

Language, Culture, and Identity:  
Romanization in Taiwan and Its Implications  
語言、文化與認同：  
臺灣的羅馬拼音及其意涵<sup>§</sup>

Pei-yin LIN  
林珮吟\*

**Keywords:** Romanization, Cai Peihuo, pinyin, aboriginal tribal-language writing, interethnic communication, link up with the world, politics of language

**關鍵詞：**羅馬拼音、蔡培火、拼音、原住民族語書寫、跨族群溝通、與國際接軌、語言政治

---

§ An earlier version of this paper was presented at the workshop "The Sounds and Scripts of Languages in Motion," one of the seven workshops selected for the Inter-Asian Connections Conference IV held in Istanbul from Oct. 2 to Oct. 5, 2013. I would like to thank the workshop directors, Professor Jing Tsu at Yale University and Dr. Ronit Ricci at the Australian National University, for reading my draft carefully and giving me constructive feedback. I would also like to thank my discussant Dr. Raja Adal from the University of Cincinnati, other workshop participants, and the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments. I acknowledge the support of the Social Science Research Council and the University of Hong Kong in the form of travel grants, which enabled me to attend the aforementioned conference.

\* Assistant Professor, School of Chinese, University of Hong Kong; 2015-2016 Harvard Yenching Institute Visiting Scholar.  
香港大學中文學院助理教授、2015-2016 哈佛大學燕京學社訪問學者。

## Abstract

Language is seldom merely a tool for communication. It is often marred with political forces and evolves with a society's social and historical particularities. Taiwan's case in particular demonstrates the intricate relationship between language and politics due to its colonial past, the Nationalist government's tendentious cultural policy, and its multi-ethnic nature. This paper examines the multi-layered politics embedded in Taiwan's various Romanization schemes and practices throughout the twentieth century. It will first offer an overview of the Romanization schemes introduced in Taiwan and then select three cases as examples to illustrate the relationship between language and interethnic exchange in different stages of modern Taiwanese history. The primary case study will be Cai Peihuo's (1889-1983) Romanization project, whereas the ruling parties' Romanization proposals in post-war Taiwan and the Romanized transliteration in Taiwan's aboriginal literature will be discussed as additional examples. This paper identifies a number of different ways in which Romanization has been utilized: as a tool to eliminate illiteracy, as a means of being in line with the international pinyin practice, and as an attempt to write in one's tribal languages. Finally, it will discuss the implications as exemplified by the three cases in point.

## 摘要

語言鮮少僅是溝通的工具，它常與政治因素相勾連，也隨著一個社群的特殊社會歷史情狀而發展。由於臺灣的殖民歷史、國民黨政府的文化政策，及其社會的多族群本質，臺灣為一個能呈現語言與政治之間複雜關係的佳例。本文探討二十世紀曾於臺灣提出或頒佈的羅馬拼音方案背後蘊含之重層政治。論文首先回顧臺灣的不同羅馬拼音方案，然後挑選三個在不同時期施行的羅馬拼音方案來闡述語言與跨族群交流間之關係。主要探究的例子為蔡培火（1889-1983）的羅馬拼音方案，輔以戰後臺灣國民黨與民進黨的羅馬拼音政策，及臺灣原住民文學中的羅馬字音譯書寫。本文指出羅馬拼音在臺灣的三種不同使用方式：即作為剷除文盲的工具、與國際拼音法接軌的手段，以及族語書寫的嘗試，也釐析上述三個羅馬拼音案例中的意涵。

## 1. Introduction

Historically, language and power have been intricately intertwined, especially during colonial periods or under authoritarian rule. Over the past hundred years, writers and intellectuals in Taiwan have expressed diverse opinions regarding the medium of language, not only when demonstrating their linguistic preferences, but also when expressing their cultural inclinations and the aims of enlightenment. As the indigenous languages Hoklo and Hakka do not have a standardized writing system, Romanization served as a convenient system, employed by foreign missionaries, to communicate with the local Taiwanese population. Throughout the twentieth century, intellectuals and writers in Taiwan have continued to adopt Romanization in different socio-historical contexts for various purposes. Although there has been some existing scholarship on the use of Romanization in Taiwan, a comprehensive and interdisciplinary study is yet to be done.<sup>1</sup> This is an important yet broad topic in which each "subtopic," such as the Romanization of the Southern Min, of Mandarin, and of the Formosan Austro-Polynesian languages, merits an in-depth study in order to do each case full justice.

The purpose of this paper, however, is not to offer a thorough and linguistics-focused account of a particular Romanization scheme in Taiwan. Rather, it aims to highlight some of the most intricate or controversial cases in which Romanization efforts in Taiwan have been deeply entangled with issues

---

<sup>1</sup> For Cai Peihuo's involvement in the Romanization movement, see Ann Heylen, *Japanese Models, Chinese Culture and the Dilemma of Taiwanese Language Reform* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012), ch.3; Henning Klöter, *Written Taiwanese* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005); Jing Tsu, *Sound and Script in Chinese Diaspora* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), ch.6. In Taiwan, there is the Taiwanese Languages League (*Tâi-uân Bó-gí Liân-bīng*). Many of its members such as Li Qin'an and Zheng Liangwei are leading scholars in Taiwanese Romanization. Its website contains postings using Chinese as well as Taiwanese Romanization.

surrounding ethnic identity and political ideology. Hence, this paper adopts a thematic approach, presenting three case studies that are chronically arranged. To highlight the impact of a certain socio-political context on the Romanization, the three examples will be drawn from various historical settings of Taiwan when inter-ethnic differences were more explicit. It will begin with a succinct overview of the Romanization schemes introduced in Taiwan. It will then discuss the three selected cases—Cai Peihuo's 蔡培火 (1889-1983) Romanization project, the ruling parties' Romanization proposals in post-war Taiwan, and the Romanized transliteration in Taiwan's aboriginal literature—to demonstrate how Romanization was tinted with various socio-political agendas in different contexts. It identifies a number of different ways in which Romanization has been utilized: as a tool to eliminate illiteracy, as a means of going global, and as an attempt to write in one's tribal languages. Finally, it will discuss the implications as illustrated by the three cases in point.

## **Romanization from Dutch Taiwan to Contemporary Taiwan: An Overview**

Romanization in Taiwan offers an entry point to examine the island's multi-layered history that has been marred by various foreign occupations and different forms of colonial enterprises. The Dutch and Spanish first set foot in Taiwan in the seventeenth century. In order to facilitate evangelization and communicate with the local population who, at that time, were mainly Taiwanese plains aborigines, the Dutch Christian missionaries invented the Sinkan 新港 writing system, using Romanization to write in the aboriginal Sirayan 西拉雅 language—an Austro-Polynesian dialect called *Formosaan taal* (Formosan language) under the Dutch rule.<sup>2</sup> The earlier Sinkan manuscripts included

---

2 Those Dutch missionaries arrived in Taiwan along with the Dutch East India Company's mercantilist expansion in the Far East. The name "Sinkan" was related to the Sinkan (or Xingang) Tribe, and the location where the plains aborigines of this tribe lived is present-day

dictionaries, books on the Christian doctrines, the Gospel of Matthew, and bilingual contracts between the Siraya and Dutch, with some written only in Sirayan. The Siraya tribe continued to use the system for another one and a half centuries after the Dutch had left. Existing documents, many of which are written bilingually in Sirayan and in Chinese, show that the Siraya people exchanged land-related contracts with the Han migrants in Sinkan writing. According to Ang Kaim 翁佳音, Sinkan writing is similar to that of seventeenth century Dutch writing, which indicates that the Dutch taught their writing system to the aborigines living in the Sinkan area. Unfortunately, following the "sinification" of the plains aborigines, of which the Siraya tribe was the most populous and powerful, the aboriginal language of Siraya died out.

When the Presbyterian Church began their missionary work in Taiwan in approximately 1860, a Romanized system was used to represent the local dialect (Taiwanese) and to translate the Bible into Taiwanese.<sup>3</sup> In June 1885, the Scottish missionary Thomas Barclay (1849-1935) launched the *Taiwan Church News* (*Taiwan Jiaohui Gongbao* 臺灣教會公報), and a more systematic Romanized education was introduced.<sup>4</sup> As it was relatively successful, Barclay suggested that Izawa Shūji 伊澤修二 (1851-1917), the first Education Minister appointed to colonial Taiwan, should follow this example by using the Taiwanese

---

Xinshi of Tainan County. For a fuller account of the Dutch missionaries' language-related activities in Formosa in the seventeenth century, see Ann Heylen's "Dutch Language Policy and Early Formosan Literacy (1624-1662)," in Wei-ying Ku (ed.), *Missionary Approaches and Linguistics in Mainland China and Taiwan* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), pp. 199-251.

3 "Taiwanese" in this context is no longer the aboriginal Sirayan language, but the Southern Min dialect brought into Taiwan by migrants mainly from Zhangzhou and Quanzhou of Fujian Province. Similar efforts took place a few decades earlier in Southeast Asia. In the early nineteenth century, Robert Morrison set up a school in Malaka to help missionaries in Southeast Asia to learn the Southern Min dialect, using the Roman alphabet. In 1832, Walter Medhurst published *A Dictionary of the Hok-k'èen Dialect of the Chinese Language: According to the Reading and Colloquial Idioms: Containing about 12,000 Characters*. It was printed by the Honorable East India company's press in Macao.

4 The newspaper was initially published as the *Taiwan Prefecture City Church News* (*Taiwan Fucheng Jiaohui Bao* 臺灣府城教會報).

people's own language to teach them about Japan.<sup>5</sup> In order to develop an effective language policy for introducing Japanese to the Taiwanese, Izawa examined two seemingly opposing ideas. These were French colonial rule in Vietnam where, after a rocky beginning that involved trying to impose French on the Vietnamese, the colonial bureaucrats were required to learn the local language, and the Dutch model in Indonesia, where it was illegal for the Indonesians to learn Dutch.<sup>6</sup> The French policy facilitated communication between the colonizer and the colonized, whereas the Dutch method reinforced the difference between the colonizers and the colonized. To best promote cultural integration, Izawa eventually opted for a combined and gradualist model, a third model exemplified by British rule in Canada. According to this model, the colonizer should learn the local language, while the colonized should also learn the colonizer's language. In addition, he selected both classical Chinese and Japanese for the establishment of the public schools established for Taiwanese children (*kōgakkō* 公學校) in Taiwan in the early years of Japanese rule.

During Japanese colonialism in Taiwan (1895-1945), language was no longer a means of facilitating trade and commerce, but became a highly contested battlefield not only within Japan but also in Taiwan, and not only between the colonizers and the colonized, but also among the colonized, whose ideologies were extremely diverse. Meanwhile, the colonial officers continued to debate whether or not they should completely abandon the teaching of Chinese in schools.<sup>7</sup> Although the colonizers took a somewhat mild stance in introducing

---

5 See Faye Kleeman, *Under an Imperial Sun: Japanese Colonial Literature of Taiwan and the South* (Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press, 2003), pp. 133-134. Kleeman also points out that the use of the Roman alphabet was debated in Japan two decades ago by the enlightenment group Meirokusha in their society journal *Meiroku zasshi* (1874-1875). Intellectuals such as Nishi Amane proposed the use of the Roman alphabet, whereas Simizu Usaburō advocated using hiragana to unify the spoken and written languages. Despite their different methods, they agreed on removing the Chinese influence (use of kanji) from the Japanese language.

