mock *Hoisan-wa* speech through the use of this sound. Historical linguists, however, indicate that this sound is a relic of Middle or Old Sinitic/Chinese (Blench, 2006; Cheng, 1973). There are also several other qualities of *Hoisan-wa* that point to its long linguistic life and survival, including tonal inflection for personhood and the use of the negation particle *mo4*, documented only in the older generation of Cantonese speakers in Macau and Hong Kong and not by younger speakers (Kuong, 2008).

Nonetheless, these phonological and lexical peculiarities are precisely the reasons why people cast such negative judgments on *Hoisan-wa*. As Kroskrity (2001) states of so-called nonstandard languages, "Rather than being understood as linguistic differences, such perceived inadequacies are instead naturalized and hierarchized in a manner which replicates social hierarchy" (503). The devaluing and subordination of *Hoisan-wa* can also be understood in terms of the perceived value of social capital

attached to a so-called standard language, be it Standard Cantonese or Modern Standard Mandarin, "which is presented as universally available, is commoditized and presented as the only resource which permits full participation in the capitalist economy and an improvement of one's place in its political economic system" (Kroskrity, 2001: 503). As this process involves erasure, where "ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some persons or activities (or sociolinguistic phenomena) invisible" (Irvine and Gal, 2000: 38) and limiting access to participation, it is one that needs to be both questioned and reevaluated.

Lee's (2007) description of the relevance of people of *Hoisan-wa* speaking backgrounds in the US is worth quoting in full:

> And yet most of the first Chinese American pioneers were Toisanese. Arriving in numbers in the 1850s to join the California Gold Rush, we stayed to build the first transcontinental railroad from the West Coast, as Irish immigrants built it from the East. Grimly, we stuck it out through the 1880s, a reign of terror of anti-Chinese legislation, antimiscegenation laws, race riots, lynchings, and torching of Chinatowns up and down the West Coast. The horror of life for California's Chinese residents was so unrelenting that it gave rise to the then-popular expression "He didn't have a Chinaman's chance." Beginning in the 1900s, we eventually settled into an uneasy, institutionalized Jim Crow segregation within the surviving Chinatowns.
>
> These Chinatowns prospered and became havens for later waves of Chinese immigrants: in the 1950s, refugees like Mother fleeing from Communist China; in the 1960s, refugees like Grandmother Chun, who had been stranded in Hong Kong after the 1949 Communist assumption of power; in the 1970's, Mandarin-speaking Taiwanese and then ethnic Chinese Vietnamese boat people; and finally in the 1980's and 1990's, Mandarin-speaking mainland Chinese moving to America for freedom and opportunity.
>
> Through all these periods, the sons and daughters of the original Chinese Americans, the Toisanese and Cantonese who built and maintained the Chinatowns, welcomed each wave of newcomers. These pioneers had not only built safe havens, but their children went on to become doctors, lawyers, decorated war veterans, US senators, a state governor, best-selling authors, movie stars, and Silicon Valley moguls. Their names are part of our culture: actors Anna May Wong, Bruce Lee, and Jason Scott-Lee; former governor Gary Locke of Washington state; and best-selling novelist Maxine Hong-Kingston. (71)

In recent decades, historical research has been mostly concerned about "the prominent role of the Chinese in building the Trans-Pacific Railroad, as well as in mining and agriculture throughout California and the western US" (Kim, 2008: 330). However, Kim comments, "the surviving records of the speech of [*Hoisan-wa*-speaking, clarification my own] Chinese laborers and other immigrants in 19th century North America have been completely neglected by linguists" (330). This has grave implications for people of *Hoisan* heritage. There is no mention in US history textbooks that the early Chinese immigrants spoke *Hoisan-wa*, or even that they spoke Cantonese; many children of *Hoisan-wa*-speaking families grow up without learning of their people's and language's place in US history, or that because anti-Chinese immigration laws, many of these families came under false aliases known as paper names (Chang, 2003), a historical term that is mostly pertinent to people of *Hoisan-wa* heritage. Taken together, these lost fragments of Chinese American history collectively constitute processes of erasure that currently remains unchallenged.

