Romanization and Language Planning in Taiwan

The University of Texas at Arlington
P.O. Box 2485
Arlington, TX 76004, USA
Email: uibun@yahoo.com

Abstract

Chiung, Wi-vun Taiffalo. 2001. Romanization and Language Planning in Taiwan. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal 9*(1). Although Taiwan is currently a Hancha (Han characters)-dominated society, romanization was in fact the first writing system used in Taiwan. The first romanized orthography is the Sinkang manuscripts introduced by the Dutch missionaries in the first half of the seventeenth century. Thereafter, Han characters were imposed to Taiwan by the Sinitic Koxinga regime that followed in the second half of the seventeenth century. As the number of Han immigrants from China dramatically increased, Han characters gradually became the dominant writing system. At present, romanization for Mandarin Chinese is an auxiliary script simply used for transliteration purpose. As for Taiwanese romanization, it is mainly used by particular groups, such as church followers and the Taiwanese writing circle. This paper provides readers an overall introduction to the history and current development of romanization in Taiwan from the perspectives of literacy and sociolinguistics. **The University of Texas at Arlington.**

Romanization and Language Planning in Taiwan[1]

1. Introduction

Although Taiwan is currently a Hancha (Han characters)-dominated society, romanization once was the unique and first writing system used in Taiwan. This system of romanization was introduced by the Dutch missionaries in the first half of the seventeenth century. Thereafter, Han characters were imposed to Taiwan by the Sinitic Koxinga regime in the second half of the seventeenth century. As the number of Han immigrants from China dramatically increased, Han characters gradually became the dominant writing system in Taiwan. At present, only Han characters and modern standard Chinese are taught in Taiwan's national education system. In contrast, romanization is excluded from school education.

This paper intends to provide readers an overall introduction to the history and current development of romanization in Taiwan from the perspectives of literacy and sociolinguistics. In this paper, the socio-political background of Taiwan is described first, followed by an introduction to each romanization era, and ending with a conclusion on the future of romanized writing in Taiwan.

2. Socio-political background

Taiwan is a multilingual and multiethnic society. There are more than twenty native languages in Taiwan, including indigenous languages, Hakka, and Holo Taiwanese (Grimes, 1996). Generally speaking, there are currently four primary ethnic groups:

---

indigenous (1.7%), Hakka (12%), Holo (73.3%), and Mainlanders[2] (13%) (Huang, 1993:21).

In addition to being a multiethnic society, Taiwan has been colonized by several foreign regimes since the seventeenth century. In 1624 the Dutch occupied Taiwan and established the first alien regime in Taiwan. Roman script was then introduced to Taiwan by the Dutch. In 1661 *Koxinga*, a remnant force of the former Chinese *Ming* Dynasty, failed to restore the Ming Dynasty against the new *Qing* Dynasty, and therefore he retreated to Taiwan. Koxinga expelled the Dutch and established a sinitic regime in Taiwan as a base for retaking the Mainland. Confucianism and civil service examination were thus imposed to Taiwan since Koxinga's regime until the early twentieth century. The Koxinga regime was later annexed by the Chinese Qing Dynasty (1683). Two centuries later, the sovereignty of Taiwan was transferred from China to Japan as a consequence of the Sino-Japanese war in 1895. At the end of World War II, Japanese forces surrendered to the Allied Forces. *Chiang Kai-shek*, the leader of the Chinese Nationalist (KMT[3] or *Kuomintang*) took over Taiwan on behalf of the Allied Powers under General Order No.1 of September 2, 1945 (Peng, 1995:60-61). Simultaneously, Chiang Kai-shek was fighting against the Chinese Communist Party in Mainland China. In 1949, Chiang's troops were completely defeated and then pursued by the Chinese Communists. At that time, Taiwan's national status was supposed to be dealt with by a peace treaty among the fighting nations. However, because of Chiang's defeat in China, Chiang decided to occupy Taiwan as a base and from there he would fight back to the Mainland (Kerr, 1992; Ong, 1993; Peng, 1995; Su, 1980). Consequently, Chiang's political regime Republic of China[4] (R.O.C) was renewed in Taiwan and has remained there since 1949. The relationship between language,

---

[2] Mainly the immigrants came to Taiwan with the Chiang Kai-shek's KMT regime around 1945.
[3] KMT was the ruling party in Taiwan since 1945 until 2000, in which year *Chen Shui-bian*, the presidential candidate of opposition party Democratic Progressive Party was elected the new president.
[4] Republic of China was formerly the official name of the Chinese government (1912-1949) in China, but was replaced by the People's Republic of China (P.R.C) in 1949.

orthography and political status was shown in Table 1

Period	Political status	Spoken Languages	Writing Systems**
-1624	Indigenous society	Aboriginal	Tribal totem
1624-1661	Dutch colonialism	Aboriginal/Taiwanese*	Sinkang Classical Han
1661-1683	Koxinga colonialism	Aboriginal/Taiwanese	Classical Han Sinkang
1683-1895	Qing colonialism	Aboriginal/Taiwanese	Classical Han Koa-a-chheh Peh-oe-ji Sinkang
1895-1945	Japanese colonialism	Aboriginal/Taiwanese/Japanese	Japanese Classical Han Colloquial Han (in Taiwanese) Colloquial Han (in Mandarin) Peh-oe-ji Kana-Taiwanese
1945-2000	R.O.C colonialism	Aboriginal/Taiwanese/Mandarin	Chinese (Mandarin) Taiwanese Aboriginal

* Taiwanese means Hakka-Taiwanese and Holo-Taiwanese in this table.
** The order of listed writing systems in each cell of this column do not indicate the year of occurrences. The first listed orthography refers to the official written language adopted by its relevant governor.

Table 1. Relation between language, orthography and political status in Taiwan.

National Language Policy [5] or monolingual policy was adopted both during the Japanese and KMT occupations of Taiwan. In the case of KMT's monolingual policy, the Taiwanese people are not allowed to speak their vernaculars in public. Moreover, they are forced to learn Mandarin Chinese and to identify themselves as Chinese through the national education system (Cheng, 1996; Tiu[n], 1996). As Hsiau (1997:307) has pointed out, "the usage of Mandarin as a national language becomes a testimony of the Chineseness of the KMT state;" that is, the Chinese KMT regime is trying to convert the Taiwanese into Chinese through Mandarin monolingualism. Consequently, research such as Chan (1994) and Young (1988) has revealed that a language shift toward Mandarin is in progress. Huang

---

[5] For details, see Huang 1993.

(1993:160) goes so far as to suggest that the indigenous languages of Taiwan are all endangered.

3. Romanization prior to 1945

Romanization in Taiwan prior to 1945 can be divided into two eras. The first era of romanization is *Sinkang* writing, which was mainly devised for the indigenous languages, and occurred in the first half of the seventeenth century during the Dutch occupation of Taiwan, and ended up in the early nineteenth century. The second romanization is *Peh-oe-ji* writing. It was devised for Holo and Hakka Taiwanese languages, and it has existed in Taiwan since the second half of nineteenth century.

