

## **A Reluctant Identity: The Development of Holo Identity in Contemporary Taiwan<sup>1</sup>**

*Fu-chang Wang*  
*Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica, Taiwan*

### **Abstract**

*This paper traces the development of Holo identity in contemporary Taiwan by comparing two waves of disputes over the proper Chinese name for the Taiwanese Holo, in the 1950s and then in the 1990s. The first debate broke out in 1958 in the literary journal Taipei Wenwu, when Taiwanese Holo intellectuals strongly contested the usages ‘福佬’ (pronounced ‘Ho Lo’ in Taiwanese Holo, but ‘Fu lau’ in Mandarin), ‘河洛’ (again ‘Ho Lo’ in Holo, but ‘He Luo’ in Mandarin), and, to a lesser degree, ‘閩南’ (‘Min nan’). These debates occurred during a feverish period of study and recording of Taiwan’s languages, cultures, and customs that developed before Taiwan was returned to Chinese rule in 1945. A close examination of the content and context of the 1958 debate indicates that its real and yet hidden agenda was in fact a clash of different national imaginations, and that it served as a proxy for dispute over views of Taiwan’s Chinese legacy at a time when hostility between Taiwanese and the newly arrived Mainlander migrants was still quite evident after the first turbulent decade of regime change. The debate ended unexpectedly without any conclusion: Holo intellectuals were unable to use the preferred term, ‘台灣話’ (‘Taiwan Hua’), and other names remained in use as a reluctant compromise.*

*The debate rose again from the late 1980s under a very different circumstance, when a new version of the Taiwanese national imagination was formally proposed by a substantial political opposition force. Ethnic tensions in the early 1990s impelled the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) to propose an alternative ideal pattern of ethnic relations in its nation-building project: facing protests from other ethnic minorities, who accused the DPP of allowing a Holo chauvinism to develop among its over-enthusiastic supporters that equated ethnic Holo with national Taiwan in its national imagination, the DPP’s Holo members responded by initiating a discourse of ‘Taiwan’s Four Great Ethnic Groups’. The 1994 debate over the proper Chinese name for the Holo ethnic group, which is still unresolved,*

---

<sup>1</sup> An early draft of this paper was presented at the 1st World Congress of Taiwan Studies, Panel on Ethnicity, Nationalism and Modern State, 26–28 April 2012, organized by the Academia Sinica. The current version incorporates substantial revisions. The author is thankful for useful suggestions by anonymous reviewers.

*indicated another dimension of Holo reluctance to accept a self-constrained identity imposed by others.*

On 26 August 1991, Taiwan's major opposition party, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), held a convention that led to the *Draft Taiwan Constitution* (台灣憲法草案), the first document of its kind proposed by a major political force in Taiwan.<sup>2</sup> Amendments were made at a second convention three years later (see Shih 1995 for the *Proceedings*); this was initiated by some DPP leaders and strong supporters of the Taiwan independence movement, but the DPP itself did not take charge, since it was widely thought that the first convention had been partly responsible for the DPP's disappointing performance in the first general National Assembly election at the end of 1991. Although the second draft was never formally discussed beyond this convention, let alone put into effect, some of its main ideas became guiding principles for official policies during the 2000–2008 DPP administration. Along with a change in the title, which was amended to *Draft Constitution of the Republic of Taiwan* (台灣共和國憲法草案), the most substantial and important amendments between the two drafts was the addition of a new chapter, entitled 'Ethnicity':

#### 第九章 族群

- 第 100 條 台灣現有住民包含原住民、新住民、客家、Holo 四大族群，統稱為台灣人。各族有自我命名之權利。
- 第 101 條 國民依法有選擇族群認同之權利，並於每回人口普查中確認。
- 第 102 條 各族群之語言文化及少數族群之工作權應予保障。國民義務教育，除個人母語外，至少需學習一種其他族群語言。
- 第 103 條 中央政府應設超黨派族群委員會，由各族群依法推派等額委員組成，處理族群事務，促進族群平等與和諧。
- 第 104 條 各族群依法推派等額國會議員組成族群委員會。有關族群之法律案應先提交族群委員會審議。

(施正鋒，1995：210–211)

#### [Chapter 9 Ethnicity]

- Article 100 There are four ethnic groups that comprise Taiwan's current residents: Aborigines, the new residents, Hakka, and Holo. They are all Taiwanese. Each group is entitled to name itself.
- Article 101 Taiwan's citizens have legal rights to choose their ethnic identity, which will be reaffirmed in every population census.
- Article 102 Every ethnic group's language and culture, as well as the working rights of the ethnic minority, should be protected. Each citizen should learn one or more ethnic languages beside his or her own mother tongue.

<sup>2</sup> Other versions of a constitution for Taiwan had been proposed by individual opposition leaders, such as Lin Yi-hsiung (林義雄) and Koh Se-kai (許世楷), in 1989. Unlike the 1991 DPP version, both Lin and Koh specifically used the term 'Republic of Taiwan'.

Article 103 A Commission for Ethnic Affairs should be established by the Central Government with equal representatives from each ethnic group to handle ethnic-related issues and to enhance ethnic harmony.

Article 104 An Ethnic Committee should be established in the National Congress with equal representation of congressional members from all ethnic groups. All laws related to ethnic affairs should be reviewed by the Ethnic Committee first.]

(Quoted in Shih 1995: 210–211)

Compared to the previous 1991 draft, in which the only ethnic group mentioned was the Aborigines,<sup>3</sup> the newly added chapter symbolized important changes in the perception of ethnicity and an ideal pattern of ethnic relations that developed during the early 1990s in Taiwan. Ethnic affairs were considered to be so vital and fundamental to Taiwan that participants thought they should be regulated in the Constitution. It was also the first time that a classification of four major ethnic groups was written into a document of this kind.<sup>4</sup>

The document also revealed a peculiar aspect of Taiwan's ethnic phenomenon: the naming of the largest ethnic group as 'Holo'.<sup>5</sup> In Article 100, there was no Chinese name for 'Holo'; instead, they chose a Romanized word. However, as will be shown later in this paper, at least four Chinese names for 'Holo' were raised during the discussion.<sup>6</sup> Apparently, the Holo participants in the 1994 convention could not agree upon any of these, and they had to compromise by using an awkward foreign term as the name of the ethnic group in this historical document. It is quite ironic that the convention could not reach a consensus on the proper name for 'Holo' in Chinese, as most people considered the DPP to be a champion for the Holo ethnic group's interests, to such a degree that it was often criticized as being guilty of Holo chauvinism in some of its practices. As Article 100 also emphasized the right of every ethnic group to self-name, the bizarre term implies a significant division among the Holo elites regarding their ethnic identity, at least at the time of 1994 convention.

This paper investigates the development and the nature of Holo ethnic identity in contemporary Taiwan by focusing on the question of why the Holo elites could not agree upon any Chinese name for their ethnic group, signaling their lack of solidarity. As ethnic identity is usually developed by an ethnic minority in pursuit of its collective interests – be they political, economic, social, or cultural – the case of

---

<sup>3</sup> Chapter 9 of the first version of the *Draft Taiwan Constitution* defines the status of Aborigines in Taiwan and their rights, including that of political autonomy, and regulates the State's obligation to establish a special organization for handling Aboriginal affairs (DPP 1991: 477).

<sup>4</sup> Koh Se-Kai's version, which was published in Japan in 1989, had already mentioned a similar classification of 'four cultural groups' ('四大文化集團') in Taiwan.

<sup>5</sup> In this paper, I choose the term 'Holo' rather than 'Hoklo', a common standard English translation for the language or the people of Hokkien (or Fujien) Province, to translate the Chinese term '福佬'. This is mainly because the former is the exact term used by Taiwanese Holo linguists and political activists after 1980s to name themselves and their language.

<sup>6</sup> The proposed Chinese names were '福佬', '河洛', '閩南' and '鶴佬' (Shih 1997).

Holo ethnic identity is especially interesting, because the Holo are typically considered to be an ethnic *majority*, at least in their relatively large population size, rather than an ethnic *minority* in Taiwan. However, the Holo also constituted the majority of the native Taiwanese population who were deprived of the right and opportunity to self-determination by different outside regimes over the past century leading up to the early 1990s, when Taiwan underwent its long overdue democratic transition. It therefore seems quite justifiable for the Holo to claim themselves as an ethnic minority. And yet, according to conventional wisdom, contemporary Holo identity in Taiwan seems to be related more to its numerical majority status rather than its previous political minority status. Why is this so?

This paper will try to answer the question by exploring two issues. *First*, what were they really fighting about in the dispute over the name for 'Holo'? Why do Holo people insist on using different Chinese names to refer to themselves? The content of the arguments will be analyzed in this part. *Second*, why were there disputes over the naming of the Holo? What were the political and social contexts of these disputes? Given that the proponents of different names in the dispute in 1994 all referred to the same historical evidence to support their claims, it seems unlikely that this would have been a newly emerging issue. This was indeed an old debate, the origin of which can be traced back to a similar debate among Taiwanese intellectuals in 1958. The contexts of the two disputes that occurred 30 years apart, not surprisingly, were quite different. By analyzing the content and context of the dispute over the name for Holo, this paper sheds light on the nature of Holo identity, and ethnic relations in general, in contemporary Taiwan.

### **'福佬' ('Fu lau'), '河洛' ('He Luo'), or '閩南' ('Min nan')? The Debate over the Proper Name For Holo In 1958**

The first debate about the proper Chinese name for Holo erupted in the latter half of 1958 in the quarterly literary journal *Taipei Wenwu* (台北文物),<sup>7</sup> published by the Taipei City Commission of Archives (台北市文獻委員會). Although different names for the Holo language and for Holo people had appeared in previous editions, as well as in publications such as *Taiwan Folkways* (臺灣風物) and *Nan-yin Wen-Hsien* (南瀛文獻) after the beginning of Chinese rule in 1945, most authors did not tackle the issue of determining a universal proper Chinese name for 'Holo'. In the early editions of *Taiwan Folkways* and *Taipei Wenwu* in the early 1950s, three terms emerged in the following order to refer to Taiwanese Holo people and the language they spoke: '福佬' ('Fu lau' in Mandarin, but 'Ho Lo' in Taiwanese Holo), '閩南' ('Min nan'), and '河洛' ('He Luo' in Mandarin, 'Ho Lo' in Holo).

In the following, I will describe the content of the debate by analyzing relevant articles that appeared in these journals on Taiwan in the early 1950s. Please see the Appendix for the chronological order in which articles appeared (as well as articles in a fourth major journal, *Wen-Hsien Journal* 文獻專刊).

---

<sup>7</sup> The full Chinese title means 'culture and artifacts of Taipei'.

### ***The Content and Origin of three Chinese Terms for Holo***

The term ‘福佬’ (*Fu lau*) made its literary debut in Taiwan in a *Taiwanese–Japanese Dictionary* (台日大辭典) compiled by Japanese linguist Ogawa Naoyoshi (小川尚義) in 1907. The entry for ‘福佬人’ says that this was originally a term used by Taiwanese Hakka to refer to Taiwanese Holo people. In 1950, a Japanese-language *Grammar of the Ho-lo Dialect of the Chinese Language Spoken Throughout Tsiang-tsiu, Tsuan-tsiu, Amoy and Formosa*<sup>8</sup> (福建語法序說) by Li Hsien-chang (李獻璋) stated in the first chapter that the proper name for the Taiwanese Holo language was ‘福佬話’ (*Ho lo ue*) rather than ‘福建語’ (literally, ‘language of Ho Kien’), as the Japanese usually and ‘mistakenly’ called it. Li was thus the primary advocate of the term ‘福佬’ in the early 1950s. However, Li later also edited a book of collected essays by a fellow Taiwanese scholar, Kuo Min-kuan (郭明昆), who had studied the Chinese family structure and Taiwanese language and who had been among the first authors to use the term ‘福佬’ (or ‘福老’, also pronounced as ‘Ho Lo’) in the 1930s, in his essays published in Japanese.<sup>9</sup> Besides publishing his own original piece discussing the origin of a common Holo greeting phrase, ‘Have you eaten yet?’ (‘汝食未’) in the very first issue of *Taipei Wenwu* in 1952, Li also translated one of Kuo’s pieces on the ancient usage of the Holo language from Japanese into Chinese and published it in *Nan-ying Wen-hsien* (南瀛文獻) in 1953. In both articles, Li specifically used the term ‘福佬話’ for the Holo language. The term ‘福佬’ was also used by many others, especially Lin Ben-yuan (林本元), who later became a core participant in the 1958 debate.

The term ‘台灣話’ (*Taiwan Hua*) was the preferred expression most commonly used by the local Taiwanese Holo, followed by ‘福佬話’ and ‘福佬人’, which were particularly used by Hakka. In fact, the term ‘福佬’ was originally derived from the Chinese expression for the name given to Holo people by Taiwanese Hakka. According to Ogawa’s 1907 *Taiwanese–Japanese Dictionary*, Taiwanese Hakka used the term ‘福佬’ to refer to Taiwanese Holo in a demeaning way (1907: 829).<sup>10</sup> Holo people, however, grew to accept the name ‘福佬’ for its expressive sound and used it when they needed to distinguish themselves from Hakka (Chi 1957; Lin 1958a). Some authors acknowledged the same common practice but used different terms, such as ‘和老’ (*Ho lo* in Taiwanese Holo) or ‘福老’, to express the same pronunciation.<sup>11</sup>

Some Taiwanese authors also began to use the term ‘閩南’ (*Min nan*), which was introduced by the Chinese Mainlanders who came to Taiwan after 1945. The new immigrants soon realized that the Taiwanese Holo language was in fact

<sup>8</sup> This is the English title as it appeared in the back of the book, although the word ‘Grammar’ was misspelled as ‘Grammer’.

<sup>9</sup> Kuo used ‘福佬’ in a paper published in 1936, and ‘福老’ in two other papers published in 1937 and 1940. Kuo and his family were killed in a ship sunk by a submarine in 1943 during the war. The edited volume of Kuo’s works was published in Japan in 1963 (Kuo 1963).

<sup>10</sup> In the Hakka (which Japanese referred to as ‘Cantonese Race’) language, ‘佬’ had negative connotations such as ‘thief’ (‘賊佬’) or ‘mute person’ (‘啞佬#’).

<sup>11</sup> For instance, Su Wei-Hsiang (蘇惟熊) used ‘和老’ in a paper published in 1952 in *Taiwan Folkways* (article 5 in the Appendix); Chi Yuan (寄園) used ‘福老’ (Chi 1957).

derived directly from Min Nan Hua (閩南話), a language spoken in the southern part of Fu-kien Province, according to the classification of Han Chinese dialects in a survey conducted in China during the 1930s. As the majority of Han Taiwanese ancestors had come from the southern part of Fu-kien Province, starting from the 1680s, it was quite reasonable for some Taiwanese to quickly adopt the new term to signify the origin of their language and their ancestral hometown. In the early 1950s, however, '閩南' was used to refer *only* to the Taiwanese Holo language, and not the people. The term '閩南人', by contrast, clearly referred to Mainlander migrants who came from the southern part of Fu-kien Province and arrived in Taiwan after 1945. Li Teng-yueh (李騰嶽) was the first author to adopt the term in the first issue of *Taiwan Folkways* (published in 1951), when he talked about Lien Ya-tan's (連雅堂) study of the Taiwanese Holo language during the 1930s.<sup>12</sup> In the following year (1952), Wu Hwei (吳槐) also used it in the inaugurating issue of *Taipei Wenwu*, in which he wrote about the change of pronunciation in the Holo language spoken in Taipei. The most important promoters of the term '閩南' were Taiwanese linguistics professor Wu Shou-li (吳守禮) and *Min-nan* dictionary compiler Hsu Cheng-chang (許成章), both of whom had relied heavily on linguistic materials compiled by Chinese scholars on the *Min-nan* Dialect.