6 *Ibid.*, pp. 139-140.

7 The debate led to a revision of the school curriculum in 1904, whereby the teaching of the Chinese language became a special course and the teaching of Chinese classics, such as the Four Books, was forbidden.

the Japanese language to the Taiwanese in that Chinese writing continued to be allowed so as to appease the educated class, the colonial language policy continued. After the assimilation policy was introduced as part of the extension of Japan proper policy (*naichi enchō shugi* 內地延長主義) in 1919, Japanese colonizers began to actively promote the Japanese language as the national language, and the relationship between the national language and the citizens' spirit was stressed. For example, in 1927, Suzuki Toshinobu 鈴木利信 argued that implementing a national language was the best and only weapon for cultivating other nations. In 1931, Li Bingnan 李炳楠, a member of the Taiwan Education Association, posited that a national language was the symbol of a nation's spirit.<sup>8</sup> Both people, when discussing the popularization of national language, echoed Ueda Kazutoshi's 上田万年 (1867-1937) notion of national language, in which the national language, citizens, and the nation are considered to form a trinity. Unsurprisingly, the Japanese colonizers' language policy yielded reasonable success in the 1940s.<sup>9</sup> However, it would be naïve to assume that using Japanese is directly equal to identifying with Japan (or not identifying with Taiwan).<sup>10</sup>

---

8 See Chen Peifeng 陳培豐, "Zouxiang yishi tongren de riben minzu zhi 'dao': 'Tonghua' zhengce mailuo zhong huangmin wenxue de jixian [Toward the Japanese 'Way' of Universal Brotherhood: The Border of Imperial-Subject Literature in the Context of 'Assimilation'] 走向一視同仁的日本民族之「道」——「同化」政策脈絡中皇民文學的界線," in *Taiwan wenyueshi shuxie guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* [Writing Taiwan's Literary History International Conference Essay Collection] 臺灣文學史書寫國際學術研討會論文集, Vol. 2 (Kaohsiung: Chun-hui Publishing, 2008), p. 152.

9 By about 1941, approximately 57% of Taiwanese people had been educated in Japanese. See Faye Kleeman, *Under an Imperial Sun: Japanese Colonial Literature of Taiwan and the South*, p. 142.

10 He Yilin 何義麟 has pointed out that there were two layers of language use for Taiwanese intellectuals during the Japanese period: to use it as a tool and as a manifestation of nationality. See his "'Guoyu' zhuanhuan guocheng zhong Taiwanren zuqun tezhi zhi zhengzhijhua [The Politicization of Taiwanese' Ethnic Features in the Process of 'National Language' Transformation] 「國語」轉換過程中臺灣人族群特質之政治化," in Wakabayashi Masahiro and Wu Micha (eds.), *Taiwan chongceng jindaihua lunwenji* [Collection of Essays on Taiwan's Multi-layered Modernization] 臺灣重層近代化論文集 (Taipei: Bozhongzhe wenhua, 2000), p. 479.

As Taiwan transferred from Japanese to Chinese control in 1945, the national language changed from Japanese to Mandarin, a language that only few Taiwanese people were able to speak at that time.<sup>11</sup> Following the Kuomintang's (KMT's) retreat to Taiwan in 1949, a series of cultural policies with an aim to de-Japanize and re-Sinify Taiwan were promulgated in order to enhance the Nationalist government's political legitimacy on the island.<sup>12</sup> Local languages, such as Taiwanese, Hakka, and aboriginal languages, were regarded as "dialects" (*fangyan* 方言). And speaking "dialects" was considered "unpatriotic."<sup>13</sup> Under the ideology of "fighting back to the mainland" (*fangong dalu* 反攻大陸), limited space was left for the further development of a Romanized writing system.

The Romanized script overall underwent several changes in post-war Taiwan. Under the KMT's enforcement of Mandarin Chinese, the Presbyterian Church continued to use the Church Romanization (*jiaoluo* 教羅) system established by the missionaries. This was considered problematic under the KMT's cultural policies. In 1969, the Nationalist government banned the Romanized scripts used by Tainan Church News, followed by subsequent attempts of forbidding the Romanized Taiwanese scripts throughout the 1970s.<sup>14</sup> However, the government only frowned on the Romanized Taiwanese texts, but not the use of Romanization completely. Hence, the censorship exerted on

---

11 Mandarin Language Policy was enforced in schools throughout Taiwan from 1945 until 1987.

12 For a detailed account on the cultural transformation in early post-war Taiwan, see Huang Yingzhe 黃英哲's "*Qu Ribenhua*" "*Zai Zhongguohua*": *Zhanhou Taiwan wenhua chongjian (1945-1947)* [*Uprooting Japan*] "*Implanting China*": *Cultural Reconstruction in Post-war Taiwan (1945-1947)* 「去日本化」 「再中國化」：戰後臺灣文化重建 (Taipei: Rye Field Publications, 2007).

13 A-chin Hsiu, "Language Ideology in Taiwan: The KMT's Language Policy, the Tai-yu Language Movement, and Ethnic Politics," *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 18, 4 (1997), pp. 302-315; Huang Xuanfan 黃宣範, *Yuyan, shehui yu zuqun yishi: Taiwan yuyan shehui xue de yanjiu* [*Language, Society and Ethnic Consciousness: The Study of Taiwan's Languages and Societies*] 語言、社會與族群意識：臺灣語言社會學的研究 (Taipei: Crane Publishing, 1995).

14 The Presbyterian Churches' use of Romanized Taiwanese-language bibles was banned in the 1970s. See Ethan Christofferson's *Negotiating Identity: Exploring Tensions between Being Hakka and Being Christian in Northwestern Taiwan* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2012), pp. 75-77.



Romanized Taiwanese texts can be seen as an integral part of the KMT regime's enforcement of Mandarin as the national language.

In the early decades of post-war Taiwan, the use of Romanization was limited, with Wade-Giles Romanization being the more commonly used system for transcribing people's names on passports.<sup>15</sup> The issue surrounding Romanization (especially for Mandarin sound-notation) did not attract substantial official attention until 1984, when Taiwan's Ministry of Education began to revise the little-used "Chinese Romanized Script" system.<sup>16</sup> In view of the People's Republic of China's *pinyin* system's gradual gaining currency internationally, Taiwan's Nationalist government was eager to propose an alternative system, with a hope to compete with the *pinyin* system on equal terms.<sup>17</sup> Under this circumstance, a new system called "Mandarin Phonetic System II" (*zhuyin fuhao di'ershi* 注音符號第二式) was introduced in January 1986. However, this system was deemed unsuitable in the debates surrounding the standardization of Chinese Romanization in the late 1990s. In 1998, under the support of Chen Shuibian 陳水扁 (the Mayor of Taipei then), Yu Boquan 余伯泉 established "universal usage" (*tongyong pinyin* 通用拼音), a Taiwanese version bearing great similarity with China's *hanyu pinyin* 漢語拼音 system.<sup>18</sup>

15 However, in elementary schools, the (sound-notating) phonetic system, popular known as ㄅㄆㄇ (bopomofo), is still being taught and remains the first system for the transcription of spoken Mandarin learned by school children. The system was developed by the Conference for the Unification of Pronunciation (*duyin tongyi hui*) from 1913 onward. In 1918, it was promulgated as the national standard. In China, it was replaced by *hanyu pinyin* in 1958. With the termination of Taiwan's UN membership, *hanyu pinyin* was adopted by the ISO as the standard Romanization for modern Chinese in 1982.

16 A Romanized sound-notation system was established among a small group of Beijing-based linguists in late 1926. But it was not until Sep. 26, 1928, that the Daxue yuan (similar to the Ministry of Education nowadays) endorsed the scheme and introduced it to the general public. The system called "Chinese Romanized Script" (*guoyu luomazi*) was renamed "Sound-translating Symbols" (*yiyin fuhao*) in 1943, which clearly defines the function of the system. In post-1949 Taiwan, this system remained valid. But the Wade-Giles system seemed more widely used.

17 The United Nations began to adopt the *pinyin* system in 1972, which assisted the *pinyin* system's "hegemony" over other Romanization systems as far as the Chinese Romanization is concerned.

18 *Tongyong pinyin* was considered by Zhang Mingqing, the spokesman of China's Taiwan Affairs Office, as an act promoting Taiwan's independence. See *United Daily News* (Dec. 1, 2000), p. 1.

Yet in 1999, the Legislative Yuan announced that Taiwan should adopt *hanyu pinyin* (with some modifications), leading Taiwan to a country with two competing systems (with Taipei City's continuing use of *tongyong pinyin*). When the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) was in power in 2002, *tongyong pinyin* was chosen to be the standard system for Chinese Romanization in Taiwan. Nevertheless, *hanyu pinyin* was still widely used in areas where the Nationalist Party remained dominant. This further made the Romanization issue in Taiwan a highly polemic and politicized one.

In addition to Taiwanese-language speakers' and Mandarin-language speakers' Romanization efforts, some of Taiwan's aboriginal authors also began to experiment with "tribal-language writing" (*zuyu shuxie* 族語書寫), using Romanization to transcribe their tribal language. Their attempt of "tribal-language writing" plays an important part, as an ethnicity marker, in aboriginal literature from Taiwan, which emerged in the 1980s. Parallel to those writers' creative endeavors, the Taiwanese government initiated various plans aimed to preserve the aboriginal languages. In 1992, the Ministry of Education entrusted Li Rengui 李壬癸 to compile a system for the Formosan (*Taiwan nandao yuyan* 臺灣南島語言) to which aboriginal languages belong. The system devised by Li was implemented in 1994, paving a foundation for the tribal-language writing after the Millennium.<sup>19</sup> Looking back at the historical trajectory that Romanization in Taiwan has undergone over the past century, issues surrounding intercultural communication and writing in one's native language are recurring. This is hardly surprising, given that the use of Romanization has been linked with the wish of being able to notate the sound of one's mother tongue and transform the spoken form to the written one. To highlight the relationship between language and interethnic exchange in different socio-historical contexts, the following sections will focus on three noteworthy applications of Romanization in Taiwan: Cai Peihuo's Romanization scheme under Japanese rule, Romanization

---

19 Before the introduction of the system, Walis Naqang published *Taiya jiaozong* [*Atayal Footprints*] bilingually (Chinese and Atayal language transcribed in Romanization) in 1991.

in post-war Taiwan, and the Romanized tribal-language writing of Taiwanese aborigines in the millennium.