3.1. Sinkang Romanization (1624-early nineteenth century)

Sinkang writing was the first romanization and the first writing system in the history of Taiwan. It was devised by Dutch missionaries and employed mainly to the writing of Siraya, an indigenous language in southwest plain of Taiwan. Sinkang romanization[6] was not well documented until the discovery of so-called *Sinkang Bunsu* or Sinkang manuscripts in the nineteenth century.

Conversion to Christianity as well as exploiting resources were important purposes for the Dutch during their occupation of Taiwan. As Campbell described it, "during that period they [i.e., Dutch] not only carried on a profitable trade, but made successful efforts in educating and Christianising the natives; one missionary alone having established a number of schools and received over five thousand adults into the membership of the Reformed Church" (Campbell, 1903:vii). The natives around Sinkang[7] were first taught

---

[6] Although romanized writing in indigenous language had been mentioned in earlier historical materials such as *Chulo Koanchi* (Topographical and Historical Description of Chulo 1717), and *E-tamsui-sia Kiagi* (A Glossary of the Lower Tamsui Dialect 1763), romanization in Sinkang was not well known until the discovery of Sinkang manuscripts.
[7] Sinkang , originally spelled in *Sinkan*, was the place opposite to the *Tayouan* where the Dutch had settled in

Christianity through the learning of the romanization of Sinkang dialect. There were some textbooks and testaments written in romanized Sinkang, such as the The Gospel of St. Matthew in Formosan Sinkang Dialect and Dutch (*Het Heylige Euangelium Matthei en Jonannis Ofte Hagnau Ka D'llig Matiktik, Ka na Sasoulat ti Mattheus, ti Johannes appa. Overgefet inde Formosaansche tale, voor de Inwoonders van Soulang, Mattau, Sinckan, Bacloan, Tavokan, en Tevorang*.), which was translated and published by Daniel Gravius in 1661 (Campbell, 1996; Lai, 1990:121-123).

After Koxinga drove the Dutch out from Taiwan, the roman scripts were still used by those plain tribes for some period. There were several manuscripts found after those native languages disappeared. Those manuscripts were written either in language(s) of native aborigines or they were bilingual texts with romanization and Han characters. Most of the manuscripts were either sale contracts, mortgage bonds, or leases (Naojiro, 1933:IV). Because most of those manuscripts were found in Sinkang areas and were written in Sinkang language, they were named Sinkang Manuscripts by scholars, or *Hoan-a-khe* (the contract of barbarians) by the public (Lai, 1990:125-127).

There are 141 examples of Sinkang Manuscripts discovered to date, the earliest manuscript dated 1683, and the most recent one dated 1813. In other words, those indigenous people continued to use the romanization for over a century-and-a-half after the Dutch had left Taiwan (Naojiro, 1933:XV).

3.2. Peh-oe-ji Romanization (1865-present)

If Sinkang writing represents the first foreign missionary activities in Taiwan, then the development of *Peh-oe-ji*[8] reveals the comeback of missionary influences after the Dutch withdrawal from Taiwan.

More and more missionaries came to preach in China in the seventeenth century, even

---

1624. The present location is *Sin-chhi* of *Tainan* county.

[8] For details about Peh-oe-ji, see Cheng 1977 and Chiung 2000b.

though there were several restrictions on foreign missionaries under the Qing Dynasty. The restrictions on foreign missionaries were continued until the Treaty of *Tientsin* was signed between Qing Dynasty and foreign countries in 1860. Taiwan, at that time, was under the control of Qing Dynasty, therefore, foreign missionaries were allowed after that treaty. Consequently, the first mission after the Dutch, settled in *Taioan-hu*[9] by missionary James L. Maxwell and his assistants in 1865 (Hsu, 1995:6-8; Lai ,1990:277-280).

Before missionaries arrived in Taiwan, there were already several missionary activities in southeast China. They had started developing romanization of some languages such as Southern Min and Hakka. For instance, the first textbook for learning the romanization of the Amoy[10] dialect, *Tngoe Hoan Ji Chho Hak* (Amoy Spelling Book) was published by John Van Nest Talmage in 1852 in Amoy. That romanization scheme was called Poe-oe-ji in Taiwan. It means the script of vernacular speech in contrast to the complicated Han characters of *wenyen*.

Peh-oe-ji was originally devised and promoted by missionaries for religious purposes. Consequently, most of its applications and publications are related to church activities. Those applications and publications of Peh-oe-ji since the nineteenth century can be summarized into the following six categories: 1) textbooks, 2) dictionaries, 3) translation of the Bible, catechisms, and religious tracts, 4) newspaper, 5) private note-taking or writing letters, and 6) other publications, such as physiology, math, and novels.

Missionaries' linguistic efforts on the romanization are reflected in various romanized dictionaries. Medhurst's *A Dictionary of the Hok-keen Dialect of the Chinese Language* published in 1837 is considered the first existing romanized dictionary of Southern Min compiled by western missionary (Ang, 1996:197-259). Douglas' *Chinese-English Dictionary of the Vernacular or Spoken Language of Amoy* of 1873 is regarded as the

---

[9] Present *Tailam* city.

[10] Amoy was a dialect of Southern Min, and was regarded as mixed *Chiang-chiu* and *Choan-chiu* dialects. The Amoy dialect was usually chosen by missionaries as a standard for Southern Min.

remarkable dictionary of influence on the orthography of Peh-oe-ji (Ang, 1993b:1-9). After Douglas' dictionary, most romanized dictionaries and publications followed his orthography without or with just minor changes. Generally speaking, missionaries' linguistic efforts on Southern Min and Peh-oe-ji have reached a remarkable achievement since Douglas's dictionary (Ang, 1993:5). William Campbell's dictionary *E-mng-im Sin Ji-tian* (*A Dictionary of the Amoy Vernacular Spoken throughout the Prefectures of Chin-chiu, Chiang-chiu and Formosa* 1913), which was the first Peh-oe-ji dictionary published in Taiwan, is the most widespread romanized dictionary in Taiwan. This dictionary has been published in fourteen editions by 1987 (Ang, 1996; Lai, 1990).

The first New Testament in romanized Amoy, *Lan e Kiu-chu Ia-so Ki-tok e Sin-iok* was published in 1873, and the first Old Testament *Ku-iok e Seng Keng* in 1884. The wide use of Poe-oe-ji in Taiwan was promoted by the missionary Reverend Thomas Barclay while he published monthly newspaper *Tai-oan-hu-sia[n] Kau-hoe-po*[11] (Taiwan Prefectural City Church News) in July 1885. In addition to publications related to Christianity, there were some other publications written in Peh-oe-ji, such as *Pit Soan e Chho Hak* (Fundamental Mathematics) by *Ui-lim Ge* in 1897, *Lai Goa Kho Khan-ho-hak* (The Principles and Practice of Nursing) by G. Gushue-Taylor in 1917, the novel *Chhut Si-Soa[n]* (Line between Life and Death) by *Khe-phoan Te[n]* in 1926, and the collection of commentaries *Chap-hang Koan-kian* (Opinions on Ten Issues) by *Poe-hoe Chhoa* in 1925.