Although it was commonly believed that the idea of '河洛' was implied by Lien Ya-tan during 1930s to refer to the Taiwanese Holo language (e.g. Ang 1987a), the first real usage of '河洛' in the literature appeared in 1955, when Wu Hwei wrote about the stories of ancient Tung and Song Dynasties preserved in the Taiwanese Holo language (which he called '*He luo yu*' (or '*Min nan yu*') ('河洛語', '閩南語')) in Volume 4 of *Taipei Wenwu* (H. Wu 1955). Wu did not specify why he chose to use the new term '*He luo yu*' ('河洛語') in the 1955 article, in which he still held on to the old term '閩南語', placed in parentheses. Later, after the debate over the proper name for Holo erupted in 1958, Wu began to write a series of articles for *Taipei Wenwu* under the title 'On *He luo yu*' ('河洛語叢談'). In the first contribution to the series, Wu clearly stated his reasons for preferring the term '河洛', as will be discussed later in this paper.

### **The Debate over the Name for Holo in 1958**

The dispute over the proper Chinese name for Holo started when Tsai Yu-Jai (蔡毓齋) published an article entitled 'Examples of *He luo hua*' ('河洛話舉例') in *Taipei Wenwu* in June 1958, in which he severely criticized the terms '閩南' and '福佬' as either historically inaccurate or absurd (Y.-J. Tsai 1958a). He was especially harsh about the general usage of '福佬' and targeted one particular author with criticisms of the specific examples of Holo idioms he had given. Tsai resented the name '福佬' for its literal implication that Holo were *savages* (*Man* 蠻) in the Fu-kien area, according to some interpretations of the two Chinese words in ancient Chinese texts.<sup>13</sup> Although Tsai did not clearly identify the target of his criticism, a regular reader of the journal could easily figure it out by comparing what Tsai claimed to

<sup>12</sup> Also known as Lien Hen (連橫), he is best known as the author of *A General History of Taiwan* (台灣通史).

<sup>13</sup> '竟有人寫作『福佬』(佬與猪同,蠻也,見苗俗記),儼然以福建之蠻苗自居,乖謬尤甚矣。'(Tsai 1958a: 11).

be 'disgusting' and 'fabricated' examples of Taiwanese Holo idioms given by others. It was quite obvious that Tsai was in fact attacking examples given in an article by Lin Ben-yuan published in the same journal nine months earlier (B.-Y. Lin 1957).<sup>14</sup> As the critique was too obvious to ignore, Lin responded by writing a rebuttal, entitled '*Fu-Lau Ren? Or Ho-luo Ren?*' '福佬人乎河洛人乎', which was published two issues later in October 1958. Lin emphasized the importance of consulting with Taiwanese Holo and Hakka for the current consensus over usage, rather than referring to an ancient Chinese text when deciding a proper Chinese term for Holo in Taiwan. He argued that *He luo* ('河洛') was not an inclusive hometown for Han migrants in Fu-kien. Likewise, it was unreasonable to expect that the ancestors of Taiwanese Holo came exclusively from *He luo* area or claimed themselves to be direct descendants of ancient Chinese kings and nobles from that area (B.-Y. Lin 1958b). Therefore, he considered '福佬', rather than '河洛', was a more appropriate Chinese name for the Taiwanese Holo.

Lin Ben-yuan's polite and yet subtle rebuttal provoked another round of debate in the next issue of *Taipei Wenwu*. Wu Hwei began to publish his series of 'On *He luo hua*', Tsai Yu-Jai wrote 'We are *He luo ren*' ('正是河洛人'), and Chi Ya (集鴉) responded with 'Comments on *Fu-Lau Ren? Or Ho-luo Ren?*' ('福佬人乎河洛人乎讀後書感'). All three articles unanimously argued for '河洛' over '福佬'.

In the first part of his series of studies on *He luo hua*, Wu confronted the naming issue in a direct manner. He explicitly claimed that other sound expressions of the term 'Holo', including '河老', '福老', '學老', '福佬', and '學佬', were inferior to '河洛' in their connotations and historical relevance. Quoting Chinese classic literature and historical documents, Wu argued that the area of the two rivers (Yellow River 黃河 and Luo River 洛水) was the political center of three ancient Chinese dynasties (夏商周) and the ancestral homes of the Han migrants who came to Fu-kein when the capital of the Eastern Jin Dynasty (東晉) fell into the hands of foreign invaders in 310CE. Wu believed that the term '河洛' originated because the Han migrants and their descendants were called 'Ho-lo' ('河洛') by the natives of Fu-kein.

Tsai (1958b: 20) again referred to a book by two Chinese scholars, Chou Ru (鄒魯) and Chang Shuan (張煊), which had been originally published in 1907 under the title *A History of Han's Hakka and Fulau* (漢族客福史) and republished in 1932 by the National Sun Yatsen University Press. Chou and Chang (1932 [1907]) wanted to clarify that both 福老 and Hakka came from the *He luo* area and were therefore pure Han people, in contradiction to a statement made by a Cantonese scholar named Huang Jei (黃節) in a book on the local history and geography of Kwang-tung Province that both were non-Han (for the details of this dispute, see Lo [羅香林] 1933: 5). Tsai claimed that the name '福老' (*Fu-lau*) was acceptable because the two Chinese scholars had used it in 1907, but that '福佬' (*Fu-lau*) was not, because '佬' (*lau*) is same as '猪' (*lau*), which means 'savages' or 'barbarians'.

To support his argument for using '河洛' rather than '福佬', Chi Ya also referred to another debate about whether Hakka and Holo were of Han descent, which had taken place in Kwang-tung Province in 1905. He further indicated that Lin Ben-

<sup>14</sup> For instance, Tsai criticized Lin for making up an absurd story to explain the origin of a Holo idiom, '無某無猴', which he said was mistaken and should be written as '無婦無後' (Tsai 1958a: 12–13).

yuan's insistence on using '福佬' to imply that the ancestors of Taiwanese Holo in Fu-kein were in fact *Bi Yueh* Tribe (百越族) rather than Han – a previous debate over which had already been settled in China some 50 years earlier – was an intentional move to separate the Taiwanese from the Chinese nation. Chi Ya did not use his real name when publishing this article, probably because this was a serious accusation: that Lin intended to claim that Taiwanese were not Han Chinese even before their ancestors migrated to Taiwan, which in some way collaborated with the major argument of the Formosan Nationalist movement proposed by Liao Wen-yi (廖文毅) in Japan in 1956.<sup>15</sup>

If we examine Chou and Chang's (1932 [1907]) original work that both Tsai Yu-Jai and Chi Ya () cited heavily in this debate, however, we cannot find the term '河洛' anywhere, even though the authors did mention that the Holo ancestors originally came from *He Nan* (河南) and later moved into *Fu Kien* (福建). Instead, the terms '河老' and '福老' repeatedly appeared in their little book (especially on page 9). Also, although Wu Hwei cited many classic texts in which the term '河洛' appeared, none of them provided direct evidence for his argument that ancestors of Taiwanese Holo were called 河洛人 by the natives after they migrated from *He Nan* to *Fu Kien*. Judging from the existing evidence, it may be fair to say that Wu in fact invented '河洛' as an substitute for the term '福老' used in Chou and Chang's book against the term '福佬', which Tsai Yu-Jai considered to be an 'unbearable and outrageous invention'.

The debate about the proper name for Holo ended quite unexpectedly after these three articles were published simultaneously in the same issue of *Taipei Wenwu*, as there was no follow-up article on the same topic.<sup>16</sup> No agreement or conclusion was reached, as different authors stuck to their preferred terms in various publications after the debate. However, Wu Hwei's series articles of 'On *He Luo Hua*' appeared regularly in *Taipei Wenwu* in ten parts over the next three years, concluding in September 1961. As Wu was the only resident member (his job title was '常駐委員' in Chinese) of Taipei City's Commission of Archives, which was the publisher of *Taipei Wenwu*, the continuing publication of his series in the specific titles could be seen as indicating the journal's unspoken official position of promoting the term '河洛' over others at that time.

### ***The context for the 1958 Debate***

How can we make sense of this old debate among cultural intellectuals from more than 50 years ago? I argue that the real issue was more than just the proper Chinese name for the Holo language and Holo people: by examining the content and focus of Taiwanese language studies undertaken by the authors involved, we can see that the debate was a confrontation over different *national* imaginations.

The 1950s followed a turbulent five years that saw regime change in 1945, the tragic conflict of the 2-28 Incident in 1947, and the relocation of the Chinese

<sup>15</sup> In his book *Formosan Nationalism* (台灣民本主義), published in Tokyo, Liao proposed that the Taiwanese nation was a people of mixed blood and therefore not Chinese (see F. Chen 1998: 67–68).

<sup>16</sup> One possible reason for the interruption of the heated debate was the sudden death of Tsai Yu-Jai in 1958, after his second article was published.

national government to the island as the Kuomintang (KMT) regime lost its civil war against the Chinese Communist regime in 1949. At the start of the new decade, Taiwanese intellectuals were slowly recovering from the initial cultural shock and engaging once again in public affairs. The inflow of more than one million Chinese Mainlanders, who were supposed to be of the 'same national lineages and cultures' (同文同種) as their fellow Taiwanese, yet who occupied most of the important positions in the transplanted national government institutions, led to rising tensions. While the ruling KMT regime sought to reduce this tension by stressing the common cultural connections and blood lineages of Taiwanese and Mainlanders, some Taiwanese intellectuals took an opposite approach that attempted to enhance mutual understanding through studying Taiwan's culture and history. They argued that hostility between Taiwanese and Mainlanders was the result of cultural misunderstanding following fifty years of Japanese rule, and the study of Taiwanese language thus became a priority. An editorial in *Taiwan Folkways* (1953) said that the journal had been created to promote mutual understanding, although some Taiwanese intellectuals also wanted to document Taiwan's unique culture and languages before they were influenced by the newly arrived migrants, who carried the 'high culture' of the supposed 'fatherland'.

This is the background for the 1958 debate over whether '河洛' or '福佬' was the proper Chinese term for the Holo language and people. Those who argued in favour of '河洛' or '閩南' tried to highlight the cultural linkage with ancestral hometowns in China and ancient Chinese language, while those who preferred '福佬' wanted to show that the Taiwanese Holo language had been influenced by other cultures and languages, especially Japan and Japanese, and had developed unique sayings and phrases. Wu Hwei's series of 'On *He Luo Hua*', as it appeared regularly in *Taipei Wenwu* (1958–1961) and later in *Taiwan Folkways* (1967–1969), was the most typical example of the former: Wu spent years searching for and compiling traces of ancient Chinese classic texts still preserved in 河洛話, including '詩經', '尚書', '禮記', and '書經'. Wu's articles were usually written in the classic style of Chinese writing (文言文), which was unfamiliar to most Taiwanese readers apart from an elite minority trained in classical Chinese literature.

In contrast, those who argued for using '福佬' (or '福老') sought to collect all the proverbs, phrases, and children's songs that Taiwanese Holo people had developed in the 300 years since their ancestors had migrated from China. This endeavor soon became a fashionable collective effort in the 1950s and 1960s, with all kinds of people devoting a great amount of time to reporting and recording what they called *Tai-yu Yen-yu* (臺語諺語), folksongs (歌謠), or vulgar proverbs (俚諺). Some authors tried to compile all the proverbs commonly used in rural agricultural settings; others wrote about proverbs relating to women, sexual relations, child-bearing customs, or life in general (please see the Appendix for related articles). Some authors even tried to record sayings that were used only in certain areas, for instance, Bei Tou (北投) Yang Ming Shan (陽明山), or southern Taiwan (see the first volume of *Taipei Wenwu* for examples). However, because there was no agreed-upon standard system to express these proverbs in writing, the authors had to devise an 'accurate' method to record their findings and to explore the meaning and story behind each item. The Taiwanese Holo proverbs recorded in these articles were so unique to Taiwan in most cases that even the

Mainlander migrants from southern Fu-kien Province who spoke a similar *Min-nan* language had a hard time understanding them. In some cases, the proverbs were used only in specific regions, and Taiwanese Holo in other regions had never heard of them.

Such works obviously intended to demonstrate the undeniable existence of a unique Taiwanese culture. They implied, implicitly or explicitly, that although Taiwanese Holo language originally came from Southern Fu-kien, it had developed into a distinctive language as early migrants and their descendants had adapted to local conditions that included being ruled by different foreign regimes, coping with Taiwan's sub-tropical climate, and interacting with Hakka and the aboriginals. Lin Ben-yuan's discussion of the languages of Taiwan vividly demonstrated this point (B.-Y. Lin 1958a). As well as distinguishing between the three major Taiwanese language categories (which he called 'dialects') of Aboriginal, Hakka, and Holo, he also discussed the influence of Japanese, and of English and French, which he judged had been for the most part mediated through Japanese. All these elements became part of the Taiwanese Holo language.

The fact that Taiwanese Holo people at this time called themselves '福佬人', and their language '福佬話', was also seen as demonstrating that Taiwanese culture was distinctive. As noted above, the term '福佬' had been used originally by Taiwanese Hakka to describe the *Min-nan* or *Holo*-speaking people in Taiwan, and in its original Chinese textual context it may even – as Wu Hwei, Tsai Yu-Jai, and Chi Ya ( ) claimed – have carried a negative connotation. Despite this, Holo people had grown to accept the term and accordingly used it to refer to themselves in the presence of Hakka. As most people in Taiwan during the Ching Dynasty were illiterate, they might not have fully understood or cared about the negative connotations of the 'written' name.

However, for a long time, it was a term that was known only to those Holo who interacted with Hakka on a regular basis. Given that Hakka had been subjected to relocations following intra-ethnic strife (分類械鬥) and were a minority concentrated within a limited geographical area, most Holo people remained unaware of the term. More common terms for their own language were *Taiwan Hua* ('台灣話') or *Tai Yu* ('台語'). The KMT regime disliked '*Taiwan Hua*', which had become popular in Taiwan during the Japanese period, because it implied a language distinct from the *Min-nan* dialect of China. When, for ideological reasons, Taiwanese Holo-speakers could not use the preferred term *Taiwan Hua*, they would instead use a term that better reflected their historical experience and relations with other Taiwanese rather than a term implying ancestral connections with China, even though their historical relations with Hakka and aboriginals may have been quite hostile. That is why they preferred '福佬' over '河洛'. Some authors disapproved of '福佬', but their reasons were taken from the debate that had taken place in China in 1905 to 1907 and were not convincing.

As hostility between the Taiwanese and the newly arrived Mainlanders was still quite evident in the 1950s and 1960s, Taiwanese Holo intellectuals who dared not openly support the Formosan Independence Movement that had developed overseas seemed to utilize the debate as a significant opportunity to express their frustration and discontent. This can be seen by examining how their studies of the Taiwanese Holo language shifted focus. Unlike their predecessors, such as Kuo Min-kuan (郭一舟) or Li Hsein-chang (李獻璋), who pioneered using the term '福佬

話' in their studies of Taiwanese Holo language during Japanese rule, Lin and others who advocated using the same term from the 1950s paid disproportionately less attention to Chinese legacies in the Holo language. Kuo's and Li's works were aimed at Japanese readers, and by publishing on ancient Chinese traces in the Holo language they tried to convince them that Taiwanese Holo was a beautiful and elegant language that probably preserved more ancient Chinese language forms, idioms, and expressions than other Chinese languages or dialects. They also used Chinese legacies in Holo as a counter-argument against the superiority of the Japanese (language) over the Taiwanese Holo (language). However, Lin and his fellow Taiwanese Holo writers who published on topics related to Taiwanese languages in the same period had a very different agenda. They attempted to highlight that Japanese legacies had been greatly diminished by the KMT's progressive policy of de-Japanization and re-Sinicization, and with that a distinctive culture in the language as a way to express Taiwan Holo identity in contrast to that of Chinese Mainlanders. Yang Yang (洋洋, apparently a pen name), for instance, published two pieces on *Taiwan Folkways* (臺灣風物) in 1958 that discussed how the Taiwanese dialect was being distorted among the younger generation due to how they were being influenced by the Japanese they learned in school (Yang 1958, 1960).