### **Fighting against Illiteracy: Cai Peihuo's Hybrid Romanization Scheme**

Concurrent with the colonizer's policy of popularizing Japanese, intellectuals in Taiwan were eager to explore a writing form that could best represent Taiwan and that would serve as the most effective medium for introducing their various enlightenment projects to the masses. Some were promoters of classical Chinese, while others advocated writing in vernacular Chinese. In the debate regarding old and new literature, vernacular Chinese won increasing support over classical Chinese, which was deemed elitist and overly ornate. Against the background of the polemics between the "old" classical Chinese and the "new" vernacular Chinese, Cai Peihuo published *My Ten Humble Opinions* (*Cháp-hāng kóan-kiàn* 十項管見) in 1925, in which he proposed promoting the Taiwanese vernacular (*péh-ōe-jī* 白話字) using Romanization, a writing scheme that, at that time, was seen as fairly foreign because the system was used by foreign missionaries.<sup>20</sup>

As a child, Cai studied Chinese under the tuition of his elder brother Cai Jiawei 蔡嘉培, but, in 1898, he attended the public primary school where only Japanese was taught. In 1906, he went on to study at the Government-General's national language school in Taipei. Upon graduation in 1910, he began working as a school teacher. In 1914, through the introduction of Lin Xiantang 林獻堂 (1881-1956), Cai met the Japanese politician Itagaki Taisuke 板垣退助 (1837-1919) during his tour of Taiwan. Cai discussed his idea of using Romanization

---

20 It is unclear whether or not Cai was influenced by the similar effort of Romanizing Mandarin made by various scholars such as Qian Xuantong, Li Jinxi, and Zhao Yuanren in China from 1922 onward.

with Itagaki but was warned that the scheme would likely further irritate the Government-General since it had already opposed Taiwan's Assimilation Society (*Tonghuahui* 同化會).<sup>21</sup>

As a member of the Presbyterian Church, Cai encountered Romanized Taiwanese at the age of fourteen.<sup>22</sup> After spending three days learning it, Cai was able to use it to communicate with his brother Cai Jiapi.<sup>23</sup> Despite Itagaki's response, Cai promoted Romanization to the Taiwan Culture Association.<sup>24</sup> In 1922, Cai published his essay "The Establishment of a New Taiwan and the Roman Script [Shin Taiwan no kensetsu to Rōmaji] 新臺灣の建設と羅馬字" in *Taiwan* 臺灣 (The Formosa).<sup>25</sup> In October 1923, Cai replaced Jiang Weishui 蔣渭水 (1891-1931) as a special member of the Taiwan Culture Association, on the condition that the Association would help to promote Romanization. Consequently, popularizing Romanization became one of the six aims of the Taiwan Cultural Association. At about the same time, Cai began to compose the aforementioned "My Ten Humble Opinions," in which his earlier essay "The Establishment of a New Taiwan and the Roman Script" is the second of the ten topics covered.

After the Taiwan Cultural Association's left turn in the 1927-1928 split, Cai left the Association but continued to promote the Romanized Taiwanese

---

21 See Cai Peihuo, *Cháp-hāng kóan-kiàn*, p. 16 in the original 1925 version, reprinted in Zhang Hanyu 張漢裕 (ed.), *Cai Peihuo quanji* [Complete Works of Cai Peihuo] 蔡培火全集, Vol. 5 (Taipei: Wu Sanlian Taiwan Historical Materials Foundation, 2000), p. 27.

22 Romanization was already used to represent Japanese. The scheme was used mainly for spiritual odes, and Romanized Japanese was introduced to Taiwan by the British missionary Mr. Doxwell.

23 Cai Peihuo, "Shin Taiwan no kensetsu to Rōmaji [The Establishment of a New Taiwan and the Roman Script]," *Taiwan* [The Formosa], the 3rd year, No. 6 (Sep. 8, 1922), pp. 38-43, reprinted in Zhang Hanyu (ed.), *Complete Works of Cai Peihuo*, Vol. 6, pp. 209-221, see Zhang's edited book, p. 214.

24 Established in 1921, the Association was an important organization that actively promoted modern knowledge. As the left-leaning faction became dominant in the 1927 split of the Association, the enlightenment projects in the 1930s developed into proletarian-oriented cultural and social movements.

25 Zhang Hanyu (ed.), *Complete Works of Cai Peihuo*, Vol. 6, p. 214.

vernacular. He composed a song in the Taiwanese vernacular in January 1929, in the hopes of attracting more potential learners. In the last part of the three-part lyric, Cai provided a rationale for learning the Romanized Taiwanese vernacular. According to the lyrics, the scheme would serve as a means for Taiwanese people to have a promising future, particularly because the Chinese language had become a distant language and Japanese proficiency was yet to be acquired. At the same time, he compiled his own *péh-ōe-jī* textbook for forthcoming seminars, in which the Romanization scheme would be taught. He managed to negotiate with the Japanese authorities and conduct the seminars for a brief period before the colonizers banned them. Cai then prepared a proposal explaining the goal of and the plan for promoting the Taiwanese vernacular, lobbying Japanese officials in the Taiwan Government-General in April 1929. Regardless of the objection by Ishiguro Hidehiko 石黑英彦, director of the Bureau of Culture and Education of the Taiwan Government-General, Cai resumed his seminars in Tainan; this attempt met with the Japanese authorities' disapproval once again. Even among the Taiwanese intellectuals who supported the Taiwanese vernacular, there were mixed responses regarding the new system. Han Shiquan 韓石泉 (1893-1963) expressed support for the new kana-integrated system, whereas Lin Xiantang and his son Lin Panlong 林攀龍 (1901-1983) preferred Cai's earlier Romanization system.<sup>26</sup>

Cai's enthusiasm for promoting the Romanized Taiwanese vernacular had much to do with the ease thereof. He was intrigued by the idea that it would enable the majority of readers to read and acquire knowledge in their own language.<sup>27</sup> As early as 1920, he expressed his concern at Taiwan's cultural "backwardness" in his conceptualization of the hierarchy of civilization, whereby the West was the most advanced and Japan was more advanced than Taiwan.<sup>28</sup> In

26 See Cai's diary entry Jun. 12, 1931, p. 174 and Mar. 19, 1932, p. 203, in Zhang Hanyu (ed.), *Complete Works of Cai Peihuo*, Vol. 1.

27 Cai Peihuo, "*Cháp-hāng kóan-kiàn*," in Zhang Hanyu (ed.), *Complete Works of Cai Peihuo*, Vol. 5, pp. 6-19.

28 Cai Peihuo, "Duinei genben wenti zhi yiduan [An Aspect of Domestic Foundation Problems],

his "The Establishment of a New Taiwan and the Roman Script," Cai stated that education cannot be popularized without an easy-to-learn script, and Romanized script was the only effective means of establishing Taiwan's spiritual civilization because it is easier than Chinese and Japanese scripts.

But his vision was more ambitious than merely elevating Taiwan's cultural level per se. He believed that the Romanization scheme could also assist interethnic communication. Specifically, Romanization could serve as a common medium enabling Japanese people to learn Taiwanese and Mainlanders to learn Japanese without the need for teachers or for attending schools. For him, this was the most cost-effective way of learning these East Asian languages. Even those Taiwanese who had no knowledge of either Japanese or Chinese could still absorb knowledge through the scheme and would be able to converse with others in a written format. Cai's Romanization scheme was, from the outset, not a narrow-minded demonstration of Taiwanese cultural nationalism. Rather, it was an expedient and utilitarian strategy to improve literacy and to elevate Taiwan's cultural level. The Romanized Taiwanese vernacular can be seen as serving as an intermediary between the colonizer and the colonized, facilitating win-win intercultural communication in which both Japanese and Taiwanese people could potentially be "bi-lingual" and could effectively exchange ideas.

While Cai's endeavor seemed futile, there was a turning point when he met Izawa Takio 伊澤多喜男 (1869-1949), the former (the 10<sup>th</sup>) Governor-General of Taiwan. At their meeting on March 30, 1931 in Japan, Izawa suggested that the Japanese authorities would have a more lenient attitude if Cai could integrate the Japanese syllabary (kana) into the orthographic representation of the Taiwanese vernacular. Izawa's suggestion was reasonable, because there was an existing writing system in use by the Japanese at that time. Izawa's proposal gave Cai new

---

對內根本問題之一端," *Taiwan seinen* [*Taiwan Youth*] 臺灣青年, Chinese Section, 1, 1 (Jul. 16, 1920), pp. 46-52, particularly pp. 49-50.

hopes of obtaining official approval. After returning to Taiwan, Cai began to experiment with a new writing system using kana. By June 1931, he had already developed a new phonetic system. He introduced it in private seminars, and continued to use the kana representation until 1935. In one of Cai's diary entries, he claimed that he noticed more than 20 Romanization mistakes on the first page of the *Great Japanese-Taiwanese Dictionary* (*Nitai dai jiten* 日臺大辭典) compiled by the Government-General of Taiwan.<sup>29</sup> To rectify these "errors," Cai referred to his own, earlier Romanization scheme to expand on his new proposal based on Japanese kana. Each symbol in the kana alphabet corresponds to a vowel or a consonant in the Romanized *péh-ōe-jī* scheme. For instance, to represent the Taiwanese sound of the verb "khui" (to open), Cai used キうイ (kh+u+i), whereas the Japanese scheme used クイ (khu+i) to represent "khui."<sup>30</sup> Hence, the kana-integrated system is more of a revised version of his earlier *péh-ōe-jī* scheme than a brand new system. As Cai spoke the Quanzhou 泉州 accent, he in the kana-based scheme added special symbols to represent the Quanzhou pronunciations. Despite the "mistakes" he found in the kana-based system used by the Japanese authorities to write Taiwanese (especially the Amoy 廈門 dialect), Cai used small round dots as tonal marks in his kana system, similar to the Japanese colonizer's existing system.

In April 1934, Cai again discussed the issue of popularizing vernacular writing with Izawa Takio. Izawa responded that it was impossible to challenge Japanese as the official language of colonial Taiwan, but felt it was feasible to use the Taiwanese language and vernacular writing as supplements in order to eliminate illiteracy. With Izawa's encouragement and the subsequent support from some of the liberal Japanese intellectuals and politicians, Cai continued to

29 See Cai's diary entry dated May 17, 1931, in Zhang Hanyu (ed.), *Complete Works of Cai Peihuo*, Vol. 1, pp. 172-173. Both Cai's kana scheme and the Japanese scheme pay attention to the nasal sound. Cai used round dots to represent this, whereas the Japanese used small circles for the same purpose.

30 See Yang Yunyan's 楊允言 online essay, "Weiceng zhuanxiang de baihuazi—Cai Peihuo [Unchanged *Péh-ōe-jī*—Cai Peihuo] 未曾轉向的白話字運動——蔡培火," <http://ip194097.ntcu.edu.tw/Ungian/Chokphin/Lunbun/CPH/CPH.PDF>, p. 5.

promote Taiwanese script. He drafted "Expressions of Willingness to Popularize Taiwan *Péh-ōe-jī* 臺灣白話字普及旨意書" in August 1934, which had more than one hundred signatures from Taiwan and nearly fifty signatures from Japan. In spite of this, during their meeting in February 1935, Governor-General Nagakawa Kenzō 中川健藏 (1875-1944) suggested that Cai should suspend the plan for the time being. The continued setbacks led Cai to leave for Tokyo in early 1936, bringing his linguistic efforts to a temporary end.