Usually, the religious believers apply Peh-oe-ji writing to their daily life after they acquire the skill of romanization. For example, they may use Peh-oe-ji as a skill of note taking or writing letters to their daughters or sons or friends in addition to reading the Bible. Peh-oe-ji was widely used among the church[12] people in Taiwan prior to 1970s.[13] Among

---

[11] Taiwan Prefectural City Church News has changed its title several times, and the recent title (1988) is *Taioan Kau-hoe Kong-po* (Taiwan Church News). It was published in Peh-oe-ji until 1970, and thereafter it switched to Mandarin Chinese (Lai, 1990: 17-19).
[12] Especially the Presbyterian Church in Taiwan.
[13] *Taioan Kau-hoe Kong-po* (Taiwan Church News), which was originally published in Peh-oe-ji, switched to Mandarin Chinese in 1970. I use this year as an indicator to the change of Peh-oe-ji circulation.

its users, women were the majority. Most of those women did not command any literacy except Peh-oe-ji. Today, there are still a few among the elder generations especially women who read only Peh-oe-ji.

Although Peh-oe-ji was originally devised for religious purposes, it is no longer limited to religious applications after the contemporary *Taibun*[14] movement was raised in the late 1980s. Peh-oe-ji has been adopted by many Taibun promoters as one of the romanized writing systems to write Taiwanese. For example, famous Taibun periodicals such as *Taioanji*, *Tai-bun Thong-sin* and *Taibun Bong-Po* adopt Peh-oe-ji as the romanization for writing Taiwanese. In addition, there were recently a series of novels translated from world literatures into Peh-oe-ji in a planned way by the members of *5% Tai-ek Ke-oe*[15] (5% Project of Translation in Taiwanese) since 1996.

In short, the Peh-oe-ji was the ground of romanization of modern Taiwanese colloquial writing. Even though there were several different schemes of romanization for writing Taiwanese, many of them were derived from Peh-oe-ji.[16] Peh-oe-ji and its derivatives are the most widely used romanization even nowadays.

For readers' better understanding of Peh-oe-ji, how Peh-oe-ji works in the *E-mng-im Sin Ji-tian* is demonstrated below. The symbols for representing the consonants, vowels, and tones[17] in Taiwanese are given in Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4. Generally speaking, there is a one-to-one relationship between orthographic symbols and phonemes as shown in Table 2 and Table 3. The only exception is the pair of *ch* and *ts* that both refer to the

---

[14] Taibun literally means Taiwanese literature or Taiwanese writing. It refers to the orthography issue in the Taiwanese language movement since 1980s. For details of the modern movement of written Taiwanese, see Chiung (1999:33-49).

[15] In November of 1995, some Taiwanese youths who were concerned about the writing of Taiwanese decided to deal with the Taiwanese modernization and loanwords through translation from foreign language into Taiwanese. The organization 5% Project of Translation in Taiwanese was then established on February 24, 1996. Its members have to contribute 5% of their income every month to the 5% fund. The first volume includes 7 books. They are Lear Ong, Kui-a Be-chhia, Mi-hun-chhiuⁿ e Kui-a, Hoa-hak-phin e Hian-ki, Thiⁿ-kng Cheng e Loan-ai Ko·-su, Pu-ho·-lang e Lek-su, and Opera Lai e Mo·-sin-a, published by Tai-leh press in November 1996.

[16] For more information about different romanized schemes, see Iuⁿ 1999.

[17] Originally, there were 8 tones in Taiwanese. But, nowadays tone 6 has merged with tone 2.

phoneme /ts/. The different usages between /ts/ and /ch/ are based on vowel position. That is, /ts/ preceding back vowels such as *tso*, and /ch/ preceding front vowels such as *chi*. For nasal sounds, a superscript n is added to indicate nasalization, such as in the example of *ti^n* (sweet). After phonemes are represented, tone marks are imposed to the nuclei of syllables and a hyphen is added between syllables, such as *ô·-kóe-khiau* (Taiwanese taro cake). Because Taiwanese is a tone language with rich tone sandhi, there can be several ways to represent tones. In the design of Peh-oe-ji, the base tone or underlying tone of each syllable is chosen and represented by its tone mark. For example, the word Taiwanese taro cake must be represented by its underlying form ô·-kóe-khiau rather than surface form ò·-koe-khiau (this is the form in actual pronunciation).

I.P.A.

b	ts	tsh	g	h	dz	k	kh	ɾ	m	n	ŋ	p	ph	s	t	th	ts

Peh-oe-ji

b	ch	chh	g	h	j	k	kh	l	m	n	ng	p	ph	s	t	th	ts

Table 2. Symbols for Taiwanese consonants in the spelling of Peh-oe-ji.

I.P.A.

a	e	i	o	ə	u

Peh-oe-ji

a	e	i	o·	o	u

Table 3. Symbols for Taiwanese vowels in the spelling of Peh-oe-ji.

Tones	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th
Hancha	君	滾	棍	骨	裙	-	郡	滑
Peh-oe-ji	kun	kún	kùn	kut	kûn	-	kūn	kút
I.P.A	˧	˥˧	˧˩	˧	˨˦	-	˧	˥

Table 4. Inventory of tone marks in the orthography of Peh-oe-ji.

4. Romanization after 1945

Romanization after 1945 can be categorized into romanized Chinese and romanized Taiwanese in terms of the language the romanization is used for. The development of Chinese romanization can be traced back to the KMT's language planning in China in the first half of the twentieth century. Generally speaking, Chinese romanization is not considered by the KMT as an independent writing system, but rather as a set of phonetic symbols for transcribing Han characters. As for the Taiwanese romanization, it is intentionally ignored (once forbidden) by the KMT regime, but it is the main concern of the promoters of the Taibun movement. For Taibun promoters, romanization is regarded as an independent orthography and thus is currently adopted as one of the proposals for writing Taiwanese.

4.1. Romanization for Mandarin Chinese

In the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, the language issues with which the Chinese government and the general public were concerned with were: 1) the unification of pronunciation (of Han characters) and the formation of a national language, and 2) the transition of written language from classical Han (*wenyen*) to colloquial writing (*baihua*).[18]

---

[18] For details, see Chen 1999; DeFrancis 1950; Gao 1992; Jhou 1978; Norman 1988; Png 1965; Tsao 1999.

Mandarin was eventually chosen as the national language and the standard pronunciation for reading Han characters. At that time, neither domestically created phonetic symbols nor western roman scripts were considered independent orthographies, but auxiliary tools for learning the national language (DeFrancis, 1950:221-236; Norman, 1988:257-263). *Jhuyin Zimu* or Phonetic Alphabet, a set of symbols derived from radicals of Han characters was devised and proposed by the Committee on Unification of Pronunciation (*Duyin Tongyihue*) in 1913 and later officially adopted by the Chinese government in 1918 as a tool for learning the correct pronunciation of the national language. It was revised slightly in 1928 and renamed *Jhuyin Fuhao*[19] or Phonetic Symbols (henceforth NPS1) in 1930. This scheme was used in China until 1958 when *Hanyu Pinyin* (henceforth HP) was promulgated. Jhuyin Fuhao was brought to Taiwan by the KMT in 1945 and it has been taught through Taiwan's national education system and has been in continuous use since then.

