

# CHAPTER 3

## THE CONTENT OF THE TAIGI LITERATURE DEBATES

### (1987~1996)

#### Introduction

The first articles of Taigi literature debates in the post-war era were Song (1987) and Lin (1988). Song Ze-Lai's article subsequently inspired many Mandarin authors with respect to the script standardization of Taigi. And the perspective illustrated by Lin (1988) article has also become the target of the argument written by Liao Hsien-hao. These two articles did not garner much reaction at that time. However, they did stir up some intensive discussions and debates that could be grouped into three phases. The first phase of the debates started with Liao's (1989) article. And the second phase of the debates started with Lin's (1991) article. The final phase of the debates started with Chen's (1996) article. These three phases are described in more details in the following paragraphs.

The theory of diglossia and digraphia is applied to an examination of the Taigi literature debates in this chapter as explained below. In the first phase of the debates, Liao with the Chinese viewpoint in mind, believed that the Taigi literature Movement was merely a rebound of Mandarin hegemony and that it manifested the greatness of the Chinese culture. However, if seen from a Taiwanese perspective, the movement was exclusively for the elevation of the status of Taiwanese native language. It did not matter if the Taiwanese view supported the unification of speech and writing, or the pursuit of the dignity and status of Taiwanese language, or the pursuit of independent existence, the ultimate view was to pursue the status of Taiwanese literary language and became a high language and script with dignity and respect. In the second phase

of the debates, Lin Yang-Min requested the use of Taigi as a literary language to delimit the Taiwan literature. We could see that this was to pursue high language and script status for Taigi and to elevate Taigi to an official language status. Taigi and other native languages were treated as low languages under the Mandarin-only policy. Since Taiwan has been a country with many different ethnic groups, in order to preserve the multi-language society, the Mandarin-only policy must be discarded and Taigi and other native languages reconstructed. In the third phase of the debates, Chen Ruo-Si treated Mandarin works as mainstream literature and high language and script and Taiwanese as just a dialect, informal and low language and script. She was a typical Taiwanese Mandarin writer who held the perspective of Chinese values and hence she believed that Taiwanese writing was not a good thing. In the last section of this chapter, I would like to probe into the language movement of the colonized nations in the post-war era in which the low language was developed into high language. Such movement was to be compared with the Taigi literature movement.

### 3.1 The debates of values between Chinese and Taiwanese perspectives

This section handled the first phase of the debates, which was part of the debates about values between Chinese and Taiwanese perspectives. This was the interrogation by the outer group of the Taiwanese local literature camp. (see also ch1.1) The first phase of debates were sparked by Liao's (1989) article. The first response to the Liao's article was the "Impressive Purism: the evaluation of the Liao's blind spots and limitation of the theory of Taigi Literature movement".<sup>1</sup> Subsequent articles published in response to the Liao's article also included "Don't distort the Taigi literature movement: Retort Mr. Liao Hsien-hao"<sup>2</sup>, "Why be pessimistic: Judgment of Taigi literature view of Liao Hsien-hao"<sup>3</sup> and "More extensive space of the literature: Fundamental understanding of Taigi literature"<sup>4</sup>. I have divided the first phase of the

debates, which was started by Liao's (1989) article, into 3 parts to be discussed. The first section will discuss the debates elicited by the Chinese standard perspective about Taigi literature. The second section will discuss the debates about the Unification of speech and writing in Taigi literature. And the third section will discuss the debates about the mindset of language hegemony.

### 3.1.1 The debates elicited by the Chinese standard perspective in the Taigi literature

Since the beginning of his thesis, Liao viewed Taigi literature as a 'Literature Revolution Movement' constructed by specific conditions of the Taiwanese social politics and historical culture. He immediately connected the background of Taigi literature with the 'Vernacular Literature Movement' before and after the Chinese May Fourth Movement. In the year 1920s, the New Taiwan Literature Movement introduced the Chinese colloquial writing to replace classical Han characters. In 1930s, it elicited the vernacular literature movement and Taiwanese language and literature debates, and in 1970s came the second vernacular literature debates. In the year 1980s, the rise of Taiwanese nationalism resulted in the emergence of Taigi script standardization and Taigi literature creation. This became the third literature innovation movement of the Taiwan literature history. Liao proceeded by pointing out that Chinese culture, which has been based on Mandarin, became more and more centralized ever since the period of the Chinese Vernacular Movement. It had not only obliterated the subjectivity of local culture, but also created the simplification of Chinese culture. Therefore, Liao (1989) stated, "On one hand, the attempt to compose literature using Minnanyu not only shows the rebound of the overstretch of commonly-spoken Chinese culture hegemony, but on the other hand, it affirmed the pivot status of the local culture and manifested the efforts of abstruse Chinese

culture.”

In response to Liao, who viewed Taigi literature movement with the perspective of Chinese value, Lin (1989) believed that Liao constructed his values on an illusory Chinese identification complex or that he did not even comprehend the literature and culture of Taiwanese. Lin (1989) indicated furthermore that no matter which Taigi literature movement was being discussed, the 1930s or the 1980s movement, the purpose of both of the movements aimed principally for the construction of a Taiwanese subject culture. On the contrary, they did not strive for the sake of Chinese culture. Only if the construction of the Taiwanese subject culture was completed, could the Taigi writing reach the state of the Unification of speech and writing, and in return, be elevated to the status of the Taiwanese native language. It enriched the performance ability of Taigi and restored the national dignity and characteristic of the Taiwanese. I agreed with the view of Lin Yang-Min with which he replied to Liao. Taigi and Taiwan native languages have always been suppressed by foreign domination, and there is no room for their existence, to say nothing of native identity and status. This kind of issue persisted even after the period of Japanese domination and post-war KMT domination. I believe that the Taigi literature movement was not a rebound to the hegemony of the Mandarin language and was not a manifestation of the greatness of Chinese culture. It was solely for the elevation of the status of Taiwan native languages, and for the aim of making Taiwanese the official language, hence becoming a dignified high language and script. Not only has the dispute emerged from treating Taigi literature movement from a Chinese standard perspective, but two falsehoods have also emerged from the judgment made by Liao about the Taiwanese litterateurs. Those falsehoods were the unification of speech and writing and the hegemonic complex of language. They too elicited debates.