Soon after Japan's surrender in 1945, Cai joined the Nationalist Party and was elected as a legislator in the first legislative elections held in 1948. It is highly likely that Cai's political involvement made him adopt and take part in the KMT's call for using the Mandarin Phonetic System to notate the "dialects" of different provinces. During the early post-war years, Cai claimed that *Péh-ōe-jī* had become outdated, expressing his wish that the government would provide teachers' training for the "Southern Min-language Phonetic System" (*Minnanyu zhuyin fuhao* 閩南語注音符號). Apart from offering advice on this matter, Cai went on to compile the *Chinese-Taiwanese Dictionary of Commonly Used Words* 國語閩南語對照常用辭典 in 1969 and published *The Three People's Principles Southern Min Transliteration* 三民主義閩南語注音本 in 1978. In the *Chinese-Taiwanese Dictionary of Commonly Used Words*, Cai commented that there were three reasons for the failure of the kana-based Taiwanese scheme: the disapproval of the Japanese colonial government, the limited number of keen promoters, and the lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Taiwanese people. The great pragmatism Cai demonstrated in his various transliteration schemes triggered different appraisals of him, ranging from a "flexible politician under political change" to a hypocritical opportunist in Peng Mingmin's 彭明敏 (b. 1923) view.<sup>31</sup>

31 See Xie Dexi 謝德錫, "Bianjuxia de rouxing zhengzhijia—Cai Peihuo," in Zhang Yanxian et al. (eds.), *Taiwan jindai mingren zhi* [A Record of Distinguished Figures in Modern Taiwan History] 臺灣近代名人誌, Vol. 1 (Taipei: Independence Evening Post, 1987), pp. 87-105. Peng's view on Cai can be found in his *A Perfect Escape* (Taipei: Yushanshe, 2009).



As this paper is less concerned with Cai as a political figure than as a language reformist, I would delve further into Cai's comment about the limited support he received regarding Romanization. The diverse views Taiwanese intellectuals held at that time about the Taiwanese language helped shed light on the tepid reception of Romanization that Cai encountered. In 1929 and 1930, both Lian Yatang 連雅堂 (1878-1936) and Huang Shihui 黃石輝 (1900-1945) stated the significance of writing in the Taiwanese language. For instance, Huang Shihui, in his much-cited essay "How Not to Advocate Taiwan's Nativist Literature" (*Zenyang bu tichang xiangtu wenxue 怎樣不提倡鄉土文學*), argued that although people from other Chinese provinces might not understand spoken Taiwanese, they could understand the written form. However, it was Guo Qiusheng 郭秋生 (1904-1980) who proposed representing Taiwanese using Chinese characters in his 1931 article "A Proposal to Develop 'Taiwanese Vernacular' [*Jianshe 'Taiwan huawen' yi ti'an*] 建設「臺灣話文」一提案."<sup>32</sup> Guo maintained that although the "handy" Romanized script in theory might be able to replace the "difficult" Chinese characters, this would not be an easy task in practice. In addition, Guo considered Chinese writing (*kanbun* 漢文) to be inherent in Taiwan; thus, the Taiwanese people should never abandon them.

In the following months, the debate developed further, with a variety of proposals being put forward. For instance, Huang Chunqing 黃純青 (1875-1956) advocated sacrificing the sound in favor of the written form (*quhua jiuwen* 屈話就文), which is very different from Guo Qiusheng's proposal of sacrificing the written form for the sound.<sup>33</sup> But Huang was not convinced by Cai's

---

32 Huang Shihui's article was originally published in *Wuren bao* [*Five People's News*] 伍人報, Nos. 9-11 (Aug. 16-Sep. 1, 1930). It was reprinted in Nakajima Toshirō 中島利郎 (ed.), *1930 niandai Taiwan xiangtu wenxue lunzhan ziliao huibian* [*Compiled Data Surrounding Taiwan's Nativist Literary Debate in the 1930s*] 1930年代臺灣鄉土文學論戰資料彙編 (Kaohsiung: Chun-hui Publishing, 2003), pp. 1-6; Guo Qiusheng's article was serialized in 33 installments in *Taiwan Shimben* [*Taiwan News*] 臺灣新聞 from Jul. 7, 1931 onward. It was also compiled in Nakajima Toshirō's book, pp. 7-52.

33 Huang and Guo also differed on whether or not inelegant expressions in the Taiwanese language should be abandoned.

Romanization scheme either, as he feared Chinese script as a consequence would be in danger of extinction.<sup>34</sup> Lin Fengqi 林鳳岐, an overseas Taiwanese intellectual, suggested a mixed representation: to write in the Chinese vernacular, but to use Romanization to represent the pronunciation.<sup>35</sup> In 1932, Zhuang Chuisheng 莊垂勝 (1897-1962), under the penname Fu Ren 負人, not only criticized those who were against the Taiwanese vernacular, including Liao Hanchen 廖漢臣 (1912-1980), Lin Kefu 林克夫 (1907-?), Zhu Dianren 朱點人 (1903-1951), and Lai Minghong 賴明弘 (1915-1958), but also suggested that the Hakka people ought to be consulted regarding the establishment of Taiwanese script.<sup>36</sup> Zhuang's view challenged the potential Hoklo cultural chauvinism. It also raised concerns about the practicality of Romanized script (as there was no obvious connection between Romanization and Chinese characters) and possible future problems caused by the un-unified tones of Taiwanese language.

Nevertheless, Zhuang thought that the Taiwanese vernacular alphabets created by Cai Peihuo in 1931 could be useful as phonetic symbols. While the majority of Taiwanese intellectuals had visions of the Taiwanese vernacular being situated within an "East-Asian" perspective, with reference to Chinese characters and the Japanese colonizer's language policy in particular, some—like Lian Wenqing 連溫卿 (1894-1957)—were more in favor of promoting the universalist Esperanto established by the Polish doctor L. L. Zamenhof (1859-

34 See Huang Chunqing 黃純青, "Taiwanhua gaizao lun [Opinions on Reforming Taiwanese Vernacular] 臺灣話改造論," initially serialized in *Taiwan xinwen* [*Taiwan News*] 臺灣新聞, from Oct. 15 to Oct. 28, 1931. In the article, Huang specified that the Amoy accent should be used as the phonology standard for Taiwanese vernacular. This article is compiled in Nakajima Toshirō (ed.), *1930 niandai Taiwan xiangtu wenxue lunzhan ziliao huibian*, pp. 121-143.

35 See Lin Fengqi 林鳳岐, "Wode gaizao Taiwan xiangtu wenxue de ti'an [My Proposal for Reforming Taiwan's Nativist Literature] 我的改造臺灣鄉土文學的提案," *Taiwan New People's News* 臺灣新民報, 391 (Nov. 21, 1931).

36 See Fu Ren 負人, "Taiwan huawen zabo [Miscellaneous Remarks on Taiwanese Vernacular] 臺灣話文雜駁," originally published in *Nanyin* [*Southern Tone*] 南音 (Jan. 1, 15; Feb. 1, 22; May 25, 1932). See the book edited by Nakajima Toshirō, *1930 niandai Taiwan xiangtu wenxue lunzhan ziliao huibian*, pp. 191-221.

1917), as it was believed this would break down linguistic barriers and facilitate mutual understanding between countries. Lian was not alone in his doubt about the limited global capacity of the Taiwanese language. Lai Minghong, for instance, felt that the Taiwanese language was used only in Taiwan and thus might hinder Taiwan's proletariats' communication with other proletariats around the world. Therefore, he felt that promoting either Esperanto or the Chinese vernacular was more feasible.

Although several intellectuals mentioned above were enthusiastic about eliminating illiteracy and promoting effective cultural exchanges, their viewpoints differed widely. Cai's linguistic mission also had a similar aim of improving literacy and minimizing the cultural/linguistic gap between the Japanese and the Taiwanese people. He was fairly consistent in his belief that the function of Romanization was as a tool for enhancing communication, even in the post-war years. In 1948, he made use of the phonetic system (*zhuyin fuhao* 注音符號) implemented in 1946 to devise his new writing system for the Taiwanese vernacular, with the desire to accelerate communication between the Mainlanders and the Taiwanese.<sup>37</sup> Similar to his appropriation of the colonizer's kana system, Cai this time revised his earlier Romanization proposal to work out a kind of "conversion" for the new system using *zhuyin fuhao*. For example, he represented 咱 (*Lan*, meaning "we") as "ㄗ ㄚ ㄛ ˊ," instead of as "ㄗ ㄛ ˊ," as if each Romanized alphabet has a corresponding equivalent in the phonetic system. Interestingly, Cai accepted the Romanized script like a "proto scheme," but established his own schemes to cater first to the kana system and then to the phonetic system on the basis of Romanization.

Curiously, although Cai used Romanization and the kana script, as well as Chinese characters for his diary writing, he did not adopt the phonetic scheme to which he devoted the longest time in order to compose his diary. For his diary writing, Cai underwent three different phases in terms of his linguistic

---

37 This phonetic system for transcribing Chinese, *zhuyin fuhao*, was introduced in the 1910s.

preference. He used Romanization for the period 1929-1931, then a mixture of kana-based orthography and Chinese characters from 1932 to early 1934, and finally only used Chinese characters for the period from around mid-February 1934 to 1936. It is interesting that Cai began to write in the Chinese vernacular (at least partially) in 1932 and eventually switched entirely to the Chinese vernacular from February 1934 in his diary, while simultaneously lobbying for support for his kana orthography. This shows that the content of Cai's writing did not always correspond directly to the form/scheme in which he chose to write. According to Ann Heylen, Cai's switching between different writing systems indicates the mental displacement Cai may have experienced after a longstanding psychological attachment and emotional commitment to the potential of the Roman script. As the kana system did not offer the same cultural-linguistic trappings as the Romanized script, Cai could only seek solutions through writing in Chinese characters.<sup>38</sup> Heylen's explanation is plausible, but it is difficult to prove whether Cai's complete linguistic switch to Chinese characters in the mid-1930s in his diary writing indicates a re-orientation of his identity. However, he had certainly made use of the Romanized script as a medium to advance his bi-literacy in Japanese and Chinese.

Although Cai's efforts remained marginalized, his passion for promoting the Taiwanese vernacular was consistent throughout his life. His linguistic efforts were not a rejection of Japanese, but an attempt to offer an alternative scheme to cultivate Taiwanese in addition to Japanese. As his kana experiment has shown, promoting vernacular Taiwanese writing is not necessarily incompatible with the colonial policy stipulating Japanese as the national language. From the beginning, Cai's Romanization plan had a transnational and East-Asian-oriented basis. He considered the system to be the most economic and the easiest tool for

---

38 Ann Heylen, "Cai Peihuo and The Romanization Movement in Colonial Taiwan 蔡培火與殖民地臺灣的羅馬字運動," in Li Qinan 李勤岸 (ed.), *Bogi bunhak ti bogi kau-iak tiong e kak-sek* [The Role of Mother Tongue Literature in Mother Tongue Education] 母語文學與母語教育中角色 (Taipei: National Taiwan Normal University, 2006), pp. 340-363.

Japanese people to learn Taiwanese. In addition, Mainlanders would be able to learn Japanese without having teachers or attending schools. It was a particularly useful scheme for illiterate people to absorb new knowledge and to communicate with others in a written form. From his enthusiasm for experimenting with different ways of vernacular writing, it is fair to say that Cai was more concerned with educating and enlightening people than in reinforcing the link between one's language and one's cultural identity. His pragmatic linguistic view enabled him to remain flexible when devising new orthographies.