Another sign that language studies were being used to distinguish Taiwanese from Mainlanders was the emergence of a special topic or genre relating to new phrases or idioms that had been popularized in Taiwan after 1945. Although Taiwanese had not initiated this topic, it was Taiwanese writers who gave the genre a strongly distinct flavor. Chung Hua 忠華 (a pen name of Chen Han-kuang 陳漢光, a well-known Mainlander author in Taiwan literature from Fu-Kien Province<sup>17</sup>) wrote the first piece on this topic, which appeared in *Taiwan Folkways* in 1958. It was entitled 'Taiwan's new Idioms after the Glorious Restoration' ('光復後台灣新俗語'), and it reported some popular ethnic slurs against Mainlanders by Taiwanese, such as '阿山', '阿山婆仔', and '外省仔'.<sup>18</sup> As Chen spoke Min-nan and could comprehend the Taiwanese Holo language quite well, it was very likely that he understood Taiwanese hostility toward Mainlanders. Chen (again as Chung Hua) also wrote a second article on the same subject for the journal, while Yang Yang also contributed a piece (see Appendix for information about these articles). Yang's article was much more explicit, with five of the six new idioms he (or she) reported coined to describe 'corrupt Mainlander officials' ('外省貪官').<sup>19</sup> In an article published in 1963, Lin Ben-yuan used his real name to write a particularly comprehensive article on this topic, 'The New Phrases that Appeared in Taiwan after its Restoration to China' ('光復後台灣的新名詞'), in which he collected 83 new

<sup>17</sup> This is confirmed as Chen's other name (字) in the bibliography compiled by his widow Lai-tsui Chen (陳賴垂) after he passed away in 1973 (L.-T. Chen 1974: 116).

<sup>18</sup> All three terms referred to 'Mainlanders' in a demeaning tone. I choose not to cite the worst examples in this paper as they are too racist to repeat.

<sup>19</sup> I was not able to find any concrete evidence to confirm whether Yang Yang was a Taiwanese or a Mainlander. However, the article's tone and knowledge of Taiwanese Holo language, as well as details of in a second article ('Distorted *Taiwan Hua*' ['走樣的台灣話'], in 1958) about the absorption of Japanese terms, are suggestive that the author was more likely to be a Taiwanese.

phrases. Readers could easily sense a strong flavor of sarcasm in this piece, which implied the emergence of a corrupt political culture and practices following the 'glorious restoration' of Chinese rule in Taiwan (B.-Y. Lin 1963).<sup>20</sup> Some of these phrases had appeared in Taiwan's news media before the outbreak of the 2-28 Incident in 1947 and represented Taiwanese elites' clear anger against and astonishment at the new rulers over the corrupt and 'backward' political culture of the time. Lin specifically stated that while these phrases were quite common and even taken for granted among Mainlanders, they were new to the Taiwanese. For some discontented Taiwanese intellectuals, the KMT regime controlled by the Mainlanders was regarded as an even worse substitute for their previous Japanese rulers, who may have been cruel and discriminatory but at least were law-abiding and decent.

As can be seen from the above analysis, Taiwanese intellectuals were divided in their attitudes toward the new rulers from the 'fatherland'. While some chose to cooperate with the new regime and adapted the Chinese nationalist doctrine in treating Taiwan's historical relations with China and Japan, others took an opposite approach. Tsai Yu-Jai was well known as closely related to Mainlander intellectuals socially: Tsai and a large number of Mainlanders established a riddle society in Taipei (集思謎社) in July 1958, with Tsai serving as its first president until he passed away a few months later.<sup>21</sup> With the coming of Mainlanders and the Chinese literature and materials they brought with them, Taiwanese Holo authors who identified with Chinese nationalist doctrine had more Chinese cultural resources at their disposal to counteract the previous dominance of Japanese materials among Taiwanese intellectuals, including those created by Taiwanese during the Japanese era. During the 1958 debate, Chinese literary materials published in China during the Japanese period in Taiwan, and therefore unknown to most Taiwanese, were heavily cited by those who favored '河洛' over '福佬' to support their claims, including Chou and Chang (1907 [1932]), Chung (1922), and Lo (1933).

In contrast, those who preferred '福佬' usually relied on materials written by Taiwanese scholars during the Japanese colonial period; these included materials both in Chinese and in Japanese, some of which already focused on documenting Taiwanese folk stories or songs as a way to record and preserve the unique Taiwanese culture (e.g. H.-C. Li 1935 [1970]). The most extreme position on this side was the development of a Formosan nationalist movement overseas, such as that of Liao Wen-yi in Japan. In 1962 the Taiwan Youth Society (台灣青年社), a Taiwan independence organization formed by Taiwanese students in Japan, formulated a Formosan nationalist discourse that saw the Taiwanese nation as consisting of Hakka, Holo, and Aborigines; Mainlanders were regarded as Chinese and therefore another regime of foreign invaders (Chang and Chen 2012:

---

<sup>20</sup> For example, Lin listed the following new phrases that carried a sarcastic tone to describe the KMT government's bureaucratic and corrupt ways of conducting official business: 馬虎 (careless), 特權 (privilege), 一問三不知 (unresponsive), 回扣 (kick-backs), 偷工斂料 (cutting corners), 揩油 (ask for bribes), 紅包 (bribe money), 護航 (cover up) and 幫閒 (hang on to and serve the rich and powerful).

<sup>21</sup> The following website has information on Tsai Yu-Jai's involvement with Mainlander scholars in the riddle society: <http://edu.ocac.gov.tw/local/riddle/page/201.htm>.

114). Although the Taiwan Independence Movement could not extend into the public domain in Taiwan, given the harsh repression by the KMT, some intellectuals on the island were sympathetic and some members of the Taiwanese elite also treated the Chinese Mainlander migrants as outsiders.

In all, we can say that the first driving force for developing a Holo identity came from the Mainlander-controlled state, which tried to impose the name '*Min nan Hua*' ('閩南話') as the substitute for '*Taiwan Hua*' ('台灣話'), the more commonly used term among the Taiwanese Holo. This formed part of a re-Sinicization project in which Mandarin was promoted as the Taiwan's national language, and Holo had the status of a Han Chinese 'dialect'. This accidentally stirred the first debate in 1958 among some Taiwanese Holo intellectuals, who shifted the focus of the debate to whether '福佬' or '河洛' was the appropriate Chinese name for Taiwanese Holo. Two different national imaginations stand behind the difference: one in which Taiwan is an inseparable part of the Chinese nation, and one in which Taiwan is seen as having developed a unique culture of its own and thus deserving to be an independent nation. Given the highly sensitive nature of national issues at this time, however, this real difference remained unspoken during the 1958 debate.

### **Consequence of the 1958 debate**

The 1958 debate was never really settled, as all three terms continued to appear in the literature. Also, other than the few who were actually involved in the debate, most authors seemed to not care about determining a universal and proper name for Holo, instead using the three Chinese terms interchangeably and sometimes even simultaneously in their works. For instance, several books and monographs on the Taiwanese Holo language published in the 1960s and 1970s used at least two different terms in their books, even though they all used '閩南話' in their Chinese titles:

- 1964: 孫洵侯, 臺灣(閩南)話攷證  
(H.H. Sun, *The Origin and Nature of Taiwan or Southern Fukien Colloquial*)<sup>22</sup>
- 1967: 董同龢, 趙榮琅, 藍亞秀, 記臺灣的一種閩南話  
(Tung Tung-ho, Chao Yung-lang and Lan Ya-shiu, *A South Min Dialect of Taiwan*)<sup>23</sup>
- 1977: 黃敬安, 閩南話考證: 證說文解字舉例  
(Huang Ching-an, *A Study of Minnan Hua*)<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> The English title of the book appeared on its front cover. 'Origin', however, was misspelled as 'Orgin'.

<sup>23</sup> In the preface, the authors discussed '閩南話' and '福佬話'. The English title appeared on the back cover; 'Dialect', however, was misspelled as 'Dealect'.

<sup>24</sup> In the preface, Huang remarked how Taiwanese were also called '河洛人', and that the title of his book could be called *A Study of Taiwan Hua* 台灣話考證.

Of the three instances cited above, the authors did not seem to care about the issue of name, as none of them take any firm stand on any one of the three terms. Huang Ching-an (1977) even used the suppressed and yet popular term '*Taiwan Hua*' in his book's preface.

More important, the debate among the cultural elites seemed to have little impact on common usages among the general public, who still preferred using the term '*Tai Yu*' ('臺語') to describe movies, pop songs, and radio programs in Taiwanese Holo, despite the KMT regime's efforts to impose the term '*Min-nan*'. If we take a look at how these terms were used in a major newspaper, the *United Daily News* (聯合報), we can see that '台語' remains the most frequently used term from the 1950s through to the 1980s, especially in the first two decades. Table 1 shows the frequencies of each term as they appeared in articles or news reports in the *United Daily News* between 1951 and 1990; of the three proposed alternative terms for Taiwanese Holo, '閩南' was the most frequently used, followed by '福佬'. Their frequencies, however, were far less than those of '*Tai-Yu*' or '*Taiwan Hua*'. As most of the newspaper's reporters were Mainlanders during the period under investigation, their frequent use of the term '*Tai-yu*' reflected the KMT regime's very limited success in its attempts to impose the new term '閩南話' at this time.

Time Period	Different terms for Holo				Tai-Yu 台語	Taiwan Hua 台灣話
	河洛	福佬	閩南	Total		
1951–60	4 (7.8)	13 (25.5)	34 (66.7)	51	1,319	113
1961–70	16 (22.2)	22 (30.6)	34 (47.2)	72	1,623	68
1971–80	25 (29.8)	33 (39.3)	26 (31.0)	84	456	61
1981–90	43 (25.0)	44 (25.6)	85 (49.4)	172	664	95
Total	88 (23.2)	112 (29.6)	179 (47.2)	379	4,062	337

(Figures in brackets are percentages)

Source: Adapted from Wang (2011: Table 3-3). The data comes from the *United Daily News Data Bank* (聯合知識庫).

**Table 1: Frequencies of appearance of the terms '閩南', '福佬', '河洛', '台語', and '台灣話' in the *United Daily News*, 1951–1990**

A simple answer to the question of why the imposed new name did not effectively replace the more commonly used word was that the KMT regime did not forcefully impose it before 1970. '*Taiwan ren*' and '*Tai-yu*' were not yet deemed to be 'inappropriate' names by the KMT regime or, more importantly, by the Taiwanese Hakka at this time. In the Chinese national imagination, Taiwan Province was a part of the Chinese national territory, and therefore the term 'Taiwan' was considered to be a regional name. There was no need to ban the use of the terms 'Taiwan' or 'Taiwanese'. The KMT regime began to oppose the terms

strongly only after they acquired a nationalistic connotation in the 1970s, with the escalation of the Taiwanese Independence Movement (TIM) overseas (especially in the US), and even more so after the 1980s, with a newly-emerging contentious Taiwanese national imagination within Taiwan. As such, even though the KMT regime and the Mainlanders formally recognized the language of Taiwanese Holo as ‘閩南話’, the term ‘閩南人’ was still mainly used to refer to their fellow ‘Mainlanders’ who came from the southern part of Fu-kein Province. They would not call Taiwanese Holo ‘閩南人’, because the term would be confusing. This convention can be observed by examining the changing meanings of the term ‘閩南’ in the *United Daily News* across time (see Table 2). In the 1950s and 1960s, these terms more often referred to Mainlanders from southern Fu-kien Province, overseas Chinese originally from Min-nan district, or the ancestors of Taiwanese Holo. These three meanings together accounted for about 85 percent of all usages in that newspaper up until 1970. From 1971, however, the term that was used nearly 80 percent of the time to refer to the Taiwanese Holo was ‘閩南’. Why? What happened?

Meaning of Usages	Main-landers	Overseas Chinese from Minnan	Taiwanese Holo	Minnan migrants in Taiwan history	Hard to judge 難以判斷	No. of usages	No. of articles
Period	大陸省籍 閩南人	海外華僑	台灣省籍 閩南人	台灣史上大陸閩南移民			
1951–60	21 (61.8)	8 (23.5)	5 (14.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	34	34
1961–70	18 (52.9)	4 (11.8)	4 (11.8)	7 (20.6)	1 (0.3)	34	34
1971–80	2 (0.7)	1 (0.4)	21 (77.8)	3 (11.1)	0 (0)	27	26
1981–90	11 (12.4)	6 (6.7)	69 (77.5)	2 (2.2)	1 (1.1)	89	85
Total	52 (28.3)	19 (10.3)	99 (53.8)	12 (6.5)	2 (1.0)	184	179

(Figures in brackets are percentages)

Source: Adapted from Wang (2011: Tables 3-4). The data comes from the *United Daily News* Data Bank.

Note: The number of usages is slightly higher than the number of articles because in some cases, two or more usages appeared in the same article.

**Table 2: Frequency Distribution of Different Meanings of ‘閩南’ (人) as they appeared in *United Daily News*, 1951–1990**

There are several reasons for the drastic change in the meaning of ‘閩南’ after 1970. Most important was the general atmosphere of a reinstated nationalizing project by the KMT regime after the mid-1960s. This created a stronger motivation to oppose the use of ‘Taiwan’, which had been given a new national meaning by the TIM. The Chinese Cultural Renaissance Movement (中華文化復興運動), launched in 1966 (Tozer 1970; Wang 2005a: 61), had an international and a

domestic purpose: internationally, it showed the world community that the KMT regime in Taiwan was the true defender of an authentic Chinese culture, in contrast to the Chinese Communist regime, which vowed to establish a new China by casting off the baggage of tradition in the Cultural Revolution (文化大革命) – this was important, given ongoing diplomatic manoeuvring by the PRC that eventually succeeded in achieving UN recognition for Mainland China in 1971 at the expense of Taiwan. On the domestic side, which was the real site of the struggle, it also meant converting Taiwan into a ‘real’ Chinese domain, which the KMT regime had failed to accomplish since 1945. The issue of promoting Mandarin as the national language was again raised as a top priority for the movement, in response to escalating internal pressure. After the first television station began to broadcast in 1962, many Mainlander national elites gradually sensed the continuing dominance of the local Taiwanese language among the general populace as they found out that television programs in Taiwanese Holo were more popular than those in Mandarin. In 1970, some Mainlander legislators were especially concerned about the negative effect of a famous puppet show in Taiwanese Holo among the Taiwanese, especially school children, and demanded that air time for TV programs in Taiwanese ‘dialects’ be gradually reduced.<sup>25</sup> From 1971, the KMT regime began to enforce a much stricter and more national language policy, including tougher punishments for students or government employees who were caught speaking Taiwanese ‘dialects’ at school.<sup>26</sup> Foreign languages were also targeted – specifically Japanese – as barriers to promoting the national language and enhancing national solidarity.<sup>27</sup>

More important, in 1968 the KMT regime also actively emphasized Taiwan and the Taiwanese people’s historical connections to China through the first standardized textbooks for students, edited by the National Editing and Translation Bureau (國立編譯館) (Wang 2005a: 62). These textbooks, issued during the heyday of the Cultural Renaissance Movement, created what I call a ‘China-Centered Paradigm’, with an official historical vision that clearly defined Taiwan’s close historical relations with China. Under these new circumstances, the KMT regime began to emphasize the Taiwanese ancestral hometowns in China, especially Fu-kien and Kwang-tung Provinces. In 1971, some Taiwanese KMT members of the Taiwan Provincial Assembly even proposed that the central

---

<sup>25</sup> See the news coverage on the inquiry made by Yang Bao-lin (楊寶琳), a Mainlander legislator of Shantung Province on the Committee of Education of the Legislative Yuan (*United Daily News*, 12 June 1970: 2). For the official record, see the *Legislative Yuan Gazette* (1970). The puppet show in question was *Huang Chun-Hsiang Puppet Show* (黃俊雄布袋戲), which debuted in February 1970 and soon became the most popular TV program at the time. See my analysis of the incident in Wang (2005a).

