

執行期間：89 年 8 月 1 日至 91 年 1 月 31 日

共同主持人：

☐ 國際合作研究計畫國外研究報告書一份

中 華 民 國 91 年 4 月 29 日

行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫成果報告

計畫編號：NSC 89—2412—H—002—028—

執行期限：89 年 8 月 1 日至 91 年 1 月 31 日

主持人：汪宏倫 國立台灣大學社會學系

一、中英文摘要

本研究藉由探討「中華文化的政治」，試圖釐清全球化與在地化（localization）的過程中，國族（nation）、國家（state）與文化三者之間的關連。過去有關此一議題的研究，多半忽略了「制度」在其中的作用。有鑑於此，本研究採取一個「全球觀點的制度論取向」，以「漢字的羅馬拼音化」為例，試圖去分析「中華民國」與「中華人民共和國」兩個國家，如何在「語文」這個制度場域進行符號抗爭，以達到全球化、在地化、乃至國族化的歷史過程。研究發現，中華人民共和國的政府，能夠成功地制訂「漢語拼音方案」，成為新的中文標音方式，同時在國際上成為普遍採用的標準，主要的原因在於「語言改革」向來是中共政權在「國族打造」過程當中的核心問題之一，同時在制訂「漢語拼音方案」之時，國內、國外情勢，都對其「國族打造」工程有利。而中共在 1970 年代之後，在政治場域上獲勝，更奠定了「漢語拼音方案」的在全球的文化霸權（領導權）基礎。反之，中華民國政府，在一開始的時候就固著在國民黨元老吳稚暉所整理的「注音符號」上，而為了與中共區隔，更是在語言政策上刻意與中共劃清界限。等到九零年代，為了因應全球化的需要，而想要制定一套拼音標準的時候，已經喪失了先機。在外有「與國際（漢語拼音方案）接軌」的壓力、內有統獨爭議的情形之下，中華民國的拼音政策終究面臨內外交逼、進退失據的窘境，至今仍舊難以做出明確的決策來。

關鍵詞：全球化、在地化、民族國家、文化、制度論

This research project intends to investigate the relationships between nation, state, and culture in the global era by analyzing the politics of “Chinese Culture,” with capital C, within and without Taiwan. Most of the existing discussions on the impacts of globalization on nation-states and/or national identities tend to ignore the effects of institutions. In contrast, this research project adopts an “institutionalist approach with a global perspective” to analyze how the two states of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) and of the Republic of China (ROC) engaged in symbolic struggles in the institutional field of language. Focusing on their policies towards romanization of the Chinese characters, it is found that the state of the PRC has been successful in implementing the *Hanyu Pinyin Fang’an* as an institutionalized standard both at the national and at the global levels. There were two major reasons for their success: first, the timing was favorable, and second, by winning the diplomatic battle in the political field in the 1970s, the PRC was able to extend its victory to the symbolic field. In sharp contrast, the state of the ROC had not concerned itself with the issue of romanization until 1990s, when the pressure of globalization gave rise to the need of a standard transliteration system. However, the timing has gone, and the pressures both from inside and from outside have made romanization a thorny issue that the state has not been able to make a decision to date.

Keywords: globalization, localization, nation-state, culture, institutionalism

二、緣由與目的

This project is to examine how forces of globalization, nationalization and

Abstract

localization have shaped the politics of Chinese culture. The making of a distinctive “national culture” has been widely considered a key part in the social and political engineering in the process of nation-building. However, since there has been two states -- namely, the state of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) and that of the Republic of China (ROC) – that claim to be the Chinese nation, the situation is much more complicated than other cases.¹ Language, which has long been considered the “carrier of culture,” is an important institutional device for nation-building. Thus, this study select language policy – more specifically, the policy towards romanization of Chinese characters – as a strategic site for examination.

