

# Journal of Taiwanese Vernacular

Vol.8, No.1, March 2016

## Contents 目錄

- 〈越南ê台灣文學kap人文研究現況〉 范玉翠薇 4  
The research situation of Taiwanese literature and humanities in Vietnam  
*Ngoc Thuy Vi PHAM*
- Revitalization and development of Taiwanese literature... 16  
*Sui-beng LIAU*  
〈台語文學ê復振kah發展〉 廖瑞銘
- Various perspectives in defining Vietnamese words and morphemes 32  
*Thien Giap NGUYEN*  
〈Ûi無全ê觀點界定越南語ê語詞kah詞素〉 阮善甲
- Artice Review:  
“A reluctant identity: The development of Holo Identity  
in contemporary Taiwan,” 56  
*Peter KANG*  
Bûn-chiu<sup>a</sup> Tō-thók:  
“M̄-chêng-goān ê sin-hūn jīn-tông: tong-tāi Tâi-oân Holo jīn-tông ê hoat-tián”  
*Pôe-tek KHNG*
- Conference Speech 研討會演講: 64  
“A Taiwanese American talks on Taiwanese literature translation”  
〈台美人談台灣文學外譯〉 *Binsiong OU*  
〈日本おける台湾原住民文学  
—果たして読まれているのだろうか?〉 下村作次郎  
“Tī Jit-pún ê Tâi-oân goān-chū-bîn bûn-hák Jit-pún thók-chiá kám thàk ah?”  
*Sakujiro SHIMOMURA*

ISSN 2076 3611



# Journal of Taiwanese Vernacular

# Tâi-gí Gián-kiù 台語研究

Vol.8, No.1, March 2016



Tâi-gí Gián-kiù

台語研究

Journal of Taiwanese Vernacular

Vol.8, No.1, March 2016



airiti  
press.



Journal of Taiwanese Vernacular

**Tâi-gí Gián-kiù**  
**台語研究**

Vol.8, No.1, March 2016



Tâi-lâm, TAIWAN

Journal of Taiwanese Vernacular

# Tâi-gí Gián-kiù 台語研究

Vol.8, No.1, March 2016

## 諮詢顧問 Advisory Board

Đoàn Thiện Thuật  
(越南國家大學語言系退休)

Jerold Edmondson  
(U. of Texas at Arlington, USA (Emeritus))

John Edwards  
(St Francis Xavier University, Canada)

三尾裕子 (日本東京外國語大學)

吉川雅之 (日本東京大學)

呂興昌 (國立成功大學台灣文學系退休)

李勤岸 (國立台灣師範大學台文所)

村上嘉英 (日本天理大學中國語系退休)

林修澈 (國立政治大學民族系)

姚榮松 (國立台灣師範大學台文所)

施正鋒 (國立東華大學民族學院)

施炳華 (國立成功大學中文系退休)

洪惟仁 (國立台中教育大學台語系退休)

康培德 (國立東華大學台灣文化學系)

張裕宏 (國立台灣大學語言所退休)

張學謙 (國立台東大學華語系)

莊永山 (國立高雄師範大學英語系退休)

董忠司 (國立新竹教育大學台語所退休)

趙順文 (國立台灣大學日文系退休)

鄭良偉 (美國夏威夷大學東亞語文系退休)

謝菁玉 (國立成功大學外文系)

## 主編 Editor-in-Chief

蔣為文 Wi-vun Taiffalo CHIUNG  
(國立成功大學台灣文學系)

## 編輯委員 Editorial Board

方耀乾 (國立台中教育大學台文系)

張宏宇 (高苑科技大學外文系)

酒井亨 (日本金澤學院大學)

簡華麗 (Oslo U. C., Norway)

Hiro Ota (U. of Hawaii at Manoa, USA)

## 英文編輯 English editor

Vivian T. Su

## 行政編輯 Administrative editor

潘秀蓮

## 出版者 Publishers

國立成功大學台灣語文測驗中心 &  
Airiti Press Inc. &  
Asian Atsiu International

## 訂閱 Subscription

國內機關團體一年兩期：NT2,000

國內個人一年兩期：NT1,000

Please refer to subscription form for  
international subscription fees.

Abstracting & Indexing

本期刊收錄於 TCI, CEPS

電子版本 Electronic journal

<http://www.ceps.com.tw>

版權保留，若無出版者之書面同意，bē-sái 用任何形式 kap 工具來再造本刊內容。

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publishers.

Copyright © NCKU CTLT & Airiti Press Inc. & Asian Atsiu International

## Contents

## 目錄

- 〈越南ê台灣文學kap人文研究現況〉范玉翠薇 4  
The research situation of Taiwanese literature and humanities in Vietnam  
*Ngoc Thuy Vi PHAM*
- Revitalization and development of Taiwanese literarure... 16  
*Sui-beng LIAU*  
〈台語文學ê復振kah發展〉廖瑞銘
- Various perspectives in defining Vietnamese words and morphemes 32  
*Thien Giap NGUYEN*  
〈Üi無仝ê觀點界定越南語ê語詞kah詞素〉阮善甲
- Artice Review: 56  
“A reluctant identity: The development of Holo Identity  
in contemporary Taiwan,”  
*Peter KANG*  
Bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup> Tō-thók:  
“M̄-chêng-goân ê sin-hûn jîn-tông: tong-tâi Tâi-oân Holo jîn-tông ê hoat-tián”  
*Pôe-tek KHNG*
- Conference Speech研討會演講: 64  
“A Taiwanese American talks on Taiwanese literature translation”  
〈台美人談台灣文學外譯〉*Binsiong OU*  
〈日本おける台湾原住民文学  
一果たして読まれているのだろうか?〉下村作次郎  
“Tī Jit-pún ê Tâi-oân goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák Jit-pún thók-chiá kám thák ah?”  
*Sakujiro SHIMOMURA*

# The Research Situation of Taiwanese Literature and Humanities in Vietnam

Ngoc Thuy Vi PHAM

Department of Taiwanese Literature

National Cheng Kung University

## Abstract

Since the economic reforms in 1986, Vietnam's annual economic growth rate has increased at at least 7%. Vietnam has gradually become an emerging economic country in Asia after China. Taiwan is not only considered as one of the earliest countries investing in Vietnam but over the years it has also been one of the three largest investor countries in Vietnam. A few years ago, being encouraged and supported by the Ministry of Education, academic exchange and education between Taiwan and Vietnam have increased, expanded and become respected.