### 3.1.2 The debates of the unification of speech and writing in the Taigi literature

The first falsehood was the agreement mentioned above. Liao said, “Taigi literature inherited or deepened the ‘blind spots’ of Vernacular Movement, the agreement”. Lin Yang-Min argued against this statement in 1989. He insisted that Liao had distorted the theory of Taiwanese theory and thus he believed that Taiwanese litterateurs were not as rigid as Liao thought they were. The so-called agreement was a claim that aimed specifically at the difference between classical Chinese or Mandarin and the colloquial language used by the Taiwanese. It had no intention of making a complete record of the colloquial pronunciation. Agreement was insisted on because the literary form of Taiwanese was proposed to be similar to the colloquial language of Holo, which was similar to the case of vernacular Chinese, which was very similar to Mandarin. Cheng (1989b), based on the demands made to the agreement in the Taigi literature, also believed that there was life in the colloquial literature of the mother tongue and this would enable a higher state of literature to then be reached. If the Taigi writing were written in half-Mandarin and half-Taigi or half-classical and half-vernacular, the writing would not be systemized. He mentioned also that Taigi literature could elevate the understanding of Taiwanese and the recognition and respect of Taiwanese culture for people who have spoken Taiwanese.

I was in one accord with the viewpoints of Lin (1989) and Cheng (1989b). The literary form claimed by the academic circle of Taigi literature was the agreement of Holo colloquial language as opposed to a full record of complete colloquial pronunciation. Liao (1989) believed, “colloquial standardization is nothing more than the rearrangement of the boundary of colloquial and written language, agreement is

doomed to be an indulgence in wishful thinking”. The agreement Liao mentioned was totally different than that claimed by the academic circle of Taigi literature. The latter led to an attempt to create a standardized script for Taigi. If the script standardization of Taigi did not take place, then it could never be an official and high language and script language. As stated by Cheng (1989b), if the language could not be written, then there was definitely no competition with one, which could be written. Thus, this demand made to the agreement in the Taigi literature was considered a huge step towards making it a literary language.

Lu (2001) believed that the theoretical investigation of ‘The Relationship between Colloquial And Written Language’ by Liao should point to the language systems, which shared similarities. Taigi and Mandarin are two totally different language systems. The evolution of classical Chinese to vernacular Chinese might accept such analysis but the Mandarin in Taiwan and Taiwanese are two different systems, which have progressed in their own ways, and the connections simply could not be seen. Lu (2001) insisted that the emergence of Taigi literature was not a challenge between refined and vulgar and dominance or even the challenge between legitimate or non-legitimate. It was simply a language system that has a history of over 400 years and is spoken by over 70% of the population. It was a system asking humbly for the rights it deserved which was given to other Mandarin language systems with the same status (Lu 2001:294). I agreed with Lu (2001). It was right for Taigi literature to fight for the status it deserved of a high language status.

### 3.1.3 The language hegemony mindset debates

The second falsehood was the language of hegemony mindset. It took place when Liao (1989) made criticisms about the litterateurs of Taigi literature. Liao (1989)

stated that Taiwanese consciousness has simmered into nationalism-to-be, which resulted in a 'legitimate mindset' or a 'hegemony mindset'. We would discuss this with respect to two aspects.

First, there was the issue of Taiwanese literature, which used Taiwanese consciousness to delimit Taiwan literature. Liao (1989) made a criticism when he said that if the foundation of Taiwan literature was to build on Taiwan local consciousness, then it would be too political, and the exclusiveness would be just too strong. He carried on by saying that this kind of attitude not only narrowed the room of Taiwan literature, but it was possible that this attitude could strangle the creativity of Taiwan literature. Lin (1989) held the view that Liao (1989) did not have the knowledge about the special background of Taiwan literature. Taiwan literature historically had always been oppressed, and discriminated against to the extent that even people who created Taiwan literature had been falsely charged and jailed. Since the eighties, the principle agitators of Taiwan literature have utilized Taiwan local consciousness, native language or the reflection on the truth about Taiwan to set as a standard to define Taiwan literature. Song (1989) suggested that Song Dong-Yang<sup>5</sup> did not purposely make a definition about Taiwan literature through the lens of Taiwanese consciousness. As a matter of fact, the use of 'Taiwan literature' was very popular by those local writers. Usually they had Taiwanese consciousness and would be under the treatment of political prosecution during the White Terror period<sup>6</sup>. The term was boldly used out of grief and indignation. Taiwan literature itself was a product of the local literature group.

I believe that utilizing the Taiwan local consciousness, native language or the reflection on the truth about Taiwan to set as a standard to define Taiwan literature

was involuntarily made by the space and the environment. Taiwan was gradually constructing itself into a multi-functional society, so within that space and time, using Taiwanese consciousness to delimit Taiwan literature was just the thing to resist the hegemony of the Mandarin language. It was necessary and it was proper. Moreover, the 27<sup>th</sup> article of the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights<sup>7</sup> stated “In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion, or to use their own language.”

Second, there was an issue about using Taigi to compose pieces of writing for Taiwan literature. Liao (1989) believed that the delimitation of Taiwan literature using Taiwanese consciousness narrowed the room of literature and strangled creativity. In his view, this limitation about using Taigi to write has constricted the Taiwan literature even more. He criticized about Lin Zong-Yuan’s statement, which is “Only the work of Minnanyu is qualified as Taiwan literature” and also the “purism”<sup>8</sup> by Robert L. Cheng. Ang (1989b) insisted that Liao (1989) was holding a wrong impression about the statement made by Lin (1988). What Lin (1988) meant was that only writing in Taiwanese was considered Taiwan literature, since Taiwanese was meant to be the native tongue of Taiwan, and this included also Minnanyu, Hakkaneese and the indigenous languages. Lin (1988:12) in the preface stated “The primary issue concerning Taiwan literature today is the construction of our own language and words. We have to learn Taiwanese. It does not matter which native tongues you are speaking with, the tongues have their own complete language structure, which are not the dialects. Mandarin does not precede the native tongues, so do not pity thyself.” Based on this statement made by Lin (1988), it was therefore easy to understand that



Taiwanese to Lin Zong Yuan meant every native language ranged from Minnanyu, Hakkaneese to indigenous languages. The author believed that Taigi literature did not include the hegemony mindset as claimed by Liao (1989), but rather that it was simply a pursuit of deserved equal status and dignity for Taigi. It was like the statement by Lin Zong-Yuan that “Taiwanese are not dialects and Mandarin does not precede the native tongues”(Lin 1988:12), this was just a demand made to pursuit high language.