<sup>26</sup> The Department of Education of the Taiwan Provincial Government (台灣省政府教育廳) issued an order to all city and county governments, schools, and government agencies under the Taiwan Provincial Government on 7 July 1971, demanding that all students and public employees use Mandarin at all times and stating that offenders should be punished (see Chang 1987: 158–164).

<sup>27</sup> The Taiwan Provincial Government issued an order on 5 March 1971 to all government agencies and schools re-asserting the prohibition against using Japanese in the public domain (See B.-Y. Chang 1987: 164–65).

government should consider amending the Household Registration Law (戶籍法) to make registration of ancestral domiciles (祖籍) mandatory, in order to 'erase the sense of distinction among Taiwanese and Mainlanders and to strengthen the will to recover China among the younger generation' (see Wang 2005b: 83–85).<sup>28</sup>

The KMT regime's new cultural policies of promoting a Chinese national sentiment obviously had a negative impact on the development of Taiwanese consciousness in general. It also had strong implications for studies of Taiwanese languages, and hence, the proper Chinese term for Holo, as discussed in this paper. Studies of Taiwanese languages were channeled into a small part of the nation-building project, which left little room for those who tried to establish a distinctive Taiwanese identity through their language studies, as they had done before the mid-1960s. Taiwanese proverbs and idioms were now considered to be vulgar, and were no longer a fashionable topic to pursue. Studies of Taiwanese Holo languages' connections with the ancient Han languages, as was first exemplified by Wu Hwei's works on *He Luo Hua*, however, were picked up by younger authors, such as Lin Jin-Chau (林金鈔) (J.-C. Lin 1975, 1980), Tarn KaornHack<sup>29</sup> (陳冠學) (Tarn 1984 [1981]), and Huang Ching-an (黃敬安). Huang began to publish a series of books compiling traces of ancient Chinese classics in the Holo language, which was now typically called '閩南話' or '河洛話', but not '福佬話' (C.-A. Huang 1977, 1984, 1985, 1990). In fact, in his 1990 book, Huang even included a long article in the appendix, entitled 'Introduction to the Historical Origin of Ho-lo People' ('河洛人 [泉州人、漳州人、唐山人、閩南人] 源流概述'), which was not directly related to the main topic of his book, to make clear his strong position on the issue of naming Holo properly in Chinese.

These were the circumstances in which '閩南' began to be used more frequently to refer to Taiwanese Holo than to Mainlanders from southern Fu-kien after 1970 in the *United Daily News* (as seen in Table 2). It seems quite evident that '閩南' was the KMT government's preferred term at this time. In fact, when the first TV drama broadcast in Taiwanese Holo was aired in 1962, it was specifically called '*Min Nan Yu* TV Drama' (閩南語電視劇), even though movies in Taiwanese Holo, first appearing in 1955, were typically called *Tai Yu* Moives (台語電影) or *Tai Yu* films (台語片), because they were privately funded and produced. Similarly, when the first TV news program in Taiwanese Holo was finally approved and aired in May 1979, it was also called *Min nan yu* News (閩南語新聞).

The period between the mid-1960s and the late 1970s was thus characterized by a rigid language policy and tight state control. Robert L. Cheng (鄭良偉) argued in the early 1970s that although the KMT government had stated clearly that there

---

<sup>28</sup> They demanded that Holo Taiwanese were to be registered as having Fu-Kien Province as their ancestral domicile, while Hakka Taiwanese should be registered as having come from Kwang-tung Province. Twenty Taiwan Provincial Assemblymen chose the highly symbolic date of 7 July, when war between China and Japan had broken out in 1937, to make public their common demand in 1971. Although their demand was never realized by the central government, it was nevertheless highly welcome by the government for its 'political correctness' implications when it was first proposed.

<sup>29</sup> Tarn KaornHack used Taiwanese Holo pronunciation to translate his name 陳冠學 into English on the cover of his book. I adopt his translation in this paper; see the author's note in the bibliography.

were two principles its language policy – using Mandarin to unify all languages in the nation, and allowing ‘dialects’ to continue to exist – in reality it practiced a linguistic assimilationism under a one-language policy (Cheng 1973). In the 1970s Cheng, a professor at the University of Hawaii, and Huang Shuan-Fan (黃宣範) a distinguished Taiwanese linguistic professor at the National Taiwan University, were the only two Taiwanese academics who dared to openly argue for a dual language policy (S.-F. Huang 1975). This was noted in a collection of essays on Taiwan’s language problems published in 1983, when the political opposition movement began to challenge the KMT regime on this particular issue (C.-H. Lin ed. 1983).<sup>30</sup>

The KMT regime’s ban on the name ‘Taiwan’ was initially a response to mounting pressure from overseas, rather than from domestic sources. The development of the overseas TIM gained a new impetus with the increasing success of the PRC’s efforts in gaining international recognition, at the expense of the KMT regime’s legitimacy, of being the true representative of the Chinese nation. The main advocate agent of the TIM moved to the US and established the World Union for Formosan Independence (WUFI) in 1969, and the group took advantage of the 1971 setback at the UN. For the first time, the KMT regime had to deal directly with the threat that the TIM might gain support inside Taiwan. Although Taiwan’s political opposition movement began to organize around a dissident magazine, *Taiwan Political Review* (台灣政論), in 1975, it did not gain real momentum until 1977, when the dissident politicians won an unprecedented number of seats in local elections. This led to the formation of the Formosa group in the form of a quasi-political party under the name Dangwai (黨外) around *Formosa Magazine* (美麗島雜誌), published in 1979. The rising tensions between the KMT regime and Dangwai, however, resulted in a clash known as the Kaohsiung Incident in late 1979. One reason for the setbacks after the clash was that the movement positioned itself as a democratic movement, and tried to avoid promoting overt ethnic and nationalist issues in its platforms. The opposition camp was more concerned about universal human rights (especially political rights) rather than group rights or ethnic equality, and the two political dissident magazines that were published in 1975 and 1979 with four issues each did not address the issue of language at all (see Wang 1996: 158–165, 2008: 107–114).

The rapid development of the opposition movement after the setbacks of the 1979 incident was to a great extent a result of its openly adopting a new Taiwan-centered national imagination which gradually evolved from a demand for self-determination in 1983 to Taiwan independence in 1987. The Taiwanese nationalist discourse developed at this stage was very different from the previous form developed overseas in how it defined the Taiwan nation. The new version of Taiwanese nationalism that began to take form in the late 1970s, as exemplified by Annette Lu’s (呂秀蓮) book *The Past and Future of Taiwan* (台灣的過去和未來)

---

<sup>30</sup> Another academic who openly expressed opinions on the language issue in opposition to Taiwan’s government policy in the 1970s was J. Bruce Jacobs (in his Chinese name 家博). He wrote a commentary that was published in *Central Daily News* (中央日報) entitled ‘Language in TV and Voices of Farmers’ (‘論電視語言與農民心聲’), on 19 January 1973, in which he suggested increasing or establishing TV programs or news in the Min-nan language to better serve the needs of farmers in rural areas (see C.-H. Lin 1983: 197–201).

in 1979, included all current residents of Taiwan as nationals of Taiwan, including Mainlanders, as long as they identified with Taiwan (Lu 1979: 166–167).

It was under these new circumstances that a new wave of debates about the proper name of Taiwanese Holo began to take shape.

**‘福佬’ (‘*Fu lau*’), ‘河洛’ (‘*He Luo*’), ‘閩南’ (‘*Min nan*’), ‘鶴佬’ (‘*He Lau*’), or ‘Holo’?: The Debate over the Proper Name For Holo In and Around the 1990s**

A new debate started in the mid-1980s with a suggestion for the proper name for Holo proposed by a linguist who based his proposition on phonological grounds. Ang Uijin (洪惟仁), a Taiwanese linguist, proposed ‘河佬’ rather than ‘福佬’ or ‘河洛’, based on his phonological research of the term ‘Holo’ in its Chinese tone. He formally proposed using the term in an article published in *Taiwan Folkways* in 1984, and again in a book entitled *Phonological Research of the Taiwanese Holo Language* (臺灣河佬語聲調研究) in 1985 (Ang 1984, 1985).<sup>31</sup> He argued that although it may be true that Taiwanese Holo people came from the ancient *He Luo* (河洛) area, he doubted that the term was correct, because the two Chinese characters are not pronounced as ‘Holo’. His new term, ‘河佬’, was chosen strictly due to its closeness to Chinese pronunciations, given that there was no consensus on the ‘correct’ Chinese term for Holo.

One year later, however, Ang admitted that he had made some mistakes in his previous argument for ‘河佬’ and changed his position by proposing yet another term for Holo in his next book (Ang 1986: 31–35): ‘鶴佬’ (‘*He Lau*’). After carefully comparing the tones and sounds of the words and consulting ancient texts, he now firmly believed that the correct term for ‘Holo’ according to the Chinese tone was ‘貉獠’ (*he lao*). He was willing to change it to ‘鶴佬’, however, because he thought ‘貉獠’ sounded ‘too “barbaric”’.<sup>32</sup> Ang also stated that Cantonese in Hong Kong had used the term ‘鶴佬’ to refer to people from Chao-chow (‘潮州人’). He repeated the same argument again in an article that appeared in *Taiwan Folkways* two years later as a formal announcement to his fellow authors about his new proposition (Ang 1988: 1).

Ang’s new proposition of ‘鶴佬’ gained some attention, because he had begun to write a regular column, ‘*Tai-yu Mailbox*’ (‘台語信箱’), for the *DPP Weekly* (民進報週刊), the official publication of the DPP, from October 1987, in which he intentionally used the new term (Ang 1987a).<sup>33</sup> In the thirteen articles that appeared in the column’s series, which finished in January 1988, eleven used ‘鶴佬話’ or ‘鶴佬人’. This intentional act, of course, aroused some reactions from readers. In one particular article that appeared two months after the column started, Ang tried to answer a question posed by a regular reader from Tai-nan County who asked him

<sup>31</sup> He also published several articles in between, that addressed the same issue. I do not cite them individually, as they were all collected in his 1985 book.

<sup>32</sup> The original text in Chinese reads: ‘由上述的考證得知, ‘hoh’lo 閩／‘hok’lo 客的正字當作「貉獠」是無可置疑的了。只是「貉獠」二字「蠻夷」的意味太濃, 我願意改稱為「鶴佬」’ (Ang 1986: 35).

<sup>33</sup> The column ran from issue 33 (10 October 1987) to 51 (30 January 1988) in *The DPP Weekly*, with 13 articles published in between according to my count of the original document.

why he chose to use ‘鶴佬’ over other terms, in a polite protest (Ang 1987b). This was not the only case in which the new term was challenged.

Hsu Chi-duan (許極燉), a Taiwanese Holo scholar who had resided in Japan for a long time, also wrote two articles for the newspapers, in 1988 and 1990, respectively, in which he criticized Ang for proposing ‘鶴佬’ and argued for ‘福佬’ or ‘台灣話’ (Hsu 1988, 1990a).<sup>34</sup> Hsu’s opinion on this issue can be traced to his previous work. In a book published in 1987, Hsu had followed the path left by authors in the 1950s debate and had collected many materials, especially by Chinese authors, that were not available to Taiwanese writers because of the separation of Taiwan and China during the Cold War. Compared to Lin Ben-yuan or others who had argued for ‘福佬’, Hsu added some newly-found evidence from Chinese texts, both ancient and contemporary, that testified to the antiquity of ‘福佬’. For instance, Hsu cited studies by Chinese scholars (Yuan *et al.* 袁家驊等) from 1959 which stated that according to Chung Du-fwo (鍾獨佛), the term ‘福佬’ could be found in the ancient Tang Dynasty (618–907CE, Yuan 1959 [2003]: 237; Hsu 1987: 22–25).<sup>35</sup> He also mentioned Lo Hsiang Lin (羅香林) (1933), and Kuo Ming-Kuen (郭明昆遺著) (1963) to demonstrate that the term ‘福佬’ (‘福老’) was widely used among well-known scholars (Hsu 2000: 2). Like his predecessors in the 1950s, Hsu was arguing specifically against the usage of the term ‘河洛’, which he believed had been invented by Lien Ya-tan (連雅堂). He continued to argue in later books for ‘台灣話’ and ‘福佬話’ (Hsu 1990b: 34–36; Hsu 2000).

Ang’s proposition of ‘鶴佬’, of course, was also supported by some Taiwanese Holo intellectuals, as well as by some Hakka. For instance, the political scientist Shih Cheng-feng (施正鋒) strongly supported this usage (Shih 1996, 1997).

These discussions over the proper Chinese name for ‘Holo’ around the late 1980s to early 1990s rarely took the form of a real debate, however, because there were few rebuttals to particular opinions or criticisms. Although, in his reply to a reader, Ang did mention that he was constantly misunderstood and attacked for his newly-invented Chinese term for Holo (Ang 1987b), most criticisms against him remained unanswered. There were many other opinions around this issue that are not presented here because of space limitations; however, they would not change the general observation, that there was no real debate among proponents of different terms in the 1980s. This does not mean that the differences are not important – in fact, they are quite important when it really matters – but that there was neither an urgent necessity nor a proper occasion to discuss the naming issue and settle it once and for all before the mid-1980s. Most people, including the authors discussed here, usually used different terms interchangeably, depending on the occasion or their personal preferences. Even though the government would prefer to use ‘閩南’ or ‘河洛’, it was not able to effectively prevent other terms, including ‘福佬’, ‘鶴佬’, or ‘台灣’ (‘話’) from being used. In which case, how can we account for the sudden surge of different opinions after the mid-1980s?

---

<sup>34</sup> Hsu returned to Taiwan for the first time in eighteen years in 1987. He founded the Taiwan Language Research and Development Foundation (台灣語言研究發展基金會) and afterwards published several books discussing topics relating to Taiwanese language.

<sup>35</sup> However, Chung Du-fwo’s original book, as published in 1922, shows that he in fact used ‘福老’ rather than ‘福佬’, as was claimed by Yuan *et al.* (Chung 1922:10–11).