From the 1990s onwards, the comparison of the Taiwanese -Vietnamese Humanities researches started to be conducted formally. In Vietnam, the Institute of Social Sciences in Vietnam established the Chinese research center in 1993. This center was later upgraded to the Institute of Chinese Studies in 2005 and the research center on Taiwan is established under it.

After many years of being on friendly terms, Vietnamese Pen invited Taiwanese Pen to take part in the Asian Poets Congress and discuss Vietnamese Literature at the beginning of March, 2015 in Vietnam. Professor Wi-vun Chiung represented Taiwanese Pen to read 2 poems in Taiwanese and responded to the interviews from Vietnamese media.

with only nearly 20 years' relationship in the field of comparative researching on Taiwanese-Vietnamese Humanities, Vietnam and Taiwan have achieved a lot of good results. We believe that with the active exchanges of researchers from Taiwan and Vietnam, this achievement will increase significantly.

Keywords: Taiwan, Vietnam, Taiwanese literature, literary contact



## 越南ê台灣文學kap人文研究現況

范玉翠薇

國立成功大學台灣文學系

### 摘要

越南自從1986年改革開放以來，每年至少以大約7% ê經濟成長率沓沓--ah發展，接續中國後壁，成做亞洲ê新興經濟體。台灣除了是上早到越南投資ê國家之一，數年來mā一直是佇越南投資ê前三名。這幾年，佇教育部ê鼓勵kap支持下面，台灣hām越南學術教育ê交流漸漸受到重視嘛愈來愈普及。Koh因為台越通婚ê增加，台灣kap越南ê民間交流嘛愈頻繁。譬如，有bē少台灣ê電視節目佇越南電視台放送。本文主要是欲呈現、探討越南學界對台灣文學kap人文研究ê現況。

戰後台灣kap越南ê台越人文比較研究大約自1990年代了後才開始有計畫來進行。佇越南，越南社科院自1993年成立中國研究中心，2005年升級成做中國研究院，下面koh設台灣研究中心。

佇文學方面ê交流，台文筆會、台灣羅馬字協會kap台越文化協會mā非常pià<sup>n</sup>-sè。台文筆會佇2015年3月初，接受「越南作家協會」ê邀請前往越南參加越南文學論壇kap亞太詩人大會等等ê文學盛會。蔣為文教授代表台文筆會上台念二首台語詩並且接受越南媒體ê訪問。

台越之間ê文學kap人文比較研究歷史雖罔kan-na 20外冬，m-koh嘛得著bē少ê成就。相信佇台越雙方研究人員ê密切交流之下，成果ê愈來愈豐碩。

關鍵詞：台灣、越南、台灣文學、文學交流

收件日期2015.11.25/修訂日期2016.1.12/接受日期2016.2.2

## 1. 前言

越南自從1986年改革開放以來，每年至少以大約7% 的經濟成長率查查--ah發展，接續中國後壁，成做亞洲的新興經濟體。台灣除了是上早到越南投資的國家之一，數年來mā一直是佇越南投資的前三名。這幾年，佇教育部鼓勵kap支持下面，台灣hām越南學術教育的交流漸漸受到重視嘛愈來愈普及。Koh因為台越通婚的增加，台灣kap越南的民間交流嘛愈頻繁。譬如，有bē少台灣的電視節目佇越南電視台放送。本文主要是欲呈現、探討越南學界對台灣文學kap人文研究的現況。

戰後台灣kap越南的台越人文比較研究大約自1990年代了後才開始有計畫來進行。譬如台灣的中央研究院佇1994年成立東南亞區域研究計畫（2003年改作亞太區域研究專題中心），越南是研究的重點。佇越南，越南社科院自1993年成立中國研究中心，2005年升級成做中國研究院，下面koh設台灣研究中心。頂面所講的單位主要研究議題是以經濟kap政治為主。若是佇語言kap文學方面的研究kap推廣，應該是以台灣的羅馬字協會、台越文化協會、台文筆會以及國立成功大學台灣語文測驗中心kap越南研究中心等單位做代表。

台灣羅馬字協會佇2002年有捐一批將近一千本的台灣研究冊予越南社科院kap社會人文大學的圖書館。這寡冊包含台灣歷史、語言、文學、文化等各方面書籍，是越南改革開放了後上大一批的台灣藏書。另外，台灣羅馬字協會嘛佇全一年設立樂安台灣研究獎助金，鼓勵越南學者kap學生從事台灣人文研究。

國立成功大學蔣為文教授佇2004年率先以越南文kap英文雙語出版《海洋台灣：歷史與語言》（*Lịch sử và ngôn ngữ Đài Loan*<sup>1</sup>）。這本冊用簡單明瞭的方式介紹台灣的語言kah文學的歷史發展，是第一本用越南文來介紹台灣文學史的專冊。另外，蔣為文教授嘛佇2006年出版《牽手學台語·越南語<sup>2</sup>》，用雙語的方式予台灣人學越南語、越南人學台語。2013年出版《越南七桃lóng毋驚：越·台·中三語手比冊》，三語的旅遊會話集。2014年閣用越南

<sup>1</sup> 冊的內容會當佇網路掠著：< <http://ebook.de-han.org/lsnn> >。

<sup>2</sup> 冊的內容會當佇網路掠著：< <http://ebook.de-han.org/khan/index.htm> >。

語出版《漢字及越南羅馬字學習效率比較》(HIỆU QUẢ CỦA VIỆC HỌC CHỮ HÁN VÀ CHỮ QUỐC NGŨ<sup>3</sup>)，探討台灣kah越南ê文字讀寫效率kap母語文學發展史。

除了出版以外，國立成功大學嘛積極招收越南學生從事台越比較研究。佇人文方面，台灣文學系招收上濟越南籍研究生，其次是中文系kap歷史系。這寡研究生kap畢業生攏變作台灣人文比較研究ê重要人才，其中，台文系ê越南籍學生成做佇越南推動台灣文學研究kap推廣ê重要推動者。