And with the falsehood on purism made by Liao to Robert L. Cheng, Ang (1989b) stated that Robert L. Cheng was a linguist, and Cheng (1988) was making the distinction from the stance of linguistics between the literary form of Taigi and Mandarin as a basis for his research. In Ang’s view, Liao (1989) should not have commented that the statement regarding the tendency for Taigi literature to lean towards ‘purism’ made by Robert L. Cheng. Liao’s criticism was doomed to be a failure. Actually, according to the observations made by Ang (1989) about Cheng (1988), Ang believed that Cheng was supportive of the combination of Mandarin and classical Chinese and might be even Japanese, English or any other vocabulary in every other language. Lin (1989) pointed out that Taigi literature did not claim to be based on pure Taigi, and did not wish to exclude vocabulary from other languages. In fact, Taigi has absorbed a considerable amount of syntax and vocabulary from other languages (Lu 1999). With regards to Liao who thought that Taigi should absorb nutrients from classical Han characters or other Han languages, if this was the case, then the Taigi script would become something that had only a few basic vocabularies, and be something like existing vernacular literature works. The casual written-style would be close to Mandarin, and so the Taigi literature Movement would not mean that much intrinsically. Based on this perspective of Liao’s, Lin (1989) pointed out

that Taigi and Mandarin both belonged to the Han system, they also shared the same qualities such as vocabulary or words, but it was the hetero-logy that set them apart. It had nothing to do with the aspect of being a dialect, and while they might absorb nutrients from each other while being in this mutual relationship, they would never become one.

In sum, it was a falsehood when Liao (1989) said that Cheng (1988) tended to go for purism. Liao also made the suggestion in which he insisted that Taigi should adopt an open policy towards classical Chinese and other Chinese dialects. I believed that the comments and suggestions from Liao leaned more toward the Chinese standard value perspective than those made by either Ang (1989) or Lin (1989). For hundreds of years, Taiwanese has not only absorbed syntax from foreign languages, but from Mandarin as well. Taigi was an open and independent language and script, it was not a dialect attached to Mandarin. The Taigi literature Movement has pursued a living space for Taigi, with the status as a literary language. Such implication was explicit and meaningful at the same time.

### 3.2 The language form of Taiwan literature debates.

This section handles the second phase of the debates. The primary investigation aimed specifically at the debates caused by using Taigi as the literary language for writing Taiwan literature. These were the debates between the Taiwan local literature interior camp and the Taigi literature camp. This debate was different than the first one in which the debate was against outer group of the Taiwanese local literature camp. (see also ch1.1) The Lin's<sup>9</sup> (1991) article caused the second phase debates. Li's (1991) article took on the challenge first, then Peng's (1991b&c) two articles and Lin's<sup>10</sup> (1991) article finally. Actually, four months before Lin (1991) started these

contentious debates, the Peng's (1991a) article was already out and shared its opinions on the language form of Taiwan literature. This section was divided into three parts for discussion. First, did vernacular literature hinder the creativity of literature? The second part discussed the debates about whether Taigi literature represents Taiwan literature. And the third part discussed the independent development of native language and vernacular literature.

### 3.2.1 Did the vernacular literature hinder the creativity of literature?

Peng (1991a) stated that native language has been suppressed for a long time, and there have been dilemmas within its development. He stated that if the dream of a vernacular literature were to be carried out, the development of local literature would have to be postponed in the meantime. He suggested that the issues of native language and the creation of local literature were best not to be mixed up together. The issue of native language should be handed over to linguists or native language advocates for reconstruction. Local literature should temporarily not be involved with native languages, and instead, local literature should be constructed and armed with local ideology and spirit. He suggested this so that the local literature can progress without any interruption. According to the words of Peng (1991a), Mandarin should be used continually to write local literature, so there would be no halts in the creation of literature. I totally disagreed with this pursuit only for the literature creation but gave no regard whatsoever to the issues of language. There should be encouragement to use native language in order to create local literature. The Taiwan Novel Literature Movement in 1920 included people who had Chinese values and claimed that Chinese vernacular should be used or people who stood for Taiwan and claimed for Taiwan vernacular. Those intellectuals at the time did not want to use the language of the dominator who colonized the country as the literary language. Ironically, what the

Mandarin language represented today is simply a stigma for the Taiwanese from the dominator who colonized the country. If the writing of Taiwan literature was done with Mandarin, then the writing should prepare itself for the challenges coming from Taigi literature. If Mandarin was to be the official native language, the Taiwan native language should receive the same treatment. It should not be looked down on as a low language by the colonizers, and hence the use of native language to write local literature was a display of dignity for the national literature, as well as achieving the status of a high language.

Another emphasis in Peng's article was the discussion of combination language. He believed that in the future, the language for Taiwan literature might be the combined language of Taiwan history and practical elements. The current languages such as Hakkanese, Minnanyu, indigenous languages, and Mandarin might be mixed to give rise to be a new language of Taiwan. He mentioned the "Trilogy of A Chilly Night" by Li Ciao and "Lang Tao Sha" by Dong Fang-Bai, both as works, which displayed such new language. This kind of combined language was a clever suggestion that needed further thought. Lu (2001) believed that the decline in the ability to use Taigi was caused by improper language policy. In order to talk about support from other foreign languages, the language of every ethnic group must be developed in a healthy way. I believe that the combination language mentioned by Peng Rui-Jin is still in the phase of Code-switching<sup>11</sup> and the language of every ethnic group in Taiwan displays such phenomena as well. Whether or not the new language of Taiwan can reach this extent of mixed language<sup>12</sup> or even reach the phase of the integration of systemized syntax and vocabularies is still largely an uncertainty. However, I agree with Lu (2001), that the crisis of the mother tongue is caused by the improper language policy. The development of the language of every ethnic group has

to be healthy to give meaning to the development of mixed language. We should not give way to the facts caused by the National Languages Policy, and also not be afraid of the movement advocating writing local literature with Taigi. The local literature camp should pursue the language policy in which the language of every ethnic group receives the same treatment. If this was accomplished, then the fate to become a low language for the language of every ethnic group might be avoided.

### 3.2.2 The debates regarding whether Taigi literature represents Taiwan literature

In the 1980s following the delimitation of Taiwan literature by Taiwanese consciousness, the Taigi literature community tried to use literary language to delimitate Taiwan literature. Therefore, Taigi literature became the subject of the emergence of the debates of Taiwan literature. Lin (1988) was the first to state this and the Taiwanese language Lin was speaking about was the mother tongue of Taiwanese at that time. These tongues included Holo, Hakkanese and indigenous languages as well. Thus, Taiwanese literature included works in Holo, Hakkanese and indigenous languages. Although he had a broad explanation of what constituted the Taiwanese language, this did not prevent him from getting criticized as being a “Holo Chauvinist”. After the first phase of the debates caused by Liao’s (1989) article, the Taiwan standard value perspective has been stabilized. There were no more questionable points in the delimitation of Taiwan literature by Taiwanese consciousness. There were no more rejections of writing in Taigi. But, later on Lin (1991) narrowly defined Taiwanese as Taigi only and this caused the second phase of the debates. This resulted in the retort of the interior of the local literature camp against the Taigi literature camp.