The first romanized phonetic scheme proposed and recognized by the Chinese government was the *Guoyu Luomazi* or National Language Romanization, which was approved in 1928 (Chen, 1999:182). Although Guoyu Luomazi was approved by the government, in reality it was not promoted for practical use. It was even less widely used in comparison to another romanized scheme *Latinxua sin wenz*[20] (Norman, 1988:259). Guoyu Luomazi was later brought together with Jhuyin Fuhao to Taiwan by the KMT during the Chiang Kai-shek occupation of Taiwan. The Guoyu Luomazi scheme was later revised and renamed *Guoyu jhuyin fuhao di er shih*[21] or National Phonetic Symbols, 2nd

---

[19] The purpose of using Jhuyin Fuhao 'sound-annotating symbols' is to "dispel any faint hope that they were to be used as bona fide writing systems" (Chen, 1999:189). This scheme was later called *Guoyu jhuyin fuhao di yi shih* or National Phonetic Symbols, 1st Scheme in Taiwan (henceforth NPS1).

[20] Latinxua sin wenz was first published in 1929 and employed among the 10,000 Chinese living in the USSR. It was considered an autonomous writing system and later introduced to China. This scheme was very popular especially in the Northwestern part of China where were under the control of the Chinese Communist Party at that time (Chen, 1999:184-186).

[21] Guoyu Luomazi was renamed National Phonetic Symbols 2nd Scheme, to distinguish it from the 1st scheme of Jhuyin Fuhao.

Scheme (henceforth NPS2) and promulgated by Taiwan's Ministry of Education (MOE) in 1986.

Although both NPS1 and NPS2 were officially promulgated by the KMT regime in Taiwan, only NPS1 is taught in schools and is actually used as an auxiliary tool for learning to pronounce Mandarin. In contrast, NPS2 is excluded from school curriculum and is simply used to transliterate Chinese names into other languages (Chen, 1999:189). As a matter of fact, not only NPS2 but also other traditional romanized schemes devised by foreigners, such as Wade-Giles and Postal schemes are used for Mandarin transliteration.[22] Moreover, the majority of Taiwanese people who are not educated in the romanized schemes, simply adapt the English K.K. phonetic symbols[23] to transliterate as they see fit (Yu, 1999). Consequently, the transliteration in romanization is in a serious chaotic situation. For example, 曹 may be transliterated *tsao*, *tsau*, *ts'ao*, *ts'au*, *chao*, *chau*, *chhao*, *chhau*, *c'ao*, *c'au*, and so on.

As a result of this chaos, much attention was paid to transliteration issues, with the government trying to unify the romanized schemes in the late 1990s. In April 1999, a national conference on transliteration schemes was held by the MOE, focusing on the review of the four existing romanized schemes, i.e. Wade-Giles, NPS2, HP, and *Tongyong Pinyin* (TYP).[24] In July of the same year, the Executive Yuan (*Heng-cheng-i^n*; similar to the cabinet in western countries) announced that HP would be adopted as the standardization for future transliteration. However, this announcement soon aroused opposition and protests against the HP system in August (Chiang, Luo, Tiu^n, & Yu, 2000). Consequently, the final decision on a transliteration scheme was intentionally left until after the presidential election in March 2000. However, the result of the 2000 presidential election

---

[22] Even for the government, different departments and different counties may use different romanized schemes.

[23] In Taiwan, the K.K. phonetic symbols are taught in schools serving as instructions of pronunciations in learning English.

[24] For more discussion on these schemes, see Cheng 2000; Tsao 1999.

fell short of the KMT's expectation. The pro-Taiwanese Independence Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) won the election and the KMT lost power for the first time since 1945 after ruling Taiwan for fifty-five years.

Since the 2000 presidential election, the Mandarin transliteration issue has remained unresolved and it has even brought more heated controversy and conflict between the new government and the pro-Chinese opposition parties, i.e. KMT, People First Party (*Cinmindang*), and New Party (*Sindang*). On September 16 of that year, the Mandarin Promotion Council (*Guoyu Tuesing Ueyuanhoe*) under the MOE of the new government approved the TYP for Mandarin transliteration. In October that too soon aroused criticism and protests from the opposition parties. *Ma Yingjiu*, the KMT mayor of Taipei started a boycott against the new government on the pinyin issue. He criticized the TYP saying that it is not an international standard for Mandarin Chinese; it would create an obstacle for Taiwan to achieve globalization. He further asserted that Hanyu Pinyin would have to be adopted to achieve this objective (Jhongshih, 2000; Jhongyangse, 2000; Mingrihbao, 2000).

This 'pinyin controversy,' or dispute over mandarin transliteration schemes has been generally considered the biggest crisis to the new government aside from the 'anti-nuclear power plant' event.[25] In fact, the current pinyin controversy is probably the most widely broadcasted dispute over the issues of transliteration that has ever occurred in Taiwan. One may be curious as to why a linguistic issue could result in such an ire and political crisis. There are two contributing factors: 1) the different national identity possessed by different parties, 2) the ruling DPP is a minority party in the Legislative Yuan (*Lip-hoat-i^n*; similar to congress).

The conflicts between TYP and HP fundamentally resulted from different perspectives

---

[25] The 4th nuclear power plant in Taiwan was approved and under construction in the 1990s during the period of KMT government. After the DPP became the ruling party, the new government stopped its construction. Consequently, it aroused protests and boycott from the opposition parties, which proposed to unseat the new president Chen Shui-bian.

of national identity rather than different linguistic designs. From the point of view of Chinese nationalism, it is important to avoid contributing to pro-Taiwanese Independence activities. During the old days while the pro-unification KMT was a ruling party, there was no doubt or problem to using the Guoyu Luomazi with regard to the nationalism issue. However, the pro-unification opinion has been decreasing since the late 1980s when the native political movement started flourishing (Chiung, 1999:8-11). Moreover, the pro-Taiwanese Independence DPP became the ruling party after the 2000 presidential election. Under this strong pro-Taiwanese independence atmosphere, using a transliteration scheme different from China was considered an attempt of the new government to move toward Taiwanese independence.[26] Although Mayer Ma criticized the TYP scheme of not being an internationally recognized system, what he really implied was that TYP was distinct from the 'Chinese PRC standard.'[27] What really concerned Ma was that TYP would lead to a further estrangement between Taiwan and China (Kang, 2000; Te, 2000).

Although the DPP won the 2000 presidential election, the new government could do little until the next election of legislative representatives in the end of 2001. The fact that the KMT still has the majority in the Legislative Yuan has inflated the pinyin controversy. To some extent, what mostly interested the KMT were fronts to boycott the new government rather than to arrive at a finding on a transliteration scheme. In this case, to unseat the new president was probably the first priority, and the adoption of the HP was simply the second. For example, those who accused the new government of not adopting the HP did not accuse the KMT of promulgating the NPS2.