Naming practices as a key to disentanglement

Having situated the historical and linguistic contexts to fully capture the nuances at play, we now turn to onomastics, a field which contests this oversimplification of nations, languages, peoples, and cultures. While much of the existing literature on onomastic practices in regions where varieties of Chinese are spoken are limited to address forms, kinship terms, and adopting Western-style English names (refer to Lee-Wong, 1994; Li, 1997; or Wong and Zhang, 2001), scholars of onomastics who have looked at Chinese American placenames (McDannold, 1994) and proper names (Louie, 1998) provide fruitful elucidation of the differences among Chineses. As Louie (1998) explains:

> The first hundred years of Chinese immigration — from the mid-nineteenth century to 1950 — saw most surnames spelled according to Cantonese dialect sounds. When the first Chinese exclusion law was enacted in 1882, the Chinese who were in this country at the time were predominantly from Guangdong province ... The exclusion laws essentially kept the Cantonese [specifically Sze-Yap varieties, clarification my own] as the prominent dialect group and froze the variety of dialect spelling for surnames belonging to Chinese Americans. (80)

A brief survey of surnames of third-generation-plus Chinese Americans yields results such as: "*Chew, Dear, Gee, Lee, Louie, Lowe, Mark*, and *Young*" (Louie, 1998: 9), reflective of early efforts to assimilate and Americanize ones' surnames. An astute *Hoisan-wa* speaker will also immediately recognize that these last names are spelled in direct correspondence to how the surnames 趙, 謝, 朱, 李, 雷, 劉, 麥, and 楊 would be read and spoken in *Hoisan-wa*. This onomastic process of spelling one's surname in accordance with language variety overlapped as immigrants from Hong Kong arrived (with the same last names spelled as: Chiu, Tse, Chu, Lee, Lui, Lau, Mak, and Yeung), then those from Taiwan (Chao, Hsieh, Chu, Li, Lei, Liu, Mai, and Yang), and most recently those from mainland China (Zhao, Xie, Zhu, Li, Lei, Liu, Mai, and Yang). Much like the [h] and [t] distinction in calling *Hoisan-wa* as mentioned in the first footnote, a seemingly innocuous change in consonant or diphthong has the potential to distinguish not only language background but also approximate time of entry to the US. This is of huge significance for *Hoisan-wa* speakers, as misspelling their names by using Mandarin *pinyin* Romanization would "skew Chinese American history" (Louie, 1998: 169). This skewing of history has the same feeling of the tainted merit one may feel when seeing Mandarin Romanization used to Romanize names of people of *Hoisan-wa* heritage; that is, even in the instances where people of *Hoisan* heritage get mentioned in the literature, their names are still ignorantly mis-Romanized or their speech misattributed as Mandarin. Li (1997) notes of Hong Kong Chinese people taking on a Western name as acquiring a "borrowed identity" (505), and the same can be said about surnames of various Chinese backgrounds taking on a Romanized form in the US. While it may be a start that historians begin to notice and attribute the place that *Hoisan-wa* speakers have had in US history, the accuracy is tainted if they do not also understand the onomastic and linguistic underpinnings behind early Chinese diaspora.

If we simply live in the fantasy of Chinese being some singular, static entity based on the current state of Chinese immigration and current affairs, then erasing part of

the history and legacy of *Hoisan-wa* speakers and other non-Mandarin speakers in the US is inevitable. As Kroskrity (2001) notes, "language ideology has the potential to promote 'the language subordination process' which amounts to a program of linguistic mystification undertaken by dominant institutions designed to simultaneously valorize the standard language and other aspects of 'mainstream culture' while devaluing the non-standard and its associated cultural forms" (502). *Hoisan-wa*, once the "mainstream" Chinese of the US, has found itself doubly marginalized by different waves of ethnic Chinese immigration, including that of more educated Hong Kong Cantonese speakers around the 1970s, as well as globally by the emergence of Mandarin as a world language. Other instances of intra-"Chinese" relationships can be seen in Lau's (2005) description of (Standard) Cantonese's relationship to Hakka in Hong Kong, which he characterizes as "a dialect murdering another dialect." Lau notes that given the changing social and demographic makeup of Hong Kong, coupled with the mapping of Cantonese as the sole symbol of Hong Kong identity, language, and culture, Cantonese can be seen as an accomplice to the "murder" of Hakka (34). While the situation in the US has not yet reached the gravity of so-called "extinction" of other varieties of Chinese, the mapping of a simplified notion of culture and language is not only dangerous, it is irresponsible.

Scholars in onomastics (Nilsen and Nilsen, 2008; Burt, 2009) note that names have a social semantic fuction beyond denotation, an argument which supports the above explanation of Chinese American naming practices. Silverstein's (1976) notions of direct and indirect indexicality are also useful in conceptualizing the situation here. If one were to encounter five men who share the same surname 謝,[3] superficially the Chinese character of their shared surname may seem to be directly indexical of — that is, having an unmediated, one-to-one relationship with — some perceived identical "Chineseness"; however, if these men were Chinese American and we were to see their surname Romanized in English, one could easily discern that "Mr Hsieh" has roots in Taiwan, "Mr Xie" in mainland China, "Mr Tse" in Hong Kong, a "Mr Der" is of *Hoisan* or Szeyap heritage, and a "Mr Zia" has some family members who speak Shanghainese. These readily perceivable notions, in turn, each indirectly index other ideologies about the languages and identities of these four people — assumptions of language backgrounds, script choice, family background, etc. Through the indirect, indexically ascribed values placed on different ways of Romanizing one's Chinese surname, we find that accepting the plurality of Chineses (that is, *not* lumping and oversimplifying) is an absolute requisite for understanding how we come to make sense of Chinese American naming practices. In other words, in order for us to reason why differences in Chinese American surname Romanizations exist, we must first acknowledge the existence of Chineses. More importantly, we must know that Chinese American immigration history, its present, and its future scopes of research must be able to account for and encompass the layer-upon-layer of immigrants with language backrounds in these different Chineses.