Lin (1991) mentioned that the sound of literature was the language that was used to write it. The language used to write the literature was the sound that the language produces. Lin (1991) has extended the meaning of 'Face' to 'Facial Accent', which included not only appearance but also sound. Lin used 'Facial Accent' to describe the appearance of Taiwanese. Within this article, while facing the various definitions of Taiwan literature, Lin (1989) clearly emphasized the definition from a literary language point of view. For three or may be four hundred years, Taiwan was colonized and had various colonial masters, thus the official language was changed accordingly. He proposed that Taiwan literature could not be written in the vernacular language. Consequently, the 'Facial Accent' of Taiwan literature could not form to become the steady national character. Lin (1991) used the logic of culture in which the majority represented the whole body to narrowly define Taiwanese as Taigi. Lin insisted Taiwanese consisted of Taiwanese Holo only, just like Mandarin in Chinese and American English in American. Those language definitions were based on fact that the race was the majority of the population. So, he believed Taigi literature was sufficient enough to represent Taiwan literature.

What Lin (1991) said Taiwan literature could not form a stable national character; Hisau (2000) explicated it as a cultural nationalism. He said, "For Hoklo revivalists, their language is the most important carrier of their traditional culture. A Hoklo writing system is believed to be essential to the formation of a new nation and the independence of the island. Culture and language are identified with a nation-to-be and a "potential"state." (Hsiau 2000: 144) In reality, I believe that Lin (1991) demanded the use of Taigi as a literary language to delimit Taiwan literature could be considered an act to pursue high language. This act was simply to elevate Taigi to the status of an official language. Mandarin writing system, however, have been

supported by the local literature camp. If writing were limited to only Taigi, it would be hard to avoid objections from authors who used to write in Mandarin and people from different ethnic groups.

As a local literature writer and Hakkinese, Li (1991) considered the statement about using Taigi to write Taiwan literature to be the result of the upsurge of Taiwanese consciousness. He argued that Taiwan literature should be based on the stance of the Taiwanese people and works should be written about Taiwanese people's experiences. In his view, the Taiwanese people included Holo, Hakkinese, aboriginals and Mainlanders who came to Taiwan in 1945. Thus, national languages should not exclude the Taiwanese language. Similarly, Taiwanese should be broadly defined to mean indigenous languages, Holo, Hakkinese and Mandarin. Li then did not agree that Taigi literature represented Taiwan literature. He thought Mandarin was a part of the Taiwanese language as well, and admitted that the Taiwan literature written in Mandarin was legitimate. Hsiao thought, "The active endeavors to rejuvenate Hoklo have in turn caused apprehension among the Hakkas."(Hsiao 2000:144)

According to Li's proposal that Mandarin writing was Taiwan literature was still the dominating view in Taiwanese society today. I did not object to the idea of using Mandarin as a language tool to communicate in Taiwan, but the precondition had to be the equality of the status of language. Only if Taiwan native language culture could be fully developed, could the work of written Mandarin be considered as Taiwan literature. In order not to return to its status during colonial times, the long persecuted native language cannot be treated only as a language tool. Not only the recovery of its dignity and status were needed, but also the space of its existence and development as well as the opportunity for a fair competition was required. The reason for

non-development could not simply be the insufficiency of the vocabulary of native languages and the inability to write in native languages.

Li (1991) said that the Taiwanese people include those people who came to Taiwan from Mainland China in 1945. As mentioned above, Li (1991) claimed that Taiwanese should be broadly defined as indigenous languages, Holo, Hakkanese and Mandarin. It seemed that Li (1991) has mixed up the Taiwan language and Taigi. According to Chiung (2006b), Taiwan language referred to the language, which because of migration, has gone through the process of becoming native. This language represented the culture of the history of Taiwanese traditions and was also recognized by most people in the public arena (Chiung 2006b). So, Taiwanese language meant indigenous languages, Holo and Hakkanese. Some people thought the definition given by Chiung Wi-Vun was much too rigid, and I still considered that only if the Taiwan native language could be treated as equal as the Mandarin language, then the Mandarin language could be assured of its place in the languages of Taiwan. With regards to the usage of the term, Taigi, I agreed with Ang (1995b) in which the wording of Taiwanese or Taigi was a wording that was accepted through common practice. The reason was that 75% of the population in Taiwan speaks Holo.

### 3.2.3 The independent development of native language and vernacular literature

Peng Rui-Jin, a local literature writer and Hakkanese, also objected to the demand of Lin Yang-Min to use Taigi as a literary language to define Taiwan literature. Peng (1991b) thought that Taigi literature functioned as a tonic for the heart in the development of the current literature. But he did not agree that Taiwan literature was Minnan literature or that the Taiwanese language was Minnanyu language. He



also objected to the use of Hakka literature as an indication of the invigoration of Hakka literature. He exemplified the case of Anglo-Saxons who migrated to America and this resulted in the formation of American English or American literature. It did not cause any damage to the dignity of American English or American literature. And in a later article, Peng (1991c) stated that subsequent to the Movement of Taiwan Novel Literature, creation tools such as the language or words have never guided the content or direction of Taiwan literature. And the theoretical factions of language reformers have never acquired a predominant role of New Taiwan Literature. He understood the difficulties of Taiwan literature becoming Taigi, and he hoped that this did not hinder the progress of literature development.