Although the Japanese authorities' attitude can easily be blamed for the failure of Cai's effort, their reservations about Cai's proposal should not be taken as a suppression of the Chinese language. Japanese colonizers in actuality were able to see both the advantages and disadvantages of the Chinese language as intermediary between the local language and Japanese. Hence, they appropriated the Chinese language according to their own purposes.<sup>39</sup> In addition to Japanese colonizers' variable view on the Chinese language, Taiwan's indigenous language debates added an extra challenge to Cai's advocacy of Romanization. His initial proposal was soon overshadowed by the intellectual majority's preference for writing in vernacular Chinese, and those sympathetic for the Taiwanese vernacular held diverse views on which writing system they should adopt. A few of them insisted on using Chinese characters in the belief that only Chinese characters could best suit their identify as Han Chinese, not to mention doubts among those supporting the Chinese vernacular about whether or not Taiwanese was worth developing into a working written language (like Japanese and Chinese). Having to compete with a variety of writing schemes, Cai's potential followers inevitably decreased.

---

39 In the early years of Japanese colonial rule of Taiwan, classical Chinese served as a strategy to minimize the resistance of the traditionally trained literati. Even though the Japanese language was advocated in order to facilitate colonial control, and the use of Chinese in newspapers and journals in 1937 was banned as an integral part of wartime mobilization, the Chinese language was later deemed to be useful in cementing the friendship between Japan and China during wartime.

One may argue that the emotional attachment to Chinese characters existed mainly among Taiwan's educated classes. For the illiterate people, Romanization was likely to offer a relatively easy way of learning. Still, Cai's efforts required more top-down support from the ruling party and from the leading figures, not simply from the masses who were yet to be taught the scheme(s). Even if there was a bottom-up social movement pushing for Romanization, the "prime time" for social movements, like the iconoclastic May Fourth movement in China in 1919, had passed. Besides, the Japanese language itself consists of the kana syllabary, which can arguably be learned with equal facility as Romanization, when compared to the greater effort required to learn Chinese characters. A kana scheme for representing Taiwanese vernacular was already in use by the Japanese, making Cai's Romanization scheme somewhat redundant. The combination of these reasons resulted in Cai's scheme remaining unfinished.

### **Linking up with the World?: Romanization Schemes in Post-war Taiwan**

As Taiwan "returned" to Chinese control after Japan's unconditional surrender in 1945, the nationalist government strove to overwrite the colonial legacy left by Japanese on the island. With the replacement of Japanese by Mandarin Chinese as the new national language, the goal of Romanization was not so much to notate the sound of one's mother tongues (or "dialects," as seen in the KMT's view) than to come up with a tangible script to communicate with the world. The KMT government overall held a *laissez-faire* attitude toward Romanization in early post-war Taiwan. As mentioned, the Wade-Giles system of Romanization appeared to be more popular than the existing system of "Chinese Romanized Script"/"Sound-translating Symbols" developed in China in the late 1920s. Precedents, such as the pinyin system proposed by the PRC government, prove the possibility of transliterating Chinese characters into a Romanized

script. Yet the development of Romanization in post-war Taiwan has been intertwined with the island's socio-political and linguistic circumstances. Socio-politically, scholars have not yet considered how the Romanization scheme would reconcile with Taiwanese people's (mostly Han-Chinese) cultural identity as well as how it would impact the government's ongoing competition with its giant neighbor's practice of spreading Chinese culture. Linguistically, it was complex because of the multi-ethnic nature of Taiwanese society.

Efforts of using Romanization to transliterate Chinese characters in post-war Taiwan often coexisted with efforts of using Romanization to notate the sounds of Taiwanese language and aboriginal languages. As early as in the 1960s, Wang Yude 王育德 (Ong Iok-tek, 1924-1985) proposed a combined system using both the Romanized and Chinese scripts.<sup>40</sup> He stated that using Chinese characters to transliterate the Taiwanese language is problematic, but using Romanization only would be very difficult to read. A win-win situation would be to take advantage of the commonly used Chinese characters and to use Romanization to notate the sounds if there are no generally used Chinese characters. Despite Wang's strong ideological inclination toward Taiwan's independence, his proposal, which integrates Chinese characters and Roman alphabets, seems sensible. Unfortunately, this scheme remained on a theoretical level without yielding much written texts. Only until Zheng Liangwei's 鄭良偉 promotion of this combined system later did this scheme win wider support among the practitioners of Taiwanese-language writing.<sup>41</sup>

In 1980, Lin Jixiong 林繼雄 (Liim Keahioong), one of Wang Yude's students, began to promote the Taiwanese Modern Spelling System (TMSS).<sup>42</sup>

---

40 Wang advocated this idea in the last essay of the 24 total essays entitled "Taiwanhua jiangzuo [Lectures on the Taiwanese Language] 臺灣話講座, serialized in *Taiwan qingnian* [*Taiwan Youth*] 臺灣青年, a journal founded in April, 1960, for which he served as the publisher.

41 In the late 1970s, Zheng began to publish *Taiwan yuwen shuang yuekan* [*Bimonthly Journal of the Taiwanese Language*] 臺灣語文雙月刊 outside Taiwan, using the combined scheme proposed by Wang.

42 Lin pioneered the TMSS in 1943, with the intent to avoid the diacritical markings of *péh-ōe-jī*

On the basis of TMSS, a Romanized orthography "modern literal Taiwanese," also known as "modern Taiwanese language," was developed. In 1991, the Taiwan Language Association (Taiwan yuwen xuehui 臺灣語文學會) started to work on the Taiwan Language Phonetic Alphabet (TLPA), a revised scheme established on the basis of the existing *péh-ōe-jī*.<sup>43</sup> Despite its several strengths, this scheme is not totally compatible with the *péh-ōe-jī* scheme. Consequently, some *péh-ōe-jī* users remained uncertain about the TLPA scheme. In 2005, the *péh-ōe-jī* supporters began to collaborate with the TLPA supporters, proposing a Taiwanese-Romanization *pinyin* system. The Ministry of Education in October 2006 promulgated the Taiwanese Romanization System (*Taiwan minnanyu luomazi pinyin fang'an* 臺灣閩南語羅馬字拼音方案), an integrated scheme using *péh-ōe-jī* and TLPA. However, this system is yet to be more fully promulgated. Other concerns include readership and how the Taiwanese Romanization System would reconcile with the current Chinese writing system.<sup>44</sup>

The Chinese Romanization underwent an equally bumpy development in the past decade. The issue became increasingly crucial in 1996, when the Taiwanese government attempted to make Taiwan the Asia-Pacific Regional Operations Center, and thus asked the Council for Economic Planning and Development to be in charge of the Chinese Romanization. This is indicative of the ruling party's

---

and the difficulty of inputting Chinese characters with the available technology. For more information about Lin's involvement as a Taiwanese language reformist, please see Lin Zhiqi 林芷琪 and Dai Yude's 戴煜德 interview with Lin Jixiong conducted in 2007, "Lin Jixiong: Xiandai wenshu fa waixiao meiguo [Lin Jixiong: The Export of Modern Written Taiwanese to America] 林繼雄：現代文書法外銷美國," in Yang Yunyan, Zhang Xueqian, and Lü Meiqin (eds.), *Taiyuwen yundong: fangtan ji shiliao huibian* [Interviews and Collection of Historical Data Related to Taiwanese Language Movement] 臺語文運動：訪談暨史料彙編 (Taipei: Academia Historica, 2008), pp. 161-178.

43 For example, "oa" is changed to "ua." Arabic numbers are used to represent the tones to facilitate the computer key-in. The TLPA system can also be applied to Hakka language, and it addresses the different accents in which Taiwan's Hoklo language is spoken more sensitively.

44 The future of Romanization is also likely to be entangled with identity politics. For example, those who oppose Romanized Taiwanese writing often regard promoting Taiwanese writing as supporting Taiwan's independence, or interpret it narrow-mindedly as a display of hoklo chauvinism.



(the Nationalist government's) pragmatic and economy-driven attitude toward Romanization at that time. The aforementioned "Mandarin Phonetic System II" and *tongyong pinyin* system offer two schemes of Romanization. However, the Taipei City Government opted for the *hanyu pinyin*, causing confusions and conflicts. There were also concerns about the compatibility between different systems at the turn of the Millennium. In 2000, when Taiwan was under the DPP rule, the *tongyong pinyin* system was under revision, with additional versions for Romanizing Taiwanese, Hakka, and the aboriginal languages. "The Principles for Using Chinese Romanization" (*Zhongwen yiyin shiyong yuanze* 中文譯音使用原則, hereafter abbreviated to "The Principles") was introduced in 2002, adopting the *tongyong pinyin* system as the standard Romanization system. However, this did not fully solve the problem of needing to standardize the Chinese Romanization in Taiwan. *Tongyong pinyin* is relatively compatible with *hanyu pinyin*, but not really compatible with the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) system. The DPP government explained that the reason for using *tongyong pinyin* is that it can better accommodate different languages (such as Taiwanese, Hakka, and aboriginal languages) spoken in Taiwan. For the DPP, being able to cater to Taiwan's linguistic reality seems to be more significant than connecting with the world. Whether or not Taiwan should use *hanyu pinyin* in order to more effectively "link up with the world/link up with the international track" (*yu guoji jiegui* 與國際接軌) triggered ongoing debates. Opponents of *hanyu pinyin* disagreed that the system would make Taiwan more oriented to international standards.<sup>45</sup> Despite the diverse opinions on which system could be more effective for Taiwan's globalization, the Nationalist Party and the DPP reached a consensus that Taiwan ought to integrate better with the world. As Wang Horng-luen 汪宏倫 has pointed out, what needs to be examined is more the consensus

---

45 See Feibianshe's article "Guoji jie 'gui' [Link up with the World?] 國際接「鬼」," *New Taiwan* 新臺灣新聞周刊, <http://www.newtaiwan.com.tw/bulletinview.jsp?bulletinid=44348>, last modified Jul. 15, 2002.

of going global rather than which system Taiwan should adopt, because both the *tongyong* and *hanyu pinyin* systems are already pan-politicized and ideologized.<sup>46</sup>

In 2008, when Taiwan once again fell back to the KMT rule, "The Principles" were further amended. And from January 2009 onward, the government declared that *hanyu pinyin* would be adopted as the official system for Chinese Romanization. Some critics regarded this as the Nationalist government's linguistic unification with the Mainland, and others continued to use other schemes. For instance, Jiang Wenyu 江文瑜 of the National Taiwan University explained that the Romanization system is not merely for foreigners; it is also a symbol of a nation's sense of autonomy. The KMT government's quick lining up with China's pinyin system is a gesture of "linguistic and cultural pro-Chinaism."<sup>47</sup> In fact, this was not the first time in contemporary China that the Taiwanese population cast doubt about the government's policy concerning Romanization. In 2002, a few years before the KMT government's adoption of *hanyu pinyin*, some people were already suspicious about the ruling party's (DPP) promulgation of *tongyong pinyin*. As *tongyong pinyin* bears approximate 85% similarity with *hanyu pinyin* that is used in China, the Taiwanese population quite naturally regarded this as an indication of the DPP's gradual leaning toward China. The abolition of *tongyong pinyin* and promotion of *hanyu pinyin* from 2009 onward only raised more questions about the political undertone of this move.

---

46 See Wang Horng-luen 汪宏倫, "Globalization and Institutional Isomorphism: Examining the Postmodern Condition of Taiwan's National Question in the Debate over the Romanization Policy of Chinese Characters 全球化與制度同形化：從拼音爭議看臺灣「國族問題」的後現代情境," *Societas: A Journal for Philosophical Study of Public Affairs* 政治與社會哲學評論, 3 (Dec., 2002), pp. 121-178, particularly pp. 163-164.