因為台越比較研究ê人才漸漸累積，專門ê研討會mā tòe teh時行。譬如，台灣羅馬字協會、台越文化協會、台文筆會kap國立成功大學越南研究中心佇2010年辦理空前大規模ê第1屆台越人文比較研究國際研討會。前來參與ê越南專家包含文學、語言、歷史、文化等各領域，有20 gōa位hiah濟，chia ê學者佇越南攏是佇一頂ê大學kah研究單位服務。第2屆嘛佇2013年盛大辦理。第3屆預定佇今(2016)年辦理。

佇文學方面ê交流，台文筆會、台灣羅馬字協會kap台越文化協會mā非常piàⁿ-sè。台文筆會佇2015年3月初，接受「越南作家協會」ê邀請前往越南參加越南文學論壇kap亞太詩人大會等等ê文學盛會。蔣為文教授代表台文筆會上台念二首台語詩並且接受越南媒體ê訪問。會議期間，主辦單位mā安排台文筆會前往越南國家主席府拜會國家主席張晉創。台越之間ê文學kap人文比較研究歷史雖罔kan-na 20外冬，m̄-koh嘛得著bē少ê成就。相信佇台越雙方研究人員ê密切交流之下，成果ē愈來愈豐碩。

## 2. 1986年進前越南對台灣ê認知

雖罔台灣hām越南佇17世紀進前就有密切ê往來，毋閣佇1986年進前，當時ê越南人對中國ê認bat超過對台灣ê認bat。原因真濟：一方面是越南kap中國有一千外冬ê久長歷史交纏，另外一方面是因為當代政治制度ê影響。

日本佇1940年到1945年之間bat短暫kap法國殖民政府共同統治越南。當時日本派駐佇越南ê軍隊、情報人員kah農技人員有包含當時屬日本籍ê台灣人(蔣為文2010)。當時越南民眾對台灣人ê印象是一个hō日本帝國主義

<sup>3</sup> 冊ê內容會當佇網路掠著：<<http://ebook.de-han.org/cqn/cqn.pdf>>。



殖民統治ê台灣民族；對中國人ê印象是受著日本帝國侵略ê周邊民族。譬如講，《越南獨立報》bat佇1945年6月25日刊一幅插圖，描述日本帝國主義侵略亞洲ê弱小民族ê情形。其中，中國kap台灣分別由二个báng-kah人物代表，將台灣kap中國當做是bô-kâng ê民族。

圖表 1. 《越南獨立報》ê插圖



第二擺世界大戰了後，越南佇1975年進前以北緯17度做界線，分作北片ê「越南民主共和國」（北越）kap南片ê「越南共和國」（南越）。北越屬社會主義陣營，kap中國以及前蘇聯等社會主義國家結盟。南越是屬資本主義陣營，kap美國、法國、台灣等是同盟陣營。

因為北越佇政治上kap中華人民共和國（之後簡稱中國）是全陣營，因此北越政府實施一个中國政策，kan-na承認中華人民共和國政府是中國唯一ê合法政府，bô承認中華民國kap台灣。北越政府佇媒體、外交kap教育頂面攏kā台灣看作是中國ê一省。彼時期ê北越民眾mā因為資訊不足，接受政府ê政策，用全款ê態度來看待台灣。

若是南越政府，因為hām蔣介石領導ê中華民國攏是反共陣線，雙方佇1955年到1975年之間互相承認、建交。蔣介石主張中華民國政府是全中國唯一ê合法政府而且台灣是中華民國ê一省，所以南越政府mā按呢堅持一中政策。南越民眾當然mā受chitê政策影響。

佇南越時期，台灣ê學者陳荊和（1917-1995）bat佇順化大學、西貢大學kap大叻大學教冊。陳荊和是出名ê國際學者，專門研究東南亞華人kap明鄉人歷史。他會當算是二十世紀台灣學者當中較早從事台越歷史比較研究ê一

位。<sup>4</sup>

公元1975年北越統一南越而且將國號改作今仔日ê「越南社會主義共和國」。雖罔統一了後ê越南bat佇1979年kap中國有軍事衝突，m̄-koh「一个中國，中華人民共和國政府是中國唯一ê合法政府」chit-ê政策基本上猶原延續到今。

### 3. 1986年之後越南對台灣ê新認知

越南統一了後ùi 1975到1986年之間實施共產制度（Thời bao cấp）ê計畫經濟。由於計畫經濟並無發揮預期效果，致使經濟大衰退。尾後，越南共產黨佇第六擺全國代表大會決議ùi 1986年12月進行經濟改革kap對外開放。

佇chit款革新開放ê背景之下，台商佇隔冬開始陸續進入越南投資設廠。佇無正式邦交ê情況之下，為著促進台越雙方ê經貿合作發展，兩國自1992年6月簽署互相設處協定，11月佇河內市設立「駐越南台北經濟文化代表處」（簡稱「駐越南代表處」），佇胡志明市設立「駐胡志明市台北經濟文化辦事處」（簡稱「駐胡志明市辦事處」）。越南chit片是1993年佇台北設立「駐台北越南經濟文化辦事處」。

代表處設立了後，李登輝前總統佇1993年閣提出南向政策鼓勵台商往東南亞發展。直屬總統府ê中央研究院mā配合南向政策佇1994年成立東南亞區域研究計畫鼓勵學界從事東南亞研究來符合台商南進ê需求。

越南社會科學院mā佇1993年成立中國研究中心，而且佇中國研究中心下底koh設台灣研究室。Tùi 2005年起，中國研究中心koh升級作中國研究院（所），台灣研究室mā升級成作台灣研究中心（Chiung 2011）。

佇1990年代，台越政府雙方關心ê議題主要是佇經濟方面。台灣chit pêng希望了解越南ê投資環境通好協助台商佇越南ê發展。若是越南hit pêng是希望參考台灣ùi農業轉型做加工出口kap工業化ê過程。

看著台商佇越南愈來愈濟ê趨勢，開始有婚姻仲介公司紹介台灣ê男性到越南娶某。根據內政部移民署ê統計資料，到kah 2015年6月底，ùi越南來ê

<sup>4</sup> 十九世紀台灣澎湖出身ê蔡廷蘭（1801-1859）bat坐船遭遇風颶漂流到越南。回國了後他bat出版《海南雜著》描述當時伊佇越南看著ê，是當時台灣人寫海外見聞ê首例。Chit本冊有翻譯做露西亞文、法文、日文kap越南文等。因為蔡廷蘭毋是有意欲從事台越比較研究，所以kan-na算是一个無意中ê越南研究者。