I, however, held three different views from Peng's. The first issue was about the naming of Taigi and the various definitions of Taigi. Peng Rui-Jin defined Taigi as Minnanyu language. And according to Lin (1991), that was the name given by the colonial masters in the colonial period. I also suspected that such a view was acquired from treating Taiwanese language status from a Chinese standard value perspective. Lin would rather people call it the Holo language rather than Minnanyu. Peng (1991b) did not agree that the Taiwanese language was Minnanyu language only. Similar to Li (1991), he objected to narrow definitions of Taiwanese. He thought that doing so was a violent solution from the majority to solve the language problem. Although Lin (1991) agreed that the majority could represent the whole body, but Lin considered the problem of Taiwanese definition was a political problem, a national recognition problem. Because external political power has not been actualized, a problem has emerged from the native language policy. Ang (1995b) thought that the Holo language has been a new dialect formed from the mixture of Jhang and Cyuan. Taiwanese or Taigi was a wording that was accepted by common practice. (illustrated in this

section).I could fully comprehend the intention of the minority of the population to strive for literary, but felt it was more important to strive for political status. Taiwan is a nation with many different languages, and the Taiwan native language has long been suppressed by exterior domination. Every language was on the verge of existence crisis. When the Taiwanese society became a democratic society, it didn't matter if the language issues involved the ethnic group structure difference or the gradation of language human rights<sup>13</sup>. The unreasonable Mandarin-only policy had to be discarded. With the use of democratic procedures, the reconstruction of the multi-ethnic group language policy could then be accomplished. The reconstruction of the multi-ethnic group language policy included the name and status of the language. A chance of fair development was given to every ethnic group in Taiwan. As a result, it might fit into the multi-language environment of Taiwan.

Second, Peng Rui-Jin did not agree that Taiwan literature was Taigi literature and he did not support Hakka literature either.<sup>14</sup> He exemplified the case of English with American literature and made correspondence to the situation of Taiwan literature. The author did not have anything to say against Peng Rui-Jin disagreeing with Hakka literature, but if Peng only devoted himself to Mandarin literature creation and was not willing to develop Hakka literature, how was the rescue and elevation of the language status of the disadvantaged minor ethnic groups possible? When Peng said that the English did no harm to the dignity of American literature, Lin Jin-Sian(1991) responded that American literature was created by the descendants of those English migrants who went out to America. He queried Peng Rui-Jin's contention that Hakkinese came to Taiwan from Tang Shan (Mainland China), and asked whether it was Hakkinese or Mandarin that they brought with them to Taiwan. Li (1991) exemplified the case of American speaking English and thought that the same

language did not have to be unified as a nation, just like when America became independent from Britain. According to Li (1991), if Taiwanese people spoke Mandarin, it did not hinder the process of independence. I believed the policy, which was carried out during KMT rule and required people to speak only the national language, did not stop the Taigi literature community demanding the pursuit of high language, even though Li Ciao and Peng Rui-Jin did not care for the harm done to Taiwanese society by the Mandarin-only policy.

Third, Peng (1991c) hoped that the issue concerning Taiwan literature becoming oriented towards the Taiwanese language would not hinder the process of literature development. He thought that ever since the of New Taiwan Literature Movement period, the language and script reformer groups had not guided Taiwan literature. And thus writers did not wait for the resolution of language issues to begin their works of literature. He therefore hoped that Taigi would not hinder the development of Taiwan literature. This article and the previously published “Local Literature and vernacular Literature” mentioned that literature creation was best not entangled with language literature innovation. Generally speaking, his assertions were consistent. I, however, could not agree with Peng’s these previous view. Although writers might have created works of Taiwanese literature despite the issues of language, the lack of subjectivity of Taiwan literature was an undisputable truth. Even if there were different colonial masters or different language used by the colonial dominators, Taiwan literature would still have been seen as works in a low language. The current Taiwan literature Movement treated writing in the mother tongue as Taiwan literature, and this meant that there must be attempts to pursue high language status for Taigi. This was the demand to break free from the unreasonable events of the past and got rid of obstructions to the development of a Taiwanese literature. If we only looked at the

Mandarin language creations of Taiwanese literature, and left no consideration for native languages to be seen as literary languages then Taiwan literature would always be a victim of the colonizers.

### 3.3 The debates about the writing value of Taigi

Originally, this section was part of the first phase, which was the debate about the Chinese standard value perspective against the Taiwan standard value perspective. But the topic of this section was more focused on the writing value of a Taigi script, and the time of the debate occurred after the second phase. Therefore, this third section was required for further discussion. Chen (1996) triggered the third phase of the debates. Lin (1996) immediately retorted the Chinese standard value perspective of Chen Ruo-Si. Ang (1996) also replied to the debate. The original article by Chen Ruo-Si that started the debates was written when she was invited to a conference held by the Central Library. The name of the conference was “A discussion of Chinese literature over the last hundred years”. She was there as a commentator and when the topic of the written Minnanyu phenomenon was discussed, she held different opinions and so aired them in the above mentioned article. She was a Mandarin writer who completely agreed with the colonizing domination of the KMT. (Lin 1996) She used terms, which were commonly used by the KMT colonizers to name her mother tongue. In other words, she used names like ‘Minnanyu’ or ‘dialect’ to refer to her mother tongue, Taigi. The article was full of Chinese standard value perspectives. The following section was divided into three parts: First, the discrimination against Taigi writing; second, the harmony of languages and ethnic groups; and third, the theory of language tools.

#### 3.3.1 The discrimination against Taigi writing

Chen (1996) thought that within a work of a literature, the use of dialects often meant that the work was often treated as less important and hence easily overlooked. If the usage were good, then it would certainly fall into the mainstream category of literature. Otherwise, it would be eliminated. She took the transformation of Wang Jhen-He and his novel writing as an example. He began his writing career by using large amount of Taigi language, which was hard to comprehend, but when the amount of Taigi dialect in his work was reduced, his works became standard pieces of Mandarin writing. Chen stated that this proved that Taigi was not good for writing. Chen (1996) carried on by saying that some pure Taigi essays were really hard even for an original Taiwanese like herself to comprehend. Because the whole reading process was like a kind of guessing game, readers usually abandoned reading such works. Lin (1996) argued whether one could comprehend the literary works in a certain language was determined by one's ability to write and speak the language. One could not deem Taiwanese to be insignificant based merely on the fact that one was a Taiwanese person and could not understand the essay written in Taiwanese. (Lin 1996; Lu 1999) Ang (1996) argued, "The theoretical foundation of Mandarin hegemony is built on the recognition as a language or as a dialect. In China, when one language is labeled as a dialect, then the language is doomed to be outside the service as an official language. And there is certainly no chance for script standardization" (Lu 1999:212).

From the documents written by Chen (1996), Lin (1996) and Ang (1996), I have noticed that although Mandarin and Taigi belong to the same language system, they were however two different languages.<sup>15</sup> And when two different languages were mixed together, both writers and readers have to be equipped with the ability to write and speak the two languages. The handling and usage of the two languages might

only then be skillful. Under the Mandarin-only policy, Mandarin was a high language whereas Taigi was a low language. Taiwanese had no chance to be officially taught at school to students.<sup>16</sup> Taiwanese people who have spoken Taiwanese were basically illiterate when it came to Taigi writing. How could the reading of Taigi be accomplished without learning to read the language first? I believed that Chen (1996) neglected the historical truth about Taiwanese under colonial suppression and denied the value of Taigi writing. In other words, Chen (1996) considered Mandarin writing as the mainstream literature and high language. To her, Taigi was nothing more than a dialect, non-mainstream and low language and script.