Discussion

This paper has shown that in overlooking linguistic diversity, one is ignoring the historicity and language of a significant but neglected portion of the early Chinese

diaspora. Alim (2007) writes that traditionally linguistically minoritized groups can find empowerment through critical language awareness, a process that uncovers both the "official, articulated language ideologies of a context as well as the unofficial, unarticulated language ideologies" of language users and listeners (166). Heightening critical language awareness about both the historicity of the varieties of Chinese with extended histories in the US as well as the current power imbalance of Chineses is one way those of non-Mandarin heritage backgrounds can gain a sense of empowerment. Drawing attention to naming practices of Chinese Americans can serve as a starting point wherein dialogue about the plurality and historicity of Chinese Americans might begin. As a teaching tool for Chinese American studies, this also problematizes the term "Chinese," challenging erroneous notions of "one-nation-one-language" by creating counter-hegemonic language ideologies of acknowledging and celebrating diversity of the multiplicity of Chineses in the history of the linguistic landscape of the US. Because one's name reflects the connections and intersections between one's identity and historicity, Louie (1998) writes

> Chinese American names provide a bonanza of information about history, language, philosophy, and social habits and attitudes. To preserve that precious information, Chinese Americans must regard the surname character as an integral part of a surname of Chinese origin. For some Americans, a surname of Chinese origin may be the only visual reminder of having Chinese ancestors, and the only proof that the surname arose in China. (178–179)

By raising awareness through looking at Chinese American naming practices, one will show how changes in society have affected how names have been Romanized over time. Changing immigration patterns and shifting political economy of languages have introduced different Chineses into the linguistic landscape of the US, and one way scholars can fully account for this landscape is by looking at naming practices, which makes it possible to accept diversity and celebrate it without erasure.

Notes

[1] The Romanization of 台山話 is something I have struggled with for a very long time. I have chosen to Romanize *Hoisan-wa* as such because this is how it is pronounced by its speakers. Many refer to *Hoisan-wa* as "Toishanese," with a voiceless alveolar plosive [t], indicative of how a Cantonese speaker — but not a *Hoisan-wa* speaker — would say it. Being a user of both varieties, and also having discussed this issue with younger speakers of *Hoisan-wa* in the US, I feel it is most fair to call *Hoisan-wa* in the way I am choosing, maintaining the glottal [h] sound, as it is a seemingly slight but ideologically fraught marker. I am staying away from the Mandarin Romanization "Taishanese." I recognize that these choices break from traditional Romanization schemes but am doing it because it makes *Hoisan-wa* visible and de-emphasizes Cantonese and Mandarin. For standardized place locations in China only, I will maintain the Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM) Romanization (e.g. Taishan).

[2] In the etymological literature, these words are credited as being loan words from "Cantonese"; however, as any *Hoisan-wa* speaker can attest, if 雜碎 (*chop-suey*) and 炒麵 (*chow mein*) were read in *Hoisan-wa*, the sounds would be more true to the English spelling than standard (Hong Kong or Guangzhou) Cantonese would. Phonologically, the "uey" and "ei" diphthongs are not found in the Standard Cantonese readings of these words, though they are in the *Hoisan-wa* readings.

[3] I am also aware that issues of script (traditional versus simplified characters) are at play here. Script choice also indexes a host of other sociopolitical ideologies which go beyond the scope of this paper.

Bibliography

Alim, H. Samy. 2007. "Critical Hip-Hop Language Pedagogies: Combat, Consciousness, and the Cultural Politics of Communication." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 6(2): 161–176.

Blench, Roger. 2006. "Lateral Fricatives in Africa and Worldwide: Explorations in the Prehistory of Phonemes." Unpublished manuscript.

Burt, Susan Meredith. 2009. "Naming, Re-Naming and Self-Naming Among Hmong-Americans." *Names* 57(4): 236–245.

Chan, Marjorie K.M., and Douglas W. Lee. 1981. "Chinatown Chinese: A Linguistic and Historical Re-evaluation." *Amerasia Journal* 8(1): 111–131.