The aims of the study are not merely about examining the relationships between the state and culture in the process of nation-building; it concerns the general issue of globalization as well. In the study of globalization, the communication between different linguistic communities has been largely ignored by current literature. Indeed, as I have argued before, globalization did not take place in an institutional vacuum (Wang 1999); and more importantly, through what linguistic channels people come to communicate and understand each other remain unexplored. It has been taken for granted that English, as a global language, has become the *lingua franca* of the world. However, this is too narrow a view to provide us with any insights into the linguistic mechanisms in global communication. Instead, following Liu He’s notion of “translingual practice,” this study intends to examine how translingual practice has been made possible through a certain institutional device – that is, the

transliteration system. In the Chinese case, it is the romanization system that forms the focus of our study.

三、結果與討論

Translingual practice occurs as soon as two linguistic communities encounter each other. Thus, the issue of romanization can be dated back to as early as the Ming Dynasty when the Italian preacher Matteo Ricci visited China. In 1605, he published *The Miracle of Western Scripts* (Xizi qiji) in Beijing, in which the first systematic efforts were made to transliterate Chinese characters into Latin alphabets. In the Qing period, another two systems were invented and popularized: the one was the so-called “Church Roman Words²” (*Jiaohui luomazi*), the other was the Wade-Giles system (Li 1999). In the Republican period, two more systems were introduced: the Mandarin Roman Words (*Guoyu luomazi*), and the Northern Latin Scripts. After 1949, the two states on the two sides of the Taiwan Strait adopted very different attitudes towards romanization.

In 1958, the state of the PRC implemented the *Hanyu pinyin Fang’an* and prescribed that it be the standard for the romanization of Chinese characters. In terms of globalization and nationalization, the *Hanyu pinyin Fang’an* can be said a success. On the one hand, it has become a standard worldwide to romanize Chinese names and characters; on the other hand, it is now the official phonetic signs used in the PRC that bears strong national emblems. In sharp contrast, the efforts by the ROC government to standardize the romanization system in Taiwan has been a failed attempt to cope with either globalization or nationalization.

¹ One has to note that the state of the ROC has dramatically changed since Chen Shui-bian’s election as the ROC president, and it no longer claims to be the Chinese nation. However, to make my analysis easier, I shall differentiate this difference in proper contexts. In general situations, the state of the ROC refers to the KMT state that had ruled the island for fifty-five years until 2000.

² I use “Roman words” instead of “Roman characters” to translate the term *luomazi*, because, once being romanized, Chinese characters, which are largely considered ideographic, are already turned into “words” that are spelled by phonetic alphabets.

There are a few reasons that account for such a discrepancy. The first concerns the incentive. While language reforms had long been CCP's primary concern for a long time before they seized the power, the KMT, in sharp contrast, barely made romanization its primary concern. The second reason concerns the timing. When the state of the PRC implemented the *Hanyu Pinyin Fang'an*, the timing and the general environment were favorable to such a project. In the wake of decolonization and nation-building in the post-WWII period, linguistic engineering to "standardize" and normalize a national language was considered normal and received little criticisms or resistance. When the PRC institutionalized the *Hanyu Pinyin Fang'an* in 1958, the "second wave" of globalization was just taking off, while the international communities paid relatively little attention to "trivial" issues like this. The volumes of international travelers, either to the PRC or the ROC, were rather small as compared with the rapidly increasing flows emerging in the 1990s. Furthermore, the overall international environment has not been favorable to the ROC, especially after the 1970s. As the PRC won the battle in the political field, it has also gained an upper-hand in the symbolic field in defining Chinese culture – this is the motto of nationalism, that every culture must have a political roof and no more than one roof. As a consequence, when the ROC intended to implement another system of romanization, it was already too late.

Finally but most importantly, romanization is now a battleground for the domestic politics. It is one of the important fields in which cultural hegemony – that is, moral and intellectual leadership – is contested by two camps, the unificationists and independentists. In other words, the ROC state faces the challenges both from *within* and from *without*. It has missed the timing, also in these two senses. Internationally, it had not done it before globalization became a conspicuous phenomenon. Internally, it had not done it before the break down of the authoritarian rule. Considering the KMT's success in

implementing Mandarin as the national language island-wide, it is reasonable to imagine that the romanization system, no matter which system was invented or adopted, would have been implemented successfully had the KMT state done it simultaneously.