### 3.3.2 The harmony of languages and ethnic groups

Chen (1996) said that “for convenience, the common language and characters of the whole province has to be exploited by us even more, and thus we can promote harmony between every ethnic group.” Lin (1996) did not believe that by using the language of the minority harmony could be promoted between ethnic groups. If it were only for the sake of convenience, why not use the language spoken by more than 80% of the population? Would that not be more convenient? So, why should just Mandarin alone be spoken? Therefore, it was clear to see that the promotion of a national language was not for the sake of convenience, nor was it for the harmony of the ethnic groups. Otherwise, the Taiwan language culture should have been respected. Lin considered the Mandarin-only and the National Language Policy that persecuted the native language culture were the real obstruction for the harmony of the ethnic groups. Ang (1996) believed the preservation of harmony of ethnic groups was an excuse used by people who believed in the ‘isms’ of Great China to depreciate dialects. According to the classification of European languages, the Han language is a language system, which includes many languages, is not able to be communicated

each other. Because China has not been separated into many countries, the Chinese thus hold the deep belief that other Han languages are dialects, and if someone thought of them as a language, then they would be considered as someone who tried to destroy the unification of Chinese ethnic groups.

I think that the fact that Chen (1996) called Taiwan “the whole province” instead of “the whole country” means only one thing that she is a person with deep and solid Chinese standard value perspectives and with these perspectives, she views the language culture values of the Taiwanese people. In Taiwan, if one considered oneself Chinese, then that person would consider Mandarin to be the most commonly spoken language, or the national language. All the other languages comprising the Han languages are then treated as dialects. Taiwan has been a society with various language cultures coming from various ethnic groups. A few colonizers of Taiwan employed political force to create the hegemony of the Mandarin while suppressing the language culture of the Taiwanese people. This forced Taigi to undergo serious language attrition. A language hegemony mindset such as the National Language Policy operated as diglossia and digraphia phenomena by political powers. This phenomenon treats the Mandarin as a high language and suppresses native language as the low language and made it suffer from language attrition. In my view, by means of promoting the national language while at the same time eliminating native languages does not really achieve the claimed harmony of the ethnic groups.

### 3.3.3 The instrumentalism

Chen (1996) said that language and script were tools for communication. If the circulation property of a tool was extensive, then that language or script was also convenient. There were more than 12 hundred million people who used Han

languages, and the use of Han languages ensured obstacle-free communication. Therefore she believed that writing in Mandarin allowed more people to read and then understand the content. She stated that even if there were a form of Taigi writing available, only a small percentage of the population could read such a script, not to mention the fact that herself as a Taiwanese could not comprehend the script either. She inferred that writers who used Taigi writing to write were making a suicidal decision in their literary life. I assume that Chen is writing from the perspective of Chinese values. She had very similar opinions as Huang Cheng-Cong. Writing in the Japanese colonial period regarding the opposition to Taiwanese language and literature, Huang Cheng-Cong opposed the use of Taiwanese language and literature mainly. He felt that as Taiwan was a small country, not independent nor backed-up by super power, thus it would be good for people to learn the Chinese vernacular as it would mean being easy for them to do things in China. (see also ch2.1) Under the ruling of external powers, Taigi has always been in the disadvantaged position politically, and has also been treated as a low language. I believe both Chen Ruo-Si and Huang Cheng-Cong were not confident in Taiwan as a nation. Back to the time of Huang Cheng-Cong, Taiwan was still colonized then, but at the time of Chen Ruo-Si, Taiwan is already a democratic nation. She was not able to pass beyond the stigma that the colonial dominators have inflicted on her. Both these writers are representative of intellectuals from the two generations who look down on themselves.

Lin (1996) believed that “there is no connection between the good and bad of the written language and work, but they certainly meant something valuable, and whether or not the work can reflect on the society of that work would determine the truth worth of its value”. Lin (1996) exemplified the case of a poet from India named



Tagore. In 1913, Tagore won a Nobel Prize with his sentimental collection of poems, which was written in Bengali and not the English language as used by the English colonial dominators. Tagore's work used his mother tongue to express his affection to his hometown. Ang (1996) also took an example of *Divina Commdia*, the world-renowned work. When this literary work was written by Dante, he used the native dialect of his country, Italian, to finish the work instead of using the popular language Latin. I believe that the examples suggested by both Ang (1996) and Lin (1996) display something impressive and are all written in their mother tongue. The true feeling of both writers toward the society, which they cared for deeply was revealed in their work using their own mother tongues and they created some marvelous pieces of work. Their mother tongues at the time were both low languages and script and were nothing like the high language and script in use in their societies. High language and script is a phenomenon of the natural division of labor of society. It could be circulated and modified and shouldn't be politically manipulated by the colonial dominators, who purposely suppressed the disadvantaged vernacular language and used it as a tool.

The instrumentalism of Chen (1996) criticized even those people who have to use Taigi to express their dignity and independence. Using America, Canada and Australia as examples she said that although those countries have become independent from Britain, they still use English as their national language and they have not lost their national pride. Lin (1996) thought that Chen used incorrect examples because he stated that English was the language of the majority of the population in countries like America, Canada<sup>17</sup> or Australia, and thus of course English was chosen to become their primary language. He contrasted this with Taiwan where Taigi was the language spoken by the majority of the population of Taiwan, but

it did not get to be the commonly spoken language of Taiwan and got suppressed instead. I agree with Lin's (1996) viewpoint.

Lu (2001) thought that the theory of the language of the colonized people being eliminated by the colonial dominators was an act of treating the language as a tool and denying the characteristics of an ethnic group. The elimination was done purposely to annul its embodied historical memories, ethnic group affections and cultural characteristics. TiuN (1999) thought any instrumentalism had less powerful persuasion because it did not notice the symbol function of language and ignored the inequality fact of social languages. I believe that language is not merely just a tool, but when deep thought is given, it can also be a culture and an ideology. It is rich in the wisdom of a nation. Because the words of a language have deep implications, it is no wonder that the colonial dominators are fond of the destruction of the languages of the colonized people. They manipulate the phenomenon of diglossia and digraphia by their political powers, and the destruction of the language was the result.