新移民有92,041人，佔東南亞新移民人數ê一半以上。將近十萬ê越南人長期 tòi 佇台灣，越南人成做台灣新興ê移民族群。這款客觀條件ê改變，造成台灣kap越南之間ê交流合作ùi經濟面發展到文化kap教育各方面。Chia ê交流會當分做二大方面：第一、菁英式ê交流，包含政府、學校、研究單位、民間團體等等。第二、社會大眾ê個人交流，例如透過跨國婚姻所展開ê民間交流。

公元2000年了後ê台越交流有較闊ê多元面貌。目前擔任國立成功大學台灣文學系教授兼越南研究中心主任ê蔣為文教授會當算是越南革新開放了後，頭一个深入越南民間從事台越人文比較研究ê台灣學者。Hit當時蔣為文 tī--leh 美國讀語言學博士，2001年7月到2002年8月去越南學習越南語kah從事田野調查ê工作。伊ê博士論文主要是做台灣漢字kap越南羅馬字ê學習效率比較，koh分析探討台越民族母語文學發展過程ê異同點。他佇越南期間發現因為「一中政策」ê影響，致使越南ê大學kap研究機關對台灣社會人文以及歷史ê認識真有限而且是偏差ê。因此伊積極推動台、越ê教育，以及文化交流活動。

因為蔣為文ê牽線，台灣南社<sup>5</sup>、台灣羅馬字協會<sup>6</sup>以及前衛出版社等單位佇2002年捐將近一千本ê台灣研究書籍予越南社科院kap河內社會人文大學ê圖書館。這批冊包含台灣歷史、語言、文學、文化等各方面，是自越南改革開放了後，上大一批台灣ê藏書。另外，台灣羅馬字協會佇全一年設立樂安台灣研究獎助金，鼓勵越南學者kap學生從事台灣人文研究kap出版。2003年ê得獎學生當中，國家大學外語學院中文系ê呂越雄以大學畢業論文〈《亞細亞ê孤兒》中ê胡太明ê精神悲劇〉得獎。Hit篇論文應該是越南改革開放以來第一篇探討台灣文學作品ê學位論文。

公元2003年8月蔣為文學成歸國了後，佇國立成功大學台灣文學系教冊。他積極推動台灣kap越南學術機構ê交流kap合作：第一、鼓勵以及提供獎學助金予越南學生到台灣留學，特別是到成大文學院讀冊。第二、邀請越南學者到台灣進行演講、訪問、參與研討會kap進行研究計畫ê合作。第三、積極進行台越雙方ê出版kap行銷計畫。第四、自2006年開始無定期

<sup>5</sup> 當時是鄭正煜擔任台灣南社ê執行長。

<sup>6</sup> 當時是張復聚擔任台灣羅馬字協會理事長。



辦理台越青年訪問團，chhōa台灣ê學者、學生去越南進行交流訪問。到kah 2015年，來成大台灣文學系讀冊包含已經畢業學生ê總人數（博士kap碩士）達到10人。另外，猶有一寡是到成大中文系或者歷史系讀研究所。這寡人才攏對台灣文學kap台越人文比較研究有真濟ê幫贊。

除了透過學校體制ê交流，蔣為文嘛積極促進民間組織ê雙片交流。他佇2009年鼓舞成立社團法人台越文化協會，以促進台灣kap越南ê文化交流為主要宗旨。另外，台灣羅馬字協會、台文筆會等社團嘛積極kap越南ê相關單位建立友好關係。

經過chiah濟冬ê交流，2015年三月台文筆會受「越南作家協會」ê邀請前往越南參加越南文學論壇kap亞太詩人大會等文學盛會。Chit屆越南文學論壇以及亞太詩人大會由越南中央半官方組織「越南作家協會」kah河內市、北寧省、廣寧省等地方政府共同辦理。主要活動場地佇越南首都河內，mā到北寧kap廣寧省參觀。此屆應邀參加ê國際來賓有來自台灣、日本、韓國、中國、美國等來自全世界總共43個國家，151位詩人kap作家攏來捧場。蔣為文教授代表台灣上台念二首台語詩，會後koh接受越南電視台VTV4以及越南通訊社訪問。佇活動當中，越南方面非常罕見將中華民國國旗kap其他國家並列，表達出某種ê政治訊息。Chit款文學交流活動m-nā促進台越兩國ê國民外交、加強兩國人民ê友誼，mā全時增加台灣文學佇國際場合ê知名度。

圖表2. 越南文學論壇以及亞太詩人大會現場





#### 4. 越南人印象中ê台灣文學作品

「啥物是台灣文學？」這款ê爭議佇台灣猶bē得著一个共識，這款ê爭議mā反映佇越南人對台灣文學作家kap作品認定頂面。

蔣為文（2006）bat提出「台灣文學」、「中華民國文學」以及「中華人民共和國文學」此三種文學互相獨立koh對立ê見解<sup>7</sup>。蔣為文khiā-tī語言kap國家認同ê觀點，來區別這三種文學。這款ê區分其實mā符合包含越南在內大多數國家ê文學案例。不而過，佇「一中政策」影響之下，因為台灣文學kap中華民國文學摻雜ê情形非常嚴重，致使一般越南民眾定定kā中華民國文學作家作品當作是台灣文學。

以越南文版ê Wikipedia做例，台灣文學予人編佇中國文學項目下底。佇台灣ê文學作家項目下底攏總收7位作家，分別是柏楊、朱孝天、古龍、林語堂、臥龍生、瓊瑤、陳喬安<sup>8</sup>。這7位，kan-na朱孝天kap陳喬安確實是佇台灣出生ê台灣人，其他ê攏是中國出生ê中國人。而且朱孝天kap陳喬安其實是「偶像劇」演員，m̄是作家。