In order to better understand the pinyin controversy, the history and differences

---

[26] For example, in a press conference on November 29, 2000 the *Guotaiban* (Office for Taiwan Affairs) of the PRC claimed that someone was trying to promote Taiwanese independence in the areas of culture and education through using a different transliteration scheme from Hanyu pinyin.

[27] For example, if Ma really was concerned about the international standardization and globalization, he should also abandon the Jhuyin Fuhao, which is used in Taiwan only.

between TYP and HP, are briefly described in the following. TYP (Tongyong Pinyin), literally means general or common transliteration scheme. TYP was proposed and devised by a research fellow at Academia Sinica, *Yu Buocyuan* and his associates in the late 1990s. The fundamental purpose of this new design was to find the maximum transferability between the Hanyu Pinyin scheme and Taiwanese vernacular scheme. In other words, Yu tried to devise a transliteration scheme, which could be used for both Mandarin and Taiwanese languages without lethal conflicts in learning. There were two proposals for TYP, i.e. TYP1 (*Ka-sek*) and TYP2 (*It-sek*) (Cheng, 2000; Yu, 2000). In the scheme of TYP1, the letter p represents [p] in IPA; however, in TYP2, the letter p represents [p^h], and b represents [p]. TYP2 was the scheme involved in the pinyin controversy. Generally speaking, TYP2 is considered to be the revised version of Hanyu Pinyin, with minor change such as the initial symbols q, x, and zh (see Table 5). It was estimated that there were around 15% differences between transliterations using TYP2 and HP (Chiang & Huang, 2000).

HP (Hanyu Pinyin) literally means transliteration scheme for Han language (to be exactly, only for Mandarin). HP was designed during the mid-1950s in China and officially promulgated in 1958 by the government of the People's Republic of China. HP is currently considered the only legal transliteration scheme in China for the transcription of modern standard Chinese (Wenzi, 1983). It was also adopted by the International Standardization Organization in 1982 as the standard form for transcribing Chinese words (Chen, 1999:187). Although the original design of HP was on the ground of autonomous orthography, it has been continuously claimed by the Chinese government that HP is intended for learners as an aid in learning standard Chinese (Chen, 1999:188-189; Hannas, 1997:24-25; Norman, 1988:263; Wenzi, 1983:6-21). In fact, not only HP, but also other phonemic writing schemes, such as Guoyu Luomazi and Jhuyin Fuhao have always been prevented from serving as independent writing systems. From the point of view of Chinese nationalism, Han characters embody the function of linguistic uniformity. In contrast,

alphabetic writing would result in linguistic polycentrism and further be harmful to national unity (DeFrancis, 1950:221-236; Norman, 1988:263). Apparently, national and political unity is considered to have priority over literacy by the Chinese government.

IPA
p ph m f t th n l k kh h tɕ tɕh ɕ tʂ tʂh ʂ ɹ ts tsh s

Hanyu Pinyin 漢語拼音
b p m f d t n l g k h j q x zh ch sh r z c s

Tongyong Pinyin 通用拼音
b p m f d t n l g k h ji ci si jh ch sh r z c s

Jhuyin Fuhao 注音符號
ㄅ ㄆ ㄇ ㄈ ㄉ ㄊ ㄋ ㄌ ㄍ ㄎ ㄏ ㄐ ㄑ ㄒ ㄓ ㄔ ㄕ ㄖ ㄗ ㄘ ㄙ

Table 5. Mandarin consonants represented by IPA, HP, TYP, and Jhuyin Fuhao.

4.2. Romanization for Taiwanese

At present, because spoken Taiwanese is not well standardized, there are correspondingly many proposals for writing Taiwanese. Those proposals may be generally divided into two groups based on their scripts: Han character script[28] and non-Han character script. Non-Han character may be further divided into two subtypes: A new alphabet, such as *Ganbun* (Hangul-like[29] scheme) designed by Ang Ui-jin, or a ready-made alphabet, which makes use of the present roman letters or Jhuyin Fuhao to write Taiwanese. To better understand the development of non-Han schemes, the number of each category is listed in Table 6 based on the 64 collections by Iu[n] (1999).

---

[28] This is the traditional way to write Taiwanese in classical style, as Hancha in classical Korean prior to the invention of Hangul. There are several problems encountered when writing colloquial speech by using Han characters. For more details in relation to this issue, see Chiung 1999 (50-51) and 1998.
[29] *Ganbun* is a Hangul-like system, which takes its idea from the design of Korean Hangul.

	Roman script	Revised Jhuyin Fuhao	Revised Kana	Hangul -like	*Total*
-1895	1	0	0	0	1
1985-1945	4	0	2	0	6
1945-1987	15	3	0	1	19
1987-	30	6	0	2	38
Total	50	9	2	3	64

Table 6. Number of each category of non-Han schemes.

Owing to the wide use of the personal computer and electronic networks in Taiwan since the 1990s, most orthographic designs, that need extra technical support other than regular Mandarin Chinese software could not survive. Therefore, the majority of recent Taiwanese writing schemes were either in Han characters-only, roman script-only or mixed scripts with roman and Han.[30] At present, there are mainly three competing romanized schemes in relation to the Taiwanese language, i.e. Peh-oe-ji, TLPA, and TYP. Among the romanization proposals, Peh-oe-ji is definitely regarded as an independent orthography rather than just a transliteration scheme (Cheng, 1999; Chiung, 2000b). However, so far there is no common agreement of whether TLPA and TYP would be treated as writing systems or simply transliteration schemes.[31]

Peh-oe-ji is the traditional romanization for writing Taiwanese (Holo and Hakka) as introduced in the previous section. Prior to the Taibun movement in the 1980s, Peh-oe-ji was the only romanized scheme in practical use for writing Taiwanese. Compared to other romanized schemes, Peh-oe-ji is still the romanization with the richest inventory of written work, including dictionaries, textbooks, literature works, and other publications in many areas (Iu[n], 1999).

---

[30] Roman and Han mixed scheme was proposed mainly to solve the problem that some native Taiwanese words do not have appropriate Han characters (Cheng, 1990, 1989). To some extent, it is like the mixture style of Korean Hancha plus Hangul or Japanese Kanji plus Kana. For more discussion on these three Taiwanese schemes, see Chiung 1999 and Tiu[n] 1998.

[31] For comparisons and contrasts between Peh-oe-ji and TLPA, see Cheng 1999 and Khou 1999.