### 3.4 Models of other country's language movements

The Taigi Literature Movement has pursued the status of a literary language for Taigi. They demanded that Taigi should be made from a low language to a high language. Such a language movement has also been seen in other countries in the postwar era, which were previously under colonial rule. Through the Creole language spoken by the Haitian people, Swahili in Tanzania Africa and Hindi in India, I observe how each one of them transformed their low language into high language under the threat of the powerful language spoken by the colonial dominators. Also observed is the actual operation of their historical experience and language policy. These observations could be made as a model of reference for the development of Taiwan

language.

### 3.4.1 The rise of Creole in Haiti

Currently, Haitian Creole is one of the two official languages<sup>18</sup> spoken in Haiti. It is a mixed language. Haitian Creole was mostly mixed with French, languages from Africa, Portuguese and Spanish. About 90% of the Haitian population speaks only Creole. During the colonization period, the Creole language was excluded outside the administrative and jurisdiction realm of the public (Valdman 1968). It was not until 1961 that the language was deemed to be an official language. However, it was gradually growing in usage since the 1980s, as education authorities, writers and promoters of Creole language have all emphasized the dignity<sup>19</sup> of the language and insisting on writing with the language. Today, many newspapers, TV and Radio programs are all in favor of the Creole language. In 1987, the Haitian Constitution assured its language status<sup>20</sup>. Although the Creole language has obtained its legitimate status, its use in the literature is not common at all.

But, on the road to become a high language, there were still intellectuals who were opposed to the elevation of the Creole language. Although the elites of Haiti have already accepted the diglossia relationship between French and Creole, many people still thought of Creole as a degeneration of the French language, more like a primitive tool with defects. They denied the status of this language. Therefore, the elites tried to encourage the teaching of French (Valdman 1968). In 1941, an Irish minister named Ormonde McConnell used the ‘The McConnell-Laubach orthography’. This orthography was queried by the elites of Haiti and they opposed making the Creole language a high language (Valdman 1968). In Taiwan, no matter if it were 1930s or 1980s, the elite intellectuals of Taiwan had the same sense of

inferiority (see also ch2.3).

In the year 1960s, the Creole language in Haiti did not have the same status as French, but it was accepted as an official language, safeguarded by the constitution and used by more than 90% of the population. The strength of the language is hence far greater than the strength of Taigi. In Taiwan more than 75% of the population have spoken Taigi, but under the tyranny of Mandarin education, this Taigi-speaking population declined rapidly. Taigi along with some other minority languages have undergone serious language attrition. Although radio or TV programs have been allowed to use the Taigi language, Taigi along with some other minority languages still have no official status and have no constitutional protection. The public domains such as education, administration or jurisdiction are still under the ruling of the tyranny of the Mandarin language. As previously mentioned in this chapter, the query made by the Chinese standard value perspective against the Taigi literature Movement, and the debates of representation of Taigi literature as Taiwan literature have enabled the understanding of the difficulties faced by Taigi to pursue high language status. Although in the process of the development of Haitian Creole, there were challenges coming from the elites of Haiti, but after all, the Creole language secured its language status. The language status of Taigi is far behind than that of Haitian Creole for half a century.

### 3.4.2 The developments of Swahili in Tanzania

The Swahili language is spoken in the eastern part of Africa and in Tanzania less than 10% of the population use the language. This situation is very different from Haitian Creole, which is spoken by most of the Haitian people. Before the country's independence, the language had a status lower than that of the English. The High

Court used English whereas the local court used Swahili. When there were Swahili radio programs, the programs were intended for those people who do not understand English or were not educated. Swahili had a status between English and the other native languages. In 1950, there was a change in the situation of the pursuit for independence. Although the negotiation of independence needed to be in English, the mobilization strength of the nation was deeply affected by the Swahili language (Whiteley 1968). The language accelerated the integration of the political movements. After independence, although the Swahili language was only taught up to elementary school level, English was still the primary language of politics and economy. Even in junior to senior education, English held predominance over Swahili, but speaking Swahili had already become a symbol of the national pride (Whiteley 1968).

Thus speaking Swahili had become a symbol of pursuing the independence of the nation, and an advocator by the name of Mushi said that Swahili is a language with some kinds of use; it is a national language and should be promoted to all government aspects of education, administration. In order to let the language develop, the bad part of the language has to be removed. And of course, it has to be standardized and encouraged for everyone to speak. Adequate grammar has to be provided. But since Swahili is the second language for most of the people, regarding the promotion aspect, it lacks teaching materials and professional teachers. This is especially serious for education above the junior high level. In the school curriculum, the use of Swahili language was evidently fewer than English (Whiteley 1968). In addition, the topic it covered was limited as well. Since so many lessons are conducted using the English language, the Swahili language has appeared to be a language without efficiency. The resulting consequence is that everyone uses English to explain things in depth at schools. Because Swahili faced its difficulty in the senior

education, the departments of community development and national cultural development established cultural committees to develop the national culture. The Swahili language is encouraged for everyone to use (Whiteley 1968).

The language status of Swahili is a real case of low language changed into high language. Although it is a mother tongue spoken by less than 10% of the population, it has still been turned into a national language, and while the maturity of the development of the language might still be low, its future is unrestricted. Because speaking Swahili is a symbol of the nation's pride and promotions are coming from the educational departments of the government. Still, the language has to compete with English, the language spoken by the colonial dominators. Swahili displayed a strong contrast to the language status of Taigi. Even though the majority of the population of Taiwan speaks Taigi, Taigi is not lucky enough to be established as an official language like Swahili, as far not promoted by the government. However, Swahili suffered the same difficult position as a low language in the colonization period and under the power of English just like Taigi has been suppressed by the Mandarin-only policy. The difficult position and the process of development of Swahili can be set as a good model for Taiwan.

### 3.4.3 The development of Hindi in India

In India, there are about 400 languages. And out of all the languages, Hindi is the language spoken by the majority of India people. About 40% of the population uses this language. The northern and central parts of India are where the primary language is mainly used. On December 1949, it became the national official language of India. English and some other 14 Indian languages have all been accepted as official language constitutionally. It increased to 22 languages in 2003. (TiuN 2006) Hindi

and Urdu belong to the language form of Hindustani. The use of the language may be extensive, but it lacks the language status as the written English. The area where Urdu is used is situated on the western part and is called Uttar Pradesh. It is guided by the westernized Islam elites. Hindi is used on the eastern part, namely Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. It has been influenced greatly by Sanskrit. The supports of both language systems are constantly competing with each other and emphasizing different elements of the language. This is particularly harmful for the development of the commonly spoken languages of India. And so Gandhi, the initiator of the national political public movement brought together the elements, which they were in favor of abandonment into a mixed form and used in North India (Gupta & Gumperz 1968).