47 See Liu Liren 劉力仁 et al., "Gai hanyu pinyin, xuezhe buman yishi xingtai lingzheng [Change to *hanyu pinyin*, Scholars' Dissatisfaction with Ideology-centric Government Policies] 改漢語拼音，學者不滿意識形態領政," *Liberty Times Net*, <http://news.ltn.com.tw/news/life/paper/243700>, last modified Sep. 18, 2008.

## Marking Ethnicity: Romanization in Taiwan's Aboriginal Literature

Although several intellectuals in post-war Taiwan continued to reform the writing system of the Taiwanese vernacular, with the most common using both Chinese characters and Romanized phonetics, it is in the writings of Taiwan's aboriginal authors that Romanization as an ethnic marker and as a tool of linguistic resistance are most evident. In 1990, Walis Nokan 瓦歷斯諾幹 (b. 1961) explained the meaning of writing in his tribal language. He stated: "Language is on the one hand the most basic tool for communication, and a tribe's symbol of identity on the other hand. After all, the starting point of aboriginal literature lies in the utilization of aboriginal language. Without writing in one's mother tongue, the so-called aboriginal literature, would always be a tributary of Taiwan literature, never a truly 'literature in the center.'"<sup>48</sup> With this idea in mind, Walis Nokan and other aboriginal authors started to explore the option of writing in his tribal language. One year later, the Atayal writer Walis Naqang's 娃利斯羅干 (b. 1967) *Atayal Footprints* (*Taiya jiaozong* 泰雅腳蹤) marked Taiwanese aborigines' first attempt at using Romanization to write in their tribal language, although most aboriginal writers at that time still wrote in Chinese for the consideration of wider readership.

Walis Naqang's initial plan was to appropriate the Romanization system in order to write in his Atayal language. However, the Bunun writer Topas Tamapima 拓拔斯塔瑪匹瑪 (b. 1960), convinced him to publish bilingually in both Chinese and the Atayal language. Tuobasi felt it would be meaningless to publish if the majority of readers could not read the text. According to Lü Huizhen 呂慧珍, even among the Atayal people, those who could understand the Romanized "Atayal" vernacular were perhaps only about ten percent.<sup>49</sup> This

---

48 Walis Nokan, "Yuan zhumin wenxue de chuanguo qidian [The Starting Point of the Aboriginal Literary Creation] 原住民文學的創作起點," in *Fandao chuqiao* [Revealing the Barbarian Knife] 番刀出鞘 (Taipei: Daw Shiang Publishing Co. Ltd., 1992), p. 133.

49 See Lü Huizhen 呂慧珍, "Jiuling niandai taiwan yuanzhumin xiaoshuo yanjiu [Research on the

indicates that the ability to use the (church) Romanization system was quite limited. This situation worsened as an increasing number of aboriginal authors received education in Chinese. In an interview, Tuobasi confessed that although the Bunun language is his mother tongue, he has developed the habit of thinking in Chinese as a result of many years of education in a city. Yubas Naogih 游霸士 撓給赫 (1943-2003), trained in the Department of Chinese at the National Taiwan Normal University, is another aboriginal author who admitted his relatively deep Sinification.<sup>50</sup>

With the aborigines' continued Sinification, the issue surrounding their cultural and linguistic survival becomes increasingly serious. It is in this regard that Walis Noqang's bilingual writing is especially important. After Walis Noqang's initial attempt, Shaman Ranpoan 夏曼藍波安 (b. 1957) of the Tao (*Dawu* 達悟) tribe and some authors from the Bunon and Atayal tribes followed Walis Noqang's strategy of writing in both Romanized and Chinese characters. This tactic highlights the tribal linguistic features without excluding the Chinese readers, who are usually the main targeted readership. However, similar to the efforts of producing a Taiwanese vernacular, Taiwan's aboriginal authors are faced with problems caused by non-standardized usage of Romanization in the choice of Chinese characters. Although seven tribes had Bibles in their own tribal languages, not all of the tribal authors attempted writing in their tribal language.<sup>51</sup>

---

Indigenous Literature from Taiwan in the 1990s] 九〇年代臺灣原住民小說研究," MA dissertation (Chinese Culture University, 2002), pp. 241-242.

50 Yubas' Chinese writing is in general more fluent and closer to the Han Chinese expressions than Topas'. He also suggested the definition of aboriginal literature should be determined by the subject matter, not by the author's ethnicity. Nevertheless, Yubas endeavored to preserve the Atayal language. He published his 2003 work *Taiya de gushi* [*Stories of the Atayal People*] 泰雅的故事 bilingually in Chinese and Romanized transliteration of the *Sayiya* 薩衣亞 language (his mother tongue).

51 The seven tribes are the Amei tribe, the Bunon tribe, the Atayal tribe, the Tarogo tribe, the Yamei tribe, the Lukai tribe, and the Paiwan tribe.

The existing tribal-language writing shows that authors are more interested in reconstructing their ethnic identity than in condemning the hegemony of the Han culture. This was more evident in Taiwan's aboriginal literature in the 1980s, when it emerged as an integral part of the aborigines' fight for equality and self-governance. "Returning me my Mother Tongue" (*huanwo muyu* 還我母語) was one of the key appeals in the aboriginal social movements in the decade, which ushered in the attempt of writing in one's tribal language as exemplified by Walis Noqang's reflections about his tribal culture in his autobiographical *Atayal Footprints*. Likewise, Shaman Ranpoan, in his *The Myths of Badai Bay* (*Badaiwan de shenhua* 八代灣的神話), collected several Tao oral myths written in both Romanized Tao language and Chinese, striving to make sense of the ancient Tao myths in modern society. Lin Tai 林太 also made an effort to document his tribe's oral stories, songs, and customs in his co-authored book entitled *The Moon Crossing the Time and Space* (*Zouguo shikong de yueliang* 走過時空的月亮). Although tribal-language writing benefits from the Romanization system used by foreign missionaries to produce the Bible in local languages, the revival of representing one's tribal language benefits from the post-martial law context in which the absolute hegemony of Mandarin Chinese was challenged. However, an immediate issue at that time was choosing and regulating the writing system in order to compile suitable textbooks. The Mandarin Phonetic System cannot accurately notate the sounds of aboriginal languages and was soon considered inappropriate. The International Phonetic Alphabet system contains too many symbols and therefore is inconvenient to use, not to mention that regarding alphabet as script is itself debatable. In comparison, Romanization stood out as a sensible compromise as it is more systematic and universally used, even though its accuracy in sound-notation can only reach roughly 80%, much lower than the 100% obtainable by the International Phonetic Alphabet system. Bearing this consensus of adopting Romanization in mind, an initial research study on this was published in a book by Li Rengui in 1992.<sup>52</sup>

---

52 See Li Rengui, *Taiwan nandao yuyan de yuyin fuhao xitong* [*The Phonetic System of Taiwan's*

Later, this was developed further and implemented as a working system in 1994, which offers a foundation for preserving Taiwan's aboriginal languages, complementing the aboriginal author's creative endeavors.

The female Atayal author Rimuy Aki's 里慕伊阿紀 (b. 1962) recent novel *Home of the Taiwan Cherries* (*Shanyinghua de guxiang* 山櫻花的故鄉) offers a salient example of the aboriginal writers' use of Romanization to register their unique ethnic features, both linguistically and culturally.<sup>53</sup> The novel is mainly written in Chinese, with bilingual passages (first in the Romanized Atayal language and then in the equivalent Chinese sentence) appearing mostly in conversations. However, it is worth noting that the Atayal linguistic characteristics are detectable in Rimuy Aki's Chinese usage. For instance, when the protagonist Bawnay's dog disappears after tracking a wild animal, the Atayal people comment that the dog "probably traces it all the way to the back of the sea." The expression "the back of the sea" ("squliq minkahuk suruw silung," 120) in the Atayal language means the Chinese mainland. But occasionally, explanations of certain Atayal traditions appear in the margins instead of the main text. The Atayal *mgaga* (headhunting) practice and their survival skills are two examples. Rimuy Aki clearly explains that the *mgaga* tradition is not for declaring war, but for determining what is right and what is wrong, as well as for taking revenge if a close relative is murdered, and, to a lesser extent, for recognizing a man's bravery. Another example is the Atayal's survival skills in the wilderness, including building hunting huts and setting up wooden footbridges

---

*Austronesian Languages*] 臺灣南島語言的語音符號系統 (Taipei: Committee for Education Research, Ministry of Education, 1992). Taiwan is considered to be the origin of the Austronesian languages. See Robert Blust, "The Austronesian Homeland: A Linguistic Perspective," *Asian Perspective*, 26, 1 (1985), pp. 45-67; Peter Bellwood, "The Austronesian Dispersal and the Origins of Languages," *Scientific American*, 265, 1 (Jul., 1991), pp. 88-93.

53 Rimuy Aki, *Shanyinghua de guxiang* [*Home of the Taiwan Cherries*] 山櫻花的故鄉 (Taipei: Rye Field Publications, 2010). All the quotes in the following paragraphs are from this book, with the page number specified in parentheses.

for river crossings. In addition to giving vivid descriptions, there are illustrations of the bridges to facilitate a better understanding among readers.

In addition to using "paratexts" to register her ethnic culture, Rimuy Aki on several occasions uses the Atayal expressions directly and puts the Chinese equivalent in brackets. Apart from spelling out the Atayal characters' names in the original Atayal language, this strategy applies to the kinship relations, items that are closely related to the Atayals' daily lives, and to culturally specific usages. For instance, "yutas" means "grandfather," "yama" means "son-in-law," black nightshades becomes "wasiq" (龍葵), being lucky becomes "mqoyat" (幸運), and "sapat" refers specifically to the pork meat used in the Atayal engagement ceremonies. In other cases, there are no Chinese equivalents, and Rimuy Aki uses transliteration, such as "抹那樣" (mnayang), "斯馬力特" (smalit), and "把亞疇" (pazih) (145). Interestingly, transliteration is also used for non-Atayal expressions. When Bawnay impresses the hunters in Sanming Village, he is hailed as "Yama buta no otosang" (father of wild boars), showing the Japanese influence. Naming their small black dog "kuro" (which means "black" in Japanese) provides another example. However, Rimuy Aki sometimes does not use transliteration, but employs a creolized strategy: using Chinese writing for the Atayal expressions. "用來補綴的人," referring to a woman married to a widower (161), and "長犄角," referring to a person who fidgets and is unfocused (159), are just a couple cases in point.

Among the various linguistic strategies Rimuy Aki employs in the novel, the most obvious one is perhaps her use of the original Atayal expressions, followed immediately afterward by the equivalent Chinese words or sentences. This tactic can be seen as a "foreignizing" strategy. According to Lawrence Venuti, "foreignization" refers to "an ethnodeviant pressure on those cultural values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad."<sup>54</sup> By retaining the 'foreignness' of the original, Rimuy Aki

---

54 Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London and New

enhances the cultural peculiarity of the Atayal tribe vis-à-vis the Chinese language. If we view Chinese as a display of Han cultural imperialism, then this strategy stressing the incommensurability between the Atayal and the Chinese language becomes a resistance against Han linguistic domination.