TLPA or Taiwanese Language Phonetic Alphabet was proposed in the early 1990's by the Association of Taiwanese Languages.[32] The major motivation for the TLPA designers to modify Peh-oe-ji is to overcome inconvenience in typing some special symbols of Peh-oe-ji in modern computer network. TLPA has been revised several times, and the latest version was finalized in 1997. In January 1998, the MOE announced that TLPA would be adopted as the official romanized scheme for Hakka and Holo Taiwanese. The hasty decision adopting TLPA immediately aroused fierce opposition from Peh-oe-ji users and Taibun-promoting groups.[33] Based on the petition proposed by the Taibun groups against TLPA, we can summarize three factors initiating the controversy. First, the MOE's procedure for determining the romanized scheme for Taiwanese was considered insufficiently detailed. Taibun groups object, moreover, that TLPA was approved without negotiations with the public in advance. The protestors even considered the whole event a strategy of the MOE to polarize Taibun groups. Second, the TLPA was simply a theoretical design and had never seen practical use. However, Peh-oe-ji has been used since the nineteenth century, and thus it has a long history of literacy convention. Third, Peh-oe-ji is definitely orthography rather than a set of transliteration symbols. However, the designers of TLPA have never clarified whether or not TLPA is intended to be a writing system.[34] The ambiguity of orthographic status of the TLPA can not conform to the expectation of the protestors.

Briefly speaking, the major differences between Peh-oe-ji and TLPA are phonetic symbols, tone marks and spelling rules. For the phonetic symbols, there are three differences. That is, *ch* and *chh* in Peh-oe-ji were modifid and became *c* and *ch* in TLPA; back vowel *o·* was represented by *oo* in TLPA; and superscript *n* was replaced with regular

---

letters *nn*, such as in the case of *tinn* (sweet). In TLPA, tones were represented by Arabic numerals. For example, tai5 (platform) represents 5th tone. As for the spelling, some conventional spellings such as *eng*, *ek*, *oa*, and *oe* were spelled as *ing*, *ik*, *ua*, and *ue*.

5. The Future of Romanization in Taiwan

Although any romanization is much more efficient [35] than Han characters, romanizations are currently not widely accepted by people in Taiwan.[36] Writing in roman script is regarded as the low language in digraphia.[37] There are several reasons for this phenomenon:

First, people's preference for Han characters is caused by their internalized socialization. Because Han characters have been adopted as the official orthography for two thousand years, being able to master Han characters well is the mark of a scholar in the Han cultural areas. Writing in scripts other than Han characters may be regarded as childish writing (Chiung, 2000b). For example, when *Tai-oan-hu-sia^n Kau-hoe-po*, the first Taiwanese newspaper in romanization, was published in 1885, the editor and publisher Rev. Thomas Barclay exhorted readers of the newspaper not to "look down at Peh-pe-ji; do not regard it as childish writing" (Barclay, 1885).

Second, misunderstanding of the nature and function of Han characters has enforced people's preference for Han characters. Many people believe that Han characters are ideally suited for all members of the Han language family, which includes Holo and Hakka Taiwanese. They believe that Taiwanese can not be expressed well without Han characters because Han characters are logographs and each character expresses a distinctive semantic

---

[35] Regarding the efficiency issues, refers to Chiung 2000b; DeFrancis 1996, 1990.
[36] For more details about the public's attitudes toward Han characters and romanization, see Chiung 1999.
[37] Digraphia, which parallels to Ferguson's (1959) idea of diglossia, has been defined by Dale (1980:5) as "the use of two (or more) writing systems for representing a single language," or by DeFrancis (1984:59) as "the use of two or more different systems of writing the same language." For discussion on the digraphia in Taiwan, refer to Chiung 2001 and Tiu^n 1998.

function. In addition, many people believe Lian Heng's (1987) claim that "there are no Taiwanese words which do not have corresponding characters." However, DeFrancis (1996:40) has pointed out that Han characters are "primarily sound-based and only secondarily semantically oriented." In DeFrancis' opinion, it is a myth to regard Han characters as logographic (DeFrancis, 1990). He even concludes that "the inefficiency of the system stems precisely from its clumsy method of sound representation and the added complication of an even more clumsy system of semantic determinatives" (DeFrancis, 1996:40). If Han characters are logographs, the process involved in reading them should be different from phonological or phonetic writings. However, research conducted by Tzeng et al. has pointed out that "the phonological effect in the reading of the Chinese characters is real and its nature seems to be similar to that generated in an alphabetic script" (Tzeng, Hung, & Tzeng, 1992:128). Their research reveals that the reading process of Han characters is similar to that for phonetic writing. In short, there is no sufficient evidence to support the view that the Han characters are logographs.

The third reason that romanization is not widespread in Taiwan is because of political factors. Symbolically, writing in Han characters was regarded as a symbol of Chinese culture by Taiwan's ruling Chinese KMT regime. Writing in scripts other than Han characters was forbidden because it was perceived as a challenge to Chinese culture and Chinese nationalism. For example, the romanized New Testament *Sin Iok* was once seized in 1975 because writing in roman script was regarded as a challenge to the orthodox status of Han characters (Li, 1996).

Usually, many factors are involved in the choice and shift of orthography. From the perspective of social demand, most people in current Taiwan have already attained the reading and writing skills in Han characters to a certain level. It seems not easy for them to abandon their literacy conventions and shift to a completely new orthography. However, for the younger generation who are at the threshold of literacy, a new orthography may be attractive to them if it is much easier to learn to read and write. If education in romanized

writing could be included in schools and taught to the beginners, romanization could quickly be a competing orthography to Han writing.

From the perspective of politics, political transitions usually affect the language situation (Si, 1996). In the case of Taiwan, the current ambiguous national status and diversity of national identity reflect people's uncertain determinations on the issues of written Taiwanese. On the other hand, people's uncertain determinations on the Taibun issues also reflect the political controversy on national issues of Taiwan. My research (Chiung, 1999) on the attitudes of Taiwanese college students toward written Taiwanese reveals that national identity is one of the most significant factors that affect students' attitudes toward Taiwanese writing. It is true that national identity played an important role in the orthographic transition of Vietnam, where romanization eventually replaced Han characters and became the official orthography (Chiung, 2000a; DeFrancis, 1977). Will this replacement happen to the case of Taiwan? Whether or not roman script will replace Han characters and Taiwanese replace Chinese depends on people's orthographic demands and their attitudes toward written Taiwanese. Moreover, people's national identity will play a crucial role in the transition. From my point of view, Han characters, at least, will retain their dominant status until the Taiwanese people are released from their ambiguity in regard to national identity.

6. Conclusion

For Mandarin Chinese, it is apparent that roman script will not be adopted as a writing system in the foreseeable future. As for the Taiwanese languages, there is no significant sign so far that romanization such as the existing Peh-oe-ji will spread or be promoted to a national status. There are three crucial landmarks in regard to whether or not Taiwanese romanization will move toward official orthography and be widely used. First, whether or not romanization will be included in school curriculum. No matter whether

romanization is taught as a transliteration scheme or as orthography, it is the important first step for the promotion of romanized writing since most Taiwanese people are 'illiterate' in romanization. The second crucial landmark is the attitude of the new DPP government towards roman script and Han characters, and the political stability of the new government if it decides to promote romanization. The third one is the common agreement on romanization among the Taiwanese language promoters. For a long while, the disagreement on romanized scheme has only added to the chaos about the romanization question and shaken the promotion of written Taiwanese. The agreement can thus improve the promotion of romanization.