### *The Emergence of a New Necessity*

Due to the KMT regime's increasingly repressive policy of promoting a national language and restricting the use of the Taiwanese language in television and radio after the mid-1970s, preserving the use of 'local dialects' became an important political agenda for the opposition movement, which began to strategically utilize the language issue to strengthen its democratization and *bentuhua* (本土化) agendas after the 1980s. It specifically used Taiwanese Holo – the 'repressed mother tongue' of the majority people in Taiwan – during its mass political gatherings and campaign activities, as the primary media of communication, to appeal to the audience's collective sense of sorrow (Y.-M. Liu 1983). The spouses of opposition leaders imprisoned in the 1979 Kaohsiung Incident who ran for public office on their husbands' behalf attracted a great deal of sympathy during these mass gatherings; some popular Taiwanese Holo language songs were also used in these campaigns. These songs and the language were typically called *Tai-yu* (台語) or *Tai-yu* songs, rather than '閩南語', because the latter name had been imposed by the KMT regime to imply the status of 'local dialect'. In terms of the language they used, the opposition movement had in a sense developed a sub-culture of its own at these public gatherings. As the movement became more successful in obtaining popular support in elections, especially after the DPP was established in 1986, such practices became standard repertoire among DPP members and supporters.

Taiwanese Hakka, however, were quite offended by such practices and felt excluded or alienated, because they implied that the Hakka (or their language) were not Taiwanese. Some Hakka among the elite began to voice their discontent by protesting against what they called the DPP's 'Holo chauvinism' ('福佬沙文主義'). This was most evidently displayed in an article published in 1987 by a famous Hakka/Holo writer<sup>36</sup> and DPP member, Li Chiau (李喬), with a sensational title: 'Arrogant Holo, Self-Abased Hakka, Self-Abandoned Aborigines' ('自大的鶴佬人、自卑的客家人、自棄的原住民') (C. Li 1987).<sup>37</sup> Li talked about his unpleasant experiences relating to the language issue with other Holo DPP comrades during the oath-taking ceremony on joining the new party and during internal meetings when they were forced to use Holo Taiwanese language. This article was widely cited among the opposition camp, especially by Hakka supporters. Some elite Hakka were especially furious to learn that the KMT government had decided in September 1987 to allow bilingual programs to be broadcast in Mandarin and in Taiwanese Holo, in response to the opposition movement's demand. This news prompted elite Hakka to launch the first-ever Hakka cultural movement magazine, the *Hakka Monthly* (客家風雲), the following month. Complaints and protests against Holo chauvinism by Hakka was a major theme of the articles published in

<sup>36</sup> According to Li's own account, he is a Holo by birth and became a Hakka by adoption.

<sup>37</sup> For some unexplained reasons, however, '鶴佬人' in the original title and in the article was changed throughout to '福佬人' when Li's series *The Ugly Sides of Taiwanese* was collected and published in book form (C. Li 1988).

the first few years of the magazine.<sup>38</sup> Some of the DPP's Hakka members even threatened to organize a Hakka party as a protest against both the KMT's language policy and the DPP's insensitive practice of imposing the Taiwanese Holo language on Hakka.<sup>39</sup> The most unbearable thing was that the DPP insisted on using the Holo language on all occasions and calling it 'Dai wan ue' ('台灣話' in Holo pronunciation).

This protest over language – which came DPP Mainlander members as well as from Hakka – was at first met with mixed reactions among DPP's Holo members. Eventually, those who were more sympathetic to the Hakkas' protest got the upper hand, given the indisputable political correctness of the Hakkas' demands. Ang, for instance, was invited to write for the *Hakka Monthly*, due to his devotion to the studies and promotion of Taiwanese language in the past. He advised that Hakka and Holo should try harder to work together to promote Taiwanese languages (Ang 1987c). At the DPP's Third National Convention, held on 29–30 October 1988, some of the DPP's Holo members, led by Lin Cho-shui (林濁水), made a formal motion demanding that programs broadcast in Hakka be added to the DPP's political agenda (Chiu 1988). Ang also advised DPP members to be more sensitive to how the Hakka felt about their calling the Holo language simply 'Taiwanese language'.

The need for a proper name for Taiwanese Holo therefore arose because the terms '台語' and '台灣話' preferred by the Taiwanese Holo were now under heavy criticism by Hakka as well as Mainlanders, who were now considered to be part of the Taiwanese nation in the new version of Taiwanese nationalist discourse. As the DPP tried to pursue its political agenda of Taiwanese nation building, healthy relations among its major ethnic groups became a major challenge.

What, then, was the proper occasion on which to discuss or settle the issue?

### ***The Presence of a Proper Occasion for Discussion***

As the DPP tried to promote a new Taiwanese national imagination to replace the old Chinese national imagination of the KMT regime, drafting a new Constitution took a high priority on its agenda. On 26–28 August 1991, the DPP held the first Convention for Drafting a Constitution by the People (人民制憲會議). The result, as discussed at the start of this paper, was the *Draft Taiwan Constitution* (台灣憲法草案). Article 24 stipulated that the state should not impose one particular language or discriminate against any other language, and that it should not take a dual language position either. Instead, the state should be multi-cultural and multi-lingual. The draft was written before a rise in ethnic tensions between Taiwanese and Mainlanders in the early 1990s (which resulted in the formation of the Chinese New Party [新黨] CNP in 1993), and the only ethnic issue that was considered as worthy of being regulated by the Constitution concerned the Aborigines. Participants in the drafting added a new Chapter 9, entitled 'Aborigines' ('原住民族'), with five new articles that were added to the original draft prepared by the DPP.

---

<sup>38</sup> Chung Shiao-sung (鍾孝上) wrote an article in the first issue of *The Hakka Monthly* to discuss the issue (Chung 1987).

<sup>39</sup> Again, Chung Shiao-sung was one the most notable figures writing on this issue.

The newly emerging conflicts over language between Holo and Hakka, however, did not receive any special attention in this final draft of the 1991 meeting.

However, ethnic conflict between Taiwanese and Mainlanders and between Hakka and Holo during the early 1990s forced the DPP to pay more serious attention to the issue. In August 1993, the DPP published its first white paper on ethnic and cultural policies (DPP 1993). It stated clearly that the DPP was proposing a new policy of recognizing four ethnic groups – the Aborigines, Minnans (閩南人), Hakka, and Mainlanders – as the constituting elements of the Taiwanese nation. It should be noted that the name of the Taiwanese Holo ethnic group in this official DPP document was '閩南人', and that there was no mention of any dispute over the proper name for Taiwanese Holo.

In 1994, the KMT regime lead by President Lee Teng-hui initiated another convention of the National Assembly in order to amend the Constitution, while proponents of the TIM – especially the core members of the Taiwanese Professors Association (TPA) – proposed an alternative second convention with the same purpose. The DPP decided to take part in the convention held by the ruling KMT regime but not to take charge of the one proposed by its radical ally. Thus, although for the most part the same DPP members who had been involved with the first convention organized and participated in the alternative second convention, the DPP was not the official organizer. During the preparation meeting, which took the form of an academic conference (Symposium on Taiwan's Draft Constitution [台灣憲草討論會]) sponsored by the TPA on 18 April 1994, new dimensions of ethnic relations in Taiwan became an important issue after the emergence of the CNP in 1993 (Shih 1995: 4). In fact, the key organizer of the conference, Shih Cheng-feng, deliberately invited a famous Hakka, the novelist Li Chiau (李喬), and a Mainlander sociologist named Chang Mau-kuei (張茂桂) to give opening remarks on the panel on ethnicity (including Aborigines), and also Lin Cho-shui (林濁水), a Holo, DPP legislator, to comment on the two papers as a way to deal with the new ethnic issues. Both Li Chiau and Chang Mau-kuei talked about the various types of ethnic chauvinism, including Han and Holo, as being the causes of ethnic tensions in Taiwan at the time. Li specifically raised the issue of Holo monopoly over the terms '*Taiwan ue*' and '*Taiwan ren*', even by some of his Holo comrades in the TPA.

Consequently, during the Second Convention of Drafting a Constitution by the People, on 26–28 June 1994, a new chapter on ethnicity was added, containing the five articles cited at the beginning of this paper. According to Shih, who was the key organizer and the editor of the conference's *Proceedings*, the most important amendment was 'Constitutional Considerations of Ethnic Relations', and this was the title of his preface to the *Proceedings* (Shih 1995). The focus of the convention was to regulate all dimensions of ethnic relations in the Constitution. To achieve this, the organizer invited participants from all ethnic groups, in order to enhance the event's ethnic representativeness, and the session on ethnicity was the most fiercely debated among all the sessions.

As this was the first time that the names of ethnic groups other than the Aborigines were to be written into the constitution draft, it also became a proper occasion to discuss the name of each ethnic group. Shih, however, says that the Holo participants could not agree upon any of the Chinese terms available at the time and the only compromise reached at the conclusion was to use the

Romanized spelling 'Holo'. The main reason for the disagreement was that Holo participants resented the connotation of a close relation with China embedded in the names '河洛人', '福佬人', or '閩南人' (Shih 1996: 70). Shih himself is a strong supporter of the term '鶴佬', as proposed by Ang, and he used it consistently throughout his works during the 1990s. His explanation for why he chose the new term clearly summarizes the core of the name debate:

Holo 族群習慣自稱為「台灣人」；客家精英往往認為太具擴張性，而一般客家人稱之為「福佬人」；在過去，官方稱之為「閩南人」或「河洛人」，帶有源自中國的弦外之音。在這裡，我們借用洪惟仁建議的「鶴佬人」，借其音而不計較其義。

[People of the Holo ethnic group are accustomed to calling themselves 'Taiwanese'. Hakka elites usually consider this term to be too exclusive and call them 'Fu lau ren' instead. In the past, the government called them 'Min nan ren' or 'Ho lo ren', with the connotations that their ancestors came from China. I will follow Ang Uijin's suggestion and use 'He lau ren' to borrow its sound without paying attention to the textual meaning of the term.]

(Shih 1997: 99)

However, Shih also appreciated the degree of complexity involved in the naming issue during and after the 1994 convention. Thus he became more conservative about promoting using the term '鶴佬', when he stated that it is a challenging task to find an agreed-upon name for the Holo other than the commonly used 'Taiwanese', to which Hakka strongly objected:

長期解決之道，可以嘗試替鶴佬人找出一個大家都可以接受的族群名字，簡單明瞭，又不與台灣民族相混淆，但恐非易事；短期內，或可努力說服鶴佬人接受「Holo」這個族名（取其音，而不計較漢字如何寫）。

[The long-term solution to the problem is to find a name for the Holo ethnic group that is acceptable to all, is simple and clear, and does not become confused with the name of the Taiwan nation. This, however, will not be easy. A short-term solution is to persuade the Holo people to accept the name 'Holo' in English, which is used simply because of its sound, and forget about how to write it in Chinese.]

(Shih 1997: 81–82)

If we compare this suggestion from the *Proceedings* of the Symposium on Taiwan's Draft Constitution, when the participants were still using different Chinese names for 'Holo',<sup>40</sup> with what was eventually written in the 1994 *Draft*

<sup>40</sup> According to the *Proceedings* of the Symposium compiled by Shih (ed. 1995), all three terms '河洛', '福佬', and '閩南' were used interchangeably by the participants, even by the same person. For instance, '河洛' appeared on pages 57, 100, and 123; '福佬' on pages 96, 100–103, 112–113, 116, and 123; and '閩南' on pages 108 and 113.

*Republic of Taiwan Constitution* two months later, it is quite evident that using the Romanized 'Holo' in this historical document as the group name for Taiwanese Holo was a compromise that had been reached among the Holo participants at the 1994 Convention, the result of a vote count among participants (Shih 1996: 70n2).

It should be emphasized that although the Romanized 'Holo' had appeared in the previous literature, usually as the English translation of the Chinese term for how Taiwanese Holo referred to themselves (e.g. H.-C. Li 1950:1; Ang 1988: 1),<sup>41</sup> this was the first time that it had been used as an official group name as a result of a face-to-face debate in a symbolically significant convention to draft a new constitution for Taiwan. The decision to use a group name from another language highlighted that they agreed only on what they called themselves verbally, and that there was no agreement about a written name. A comparison of the debates in 1958 and 1994 also reveals that some important changes had occurred in the meantime. Shih informed us that the three Chinese terms for Holo were all rejected in 1994 because of their implication that the Holo descended from China. In other words, while some of their predecessors had advocated '福佬' as more related the Taiwanese historical experience than '河洛' or '閩南', which were seen as more connected to China, the Holo participants of the 1994 convention thought that the name '福佬' also implied a connection with China. Even though the fourth alternative name, '鶴佬', as proposed by Ang Uijin in 1986, was chosen and adopted by some, strictly on the basis of its phonetic resemblance to 'Holo', participants did not support this name either.

### ***The Impact of and Reaction to the New Romanized Word for 'Holo'***

Although the most important amendment made in the 1994 convention was a new chapter on ethnicity, the content of the new draft was not mentioned in any mainstream media and it seems that most people in Taiwan did not even know about the 'consensus' on naming Holo that had been reached. The compromise was overshadowed in news coverage by the convention's more radical programs of selecting a new national flag and national anthem for the new Republic of Taiwan, which triggered strong reactions from the government and the ruling KMT.<sup>42</sup> The fact that the convention's organizers and participants were mostly pro-Taiwan independence members of the opposition camp indicated that neither the choice of 'Holo' nor the rationale for it reflected a widely preferred preference, even within the political opposition. As popular support for Taiwan's independence was still quite low at the time,<sup>43</sup> the DPP decided not to take a radical position on

---

<sup>41</sup> Li's 1950 book used 'Ho-lo' in the English title of the book on the back cover. Ang's 1988 article used 'hoh-lo'.

<sup>42</sup> See the news coverage on the reactions of an unknown official in the Ministry of Interior and the spokesperson of the KMT during the 1994 convention (*China Daily News*, 25 June 1994: 4 and 26 June 1996: 4). Media coverage of the convention focused on the new flag-raising ceremony attended by more than 3,000 people.

<sup>43</sup> According to a Gallup Poll, support for Taiwan independence between 1989 and 1994 fluctuated between 8.2 and 27 percent (*China Evening News*, 17 April 1994: 1):

the issue. The director of the DPP's Policy Research Center, Chen Chung-hsin (陳忠信), even wrote an article in the *China Daily News* two weeks after the 1994 convention to explain the party's more cautious position: that declaring Taiwan independence and initiating a new constitution should be a decision made collectively by the Taiwanese people, even when the DPP became the ruling party.<sup>44</sup>

Consequently, the new Romanized name at first had no visible immediate impact on the common usage of how to refer to Taiwanese Holo. In fact, it did not enter the public sphere until after 2000, when the DPP became the ruling party after winning the Presidential election. The first time that the term appeared again in the public domain was when the Commission for Promoting National Language in the Ministry of Education (教育部國語推行委員會) passed a Draft Language Equality Law (語言平等法草案) in February 2003, which defined ten Aboriginal languages, Hakka, Holo, and Mandarin as the 'National Languages' of Taiwan, as follows:

國家語言係包括國內使用之各原住民語（阿美族語、泰雅族語、排灣族語、布農族語、噶瑪蘭族語、卑南族語、賽夏族語、雅美族語、邵族語等）、客家話、Ho-lo 話（台語）、華語。

《語言平等法草案》，第二條，第三項，2003

One of the most controversial parts of this official document, was that the Taiwanese Holo language was referred to as 'Ho-lo 話 (台語)', while Mandarin was indicated by '華語' rather than the more commonly used term '國語'. The decision to use 'Ho-lo 話 (台語)' was again a compromise among the Taiwanese Holo members of the Commission, made under protest from their Hakka colleagues, after they had for different reasons rejected all six commonly used Chinese terms (C.-Y. Lin 2003).<sup>45</sup> Although the intention of the new law was to ensure that all languages used in Taiwan would be recognized as national languages that would enjoy equal rights and protection from the state as part of a new ideal of multiculturalism, the act of renaming the two most-spoken languages in Taiwan in this draft triggered strong reactions from some KMT legislators and members. The KMT think tank, the National Policy Foundation (國家政策研究基金會), severely criticized the draft in a radio talk show immediately after it was made

Date	For	Against		Date	For	Against
1989.9	15.8	57.3		1992.12	15.1	63.3
1989.12	8.2	62		1993.5	23.7	54.3
1990.3	15.8	62		1993.11	20	54.7
1990.6	12.5	67		1994.4	27	45.6
1991.6	12.7	65.3				

<sup>44</sup> Chen Chung-hsin, 'It is the People Who should Decide on Taiwan Independence and Drafting A New Constitution' ('要不要「獨立、制憲」由台灣人民決定'), *China Daily News*, 17 July 1994: 11.