Chang, Iris. 2003. *The Chinese in America: A Narrative History*. New York: Viking Adult.

Cheng, Teresa. 1973. "The Phonology of Taishan." *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 1(2): 256–322.

Irvine, Judith, and Susan Gal. 2000. "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation." *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*. Ed. P. Kroskrity. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 35–83.

Keeler, Lauren. 2008. "Linguistic Reconstruction and the Construction of Nationalist-Era Chinese Linguistics." *Language and Communication* 28(4): 344–362.

Kim, Richard I. 2008. "California Chinese Pidgin English and its Historical Connections: Preliminary Remarks." *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 23(2): 329–244.

Kingston, Maxine Hong. 1989. *Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood Among Ghosts*. New York: Vintage.

Kroskrity, Paul. 2001. "Language Ideologies." *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Ed. A. Duranti. Malden: Wiley Blackwell, 496–517.

Kuong, Io-Kei Joaquim. 2008. "Yes/no Question Particles Revisited: The Grammatical Functions of *mo4*, *me1*, and *maa3*." *Proceedings of the Twentieth North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics (NAACL-20)*. Ed. M. Chan. GSIL: University of Southern California, 715–733.

Lau, Chun Fat. 2005. "A Dialect Murders Another Dialect: The Case of Hakka in Hong Kong." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 173: 23–35.

Lee, William Poy. 2007. *The Eighth Promise: An American Son's Tribute to his Toisanese Mother*. New York: Rodale.

Lee-Wong, Song Mei. 1994. "Address Forms in Modern China: Changing Ideologies and Shifting Semantics." *Linguistics*: 32: 299–423.

Leung, Genevieve. 2009. "'CHINESE' Confusion: A Look at the Use of 'Cantonese' and 'Mandarin' in Newspapers." Unpublished term paper, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

Li, Chris Wen-Chao. 2004. "Conflicting Notions of Language Purity: The Interplay of Archaising, Ethnographic, Reformist, Elitist, and Xenophobic Purism in the Perception of Standard Chinese." *Language and Communication* 24(2): 97–133.

Li, David C. S. 1997. "Borrowed Identity: Signaling Involvement with a Western Name." *Journal of Pragmatics* 28(4): 487–513.

Louie, David Wong. 2000. *The Barbarians are Coming*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Louie, Emma Woo. 1998. *Chinese American Names: Tradition and Transition*. Jefferson, NC: McFarlan and Company.

Mair, Victor H. 1991. "What is a Chinese 'Dialect/Topolect'? Reflections on Some Key Sino-English Linguistic Terms." *Sino-Platonic Papers* 29: 1–31.

McCoy, John. 1966. "Szeyap Data for a First Approximation of Proto-Cantonese." Unpublished PhD dissertation. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

McDannold, Thomas A. 1994. "Chinese Placenames and Their Significance." *Origins and Destinations: 41 Essays on Chinese America*. Los Angeles: Chinese Historical Society of Southern California.

Nilsen, Alleen Pace and Don L.F. Nilsen. 2008. "Guest Editorial." *Names* 56(1): 3–5.

Ng, Fae Myenne. 1993. *Bone*. Hyperion: New York.

Ramsey, S. Robert. 1987. *The Languages of China*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Roy, John. 1987. The Linguistic and Sociolinguistic Position of Black English and the Issue of Bidialectalism in Education. *Childhood Bilingualism: Aspects of Linguistic, Cognitive and Social Development*. Ed. P. Homel, M. Palij, & D. Aaronson. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Silverstein, Michael. 1976. "Shifters, Linguistic Categories and Cultural Description." *Meaning in Anthropology*. Ed. K. Basso and H. Selby. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 11–55.

Stubbs, Michael. 1998. *Text and Corpus Analyses*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Wiley, Terrence. G. 2008. "Chinese 'Dialect' Speakers as Heritage Language Learners." *Heritage Language Education: A New Field Emerging*. Ed. D. Brinton, O. Kagan, and S. Bauckus. New York: Routledge, 91–106.

Wong, Andrew and Qing Zhang. 2001. "The Linguistic Construction of the *Tongzhi* Community." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 10(2): 248–278.

Yep, Laurence. 1991. *The Lost Garden*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Yue-Hashimoto, Anne O. 2005. *The Dancun Dialect of Taishan*. Hong Kong: Language Information Sciences Research Center, City University of Hong Kong.

Notes on contributor

Genevieve Leung is a doctoral candidate in Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education. She is interested in *Hoisan-wa* language and cultural maintenance and the teaching of Cantonese as a heritage language in the US.

Correspondence to: Genevieve Leung, University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education, 3700 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA. Email: gleung@dolphin.upenn.edu