References

Ang, Ui-jin. (1993). Introduction to Douglas' Amoy-English dictionary [Tou-ka-tek E-eng Tai-su-tian Kankai]. In *A Collection of Southern Min Classic Dictionaries* [*Ban-lam-gi Keng-tian Su-su Hui-pian*]. (4), 1-9. Taipei: Woolin Press.

Ang, Ui-jin. (1996). *A List of Historical Materials: Language Category* [*Tai-oan Bun-hian Su-bok Te-kai : Gi-gian-lui*]. Taipei: NCL-Taiwan.

Barclay, Thomas. (1885). *Taiwan Prefectural City Church News* [*Tai-oan-hu-sia^n Kau-hoe-po*]. No.1.

Campbell, William. (1992). *Formosa Under the Dutch.* (originally published in 1903). Taipei: SMC Publishing Inc.

Campbell, William. (1996). *The Gospel of St. Matthew in Formosan (Sinkang Dialect) With Corresponding Versions in Dutch and English Edited From Gravius's Edition of 1661.* (originally published in 1888). Taipei: SMC Publishing Inc.

Chan, Hui-chen. (1994). *Language Shift in Taiwan: Social and Political Determinants.* Ph.D. dissertation: Georgetown University.

Chen, Ping. (1996). Modern written Chinese, dialects, and regional identity. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 20 (3), 223-43.

Chen, Ping. (1999). *Modern Chinese: History and Sociolinguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cheng, Robert L. (1989). *Essays on Written Taiwanese* [*Kia^n Hiong Phiau-chun-hoa e Tai-oan-oe-bun*]. Taipei: Independence Press.

Cheng, Robert L. (1990). *Essays on Taiwan's Sociolinguistic Problems* [*Ian-pian tiong e*

Tai-oan Sia-hoe Gi-bun]. Taipei: Independence Press.

Cheng, Robert L. (1996). Democracy and language policy [Bin-chu-hoa Cheng-ti Bok-phiau kap Gi-gian Cheng-chhek]. In Si (1996), 21-50.

Cheng, Robert L. (1999). The transferability between Peh-oe-ji and other romanized schemes [Tai-gi Lo-ma-ji Su-bin-gi kap Tai-oan Sia-khu lai Phiau-im He-thong e Kiong-thong Seng-keh]. In proceedings of the Conference on the Rebirth and Reconstruction of the Taiwanese Languages, 46-61.

Cheng, Robert L. (2000). A review of the four transliteration schemes in terms of learners of English and Taiwanese vernacular [Chiam-tui Eng-bun Hak-sip Su-iau ham Tai-oan Bo-gi Tek-seng Pheng 4 Tho Hoa-gi Phin-im Thong-iong-seng]. Paper presented at the Conference on Transliteration Scheme for Han Characters, held by the Linguistics Institute, Academia Sinica, Taiwan.

Cheng, Robert. L. and Cheng, Susie S. (1977). *Phonological Structure and Romanization of Taiwanese Hokkian* [*Tai-oan Hok-kian-oe e Gi-im Kiat-kau kap Phiau-im-hoat*]. Taipei: Student Press.

Chiang, Wen-yu and Shuanfan Huang. (2000). Using TYP can get connection to the world easier than HP [Thong-iong Phin-im Li i i Se-kai Chiap-kui]. Taiwan Tribune, no. 1856.

Chiang, Wen-yu, Jhao-jin Luo, Hak-khiam Tiu[n] & Buocyun Yu, (2000). On the issue of transliteration scheme: a balance of globalization and localization [Lun Tai-oan Phin-im : Kok-che-seng kap Chu-the-seng Peng-heng Koan-tiam]. Paper presented at the Conference on Transliteration Scheme for Han Characters, held by the Linguistics Institute, Academia Sinica, Taiwan.

Chiung, Wi-vun T. (1998). The influence of Han characters on Taiwanese people's linguistic perception [Han-ji tui Tai-oan-lang e Gi-gian Gin-ti e Eng-hiong]. Paper presented at the 4th Annual North America Taiwan Studies Conference, University of Texas at Austin. <http://ling.uta.edu/~taiffalo/download>

Chiung, Wi-vun T. (1999). *Language Attitudes toward Taibun, the Written Taiwanese.* MA thesis: The University of Texas at Arlington. <http://ling.uta.edu/~taiffalo/download>

Chiung, Wi-vun T. (2000a). Language, literacy, and nationalism: a comparative study of Vietnam and Taiwan. Paper presented at the 5th International Symposium on Languages & Linguistics: Pan-Asiatic Linguistics, Vietnam National University, TPHCM, Vietnam. <http://ling.uta.edu/~taiffalo/download>

Chiung, Wi-vun T. (2000b). Peh-oe-ji: a childish writing? Paper presented at the 6th Annual North American Taiwan Studies Conference, Harvard University.

<http://ling.uta.edu/~taiffalo/download>

Chiung, Wi-vun T. (2001). Digraphia with and without biliteracy: a case study of Taiwan. Paper presented at the Graduate Student Conference on East Asia, Columbia University. <http://ling.uta.edu/~taiffalo/download>

Dale, Ian R.H. (1980). Digraphia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* 26, 5-13.

DeFrancis, John (1950). *Nationalism and Language Reform in China.* Princeton University Press.

DeFrancis, John. (1977). *Colonialism and Language Policy in Viet Nam.* The Hague.

DeFrancis, John. (1984). Digraphia. *Word* 35 (1), 59-66.

DeFrancis, John. (1990). *The Chinese Language: Fact and Fantasy.* (Taiwan edition). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

DeFrancis, John. (1996). How efficient is the Chinese writing system? *Visible Language* 30 (1), 6-44.

Ferguson, Charles. (1959). Diglossia. *Word* 15, 325-40.

Gao, Tianru. (1992). *Theory and Practice of the Modern Language Planning in China* [Jhongguo Siandai Yuian Jihua de Lilun yu Shihjian]. University of Fudan Press, China.

Grimes, Barbara. (1996). *Ethnologue: Language of the World.* (12th edition). Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Hannas, William. C. (1997). *Asia's Orthographic Dilemma.* University of Hawaii Press.

Hsiau, A-chin. (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), 302-315.

Hsu, Chian Hsin. (eds.). (1995). *A Centennial History of The Presbyterian Church of Formosa* (Tai-oan Ki-tok Tiu^n-lo Kau-hoe Pah-ni-su). (3rd edition). Tailam: Presbyterian Church of Formosa Centenary Publications Committee.

Huang, Shuanfan. (1993). *Language, Society, and Ethnic Identity* [Gi-gian Sia-hoe i Chok-kun I-sek]. Taipei: Crane.

Iu^n, Un-gian and Hak-khiam Tiu^n (1999). A review of the non-Han alphabetic schemes for Holo Taiwanese [Tai-oan Ho-lo-oe hui-Han-ji Phin-im Hu-ho e Hoe-kou kap Hun-sek]. In proceedings of the Conference on the Rebirth and Reconstruction of the Taiwanese Languages, 62-76.