<sup>45</sup> The six terms mentioned during the meeting of the Commission of Promoting National Language were: '福建話', '福佬話', '河洛話', '鶴佬話', '學佬話' and '閩南話' (see C.-Y. Lin 2003).

public, and later published the transcripts of the entire program on its official website.<sup>46</sup> The host, Chao Li-yu (趙麗雲), and the invited speaker, KMT legislator Wu Tun-yi (吳敦義), specifically commented on the 'bizarre' terms 'Ho-lo' '話' ('台語') and '華語', which he saw as indications of the DPP administration's 'de-Sinicization' scheme (去中國化). In the talk show, both Chao Li-yun and Wu Tun-yi favored the terms '河洛話' or '閩南語'. Eventually, under great pressure, the DPP's Minister of Education announced that he would withdraw the Draft Language Equality Law to avoid any further controversy.<sup>47</sup>

Another good occasion for evaluating the impact of the newly-proposed Romanized name on the usages of terms was the Convention for Ethnic and Cultural Development (族群與文化發展會議), organized by the Executive Yuan of the DPP administration on 16–18 October 2004. After the controversial 2004 Presidential election, in which the incumbent DPP President Chen Shui-bian won his second term by a very narrow margin after a shooting incident on the eve of the election, the ruling DPP decided to hold the first-ever national meeting to deal with ethnic and cultural issues as a response to the political confrontations and turmoil that followed. The 333-page convention *Proceedings* were published three months later (Executive Yuan 2005). Again, several names for 'Taiwanese Holo' were used during the three-day convention without anyone seriously thinking about settling the naming issue. According to my calculations, on the 56 occasions when the Taiwanese Holo (language) was mentioned, participants used at least ten different names. Other than the four most commonly used Chinese names ('河洛', '閩南', '福佬', and '鶴佬'), their variations ('閩', '福老', and '鶴老'), and the Romanized 'Holo', another new Chinese term, '福台語' (*Fu Tai Yu*), was also used.<sup>48</sup> This new term was proposed by some as a response to Hakka protest over the common practice of calling the Taiwanese Holo language '台語'. In the same vein, they called the Hakka language '客台語' to show that it was also considered to be one of the 'Taiwanese languages'. Table 3 shows the frequencies of each term as it appeared in the *Proceedings*.

<sup>46</sup> See <http://old.npf.org.tw/Symposium/s92/920222-EC.htm> for the complete transcript of the radio talk show broadcast on 22 February 2003 on the China Broadcast Station (中國廣播電台), a KMT-owned radio station. The KMT think tank was established by Lien Chan after he lost the 2000 Presidential Election.

<sup>47</sup> In 2007, a newly revised Draft National Language Development Law (國家語言發展法草案) proposed by the Council for Cultural Affairs (文化建設委員會) was sent to the Legislature Yuan for approval without a controversial part with had specifically defined the national languages. However, the National Policy Foundation still published an article criticizing the new draft by referring to the original 2003 draft (H.-Y. Liu 2007). The revised draft was boycotted by the KMT and by the People First Party (PFP) legislators, and never even made it onto the agenda for discussion in the national congress.

<sup>48</sup> The new term was used by Chang Su-fang (張淑芬), the Chairperson of the Taiwan Mother Tongue Education Association (台灣母語教育學會理事長), who clearly stated that she did not like other terms ('河洛', '閩南', '福佬') during the panel on the Preservation and Development of Ethnic Languages (Executive Yuan 2005: 150). Yu Bao-chuan (余伯泉), another Taiwanese language activist, also used the term during the same panel.

Names ( Frequencies )	Frequencies
河洛	18
閩南 (14)、閩 (2)	16
福佬 (6)、福老 (2)	8
鶴佬 (3)、鶴老 (1)	4
Holo	4
台語	4
福台語	2
Total	56

**Table 3: Frequencies of different terms of Taiwanese Holo appearing in the 2005 Convention for Ethnic and Cultural Development Proceedings**

As can be seen in Table 3, the most frequently used term at this convention was '河洛' (18 times), followed by '閩南' (16 times); the others were all used less than 10 times. As the DPP had just adopted the term '河洛' in the highly symbolic Resolution 'Multi-Ethnicity, One Nation' ('族群多元國家一體決議文') in September 2004, and President Chen Shui-bian had also used '河洛' in his opening remarks, it is no surprise that '河洛' became the most popular term at this convention. It seemed that the DPP had adopted the term '河洛' without paying attention to its original textual connotation of emphasizing Holo's close historical relation with China. In contrast, the Romanized 'Holo' was used only four times by Taiwanese Holo Language teachers or researchers.<sup>49</sup>

The compromise decision to use Romanized 'Holo', nevertheless, was honored to a certain degree by other Taiwanese Holo intellectuals. For instance, if we check the entry for 'Taiwanese Holo' in the *Dictionary of Taiwan History* (臺灣歷史辭典) published in 2004, we find that even though the author prefers to use '福佬', he nevertheless put the Romanized 'Holo' next to the Chinese term as part of the title of this entry, which is as follows:

#### 福佬 (Holo)

福佬又常被寫為「河洛」或「鶴佬」，雖然一般認為福佬人即閩南人，但實際上臺灣的福佬人是指來自閩南、粵東操閩南語系的漢人移民，主要包括泉州、漳州、廣東潮州部分移民，在歷史上由於原鄉不同，福佬中的漳州人及泉州人曾是分類械鬥中的主角。與客家人相似，語言也是其族群認同的重要標誌。而目前漳州、泉州之分已不再明顯，福佬人下的分類亦已不具現實意義。目前福佬人是臺灣人口數最多的族群，約占臺灣人口總數的 75% 左右。

薛化元 2004：1034，《臺灣歷史辭典》

<sup>49</sup> Romanized 'Holo' appeared on pages 87, 152, 277, and 281 of the *Proceedings*. It should be noted that it was misspelled as 'itolo' on page 281, which indicated that even the government officials responsible for spell-checking, to have made such a mistake, had no idea what it meant.

['*Fu-lau*' is often referred to as '*Ho lo*' (‘河洛’) or '*He lau*'. Although it is commonly believed that *Fu lau ren* are in fact *Min nan ren*, Taiwan's *Fu lau ren* are Han immigrants from the southern part of Fu-kien and the eastern part of Kwang-tung who spoke the Min-nan dialect. They included immigrants from Chuan-chow, Chang-chow of Fu-kien Province and Chao-chow of Kwang-tung Province. Given that they came from different ancestral hometowns, migrants from Chang-chow and Chuan-chow were participants on the opposite sides of the classificatory strife during the Ching Dynasty. Like for Hakka, language is also an important marker for the *Fu lau* ethnic identity. Currently, the distinction between Chang-chow and Chuan-chow is no longer visible and has no practical meaning. As of now, *Fu lau ren* is the largest ethnic group in Taiwan, making up about 75% of its population.]

(Hsueh Hua-yuan, 2004, *Dictionary of Taiwan History*)

It is quite evident that the debate over the Chinese name for 'Holo' was still nowhere near being settled in 2004, and not even in 2013, when this paper is being written. Different usages continue to appear in all kinds of public media by different authors. Also, most people seem not to care about the debate, and refer to different terms interchangeably without showing any preference. There are, however, continuing discussions on the issue every once in a while whenever someone – usually a member of the cultural elite – openly expresses a strong opinion in support of one particular usage over others. The most heated debates have usually occurred when certain terms have been chosen to illustrate different national imaginations. For example, a dispute occurred overseas in 2008 when a well-respected Taiwanese Holo cultural worker, Hong Ming-ling (洪敏麟), was invited to give a series of lectures to Taiwanese communities in the United States. His strong opinion that Taiwanese Holo language came from the ancient *He Luo* (河洛) district, or the area of the Central Plain (中原), and that therefore its 'correct name' should be *He Luo Hua* '河洛話', provoked some equally strong criticisms in the newsletters of the San Diego Taiwanese Cultural Association (see Chen 2008; Chu 2008). Hong's critics focused mainly on his underlying Chinese nationalist consciousness, embedded in his one-sided selection of fragmented historical facts to support his conviction about the origin of the Taiwanese Holo language. Others have used reasoning more logical than this to discredit the argument of a historical connection between the Taiwanese Holo language and the language spoken in the ancient *He Luo* 河洛 district (for instance, K.-M. Wu 2008: 69–71). These disputes are hard to settle, as personal preferences for particular terms are usually confounded with mixed historical evidence and different national imaginations. Some even think that it would be virtually impossible to find a Chinese name for the Taiwanese Holo that would be acceptable to all (e.g. K.-M. Wu 2008).

### Concluding Remarks

In what respects can an analysis of the two waves of debates over the Chinese name for 'Holo' inform us about the development of Holo identity in contemporary Taiwan?

The historical account of the first debate in 1958 indicates that most Taiwanese Holo were quite accustomed to and preferred to call themselves '台灣人', and their Holo language '台語' or '台灣話'. In its content and nature, the Taiwanese identity was an ethnic minority identity that was formed in contrast with a Japanese identity before 1945 and a Chinese Mainlander identity after 1947. Although the Hakka spoke a different language and had a slightly different culture from the Holo, they were considered to be Taiwanese when such an identity was first conceived in the 1930s under Japanese colonial rule. As the Japanese constantly emphasized the distinction between the Holo and Hakka in their official documents and population census – respectively, '福建(語)族' and '廣東(語)族' – even the Holo and Hakka who resided in their own ethnically concentrated geographic areas began to acknowledge the existence of other Han people. In common usage, however, most Holo still called themselves and their language Taiwanese, and only referred to themselves as Holo in the presence of Hakka (B.-Y. Lin 1958a). The Holo identity, therefore, was at best a situational identity that existed mostly only among the Holo who had the chance to engage in regular contact with Hakka. As Hakka only accounted for not more than 15 percent of Taiwan's population and tended to be concentrated in certain geographical regions, it is little wonder that many Taiwanese Holo who resided in areas without a substantial Hakka population were unfamiliar with the term, let alone would not identify themselves as such before the 1960s, when geographical mobility was still quite limited. The development of a Holo identity to include all Taiwanese who spoke the Taiwanese Holo language was a result of a compromise among the Taiwanese Holo, who after 1945 were forced to refer to their language or themselves by names other than Taiwanese. The fact that the KMT government tried to promote or even impose the name '閩南(話)' on the Holo language, and later on the Holo people, indicated a strong intention to subordinate the Taiwanese within the KMT's nationalist ideological indoctrination, in order to reduce rising tensions caused by mutual misunderstanding and the tragic conflicts that occurred during the initial contacts between Taiwanese and Mainlanders. The debate over '河洛' and '福佬' among the Taiwanese Holo cultural elites in the late 1950s demonstrated an effort to defend their rights to name themselves with a different national imagination than that of the KMT regime. The Holo identity, therefore, was initially conceived as a reluctant compromise among these elites.

The second wave of debate, around the 1990s and still not resolved, demonstrates another dimension of reluctance around the Holo identity. The earlier debate was between members of the cultural elites, and did not have a significant impact on the general public. Consequently, the everyday meanings of 'Taiwanese' and 'Holo' persisted, and the Taiwanese identity remained the most important form of an ethnic minority identity among the Holo and Hakka, as constructed and promoted by the opposition movement camp. This was especially the case among the postwar generations from the 1980s. However, as the opposition camp escalated the scope of its challenge and began to develop a Taiwanese nationalist discourse to counteract the Chinese nationalist discourse of the KMT regime after 1980s, language issues between Holo and Hakka began to take a different course. Even though the Taiwanese nationalism constructed in Taiwan after the 1980s defined all residents in Taiwan as belonging to the Taiwan nation, both the definition formulated by the KMT regime as part of its nationalist

project and the opposition counter-strategy had alienated most people other than the Holo. The Hakka were the first to raise their discontent over the DPP's insistence on using only the Taiwanese Holo language as a weapon in its mass gatherings, and of calling it '*Taiwanese Hua*' after 1987. There was protest from other ethnic minorities, who also accused the DPP of allowing Holo chauvinism to develop among its overly enthusiastic supporters, and of identifying ethnic Holo with national Taiwan in its national imagination. In response, in 1993 the DPP's Holo members initiated a discourse of 'Taiwan's four great ethnic groups'. However, the eventual outcome was the awkward compromise of using Romanized Holo as the name of the Holo people, as was shown in the chapter on ethnicity in the *Draft Taiwan Constitution* in 1994.

More important, due to accusations from other ethnic minorities, Holo identity has a new negative connotation, of being an ethnic chauvinist majority group that in its conception of a new Taiwan nation has attempted to exclude other ethnic minorities from their rightful place. A survey of the *United Daily News* indicates that various terms for 'Holo chauvinism' debuted in the news media only in 1990.<sup>50</sup> Between 1990 and 2010, however, different terms appeared 66 times in different news units in this paper alone (Table 4).

Terms	福佬沙文	河洛沙文	閩南沙文
1990–2000	18	3	8
2001–2010	30	1	6
Total	48	4	14

**Table 4: Articles Referring to 'Holo Chauvinism' in the *United Daily News*, 1990–2010**

Accusations of Holo chauvinism unsurprisingly in most cases targeted the DPP, especially when the DPP was the ruling party in Taiwan between 2000 and 2008. The stigmatization was so successful that the DPP was eventually forced to respond publicly to the accusation in a news bulletin announcing its 'Political Agenda for the Next Ten Years' ('十年政綱') released on 11 August 2010. Some Taiwanese Holo were so bothered about the accusation that it became one of the main reasons why they would not support the DPP. Consequently, Taiwanese Holo were quite divided in their minority ethnic consciousness and partisan support compared to Mainlanders, who overwhelmingly voted for KMT or Mainlander candidates in the major elections.

Table 5 below demonstrates the voting patterns among different ethnic groups in Taiwan in the four Presidential elections between 2000 and 2012; it shows that Taiwanese Holo as a category of people is still far from being a group of people with a fully developed ethnic consciousness.

<sup>50</sup> Hakka elites were the first to propose such a concept in 1987 in the *Hakka Monthly* (客家風雲) magazine.