瓊瑤（越南文Quỳnh Dao）有真濟愛情作品翻譯作越南文，譬如《窗外》（Song Ngoại）、《煙雨濛濛》（Đòng sông ly biệt）、《還珠格格》（Hoàn Châu cách cách）等。古龍mā有武俠小說翻作越南文。因為言情小說kap武俠小說ê銷量較大，大多數越南讀者mā將瓊瑤kap古龍誤認做台灣文學ê代表作家。Koh，越南大約有100萬ê華人。這寡華人基本上多數攏bat華語文而且認同中華民國。這個因素mā予中華民國文學予人誤認做台灣文學。相

<sup>7</sup> 蔣為文（2006）指出「台灣文學」就是「台灣人」用「台灣語言」（包含台語、客語、原住民語）所創作ê任何文學作品。譬如講，認同家己是台灣人ê「黃勁連」、「曾貴海」、「夏曼藍波安」等人分別用「台語」、「客語」、「達悟語」書寫e文學作品就是「台灣文學」。若「中華民國文學」是「持有中華民國國籍者」用中華民國國語（就是「華語」）所創作ê任何文學作品。彼寡佇政治上認同家己是台灣人，毋閣卻是選擇用殖民者語言「華語」書寫ê「陳芳明」、「彭瑞金」等人e作品就是屬台灣被殖民歷史當中ê「中華民國文學」，因為in leh替殖民者ê大中國語言文化政策背書。論到hit寡無認同台灣國，只認同「中華民國」ê人，像：「余光中」、「白先勇」等，嘛屬「中華民國文學」ê一部分。「中華人民共和國文學」（或者簡稱「中國文學」）就是「中國人」（無論tòa-tī中國或者台灣、海外）用中國普通話（就是「華語」）所創作ê任何文學作品。

<sup>8</sup> 越文網址佇：<[https://vi.wikipedia.org/wiki/Th%E1%BB%83\\_lo%E1%BA%Ali:Nh%C3%A0\\_v%C4%83n\\_%C4%90%C3%A0i\\_Loan](https://vi.wikipedia.org/wiki/Th%E1%BB%83_lo%E1%BA%Ali:Nh%C3%A0_v%C4%83n_%C4%90%C3%A0i_Loan)>。

對之下，佇台灣猶未成做主流ê台語文學，因為知名度無夠而且欠缺會曉台語文ê越南翻譯者，所以台語文學對越南人來講猶原真生疏。Koh，若準是本土台灣人以華語出版ê文學作品，mā真oh會當佇越南ê冊店揣tiòh。

近年來「偶像劇」漸漸改變讀者ê閱讀習慣，成做民眾接觸文學ê新興管道。佇越南mā全款。台灣ê華語「偶像劇」kap台語本土劇成做越南大眾認bat台灣社會文化ê重要媒介。譬如講，陳喬安ê華語劇《命中注定我愛你》（Định mệnh anh yêu em<sup>9</sup>），朱孝天ê《流星花園》（Vườn sao băng），民視ê《風水世家》（Phong Thủy Thế Gia<sup>10</sup>）、《夜市人生》（Đời sống chợ đêm<sup>11</sup>）、《意難忘》（Mối Tình Đầu<sup>12</sup>），三立ê《台灣龍捲風》（Con Lốc Của Rồng<sup>13</sup>）、《台灣霹靂火》（Đài Loan phích lịch hoả），台視ê《懷玉傳奇》（Hoài Ngọc Truyền Kỳ<sup>14</sup>）等攏bat佇越南放送。若將電視劇當做廣義ê文學作品，按呢多數越南民眾慣勢透過電視劇認bat當代ê台灣文學。因為台灣電視劇佇越南播出ê時，差不多攏翻作越南語--ah，並無以原音放送，致使越南人較無機會聽tiòh台語。所以真濟ê越南人m̄知講台灣人是用台語當作民族ê母語，掠準講台灣人攏使用華語。

<sup>9</sup> 會當佇網站看越南語版：<[https://vi.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C4%90%E1%BB%8Bnh\\_m%E1%BB%87nh\\_anh\\_y%C3%AAu\\_em](https://vi.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C4%90%E1%BB%8Bnh_m%E1%BB%87nh_anh_y%C3%AAu_em)>。

<sup>10</sup> 會當佇網站看越南語版：<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tgTHtEshp0A>>。

<sup>11</sup> 會當佇網站看越南語版：<[http://mojim.net/tw\\_search\\_u2\\_H\\_e768WeDDc.html](http://mojim.net/tw_search_u2_H_e768WeDDc.html)>或 <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N88jqpwj4io>>。

<sup>12</sup> 會當佇網站看越南語版：<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0DBxdc93m4s>>。

<sup>13</sup> 會當佇網站看越南語版：<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yUgqNbeh9pY>>。

<sup>14</sup> 會當佇網站看越南語版：<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PqS3HIBieXI>>。

圖表 3. 夜市人生越南語版



## 5. 結論

對整體來講，雖罔台灣kap越南ê文化交流愈來愈普遍，m-koh越南人對台灣文學，特別是傳統紙本文學ê作品kap作家ê認bat猶原非常有限。其中，有bê少中華民國文學作品予越南人誤認做一般ê台灣文學。比較紙本形式ê文學作品，新興ê台語電視劇文學作品顛倒較受越南大眾歡迎kap接受。

若欲佇越南推廣台灣文學iah是台語文學，下面幾項作法提供參考：第一、加強文學作品ê越南文翻譯，予koh較濟ê越南語讀者有機會接觸台灣文學。第二、鼓勵將文學作品hip作電視劇iah是電影，予台灣文學會當以影音ê方式予koh較濟人接觸、親近。等讀者對台灣文學有興趣了後，才koh進一步來推廣紙本作品ê閱讀。第三、建議佇越南設立台灣中心，成做在地推廣台灣文學、台灣語文ê營運中心。第四、鼓勵越南ê大學中文系kap台灣ê台灣文學系多多交流。

### 讀者回應

任何批評指教，歡迎email: [thuyvitw@gmail.com](mailto:thuyvitw@gmail.com)，范玉翠薇收。

感謝

感謝國立成功大學蔣為文教授接受作者ê訪問並提供相關資料kap訊息。

## 參考冊目

Chung, Wi-vun. 2011 “Features and Prospects in Comparative Studies of Vietnam and Taiwan,” *Journal of Taiwanese Vernacular*, 3(2), 122-141.