Jhongshih (2000). Taipei is against the MOE in regard to the transliteration scheme [Jhongwen Yiyin Sithong Beishih Maosang Jiauyubu]. China Times.com , October 8.

Jhongyangse (2000a). Taipei has opposite views on the transliteration issue [Jhongwen Engyi Beishih yu Jhongyang Bu Tong Diau]. Central News, October 5.

Jhongyangse (2000b). Taipei will not adopt TYP [Caiyong Tongyong Pinyin Beishihfu BuYi]. Central News, October 7.

Jhou, Yiuguang. (1978). *Introduction to the Reform of Han Characters* [Hanzi Gaige Gailun]. Macao: Erya.

Kang, Tong-eng. (2000). Anti-Taiwanization is real, but globalization is a lying [Hoan-pun-thou-hoa si Chin-e, Kok-che-hoa si Ke-e]. Taiwan Daily News, October 12.

Kerr, George H. (1992). *Formosa Betrayed* [*Pi Chhut-be e Tai-oan*]. (Taiwan edition). Taipei: Chian-ui Press.

Khou, Tiong-bo. (1999). The importance of romanization and national orthography for the Taiwanese languages [Iu Tai-gi-bun Kok-ka Gi-gian-hoa Lun Lo-ma Phin-im e Tiong-iau]. In proceedings of the Conference on the Rebirth and Reconstruction of the Taiwanese Languages, 154-163.

Lai, Young-hsiang. (1990). *Topics on Taiwan Church History* [*Kau-hoe Su-oe*]. Vol. 1. Tailam: Jin-kong Press.

Li, Khin-hoann. (1996). Language policy and Taiwanese independence [Gigian Cheng-chhek kap Taioan Toklip]. In Si (1996), 113-134. Taipei: Chian-ui.

Lian, Heng. (1987). *Taiwanese Etymology* [*Tai-oan Gi-tian*]. (originally published in 1957). Taipei: Chin-fong.

Lu, Heng-chhiong. (1998). Only 5% of the Peh-oe-ji revised? essay on the MOE's TLPA [Jhen de jhih Gai lo 5% ma: Tan Jiauyubu Taiyu Yinbiau de Gonggau]. Taiwan Church News. No. 2412.

Mingrihbao (2000). Ma Yingjiu emphasized on the importance to get connection to the world [Ma Yingjiu Ciangdiau Jhongwen Yiyin Sitong iau yu Shihjie Jiegue]. Tomorrow News, October 13.

Naojiro Murakami, B. (1933). *Sinkan Manuscripts*. Taipei: Taihoku Imperial University.

Ngou, Siu-le. (1998). Some thoughts on the adoption of the TLPA [Tui Kau-iok-pou Pan-teng Tai-oan Gi-gian Im-phiau e Khoa[n]-hoat]. Taiwan Church News. No. 2412.

Norman, Jerry. (1988). *Chinese.* NY: Cambridge University Press.

Ong, Iok-tek. (1993). *Taiwan: A Depressed History* [*Tai-oan: Khou-bun e Lek-su*]. Taipei: Independence Press.

Peng, Ming-min. and Yuzin Chiautong Ng. (1995). *The Legal Status of Taiwan* [*Tai-oan chai Kok-che-hoat siong e Te-ui*]. Taipei: Taiwan Interminds.

Phe[n] (1998). Petition on the adoption of the TLPA [Khong-gi Kau-iok-pou Phian-bin Kong-pou Tai-oan Gi-gian Im-phiau e Put-tong Chhok-si Lian-su-su]. <http://ws.twl.ncku.edu.tw/>

Png, Su-tok. (1965). *History of the National Language Movement in China in the past 50 years* [*Wushihnian lai Jhongguo Guoyu Yundongshih*]. Taipei: Mandarin Daily News Press.

Si, Cheng-hong. (1996). The relationship between language and politics [Gi-gian e Cheng-ti Koan-lian-seng]. In Si (1996), 53-80.

Si, Cheng-hong. (eds.). (1996). *Linguistic Politics and Policy* [*Gi-gian Cheng-ti kap Cheng-chhek*]. Taipei: Chian-ui.

Su, Beng. (1980). *Four Hundred Years of Taiwanese History* [*Tai-oan-lang 400 Ni Su*]. California: Paradise Culture Associates.

Taiwan Pinyin Info Online <http://888.rockin.net/pinyin/>

Te, Cheng-tek. (2000). Re-thinking the adoption of the Hanyu pinyin [Hanyu Pinyin de Shangcyue]. Liberty News, October 15.

Te[n], Iong. (1998). The MOE's TLPA is controversial [Kau-iok-pou Tai-oan Gi-gian Im-phiau Cheng-gi Che]. Taiwan Church News. No. 2411

Tiu,[n] Lu-hong. (1996). An analysis on the Taiwan's current language policy [Tai-oan Hian-heng Gi-gian Cheng-chhek Tong-ki e Hun-sek]. In Si (1996), 85-106.

Tiu[n] Hak-khiam. (1998). Writing in two scripts: a case study of digraphia in Taiwanese. *Written Language and Literacy* 1 (2), 225-47.

Tsao, Feng-fu. (1999). The language planning situation in Taiwan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 20 (4&5), 328-75.

TYP Web (2001). A chronicle of the major events on the pinyin policy [Taiwan Pinyin Jhengce Dashihji]. <http:// abc.iis.sinica.edu.tw/tp/policy2001.htm>

Tzeng, Ovid, Daisy Hung & Angela Tzeng. (1992). Auto activation of linguistic information in Chinese character recognition. *Advances in Psychology* 94, 119-30.

United news. (2000). PRC Office for Taiwan Affairs: the across parties team is playing with words [Jhonggong Guotaiban: Kuadangpai Siaozu Gongshih Wenzih Iousi]. United News, November 30.

Web of the Tongyiong Pinyin (2001).Taiwan Tongyong Yuyan Pinyin Wangjhan <http://abc.iis.sinica.edu.tw/>

Wenzi Gaige (1983). *The design and application of the Hanyu pinyin* [*Hanyu Pinyin Fangan de Jhihding he Yingyong*]. Orthographic Reform Press.

Young, Russell. (1988). Language Maintenance and Language Shift in Taiwan. *Journal of*

Multilingual and Multicultural Development 9 (4), 323-38.

Yu, Buocyun, Wenfang Fan, and Ovid Tzeng. (1999). An analysis of the design and policy on Chinese transliteration [Jhongwen Yiyin de Yanjiu yu Jhengce Jhihding Fensi]. <http://abc.iis.sinica.edu.tw/tp/>

Yu, Buocyuan et al. (2000). On the TYP1 and TYP2 [Lun Kah-lui ham It-lui Phin-im: Kah It Siong-thong Koan-tiam]. Paper presented at the Conference on Transliteration Scheme for Han Characters, held by the Linguistics Institute, Academia Sinica, Taiwan.

Address of the author

Wi-vun Taiffalo Chiung

Program in Linguistics

The University of Texas at Arlington

P.O. Box 2485, Arlington, TX, USA

Email: uibun@yahoo.com