Candidates	Voter's Ethnic Background				Votes estimates	Actual Votes received
	Holo	Hakka	Main-landers	Aborig-ines		
2000						
Chen Shui-bian	54.7	31.9	11.5	0	45.0	39.38
James Soong	26.2	45.8	78.1	100.0	36.7	36.74
Lian Cheng	19.1	22.3	11.5	0	18.3	23.12
(% in voters)	(72.0)	(13.9)	(13.3)	(0.8)		
2004						
Chen Shui-bian	58	44	11	25	50	50.11
Lian Cheng	42	56	89	75	50	49.89
(% in voters)	(72)	(14)	(11)	(1)		
2008						
Ma Ying-jeou	49	68	88	--	54	58.45
Frank Hsieh	33	16	4	--	27	41.45
Invalid votes	1	2	0	--	1	
Refuse to answer	17	13	8	--	17	
(% in voters)	(73)	(11)	(9)	--		
2012						
Ma Ying-jeou	41	58	82	--	46	51.60
Tsai Ying-wen	39	25	8	--	33	45.63
James Soong	2	1	3		2	2.77
Invalid votes	1	3	0	--	1	
Refuse to answer	17	14	7	--	17	
(% in voters)	(74)	(9)	(9)	--		

(Figures in columns are percentages)

## Sources:

1. The 2000 data were adopted from the 'Survey Research of the Voting Behaviors of the 2000 Presidential Election', collected by the Department of Political Science, Soochow University (東吳大學政治學系). A national random sample of 1,308 individuals was interviewed after the election. Those who reported voting for other candidates (Li Ao [李敖] and Hsu Hsing-liang [許信良], who between them received 0.76 percent of actual votes cast) or refused to answer were deleted from column percentage calculations.
2. The 2004 data were adopted from an 'Exit Poll of the 2004 Presidential Election' conducted by the TVBS Poll Center (a Taiwan Cable TV network company) and Mitofsky International (a US poll company) on Election Day. A national random sample of 13,244 individuals was polled outside 150 voting posts throughout the country. See Table 2-4 of the full report released on 12 April 2004 on the TVBS website: [http://www.tvbs.com.tw/news/poll\\_center/default.asp](http://www.tvbs.com.tw/news/poll_center/default.asp).

**Table 5: Voting for Different Candidates by Ethnic Background in the Presidential Elections, 2000, 2004, 2008, and 2012 (continued on next page)**

3. The 2008 data were adopted from '2008 Presidential Election Poll: Two Days after Election' conducted by TVBS on 24 March 2008. A national sample of 1,112 individuals was polled. See Table 2-5 of the report released on the TVBS website: [http://www.tvbs.com.tw/FILE\\_DB/DL\\_DB/even/200804/even-20080402101905.pdf](http://www.tvbs.com.tw/FILE_DB/DL_DB/even/200804/even-20080402101905.pdf).
4. The 2012 data was adopted from '2012 Presidential Election Poll: Two Days after Election' conducted by TVBS on 16–17 January 2012. A national sample of 1,425 individuals was polled. See Table 2-4 of the report released on the TVBS website: [http://www1.tvbs.com.tw/FILE\\_DB/PCH/201201/dfbrol1dv8.pdf](http://www1.tvbs.com.tw/FILE_DB/PCH/201201/dfbrol1dv8.pdf).

**Table 5 (Continued): Voting for Different Candidates by Ethnic Background in the Presidential Elections, 2000, 2004, 2008, and 2012**

**Appendix: 臺灣風物、台北文物、文獻專刊、南瀛文獻中有關台灣語言名稱的文章彙編(A List of Articles on the Naming Issues of Taiwanese Languages in *Taiwan Folkways*, *Taipei Wenwu*, *Wen-hsein Journal*, and *Nan-ying Wen-hsein*)**

	刊名	日期	卷(期)	作者	篇名
1	臺灣風物	1951.1.1	1 (1)	李騰嶽	連雅堂先生的臺語研究
2	臺灣風物	1951.1.1	1 (1)	朱峰	查埔與查畝
3	臺灣風物	1952.5.1	2 (3)	秋水	查埔查某考
4	臺灣風物	1952.7.10	2 (4)	蘇惟熊	臺灣話人稱代名詞的特殊用法
<i>Continued...</i>					
5	臺北文物	1952.12.1	1 (1)	吳槐	漫談臺北市語音的變遷
6	臺北文物	1952.12.1	1 (1)	李獻璋	見面話小考：試論「汝食未？」底由來
7	臺灣風物	1952.12.1	2 (8)	正希	臺灣婦女罵人的口頭語
8	臺灣風物	1952.12.1	2 (8)	A・P	有關女性俚諺
9	文獻專刊	1952.5.27	3 (1)	廖漢臣	臺灣歷史與諺語
10	臺灣風物	1953.7.31	3 (2)	陳漢光	桃園縣地名研究初稿
11	臺灣風物	1953.7.31	3 (2)	阿Q之友	桃園客家歌謠小集
12	臺北文物	1953.11.15	2 (3)	蔡煜	稻江歲時諺
13	南瀛文獻	1953.9.20	1 (2)	郭一舟	福佬話的古語研究
14	臺灣風物	1954.1.1	4 (1)	紅娘輯	有關嫁娶俚諺(台灣福佬語系流行)
15	臺灣風物	1954.2.20	4 (2)	金撰	北投俚諺拾零
16	臺灣風物	1954.3.12	4 (3)	吳萬水	陽明山俚諺拾零
17	臺北文物	1954.5.1	3 (1)	琪樹	「將的享的」的語原考
<i>Continued</i>					

18	臺灣風物	1954.5.31	4 (5)	潘阿鹿	士林俚諺
19	臺北文物	1954.8.20	3 (2)	黃師樵	新文學運動與白話字運動
20	臺灣風物	1954.11.30	4 (10)	林本元	臺灣成語解說
21	臺北文物	1954.12.10	3 (3)	廖毓文	臺灣文字改革運動史略
22	臺北文物	1955.5.5	4 (1)	廖毓文	臺灣文字改革運動史略 (下)
23	南瀛文獻	1955.6.25~ 1955.12.25	2 (3)–3 (2)	吳新榮、林永 梁、徐清吉、陳 日三	南部農村俚諺集
24	臺北文物	1955.11.20	4 (3)	吳槐	河洛語（閩南語）中之唐 宋故事
25	臺北文物	1955.11.20	4 (3)	集鴉	耍雅疏
26	臺灣風物	1956.2	6 (2)	李獻璋	福佬話詞彙（未定稿） No. 1
27	臺灣風物	1956.4	6 (3, 4)	李獻璋	福佬話詞彙（未定稿） No. 2
28	臺北文物	1956.4.30	5 (1)	廖漢臣	臺北市之特殊諺語
29	臺灣風物	1956.6	6 (5, 6)	李獻璋	福佬話詞彙（未定稿） No. 3
30	南瀛文獻	1956.6.30	3 (3, 4)	李獻璋	福佬話方言中之沒有聲母 的詞彙（上）
31	臺灣風物	1956.8	6 (7, 8)	李獻璋	福佬話詞彙（未定稿） No. 4
32	南瀛文獻	1956.12.31	4 (上)	李獻璋	沒有聲母的福佬話詞彙 (下)
33	臺北文物	1957.1.15	5 (2)	寄園	談臺灣之語言
34	臺北文物	1957.1.15	5 (2)	東華	臺北歲時的俚諺
35	臺北文物	1957.6.30	5 (4)	林本元	臺北人講臺北話
36	臺北文物	1957.9.1	6 (1)	林本元	正臺北人語
37	臺北文物	1957.9.1	6 (1)	蔡煜	警俗俚諺
38	臺灣風物	1958.1–4	8 (1, 2)	忠華	光復後台灣新俗語
39	臺灣風物	1958.5–6	8 (3)	忠華	光復後台灣新俗語（二）
40	臺北文物	1958.6.20	6 (4)	吳守禮	「事情」（tai chi）本字考 ：閩南方言研究札記之一
41	臺北文物	1958.6.20	6 (4)	蔡毓齋	河洛話舉例
42	臺北文物	1958.6.20	6 (4)	林本元	臺灣白話字的商榷
43	臺北文物	1958.6.20	6 (4)	陳君玉	市語漫筆
44	臺北文物	1958.6.30	7 (1)	林本元	臺灣方言論
45	臺灣風物	1958.8	8 (4)	洋洋	「光復後台灣新俗語」補
46	臺北文物	1958.10.15	7 (3)	朱峰	臺灣方言之語法與語源

Continued

47	臺北文物	1958.10.15	7 (3)	林本元	福佬人乎河洛人乎？
48	臺北文物	1958.10.15	7 (3)	曹甲乙	臺北有關子女的俚諺
49	臺灣風物	1958.12.	8 (5)	洋洋	走樣的臺灣話
50	臺北文物	1958.12.30	7 (4)	林本元	臺語絲
51	臺北文物	1958.12.30	7 (4)	吳槐	河洛話叢談
52	臺北文物	1958.12.30	7 (4)	蔡毓齋	正是河洛人
53	臺北文物	1958.12.30	7 (4)	集鴉	福佬人乎河洛人乎讀後書感
54	南瀛文獻	1958.6.20~ 1966.4.15	4 合刊- 11 合刊	林永梁	南部農村俚諺補遺
55	臺北文物	1958.12.30~ 1959.6.30	7 (4)-8 (2)	劉龍岡	臺諺類集
56	臺北文物	1959.4.10	8 (1)	吳槐	河洛話叢談（二）
57	臺北文物	1959.6.30	8 (2)	吳槐	河洛話叢談（三）
58	臺灣風物	1959.9.	9 (3)	新客	新竹客家農諺
59	臺北文物	1959.10	8 (3)	吳槐	河洛話叢談（四）
60	臺北文物	1960.2	8 (4)	吳槐	河洛話叢談（五）
61	臺北文物	1960.2.15	8 (4)	劉寄園	臺灣俗語考
62	臺北文物	1960.2.15	8 (4)	曹甲乙	臺北有關男女的俚諺
63	臺北文物	1960.3	9 (1)	吳槐	河洛話叢談（六）
64	臺北文物	1960.3.31	9 (1), (2)	吳瀛濤	臺語常用俗語集解
65	臺灣風物	1960.3.31	10 (2)	吳從宜	臺灣語言與大陸
66	臺灣風物	1960.3.31	10 (2)	洋洋	「走樣的台灣話」補
67	臺北文物	1960.11	9 (2, 3)	吳槐	河洛話叢談（七）
68	臺北文物	1960.11.15	9 (2)	吳懷宇	艋舺俗語掌故
69	臺北文物	1960.12	9 (4)	吳槐	河洛話叢談（八）
70	臺北文物	1961.3.1	10 (1)	吳瀛濤	臺語罕用俗語掌解
71	臺北文物	1961.3	10 (1)	吳槐	河洛話叢談（九）
72	臺北文物	1961.9.1	10 (2)	吳瀛濤	臺灣特殊俗語類集
73	臺北文物	1961.9	10 (2)	吳槐	河洛話叢談（十）
74	臺灣風物	1961.9.30	11 (8)	林本元	元曲中的臺語
75	臺灣風物	1962.4.20	12 (2)	林本元	臺灣日用成語梗概
76	臺灣風物	1962.12.31	12 (6)	林本元	光復後台灣的新名詞
77	臺灣風物	1963.10.30	13 (4)	林本元	「三八」和「百八」的意義
78	臺灣風物	1963.11.30	13 (5)	蔡懋棠	關於臺語研究的幾個問題
79	臺北文獻	1963.12.30	6 期	吳守禮	臺灣方言研究文獻目錄

Continued

80	臺灣風物	1963.2.28	13 (1)	廖漢臣	俚諺拾零
81	臺灣風物	1964.6.29	14 (1)	蔡懋棠	臺語變聲法
82	臺灣風物	1964.9.30~ 1964.10.31	14 (3, 4)	王金連	臺灣客家俗諺資料
83	臺北文獻	1965.12.1	10 期	劉建仁	連式臺灣語典音讀索引
84	臺灣風物	1965.2.28	14 (6)	張濤	有關「春」的俗諺
85	臺灣文獻	1965.6.27	16 (2)	吳本立	河洛話
86	臺灣風物	1965.6.30	15 (2)	林本元	聲類統編
87	南瀛文獻	1965.6.30	10	許成章	臺灣閩南語的研究
88	臺灣風物	1965.8.30	15 (3)	曹甲乙	人生俚諺一百二十則
89	臺北文獻	1966.12.31	13 期	吳瀛濤	臺灣俚諺集
90	臺灣風物	1966.2.28	16 (1)	牛八庄	漁村俚諺拾錦
91	臺灣風物	1966.2.28	16 (1)	鄭喜夫	澎湖之諺語
92	南瀛文獻	1966.4.15	11 合刊	吳瀛濤	臺灣俚諺集
93	臺灣風物	1966.8.30	16 (4)	吳本立	入聲字
94	臺灣風物	1966.8.30	16 (4)	吳瀛濤	臺灣語錄
95	臺灣文獻	1966.9.27	17 (3)	吳本立	十五音與注音符號
96	臺灣風物	1967.2.28	17 (1)	吳瀛濤	臺語釋義
97	臺灣風物	1967.2.28	17 (1)	李騰嶽	臺灣方言的問題
98	臺灣風物	1967.2.28	17 (1)	吳槐	語言發音的轉變
99	臺灣風物	1967.2.28	17 (1)	楊達	諺語四則
100	臺灣風物	1967.2.28	17 (1)	陳漢光	龍溪有關臺灣的諺語
101	南瀛文獻	1967.6.30	12 合刊	徐清吉	臺灣俗諺新註
102	南瀛文獻	1967.6.30	12 合刊	許成章	臺灣閩南語的研究 (二)
103	文獻專刊		6 (3)	廖漢臣	臺灣諺語的形式和內容
104	文獻專刊		6 (3)	廖漢臣	諺語作品
105	臺灣風物	1967.10	17 (5)	吳槐	廣雅中河洛語釋 詁—河洛語叢談之 十一
106	臺灣風物	1968.2	18 (1)	吳槐	廣雅中河洛語釋 詁—河洛語叢談之 十二
107	臺灣風物	1968.4	18 (2)	吳槐	廣雅中河洛語釋 詁—河洛語叢談之 十三
108	臺灣風物	1968.6	18 (3)	吳槐	廣雅中河洛語釋 詁—河洛語叢談之 十四

Continued

109	臺灣風物	1968.8	18 (4)	吳槐	廣雅中河洛語釋 詁—河洛語叢談之 十五
110	臺灣風物	1969.6	19 (1, 2)	吳槐	廣雅中河洛語釋 詁—河洛語叢談之 十六
111	臺灣風物	1969.6	19 (1, 2)	許成章	閩南語的音與字問 題
112	臺灣風物	1969.12.30	19 (3, 4)	吳槐	河洛（閩南）語之 數詞
113	臺灣風物	1970.2.16	20 (1)	陳修	臺灣話雜記
114	臺灣風物	1970.8.16	20 (3)	許成章	台灣閩南語辭典
115	臺灣風物	1970.11	20 (4)	許成章	台灣閩南語辭典 （續前期）

## References

**Author's note:** An asterisk next to a name or title indicates that the rendering into English follows the form given by the original author.