蔣為文2006〈「中華民國文學」等於「台灣文學」嗎？〉收錄於蔡金安編《台灣文學正名》。台南：台灣海翁台語文教育協會。

蔣為文2010〈留Tiàm tī越南ê農技人員吳連義ê案例研究〉，《台灣風物》，60(2)，63-86頁。





# 台語文學ê復振kah發展<sup>1</sup>

## ——兼論台語文學發展ê關鍵

廖瑞銘

中山醫學大學台灣語文學系

### 摘要

照文學發展ê基本邏輯，任何民族ê文學攏是以母語為主要ê創作語言，ùi口傳形式向書面語形式發展，台語文學mā無例外。

台語文學ùi民間口傳文學形式開始，經過文字書寫系統ê學習建立，chiah koh進入作家書面語文學創作ê階段。考察台語文學發展，首先ài ùi口傳文學開始，當建立文字書寫系統以後，用漢字書寫kah白話字書寫ê台語文學分別是按怎leh發展？尤其tī日治時期，台灣文學ùi古典漢文過渡到現代白話文學，呈現出中文、日文、白話字全時存在，多語交響，多文書寫ê盛況。

戰後，遭受著另外一次「國語政策」ê壓抑，台語文學只有存在tī基督教長老教會內部ê白話字文學，以及台語流行歌、民間戲曲、現代戲劇、唸歌kah歌仔冊等表演藝術形式ê文學事實中，其他差不多全面停止發展。直到1980年代，拜母語復振運動之賜，台語文學才會得重新得著發展ê生機。

母語意識覺醒後這一波ê台語文學發展，咱hā<sup>2</sup>過書寫文字ê爭論、電腦資訊處理問題ê克服、台語文學主體性kap學術體制內學科領域確立種種ê關卡。文學創作ùi篇幅較細ê台語詩、散文開始，發展到篇幅較大ê長篇小說。台語文學作家社群循母語文運動團體組成。台語文學題材kah風格，tòe時代演變，ùi政治性、鄉土性發展到一般性以及都會性。上重要ê的是台語文學ùi體制外行向體制內，結合語言教學kah研究體制化，hō台語文學會得向學科建制化發展。

關鍵詞：台語文學、白話字文學、母語復振運動、作家社群

<sup>1</sup> 本文是本期刊顧問廖瑞銘教授佇「2015台灣文學外譯國際學術研討會」發表ê論文，由陳永鑫翻譯做英語。廖教授佇今（2016）年正月過往，特別刊這篇論文來紀念伊。

# Revitalization and Development of Taiwanese Literature: On the Key to the Development of Taiwanese Literature

Sui-beng LIAU

Department of Taiwanese Languages, Chung Shan Medical University

## Abstract

Like all national literatures in the world, Taiwanese (also known as Tâi-gí) literature was naturally initiated using Tâi-gí native speakers' mother tongue, and developed from oral to written form.

Tâi-gí literature started with folk literature (oral literature), and, after a period of creation and learning of writing system, achieved the sequential form of written literature. Accordingly, a research on the development of Tâi-gí literature should begin with its oral form probing and estimating the works, then extend to the exploration of Tâi-gí literature written in Chinese (Han) characters and Romanized spelling system (Pêh-ōe-jī), analyzing their respective developments. It's relatively appropriate to pay attention to the period when Taiwan was under Japanese colonial rule. Taiwanese literature transited then from classical literary Chinese form to the modern written vernacular form. It was a spectacular era when polyphonic linguistic landscapes arose and multilingual writing blossomed.

After the World War II, Tâi-gí literature, oppressed by KMT who took measures to promote Chinese Mandarin as National Language, could merely exist in the publication and religious practices in the Presbyterian Church in Taiwan (PCT) or believers' personal use, as well as in the texts for performing arts, such as Tâi-gí pop songs, folk theaters and operas, modern theaters, narrative ballads and ballad text books, etc. Tâi-gí literature in the other spheres almost vanished completely. Not until the 1980s' and along with the rise of the Language Revitalization Movements did Tâi-gí literature restore its vitality and regain the way to development.

In the development of Tâi-gí literature along with the awakening of the cultural awareness of mother tongue, many problems were encountered and had to be solved, such as the argument about writing systems, difficulties in informatization of Tâi-gí literature data and writing systems, establishment of the subjectivity of Taiwanese literature, and academic institutionalization of its subject areas, etc.

Keywords: Taiwanese (Tâi-gí) literature, POJ literature, language revitalization, community of writers

## 1. Foreword

It's appropriate to consider the development of Tâi-gí literature synchronous with Taiwanese language revitalization. If there had been no revitalization movements of Taiwanese mother tongues during the 1980s, Tâi-gí literature wouldn't have been so prosperous.

Since Tâi-gí was taken for one of the dialects of Chinese (Han) language, and, like the other countries in Chinese cultural sphere<sup>2</sup> (or called East Asian cultural sphere, Sinosphere, etc.) including Japan, Korea and Vietnam, Taiwanese people uses Hanzi (漢字, Chinese characters) as a writing system, traditional literature in Taiwan never reflected the actual use of Taiwanese languages. In one word, there wasn't Tâi-gí literature.

Fortunately, Tâi-gí was much luckier than the other "dialects" inside China, it was given another writing system other than Chinese characters, the Pêh-ōe-jī (abbreviated POJ, literally vernacular writing, also known as Church Romanization). POJ is an orthography developed by Western missionaries during the second half of the 19th century. It was taught to the believers and used for publishing religious books and journals. Well refined, standardized and widespread in Taiwan, it became a new writing system of Tâi-gí.

Nevertheless, the Chinese characters have long been taken for the mainstream and orthodox writing system, which is not only used by the intellectuals but also by those who collect and transcribe the folk literature. On the contrary, the POJ is rejected for nationalist and religious factor. It's regarded as an alien and unofficial writing system. Consequently, it's only used and handed down in the Presbyterian Church in Taiwan (PCT).