In Banaras in 1893, the first association to promote Hindi in a systemized kind of way was established. And in 1910, an association Hindi Saitya Sammelan (HSS), which was politically channeled, was established in Allahabad. In the initial phase of the development, Gandhi together with some other parliament leaders succeeded in turning Hindi into a national written language. They overcame the communication barriers for most social elites and the general public. The connection between Hindi and other local dialects were constructed (Gupta & Gumperz 1968). In order to reach the policy of fundamental education, which Gandhi had in mind, they stressed particularly the importance of literacy lessons for every village and in the countryside. The importance was extended with the help of many centers. In addition, centers have had a strong influence in promoting Hindi in the south part of the country, which is non-Hindi speaking. HSS has expended its organization to all the north part of India and the efforts of its teaching target directly at the people who are already acquainted with the reading and writing Hindi language. It has formed many prestigious literature writers (Gupta & Gumperz 1968). Educational centers have been the resource of

support for HSS organizations. Financially, through the tests and trainings, they have provided large amount of funds. Structurally speaking, HSS has obtained its right from the government to supervise routinely its educational and literacy activities in the north of India and some other places as well. Thousands upon thousands, teachers and the people who propagate in local education centers have testified the effect of a unified wording system (Gupta & Gumperz 1968).

Hindi is the language used by the majority of the population in India, but there are about 400 other languages in India. In the earlier period, there were differences<sup>21</sup> on the usage of Hindi and the language faced the tyranny of the English language spoken by the planters. Hindi also used to be challenged by many other languages. But through the efforts of Gandhi and some other people and the power elaborated by HSS organizations on language educations, Hindi has reached all of India. In contrast, Taiwan does not have that many types of language as India, but based on the population and land mass ratio, the density of language in Taiwan is still considerably high. The ethnic group of which speaks Taigi has a higher rate than people who speak Hindi in India. These two languages had all been suppressed by the colonizing dominations. But the process of Taiwanese pursuing to be a literary language and the effectiveness of its promotion are considered, then it is not as successful as Hindi (see also ch4.1). This successful case of turning Hindi from low language into high language is worthy of a model for Taiwan.

### Brief summary

From 1987 to 1996, Taigi literature encountered three phases of debate. And the main debate had the language form of Taiwan literature and the debate of Chinese standard value perspective against Taiwan standard value perspective. The above



discussion of the three phases encircles the foundation of theory of diglossia and digraphia. Taigi is emphasized as language and script that have independent quality. It is not a dialect attached on the Mandarin. Therefore, it is a must to pursue the language status that Taigi deserved.

Because of the debate of Taigi literature, the investigation of related topics for discussion is also solicited. Among which is the unresolved issue of Taigi standardization of the Taigi literature camp. There are different views coming from different groups on the standardization of written Taigi. Because of the existent crisis of the mother tongue, the issues, claims and execution status of the mother tongue education have all been investigated. A language policy with independent property is demanded because of the suppression of the Mandarin-only policy. It is with hope that a society with multi-languages can be actualized.

#### Endnotes:

<sup>1</sup> See Ang (1989)

<sup>2</sup> See Lin (1989)

<sup>3</sup> See Song (1989)

<sup>4</sup> See Cheng (1989)

<sup>5</sup> Song Dong-Yang was the pseudonym of Chen Fang-Ming, the professor and director of Graduate Institute of Taiwanese Literature in National Chengchi University.

<sup>6</sup> White Terror period is indicated to the martial law period between 1949 and 1987. During this period, Taiwanese people was oppressed by KMT government. Many people were sentenced by military court and lost their freedom or life.

<sup>7</sup> See <http://www.hrweb.org/legal/cpr.html#Article%2020.2>

<sup>8</sup> See Song (1989); According to Song's explanation, the purism means erasing the

vocabulary from other language etymology.

<sup>9</sup> See Lin (1991)

<sup>10</sup> See Lin, Jin-Sian (1991)

<sup>11</sup> For more detail of the definition of Code-switching, please see Nilep, Chad (2006) “ ‘Code-switching’ in Sociocultural Linguistics”, *Colorado Research in Linguistics*, June, Vol.19. Accessed at [http://www.colorado.edu/ling/CRIL/Volume19\\_Issue1/paper\\_NILEP.pdf](http://www.colorado.edu/ling/CRIL/Volume19_Issue1/paper_NILEP.pdf) on March 28, 2008

<sup>12</sup> For more detail about the definition of mixed language, please see Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez and Ming Ming Chiu, (1999)“Building a Culture of Collaboration through Hybrid Language Practices”, *Theory into Practice*, Spring, Vol. 38, No. 2, and *Building Community through Cooperative Learning*, pp. 87-93

<sup>13</sup> The article 2.1 of ‘The Universal Declaration of Human Rights’ adopted and proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 December 1948.stated “Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.”

<sup>14</sup> Peng (1991) stated, “If someone expects Hakka literature to be the index of revitalization, it would be the same thing as burying Hakka literature. Although there are more than 50 million members of Hakkanese ethnic groups in the world, I don’t think the population could become the reason for the existence of Hakka literature”

<sup>15</sup> Ang (1996) stated that the ratio of the same etymology between Mandarin and Holo, reaches 48.88%, while the situation in English and German reaches 58.56%. Closer etymology can result in different language relationships, for sure, a more

distant relationship. Then Holo became a dialect of Mandarin through the operation of political power.

<sup>16</sup> From 2000, one forty-minute session a week for vernacular language teaching in elementary schools was implemented in Taiwan.

<sup>17</sup> According to the data of Canada's National Statistical Agency (accessed on September 27, 2007), the population in Quebec was 7,700,807 as of July 1, 2007. This was 23.35% of the national population of Canada (total population: 32,876,026)

<http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/070927/d070927a.htm>

<sup>18</sup> The 5<sup>th</sup> article of Haitian Constitution (1987) stated, "All Haitians are united by a common language: Creole. Creole and French are the official languages of the Republic."

<sup>19</sup> In the article of Schieffelin & Doucet (1994) viewed the role of Haitian Creole in national identity formation.

<sup>20</sup> The 40<sup>th</sup> article of Haitian Constitution (1987) stated "The State has the obligation to publicize in the oral, written and televised press in the Creole and French languages all laws, orders, decrees, international agreements, treaties, and conventions on everything affecting the national life, except for information concerning national security."

<sup>21</sup> For the more detail, please refer King (1994).