- Ang, U.\* 洪惟仁 (1984) '臺灣話的價值' ['The value of Taiwan Hua'], *臺灣風物* [*Taiwan Folkways*], 34 (1): 57–70.
- Ang, U.\* 洪惟仁 (1985) *台灣河佬語聲調研究* [*Phonological Research into Taiwanese Holo*] Taipei: 自立晚報文化出版部 [Independent Evening News Publishers].
- Ang, U.\* 洪惟仁 (1986) *臺灣禮俗語典* [*A Dictionary of Taiwan's Ritual Languages*], Taipei: 自立晚報文化出版部 [Independent Evening News Publishers].
- Ang, U.\* 洪惟仁 (1987a) '台語信箱：台語會被消滅嗎？' ['Will Taiwanese be Wiped out?'], *民進黨週刊* [*DPP Weekly*], 33: 3.
- Ang, U.\* 洪惟仁 (1987b) '台語信箱：閩南人是河洛人？' ['Minnan Ren or Holo Ren?'], *民進黨週刊* [*DPP Weekly*], 42: 3.
- Ang, U.\* 洪惟仁 (1987c) '鶴佬人看客家人：促進閩、客團結的一些省思' ['How Holo see Hakka: Some Reflections on Enhancing Solidarity between Minnan and Hakka'], *客家風雲* [*The Hakka Monthly*], 2: 20–25.
- Ang, U.\* 洪惟仁 (1988) '談鶴佬語的正字與語源' ['On the Correct Terms and Origins of Holo language'], *臺灣風物* [*Taiwan Folkways*], 38 (1): 1–49.
- Chang, B.-Y. 張博宇 (1987) *慶祝台灣光復四十週年台灣地區國語推行資料彙編（上）* [*Collections of Materials on Promoting a National Language in Taiwan in Celebration of the Fortieth Anniversary of Taiwan's Restoration*], Nantou: 台灣省政府教育廳 [Department of Education, Taiwan Provincial Government].
- Chang, Y.-H. 張炎憲 and Chen, M.-R. 陳美蓉採訪整理 (2012) *建國舵手黃昭堂* [*A Leader in Nation-Building: Oral History of Ng Yu Zin*], Taipei: 財團法人吳三連台灣史料基金會 [Wu San-lien Taiwan Historical Materials Foundation].
- Chen, C.-T. 陳清池 (2008) '試論 Holo (河洛，福老) 語的起源地' ['On the Origin of Holo Language'], *San Diego Taiwanese Cultural Association Newsletters* [美國

- 加州聖地牙哥台灣同鄉會鄉訊]. <http://www.taiwancenter.com/sdtca/articles/9-08/10.html>.
- Chen, F.\* 陳佳宏 (1998) *海外台獨運動史 [A History of Taiwan Independence Movement Overseas]*, Taipei: 前衛出版社 [Vanguard Publishers].
- Chen, L.-T. 陳賴垂 (1974) '陳漢光先生遺著目錄' ['Bibliography of the Late Chen Han-kuang'], *臺灣風物 [Taiwan Folkways]*, 24 (3): 108–124.
- Cheng, R.L. 鄭良偉 (1973) '論雙語式語言統一的理論與實際：兼論台灣需要「語言計畫」' ['The Theories and Practices of Dual-Language Linguistic Unification'], *大學雜誌 [The Intellectuals]*, 68:.
- Chung, D.-F. 鍾獨佛 (1922) *粵省民族攷原 [Textual Research on the Origins of the People in Kwang-Tung Province]*, unknown publisher.
- Chi, Y. 寄園 (1957) '談臺灣之語言' ['On the Language of Taiwan'], *臺北文物 [Taipei Wenwu]*, 5 (2): 63–65.
- Chiu, S.-W. 邱書瑋 (1988) '民進黨如何看待客語' ['How the DPP Treats Hakka Language'], *客家風雲 [The Hakka Monthly]*, 13: 21–23.
- Chou, R. 鄒魯 and Chang, S. 張煊 (1932 [1907]) *漢族客福史 [A History of Han Hakka and Fulau People]*, Kuangtung: 國立中山大學出版部 [National Sun Yatsen University Press].
- Chu, J.-Y. 朱真一 (2008) '異哉！台灣人的「河洛」及「中原」意識，美國加州聖地牙哥台灣同鄉會鄉訊' ['The Peculiar Case of Taiwanese's "He lo" and "Central Plain" Consciousness'], *美國加州聖地牙哥台灣同鄉會鄉訊 [San Diego Taiwanese Cultural Association Newsletters]*, October 2008, <http://www.taiwancenter.com/sdtca/articles/10-08/8.html>.
- DPP 民主進步黨中央黨部 (1991) *人民制憲會議實錄 [Proceedings of the Convention for Drafting a Constitution by the People]*, Taipei: 民主進步黨中央黨部 [DPP Central Headquarters].
- DPP 民主進步黨中央黨部 (1993) *多元融合的族群關係與文化：民主進步黨的族群與文化政策 [A Multi-Fusion Ethnic Relations and Culture: DPP's Ethnic and Cultural Policies]*, Taipei: 民主進步黨中央黨部 [DPP Central Headquarters].
- Executive Yuan 行政院 (2005) *族群與文化發展會議大會實錄 [Proceedings of Convention for Ethnic and Cultural Development]*, Taipei: 行政院 [Executive Yuan].
- Hsu, C.-D. 許極燉 (1987) *台灣話流浪記 [A Story of Taiwan Hua Wandering]*, Taipei: 台灣語言研究發展基金 [Taiwan Language Research and Development Foundation].
- Hsu, C.-D. 許極燉 (1988) '台灣的語言問題知多少' ['Taiwan's Language Problems'], *民眾日報 [Commons Daily]*, 18–26 May.
- Hsu, C.-D. 許極燉 (1990a) '略談台灣話的名稱問題：是福佬話豈是鶴佬話' ['A Brief Discussion of the Name for Taiwan Hua'], *台灣時報 [Taiwan Times]*, 8 February.
- Hsu, C.-D. 許極燉 (1990b) *台灣語概論 [An Introduction to Taiwan Language]*, Taipei: 台灣語言研究發展基金會 [Taiwan Language Research and Development Foundation].
- Hsu, C.-D. 許極燉 (2000) *台灣話通論 [An Introduction to Taiwan Hua]*, Taipei: 南天書局 [SMC Publishing Co.].
- Huang, C.-A. 黃敬安 (1977) *閩南話考證：證說文解字舉例 [Textual Research of Min-nan Hua: Examples from 說文解字]*, Taipei: 文史哲出版社 [Wen-Shi-Tze Publishers].

- Huang, C.-A. 黃敬安 (1984) *閩南話考證：史記例證* [Textual Research of Min-nan Hua: Examples from 史記], Taipei: 文史哲出版社 [Wen-Shi-Tze Publishers].
- Huang, C.-A. 黃敬安 (1985) *閩南話考證：荀子、史記、漢書例證* [Textual Research of Min-nan Hua: Examples from 荀子、史記、漢書], Taipei: 文史哲出版社 [Wen-Shi-Tze Publishers].
- Huang, C.-A. 黃敬安 (1990) *閩南話考證：古書例證* [Textual Research of Min-nan Hua: Examples from Ancient Books], Taipei: 文史哲出版社 [Wen-Shi-Tze Publishers].
- Huang, S.-F. 黃宣範 (1975) '國語與方言之間' ['Between National Language and Dialect'], 聯合報 [United Daily News], 14 November.
- Kuo, M.-K. 郭明昆遺著 (1963) *中國の家族制及び言語の研究* [Studies of Chinese Family Institution and Language], Tokyo: 泰山文物社 [Taishan Bunbutsusha]. Edited by H.-C. Li\* 李獻璋編輯.
- Legislative Yuan Gazette 立法院公報 (1970) '立法院教育委員會第四十五會期第十三次全體委員會紀錄' ['Proceedings of the 13th Meeting of Committee of Education, in the 45<sup>th</sup> Session of the Legislative Yuan'], 59 (56): 13–24.
- Li, C. 李喬 (1987) '自大的鶴佬人、自卑的客家人、自棄的原住民' ['Arrogant Holo, Self-Abased Hakka, Self-Abandoned Aborigines'], 台灣新文化 [Taiwan New Culture], 15:6–12.
- Li, C. 李喬 (1988) *台灣人的醜陋面：台灣人的自我檢討* [The Ugly Sides of Taiwanese], Taipei: 前衛出版社 [Vanguard Publishers].
- Li, H.-C.\* 李獻璋 (1935 [1970]) *台灣民間文學集* [A Collection of Taiwan Folk Literature], Taipei: 文光出版社 [Wen-Kuang Publishers].
- Li, H.-C.\* 李獻璋 (1950) *福建語法序說* [A Grammar of the Ho-lo Dialect of the Chinese Language Spoken Throughout Tsiang-tsiu, Tsuan-tsiu, Amoy and Formosa], Taipei: 南風書局 [Nan Fang Book Store].
- Lin, B.-Y. 林本元 (1957) '正臺北人語' ['Standard Taipei Residents' Language'], 臺北文物 [Taipei Wenwu], 6 (1): 51–59.
- Lin, B.-Y. 林本元 (1958a) '臺灣方言論' ['On Taiwan's Dialects'], 臺北文物 [Taipei Wenwu], 7 (1): 89–96.
- Lin, B.-Y. 林本元 (1958b) '福佬人乎河洛人乎' ['Fu-Lau Ren? Or Ho-lo Ren?'], 臺北文物 [Taipei Wenwu], 7 (3): 25–9.
- Lin, B.-Y. 林本元 (1963) '光復後台灣的新名詞' ['The New Phrases that Appeared in Taiwan after its Restoration to China'], 臺灣風物 [Taiwan Folkways], 12 (6): 3–15.
- Lin, C.-H. 林進輝編 (ed.) (1983) *台灣語言問題論集* [A Collection of Essays on Taiwan's Language Problems], Taipei: 台灣文藝雜誌社 [Wen-yi Magazines].
- Lin, C.-Y. 林竺筠 (2003) '各族語言平等，將有法可循' ['There will be a Law for Language Equality'], 新台灣新聞週刊 [The New Taiwan Weekly], Number 360.
- Lin, J.-C.\* 林金鈔 (1975) *閩南語研究* [A Study of Minan Dialect], Hsinchu: 竹一出版社 [Chu-Yi Publishers].
- Lin, J.-C.\* (1980) *閩南語探源* [Research on the Original Meaning of the Minan Dialect], Hsinchu: 竹一出版社 [Chu-Yi Publishers].
- Liu, H.-Y. 劉新圓 (2007) '《國家語言發展法草案》隱藏政治動機' ['The Political Motivation behind the Draft of National Language Development Law'], 國政分析 [National Policy Foundation Backgrounder], 21 May <http://www.npf.org.tw/post/3/2302>.

- Liu, Y.-M. 劉禹民 (1983) '台語與政見發表會' ['*Tai-yu and the Electoral Campaign Gatherings*'], *八十年代* [*The 1980s*], 31.
- Lo, H.L.\* 羅香林 (1933) *客家研究導論* [*An Introduction to the Study of the Hakkas in Its Ethnic, Historical, and Cultural Aspect*], Hsingning, Kuangtung: 興寧希山書藏 [Hsinning HsiShan Bookstore].
- Lu, A. 呂秀蓮 (1979) *臺灣的過去與未來* [*The Past and Future of Taiwan*], Taipei: 拓荒者出版社 [Pioneer Publishers].
- Shih, C.-F.\* 施正鋒編 (ed.) (1995) '台灣憲政主義' *Taiwan's Constitutionalism*, Taipei: 前衛出版社 [Vanguard Publishers].
- Shih, C.-F.\* 施正鋒編 (1996) '語言的政治關連性, 收於施正鋒主編' ['The Political Relevance of Language'], in C.-F. Shih (ed.) *語言政治與政策* [*Language Politics and Policies*], Taipei: 前衛出版社 [Vanguard Publishers], pp. 53–80.
- Shih, C.-F.\* 施正鋒編 (1997) '台灣族群政治, 收於施正鋒主編' ['Ethnic Politics in Taiwan'], in C.-F. Shih (ed.) *語言政治與政策* [*Language Politics and Policies*], Taipei: 前衛出版社 [Vanguard Publishers], pp. 73–108.
- Taiwan Folkways* 臺灣風物 (1953) '本刊同仁, 本誌創刊二週年概況' 'A Brief on the Second Anniversary of *Taiwan Folkways*', *臺灣風物* [*Taiwan Folkways*], 3 (5, 6): 4–6.
- Tarn, K.\* 陳冠學 (1984 [1981]) *臺語之古老與古典* [*The Antiquities & Classics of Taiwanese*], Kaohsiung: 第一出版社 [First Publishing Co.].
- Tozer, W. (1970) 'Taiwan's "Cultural Renaissance": A Preliminary View', *The China Quarterly*, 43 (July–September): 81–99.
- Tsai, Y.-J. 蔡毓齋 (1958a) '河洛話舉例' ['Examples of *Holo Hua*'], *臺北文物* [*Taipei Wenwu*], 6 (4): 11–16.
- Tsai, Y.-J. 蔡毓齋 (1958b) '正是河洛人' ['*Holo Ren* Indeed'], *臺北文物* [*Taipei Wenwu*], 7 (4): 20–22.
- Wang, F.-C. 王甫昌 (1996) '台灣反對運動的共識動員: 一九七九至一九八九年兩次挑戰高峰的比較' ['Consensus Mobilization of the Opposition Movement in Taiwan: Comparing Two Waves of Challenges, 1979–1989'], *台灣政治學刊* [*Taiwanese Political Review*], 1: 129–207.
- Wang, F.-C. (2005a) 'Why Bother About School Textbooks?: An Analysis of the Origin of the Disputes over *Renshi Taiwan* Textbooks in 1997', in J. Makeham and A.-C. Hsiao (eds.) *Cultural, Ethnic and Political Nationalism in Contemporary Taiwan: Bentuhua*, New York: Palgrave, pp. 55–99.
- Wang, F.-C. 王甫昌 (2005b) '由「中國省籍」到「台灣族群」: 戶口普查籍別類屬轉變之分析' ['From Chinese Original Domicile to Taiwanese Ethnicity: An Analysis of the Census Category Transformation in Taiwan'], *台灣社會學* [*Taiwanese Sociology*], 9: 59–117.
- Wang, F.-C. 王甫昌 (2008) '族群政治議題在台灣民主轉型中的角色' ['The Role of Ethnic Politics Issues in Taiwan's Democratization Transition'], *台灣民主季刊* [*Taiwan Journal of Democracy*], 5 (2): 89–140.
- Wang, F.-C. 王甫昌 (2011) '福佬 (或河洛) 人, 收於蕭新煌、潘英海、王甫昌、邱彥貴、李廣均、王宏仁、張翰璧著' ['*Fu lau (Ho lo) People*'], in M.H.H. Hsiao I.H. Pan, F.-C. Wang, Y.-K Chiu, K.-C. Lee, H.-R. Wang, and H.-B. Chang, *臺灣全志 卷三 住民志 族群篇* [*A Gazette of Taiwan, Volume 3 The Resident: Ethnic Groups*], Nantou: 國史館台灣文獻館 [Taiwan Historica], pp. 183–291.

- Wu, H. 吳槐 (1955) '河洛語（閩南語）中之唐宋故事' ['The Stories of Teng and Song Dynasties Contained in the *Ho-lo yu (Min-nan Yu)*'], *臺北文物 [Taipei Wenwu]*, 4 (3): 67–75.
- Wu, K.-M. 吳坤明 (2008) '台灣閩南語之淵源與正名，台灣學研究' ['The Origin and Proper Name of the Taiwan Min-nan Language'], *Taiwan Study [台灣學研究]*, 5: 54–73.
- Yang, Y. 洋洋 (1958) '走樣的臺灣話' ['*Distorted Taiwan Hua*'], *臺灣風物 [Taiwan Folkways]*, 8 (5): 3–4.
- Yang, Y. 洋洋 (1960) '「走樣的臺灣話」補' ['More on Major Journal, *Wen-Hsien Journal* (文獻專刊 *Taiwan Hua*)'], *臺灣風物 [Taiwan Folkways]*, 10 (2): 28–33.
- Yuan, C.-H. et.al.\* 袁家驊等着 (1959 [2003]) *汉语方言概要 [Hanyu Fangyan Gaiya\*]*, Beijing: 语文出版社 [Yuwen Publishers].

*Address for correspondence: Professor Fu-Chang Wang, Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica, 128 Sec. 2 Academia Rd., Nankang, Taipei 11529, Taiwan*