All the nations in the world, literature is naturally initiated using its native speakers' mother tongue, and developed from oral to written form after its writing system is created. But, the history of literature can only include the

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Chiung, Wi-vun Taiffalo (2005). *Language, Identity and Decolonization*. Tainan: National Cheng Kung University. ISBN 9789578845855.

written literatures. None of the existing histories of literature in Taiwan have mentioned Tâi-gí literature for two reasons:

1. The literary tradition of Taiwan and that of China are ambiguous. Due to the use of the same writing system, they are not distinguishable. That makes Tâi-gí literature a Chinese dialectal literature, local literature or just a part of Chinese folk literature in a broad sense.
2. The history of literature in Taiwan consisted only the writings using Chinese characters, the oral literature such as narrative ballads, ballad text books, pop songs, and the comedy play scripts were all categorized as folk or popular literatures, let alone the writings using POJ, which have never been recognized.

The present paper will discuss the the subjectivity of the literatures using Tâi-gí as a tool of creation, and demarcate its history with the awakening of the cultural awareness of mother tongue, in order to reinterpret the framework of the development of Tâi-gí literature. Three phases of its development will be observed: first of all, the process of its passing from oral literature to written literature; secondly, the process of its passing from old (traditional) literature to new literature during the period before the awakening of the cultural awareness of mother tongue, as well as the comparison between Hanzi literature and Tâi-gí literature; and thirdly, the development of Tâi-gí literature after the awakening of the cultural awareness of mother tongue. Besides the introduction to the historical situations and trace of the development of Tâi-gí literature, we aim to demonstrate that the key to its development is the sustainability of Tâi-gí language.

## 2. Tâi-gí literature from oral literature to written literature

Literature uses language in artistic ways. When the writing system wasn't created, literature existed in oral form, which is called oral literature, or simply, orature. When a common writing system was established, the authors would



create their works directly using the written language, which is called written literature. The latter is the main concern of the history of literature.

Generally, people name a literature according to the language in which it's written, for example, among them, the English literature, the Spanish literature, the German literature, the Japanese literature, etc. No one would dissent this usage. In brief, a literature is decided by what language it uses, hence English literature may consist of works from many different countries. Sometimes, several languages are spoken in one single country, and there are correspondingly several literatures. This is the case of, for example, Belgium, a multilingual country, which has three independent memberships in PEN-International, including French, English and Dutch memberships.

There are 85 languages in China, only 23 of them use a writing system. But the only acknowledged written literature is the Chinese (or Sinophone) literature. Literary works using the other languages (all taken for dialects in China) are considered nothing but oral literature. Those that have been transcribed with Chinese characters, are merely regarded as one kind of the Chinese folk literature. In the eyes of the Chinese, the Taiwanese literature is just a regional variety like the Cantonese literature, Zhejiang literature, Shanghai literature, etc. That's why Chiam hông-chì (詹宏志Jan, Hung-Tze)<sup>3</sup> was worried and pointed out, in 1985, that the Taiwanese literature would occupy only one page in the history of Chinese literature, or taken for some sort of frontier literature. Fortunately, with the progress of the times, the conscious and self-respect of Taiwanese people have grown, and people have realized that Taiwan is an independent political entity and not subordinate to China, and reciprocally. Taiwanese literature will not become a frontier literature, as Chiam worried. It has its own subjectivity. When the first department of Taiwanese Literature was established in university in 1995, the discipline area was thus formed, and the status of Taiwanese

---

<sup>3</sup> Chiam is the chairman of PChome Online and also the founder of PChome Publication and Cite Publication.

Literature was recognized.

Tâi-gí is one of the languages spoken in Taiwan. The status of Tâi-gí as a tool of creating Tâi-gí literature is definitely appropriate. Nevertheless, it's exhausting to discuss the status of Tâi-gí literature, so is to debate on the status of Taiwan as a country. The problem is that Taiwan and China have long been considered to be of the same language and the same race. Some always believe that Taiwan is a part of China, Tâi-gí is a dialect of Chinese language and therefore only Chinese characters could be accepted as the legitimate writing system. All these thoughts hinder Tâi-gí literature from establishing its proper status and category.

As a matter of fact, the development of Tâi-gí literature conforms completely with the general rule of the development of all the literatures in the world, which is from oral form to written form.

When European sailors sighted the main island of Taiwan and named it Ilha Formosa (beautiful island) in the 15th century, Taiwan appeared in the World History for the first time. Sailing from their powerful thalassocrat country, the Hollanders were the first to come to Taiwan. They came and occupied Taiwan in 1624. The Dutch East India Company of which the headquarters were settled in Batavia ruled the new colony. At that time, the inhabitants on the island are all the Austronesian aborigines. The Dutch recruited 5,000 farming migrants in 1626 from Hok-kiàn (福建Fujian), a province in the southern region of China. At the end of the Dutch rule, there were about 25,000 Chinese migrants. At about the same time, the Spanish came ashore at Sam Tiau-kak at the north of Taiwan, and constructed the fortress of St. Salvado at Siā-liâu for ruling the north of Taiwan. Both countries sent missionaries to preach in Taiwan. The Dutch missionaries learnt Sinckan language, a language spoken by the Siraya tribe and created a romanized script and compiled a dictionary of the language, teaching the natives how to write their own language. That's why we can still see The Sinckan Manuscripts (新港文書), consisting of a series of leases, mortgages, and other commerce contracts written in the Sinckan language. This writing system is no

more in use because the Siraya people were “Han-ized,” and no written literary texts have been discovered.

The farming migrants from the south of Hok-kiàn didn’t bring a writing system for their language. The Chinese migrants had popular oral literatures but not any written literary texts until the arrival of a literatus named Shen Wen-kuang (沈光文1612-1688) from Zhejiang, drifted to Taiwan because of a Typhoon by accident. With 12 Chinese intellectuals and officials, Shen founded a poetry club entitled “Tong-gîm Siā” (東吟社). They taught Taiwanese people Chinese characters and poetry composing skills. Some researchers, such as Iáp, Chiòh-thô (葉石濤), regard Shen as the very first poet in the history of Taiwanese literature. Shen’s contemporary, Kùi, Kî-kong (季麒光, also a member of the poetry club) even heaped praises on him, saying, “There was not humanity in Taiwan until the arrival of Shen, and there was not literature in Taiwan until the arrival of Shen.”