The linguistic situation in Hong Kong is another interesting case for reference. On the one hand, the Cantonese dialect used in Hong Kong is rather different phonetically from Chinese Mandarin; on the other hand, the British colonial government had neither interests nor incentives to impose a standardized romanization system in Hong Kong. For the colonizer, insofar as their dominance and administration could be maintained, they did not carry the burden to build a distinctive "national culture." The lack of a standard of romanization system has rarely been considered a problem.

四、計畫成果自評

The self-evaluation of the project can be elaborated from two aspects:

First, on the contributions of the study, this project has systematically built up a database for the romanization of Chinese characters. In terms of first-hand or secondary materials, this project has compiled rather comprehensive and updated database concerning the debate. Intellectually, it also helps us clarify the relationships between globalization, culture and the nation-state. In addition, the issue of translingual practice has also been brought into the picture of globalization, making our understanding of the process of globalization more comprehensive.

Second, as with most studies, this project has its own limitations as well. There are at least two things that this project has not dealt with and will remain to be explored in further studies. First, because of the lack of access, I was unable to investigate how the *Hanyu Pinyin Fang'an* was implemented the practiced in the PRC, especially before the 1980s. My

preliminary finding suggests that the *pinyin* policy might not have been so successful as outsiders imagine in early years. Although the *pinyin* system was in part invented in order to “sweep illiteracy” (*saomang*), ironically, it is found that in rural areas, where “sweeping illiteracy” were supposedly most needed, the *pinyin* system was rarely taught.

The second limitation concerns the ROC’s side, and it is a limitation that can hardly be overcome because of the intrinsic nature of the topic. The debate concerning the *pinyin* system has not been settled yet, and since it is a highly sensitive issue that is tightly connected with the issue of unification/independence, its future is as undetermined as the status of the ROC. As pointed out above, the momentum of institutionalizing the *pinyin* system has been reversed ever since DPP’s Chen Shui-bian was elected the President of the ROC, it remains unclear whether the policy will be modified again if there is to be a change-over of the regime in the future.

There are some future studies that can be done following this exploratory one. It is possible to expand the scope of the study to include other cases where Hanzi (Chinese characters) or non-Roman linguistic system are in use – for instance, Singapore, Japan, Korea, Vietnam, to name but a few. A project of this kind, of course, calls for a research team that combines experts and specialists of different kinds and in different areas. However, such a comparative study is quite promising and is worth pursuing.

五、參考文獻(Selected Bibliography)

- [1] 文字改革出版社 (Ed.). 1957. 漢語拼音方案草案討論集. 北京: 新華書店.
- [2] 文字改革出版社 (Ed.). 1957. 漢語拼音方案草案討論集. 北京: 新華書店.
- [3] 文字改革出版社 (Ed.). 1976. 中國人名地名拼寫規範化問題. 北京: 新華書店.
- [4] 文字改革出版社 (Ed.). 1983. 《漢語拼音方案》的制訂和應用. 北京: 新華書店.
- [5] 地圖出版社 (Ed.). 1974. 漢語拼音《中華人民共和國地圖》地名索引. 北京: 新華書店.
- [6] 李樂毅. 1999. 你了解漢語拼音嗎?. 香港: 三聯書店.
- [7] 汪學文. 1967. 中共文字改革與漢字前途. 台北: 國際關係研究所.
- [8] 汪學文. 1974. 共匪文字改革總批判. 台北: 中華民國國際關係研究所.
- [9] 汪學文. 1977. 中共簡化漢字之研究. 台北: 國立政治大學國際關係研究中心.
- [10] 周有光. 1997. 漢語拼音方案基礎知識. 香港: 三聯書店.
- [11] Chen, Ping. 1999. *Modern Chinese: History and Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [12] DeFrancis, John. 1972. *Nationalism and Language Reform in China*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- [13] DeFrancis, John. 1984. *The Chinese Language: Fact and Fantasy*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- [14] DeFrancis, John. 1989. *Visible Speech: The Diverse Oneness of the Writing Systems*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.