However, it is worth noting that the younger generation, such as the girls attending the youth training camp, would sometimes communicate with each other directly in Chinese. The conversational exchanges between some of the village girls during the training session are therefore presented only in Chinese, instead of bilingually. Sun Dachuan 孫大川 has commented that using Romanization to write in one's native tongue is not conducive to one's indigeneity. On the contrary, it carries the risk of becoming narrow-minded. Borrowing from Chinese should be a more effective writing strategy that does not necessarily compromise one's ethnicity.<sup>55</sup> Sun's view may be valid,<sup>56</sup> but it underestimates Rimuy Aki's auto-ethnographic linguistic effort through Romanization.

If the examples discussed above illustrate Rimuy Aki's co-switching process in composing the novel, readers will soon discover that the languages co-switched among the aboriginal population in the novel are not limited only to the Atayal language and to Chinese. They also include Japanese usage, the Zou tribe's expressions, and the Bunun tribe's language. For instance, when the aboriginal youths perform a Chinese anti-Communist play on stage, some of the elderly people in the audience who do not understand Chinese shout out "bad person" in Japanese (transliterated as "巴格亞魯") and several other tribal

---

York: Routledge, 1995), p. 20.

55 Cao Huimin, *Chuzou de xiawa: Yiwei dalu xueren de Taiwan wenxueguan* [*When Eva Leaves Home: A Mainlander Scholar's View on Taiwan Literature*] 出走的夏娃：一位大陸學人的臺灣文學觀 (Taipei: Showwe Information Co. Ltd., 2010), p. 60.

56 I agree with him that there is no absolute relationship between one's identity and one's so-called "mother tongue." In other words, the Atayal ethnicity can be represented in Chinese, especially by "Atayalized Chinese." This paper is primarily concerned with Romanization: Rimuy Aki's "Atayalized/creolized Chinese" is therefore not discussed in detail.



languages (211). When the young Atayal girl Bidai tries to communicate with the Bunun children, both tribal languages are used (131). Interestingly, toward the end of the novel, it is said that the Atayal and the Zou people communicate with each other in the Bunun language, the most dominant language in that area. This indicates that language, for the purpose of communication, is not always tied to one's tribal identity. More often, it is an expedient accommodation resulting from a specific social context.

## Conclusion

This paper analyzes the history of Romanization by comparing the efforts made by missionaries in Taiwan, by the Taiwanese (Christian) intellectual Cai Peihuo during the colonial period, by Taiwan's central governments, and by aboriginal authors in contemporary Taiwan. It demonstrates that in those different contexts, Romanization has served as a means to combat illiteracy and assist interethnic/intercultural communication, to be in sync with global community, and to articulate one's ethnic features linguistically. Originating in Amoy as "Church Romanization" and introduced into Taiwan at the end of the nineteenth century, Romanization was further developed by Cai Peihuo with an East Asian touch, and with varied revised writing systems that corresponded to historical contingencies such as Japanese rule and the Nationalist takeover of Taiwan. Cai's effort in developing the Taiwanese language from a spoken language to a language with a writing system underwent three stages: the Romanization system, the Japanese kana system, and the Chinese phonetic system. Despite his devotion and ambitious goal of combating illiteracy and facilitating intercultural communication, Cai's endeavor failed to gain wider support. This was attributable to a variety of reasons, including colonial control, the conflicting views among those in support of vernacular Taiwanese, and the KMT's enforcement of a strict mandarin language policy.

Cai's linguistic mission painted a rather ironic picture of Romanization in colonial Taiwan. He advocated Romanization in order to offer an alternative linguistic tool aimed at assisting assimilation, which was either received lukewarmly or rejected outright in the name of assimilation.<sup>57</sup> If we take Cai's hierarchical view of Western and Eastern civilizations into consideration, the Japanese colonizers' disapproval of the Romanized script seems logical, as approving of it might entail the loss of the superior status of Japanese as a language of civilization. In colonial Taiwan, Romanization was embedded with various layers of cultural, social, and political considerations and had to compete not only with Chinese script and the colonizer's writing system, but also with different representations of the Taiwanese vernacular. Romanization in theory could also function as a universal means of communication among people speaking completely unrelated languages—"the universality myth," to use DeFrancis's term. Nonetheless, several of Cai's peers opted for the myth of the Chinese script because the Romanized script was deemed too "foreign" and thus far away from their cultural affiliations.

In post-war Taiwan, there were continued efforts to develop a standard writing system for vernacular Taiwanese and for Mandarin Chinese. The government's varied attitude toward different competing systems often invite politically charged disputes in which linguistic concerns are disregarded. The aboriginal authors' use of Romanization to represent their tribal languages demonstrates again that the Latin alphabet was endowed with a distinct ethnic meaning. In the cases discussed above, Romanized script serves as an expedient

---

57 Compared to his peers, such as Lin Chenglu, Cai was more open-minded toward assimilation. Cai felt that there were natural and artificial assimilations. The former would most likely be successful, whereas the latter would fail. He further emphasized that assimilation should be based on equality and mutual respect, not on a superior culture imposing its culture on a weaker culture. See Cai Peihuo, "Yu Riben benguomin shu [Letters to the Japanese in Japan] 與日本國民書," in *Complete Works of Cai Peihuo*, Vol. 3, pp. 120-129, 154-155, and 166-167. But Cai's earlier open-mindedness toward assimilation policies ended in disillusionment. See Jing Tsu, *Sound and Script in Chinese Diaspora*, p. 275; for further details, see Rimuy Aki, *Shanyinghua de guxiang [Home of the Taiwan Cherries] 山櫻花的故鄉*.

measure for the preservation of the aboriginal language and access to the Chinese-dominated market. Similar to the colonial period, Romanization once again is placed vis-à-vis the Chinese writing system. Although language, like religion and customs, has for long been considered an important element of a nation-state, I would like to contend that not using the Chinese scripts (as in Romanization) does not essentially make a nation-state "less Chinese." Vice versa, the Latin alphabets are not necessarily a property belonging exclusively to the Roman Empire, or any specific state. When the Latin alphabets have been used to adequately spell out the Chinese language, they to some extent are no longer "foreign."<sup>58</sup> To view this in a post-colonial perspective, one can argue that even though a language initially is imposed by the colonizer, or from a foreign culture, it gradually becomes localized such as the case of Taiwanese aboriginal authors' Chinese-language writing. An absolute binary Chinese/Western or local/external division is therefore difficult to sustain, even though one must remain vigilant about the power politics embedded in linguistic preference.

The Chinese script in the works by Taiwan's aboriginal writers represents the result of the Han population's imperialistic linguistic policy, whereas the Romanized expressions serve as a post-colonial linguistic abrogation. In this process, the aboriginal authors were able to engage with their tribal traditions and acknowledge their presence. Rimuy Aki's case extends Cai's initial scheme by illustrating that Romanization is not merely useful for representing vernacular Taiwanese, but can also represent the aboriginal languages and cultures to assist inter-ethnic understanding. Since the foreign missionaries' introduction of Romanization to Taiwan, the Romanized script has played a role in evangelizations and functioned as a means of facilitating cultural enlightenment

---

58 This view in fact was already discussed several decades ago. Zhou Youguang once pointed out that the Latin alphabets belong to the common cultural heritage of human civilizations. See Zhou Youguang 周有光, *Wenzi gaige gailun* [*An Overall Discussion on the Reform of Chinese Characters*] 文字改革概論 (Beijing: Xinhua Bookstore, 1961), p. 86.

and representing the untranslatable ethnic peculiarities of Taiwan's aboriginal cultures.

In terms of writing in one's mother tongue in present-day Taiwan, writers commonly use both Chinese characters and Romanization in their attempts to articulate their ethnic identity (such as the case of Rimuy Aki). It is obvious that Romanization serves as a useful ethnic medium, yet simultaneously it implies that only through Romanization can individuals make their language/native tongues intelligible in sounds. This could potentially be a great drawback to utilizing Romanization. Similar to the "bilingual" attempt, the Romanized ethnic writing suggests that it is impossible to return to a "pure" tribal cultural system without the mediation of either the Roman script or the Chinese script. But perhaps one ought to shy away from privileging written scripts over oral traditions, although having a writing system does help preserve endangered languages. In this light, Romanization works as a reasonable expediency for Taiwan's aborigines to develop their own writing systems.

With the official implementation of the Aboriginal Language Writing System in 2005, a revised version of the system compiled by Li Rengui that became effective in 1994, and the newly introduced Aboriginal Language Proficiency Test in 2001, the demand for a united and standardized Romanized writing system is expected to gain greater momentum. Some recent empirical data suggest that pure Romanization can be a more desirable system than the mixed use of Chinese characters and Romanization. As Teng Hongtin observes, students tend to use Romanization rather than the mixed rendering because they find Romanization easier.<sup>59</sup> This resonates with Cai Peihuo's insights offered approximately one century ago. The long journey that Romanization has

---

59 See the online comments posted by Ding Fengzhen 丁鳳珍, a teacher of Taiwanese language. Based on his/her own teaching experience, Teng found that students in the exam tended to prefer to the Romanization system, rather than the mixed Chinese-Romanization scheme (*hanluowen*), if given a choice of translating a Chinese paragraph into Taiwanese; <http://taiji.fhl.net/Kateng/Kateng20.html>.

embarked in Taiwan and the implications of its various schemes need to be understood contextually. Although many found it "easy," the integration of available systems is still needed and remains a challenge ahead. ♦

---

♦ Responsible editor: Yeh-ming Chin (金葉明)

## Bibliography

Bellwood, Peter

- 1991 "The Austronesian Dispersal and the Origins of Languages," *Scientific American*, 265, 1 (Jul., 1991), pp. 88-93;  
DOI:10.1038/scientificamerican0791-88

Blust, Robert

- 1985 "The Austronesian Homeland: A Linguistic Perspective," *Asian Perspective*, 26, 1 (1985), pp. 45-67

Cai, Peihuo 蔡培火

- 1920 "Duinei genben wenti zhi yiduan [An Aspect of Domestic Foundation Problems] 對內根本問題之一端," *Taiwan seinen* [*Taiwan Youth*] 臺灣青年, Chinese Section, 1, 1 (Jul. 16, 1920), pp. 46-52
- 1922 "Shin Taiwan no kensetsu to Rōmaji [The Establishment of a New Taiwan and the Roman Script] 新臺灣の建設と羅馬字," *Taiwan* [*The Formosa*] 臺灣, the 3<sup>rd</sup> year, No. 6 (Sep. 8, 1922), pp. 38-43, reprinted in Zhang Hanyu 張漢裕 (ed.), *Cai Peihuo quanji* [*Complete Works of Cai Peihuo*] 蔡培火全集, Vol. 6 (Taipei: Wu Sanlian Taiwan Historical Materials Foundation 吳三連台灣史料基金會, 2000), pp. 209-221
- 2000 *Chap-hāng kóan-kiàn* [*My Ten Humble Opinions*] 十項管見, reprinted in Zhang Hanyu (ed.), *Cai Peihuo quanji* [*Complete Works of Cai Peihuo*] 蔡培火全集, Vol. 5 (Taipei: Wu Sanlian Taiwan Historical Materials Foundation 吳三連台灣史料基金會, 2000), pp. 5-174

Cao, Huimin 曹惠民

- 2010 *Chuzou de xiawa: Yiwei dalu xueren de Taiwan wenxueguan* [When Eva Leaves Home: A Mainlander Scholar's View on Taiwan Literature] 出走的夏娃：一位大陸學人的臺灣文學觀 (Taipei: Showwe Information Co. Ltd. 秀威資訊, 2010)

Chen, Peifeng 陳培豐

- 2008 "Zouxiang yishi tongren de riben minzu zhi 'dao'—'Tonghua' zhengce mailuo zhong huangmin wenxue de jiejian [Toward the Japanese 'Way' of Universal Brotherhood: The Border of Imperial-Subject Literature in the Context of 'Assimilation'] 走向一視同仁的日本民族之「道」——「同化」政策脈絡中皇民文學的界

線," in *Taiwan wenxueshi shuxie guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* [Writing Taiwan's Literary History International Conference Essay Collection] 臺灣文學史書寫國際學術研討會論文集, Vol. 2 (Kaohsiung: Chun-hui Publishing, 2008), pp. 139-172

Christofferson, Ethan

2012 *Negotiating Identity: Exploring Tensions between Being Hakka and Being Christian in Northwestern Taiwan* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2012)

Ding, Fengzhen 丁鳳珍 [Teng, Hongtin]

2006 "Taiyu kám you weilai 臺語 kám 有未來?," <http://taigi.fhl.net/Kateng/Kateng16.html>, last modified Mar. 26, 2006

Feibianshe 費邊社

2002 "Guoji jie 'gui' [Link up with the World?] 國際接「鬼」," *New Taiwan* 新臺灣新聞周刊, <http://www.newtaiwan.com.tw/bulletinview.jsp?bulletinid=44348>, last modified Jul. 15, 2002

Fu, Ren 負人

1932 "Taiwan huawen zabo [Miscellaneous Remarks on Taiwanese Vernacular] 臺灣話文雜駁," originally published in *Nanyin* [Southern Tone] 南音 (Jan. 1, 15; Feb. 1, 22; May 25, 1932), reprinted in Nakajima Toshirō (ed.), *1930 niandai Taiwan xiangtu wenxue lunzhan ziliao huibian* [Compiled Data Surrounding Taiwan's Nativist Literary Debate in the 1930s] 1930年代臺灣鄉土文學論戰資料彙編 (Kaohsiung: Chun-hui Publishing 春暉出版, 2003), pp. 191-221

He, Yilin 何義麟

2000 "'Guoyu' zhuanhuan guocheng zhong Taiwanren zuqun tezhi zhi zhengzhihua [The Politicization of Taiwanese' Ethnic Features in the Process of 'National Language' Transformation] 「國語」轉換過程中臺灣人族群特質之政治化," in Wakabayashi Masahiro and Wu Micha (eds.), *Taiwan chongceng jindaihua lunwenji* [Collection of Essays on Taiwan's Multi-layered Modernization] 臺灣重層近代化論文集 (Taipei: Bozhongzhe wenxue, 2000), pp. 449-479

Heylen, Ann

2001 "Dutch Language Policy and Early Formosan Literacy (1624-1662)," in Wei-ying Ku (ed.), *Approaches and Linguistics in Mainland China and Taiwan* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), pp. 199-251

- 2006 "Cai Peihuo and The Romanization Movement in Colonial Taiwan 蔡培火與殖民地臺灣的羅馬字運動," in Li Qinan 李勤岸 (ed.), *Bogi bunhak ti bogi kau-iak tong e kak-sek* [*The Role of Mother Tongue Literature in Mother Tongue Education*] 母語文學與母語教育中ê角色 (Taipei: National Taiwan Normal University, 2006), pp. 340-363
- 2012 *Japanese Models, Chinese Culture and the Dilemma of Taiwanese Language Reform* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012)
- Hsiu, A-chin 蕭阿勤  
1997 "Language Ideology in Taiwan: The KMT's Language Policy, the Tai-yu Language Movement, and Ethnic Politics," *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 18, 4 (1997), pp. 302-315; DOI: 10.1080/01434639708666322
- Huang, Chunqing 黃純青  
1931 "Taiwanhua gaizao lun [Opinions on Reforming Taiwanese Vernacular] 臺灣話改造論," initially serialized in *Taiwan xinwen* [*Taiwan News*] 臺灣新聞 from Oct. 15 to Oct. 28, 1931, reprinted in Nakajima Toshirō 中島利郎 (ed.), *1930 niandai Taiwan xiangtu wenxue lunzhan ziliao huibian* [*Compiled Data Surrounding Taiwan's Nativist Literary Debate in the 1930s*] 1930年代臺灣鄉土文學論戰資料彙編 (Kaohsiung: Chun-hui Publishing 春暉出版, 2003), pp. 121-143
- Huang, Xuanfan 黃宣範  
1995 *Yuyan, shehui yu zuqun yishi: Taiwan yuyan shehui xue de yanjiu* [*Language, Society and Ethnic Consciousness: The Study of Taiwan's Languages and Societies*] 語言、社會與族群意識：臺灣語言社會學的研究 (Taipei: Crane Publishing, 1995)
- Huang, Yingzhe 黃英哲  
2007 "*Qu Ribenhua*" "*Zai Zhongguohua*": *Zhanhou Taiwan wenhua chongjian (1945-1947)* ["*Uprooting Japan*" "*Implanting China*": *Cultural Reconstruction in Post-war Taiwan (1945-1947)*] 「去日本化」「再中國化」：戰後臺灣文化重建 (1945-1947) (Taipei: Rye Field Publications 麥田出版, 2007)
- Kleeman, Faye  
2003 *Under an Imperial Sun: Japanese Colonial Literature of Taiwan and the South* (Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press, 2003)
- Klötter, Henning  
2005 *Written Taiwanese* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005)



- Li, Rengui 李壬癸 [Li, Jen-kuei]  
 1992 *Taiwan nandao yuyan de yuyin fuhao xitong* [*The Phonetic System of Taiwan's Austronesian Languages*] 臺灣南島語言的語音符號系統 (Taipei: Committee for Education Research, Ministry of Education, 1992)
- Lin, Fengqi 林鳳岐  
 1931 "Wode gaizao Taiwan xiangtu wenxue de ti'an [My Proposal for Reforming Taiwan's Nativist Literature] 我的改造臺灣鄉土文學的提案," *Taiwan New People's News* 臺灣新民報, 391 (Nov. 21, 1931)
- Lin, Tai 林太, Li Wensu 李文甦 and Lin Shengxian 林聖賢  
 1992 *Zouguo shikong de yueliang* [*The Moon Crossing the Time and Space*] 走過時空的月亮 (Taichung: Morning Star Publishing 晨星出版, 1992)
- Lin, Zhiqi 林芷琪 and Dai Yude 戴煜德  
 2008 "Lin Jixiong: Xiandai wenshu fa waixiao meiguo [Lin Jixiong: The Export of Modern Written Taiwanese to America] 林繼雄：現代文書法外銷美國," in Yang Yunyan 楊允言, Zhang Xueqian 張學謙, and Lü Meiqin 呂美親 (eds.), *Taiyuwen yundong fangtan ji shiliao huibian* [*Interviews and Collection of Historical Data Related to Taiwanese Language Movement*] 臺語文運動訪談暨史料彙編 (Taipei: Academia Historica 國史館, 2008), pp. 161-178
- Liu, Liren 劉力仁 et al.  
 2008 "Gai hanyu pinyin, xuezhè buman yishi xingtai lingzheng [Change to *hanyu pinyin*, Scholars' Dissatisfaction with Ideology-centric Government Policies] 改漢語拼音，學者不滿意識形態領政," *Liberty Times Net*, <http://news.ltn.com.tw/news/life/paper/243700>, last modified Sep. 18, 2008
- Lü, Huizhen 呂慧珍  
 2002 "Jiuling niandai taiwan yuanzhumin xiaoshuo yanjiu [Research on the Indigenous Literature from Taiwan in the 1990s] 九〇年代臺灣原住民小說研究," MA dissertation (Chinese Culture University 中國文化大學, 2002)
- Medhurst, Walter  
 1832 *A Dictionary of the Hok-kèèn Dialect of the Chinese Language: According to the Reading and Colloquial Idioms: Containing about 12,000 Characters* (Macao: The Honorable East India Company's Press, 1832)

- Peng, Mingmin 彭明敏  
2009 *A Perfect Escape* 逃亡 (Taipei: Yushanshe 玉山社, 2009)
- Rimuy, Aki 里慕伊阿紀  
2010 *Shanyinghua de guxiang* [*Home of the Taiwan Cherries*] 山櫻花的故鄉 (Taipei: Rye Field Publications 麥田出版, 2010)
- Shaman, Ranpoan 夏曼藍波安  
1992 *Badaiwan de shenhua* [*The Myths of Badai Bay*] 八代灣的神話 (Taichung: Morning Star Publishing 晨星出版, 1992)
- Tsu, Jing  
2010 *Sound and Script in Chinese Diaspora* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010)
- Venuti, Lawrence  
1995 *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995)
- Walis, Naqang 娃利斯羅千  
1991 *Taiya jiaozong* [*Atayal Footprints*] 泰雅腳蹤 (Taichung: Morning Star Publishing 晨星出版, 1991)
- Walis, Nokan 瓦歷斯諾幹  
1992 *Fandao chuqiao* [*Revealing the Barbarian Knife*] 番刀出鞘 (Taipei: Daw Shiang Publishing Co. Ltd. 稻鄉出版, 1992)
- Wang, Horng-luen 汪宏倫  
2002 "Globalization and Institutional Isomorphism: Examining the Postmodern Condition of Taiwan's National Question in the Debate over the Romanization Policy of Chinese Characters 全球化與制度同形化：從拼音爭議看臺灣「國族問題」的後現代情境," *Societas: A Journal for Philosophical Study of Public Affairs* 政治與社會哲學評論, 3 (Dec., 2002), pp. 121-178; DOI: 10.6523/168451532002120003003
- Xie, Dexi 謝德錫  
1987 "Bianjuxia de rouxing zhengzhijia—Cai Peihuo," in Zhang Yanxian (ed.), *Taiwan jindai mingren zhi* [*A Record of Distinguished Figures in Modern Taiwan History*] 臺灣近代名人誌, Vol. 1 (Taipei: Independence Evening Post 自立晚報, 1987), pp. 87-105
- Yang, Yunyan 楊允言  
2011 "Weiceng zhuanxiang de baihuazi—Cai Peihuo [Unchanged Péh-ōe-jī—Cai Peihuo] 未曾轉向的白話字運動—蔡培火, <http://ip194097.ntcu.edu.tw/Ungian/Chokphin/Lunbun/CPH/CPH.PDF>, last modified Feb. 18, 2011

Yubas, Naogih 游霸士撓給赫

2003 *Taiya de gushi* [*Stories of the Atayal People*] 泰雅的故事  
(Taichung: Morning Star Publishing 晨星出版, 2003)

Zhang, Hanyu 張漢裕 (ed.)

2000 *Cai Peihuo quanji* [*Complete Works of Cai Peihuo*] 蔡培火全集,  
Vols. 1 & 3 & 5 & 6 (Taipei: Wu Sanlian Taiwan Historical  
Materials Foundation 吳三連台灣史料基金會, 2000)

Zhou, Youguang 周有光

1961 *Wenzi gaige gailun* [*An Overall Discussion on the Reform of  
Chinese Characters*] 文字改革概論 (Beijing: Xinhua Bookstore  
新華書店, 1961)