In fact, the establishing of writing system by means of education should be ascribed to Chief of General Staff Tân, Éng-hôa (陳永華) who constructed The Tainan Confucius Temple and founded the “First Academy of Taiwan” (全臺首學) in 1665 after the arrival of Koxinga in 1662. Taiwan became a member of the Chinese cultural sphere thence. But this writing system doesn’t reflect the actual use of the oral language. The traditional “Han” poetry therefore should not be taken for Tâi-gí literature, although those poems could be read in “classical Chinese pronunciation” (文言音). Besides these classical poems, using Chinese characters to write the scripts or transcription of the oral literatures, such as folk stories, legends, ballads, and theaters are not written literature, either. The authentic Taiwanese written literature didn’t appear until the second half of the 19th century when the Presbyterian Church in Taiwan (PCT) sent missionaries to Taiwan and used POJ as a reading and writing tool.

In 1885, the first newspaper printed in Tâi-gí, the *Tâi-oân Hú-siâ<sup>n</sup> Kàu-*

*hōe-pò* (台灣府城教會報, literally: “*Taiwan Prefecture City Church News*”) was published in Tâi-lâm under the direction of Rev. Thomas Barclay (M.A. 1849-1935), along with many missionary books. He insisted that all the publications, as well as all the minutes of meetings, files and documents should be written down in POJ, which made POJ the official writing system in PCT. Believers of PCT learned to write using this system and produced an abundance of POJ literatures. In 2000, a project of collection and digitalized reservation of POJ literary documents was carried out by Prof. Lī Heng-chhiong, Prof. Lí Khîn-hōa<sup>n</sup>, Prof. Liāu Sūi-bêng and Prof. Iū<sup>n</sup> Ūn-giân. Besides, Dr. Si Chùn-chiu has also been devoted to the gathering of POJ literatures theses years and obtained a remarkable number. Their efforts have ascertained and confirmed the development of “POJ written literatures” was initiated before the 1920s when the modern Taiwanese Literature started.

### 3. Development of Taiwanese Literature before the awakening of the cultural awareness of mother tongue during the period of Japanese rule

A big change occurred during the period of Japanese rule. This era is marked with the transit from the old classical literature to the modern vernacular literature and the multilingual literary arena of polyphonic heteroglossia and hybrid utterance of various writings in POJ, Chinese and Japanese.

In 1895, Japanese started in Taiwan the colonial rule, hence lasting for half a century. Just like the other colonial governments, they educated Taiwanese people in Japanese language and covered up Taiwanese history and culture with colonists’ language and history. Nevertheless, at the beginning, apart from educating the new generations, the Japanese Taiwan Governor-Generals promoted also the status of the classical Chinese poetry (Han poetry) by, for example, organizing the Meeting of Literature Glorification (揚文會) in order to win the classical literati over. This fact indicates that the classical literature was



once the main stream of Taiwan literary circle. The Han poetry was the literary form for the classical literati to express their emotion.

In the 1920s, in view of the failure of the Tapani incident<sup>4</sup> in 1915, the armed rebellion against Japanese rule was considered inefficient to make a breakthrough, and a new movement aiming at cultural reform was commenced. The education formed a new generation of intellectuals, some of them even went studying abroad. They came into contact with new trend of thought and modern knowledge. They had a new way of looking at language and literature, and believed that a reformation of language and literature could advance the new culture. After that followed the Debate of the Old & the New Literature in the 1920s, as well as the argument about Taiwanese language and writing systems in 1930s. Since the Chinese characters were the most used writing system in Taiwan and people generally took it for the only legitimate tool of literature creation, the issues mentioned above were trapped and never reached a consensus (In fact, there might be still no common ground to this day). Afterwards, when the Japanese government carried out the policy of Japanization<sup>5</sup>, all writings and publications in Chinese characters were absolutely forbidden. Not only the old but also the new Taiwanese literature were devastated.

The development of Taiwanese literature could be divided in two lines: the oral popular literature stayed flourishing and kept spreading with various forms, such as ballad books and popular songs, while the written literature was trapped by the choice between different orthographies. Lōa Hō, hailed as the “father of modern Taiwanese Literature” and Khóo péng-teng had some compositions written in Chinese characters. More POJ writings were published and circulated especially in the PCT. The most famous POJ writers were Tē<sup>n</sup> Khe-phòan who published *Chhut Sí-sò<sup>a</sup>* in 1926, and Chhò<sup>a</sup> Pòe-hóe who published *Chap-hāng Koán-kiàn* in 1925, both at about the same time of the beginning of new Taiwanese Literature. Lōa Jîn-seng even published *Chhi-á-lāi ê pek-hap-hoe* and

<sup>4</sup> One of the largest armed uprisings during the Japanese rule in Taiwan.

<sup>5</sup> Movement to make people become subjects of the emperor.

*Khó-ài ê siū-jîn* in the 1960s.

On 25th October 1945, the Japanese handed Taiwan over to the Chinese colonial ruler. Just like what the former Japanese ruler did, the ROC administration of Taiwan under Chen Yi banned almost immediately the use of Japanese, which was a familiar tool for Taiwanese intellectuals and carried out the Guoyu (國語, Chinese National Language) policy in order to assimilate Taiwanese people into Chinese. The publications in Japanese being completely prohibited, Taiwanese writers who couldn't master the Chinese language didn't have any place to publish their works. The literary journal *Tâi-oân Bûn-gē* and *Liéh Poetry Journal* inaugurated in 1964 finally gave these authors, who “strode across two languages” as Lâm Heng-thài said, a place to publish their works without bearing the discrimination from the “Continental” Chinese writers and editors who predominated the mainstream literary media.

While the Taiwanese writers were exerting all their strength at learning the language of the “new fatherland”, they didn't had time for discussing the issues of *Tâi-gí* literature. Decades after the end of the World War II, many Taiwanese writers, now familiar with Chinese mandarin, wrote in Chinese and published their works in the literary arena dominated by Chinese literati, who called the literature at that time “the modern Chinese Literature.” No one cared if the Taiwanese literature existed, let alone any conscious discussion about the *Tâi-gí* literature.

In 1971, Taiwan was expelled out of UN and the KMT government of Chiang Kai-shek could never represent “China”. Taiwanese people finally saw the reality of this political entity and had a look back at their own homeland. The whole cultural circle raised a storm of “home town fever,” searching for their roots on their own land. Painters, musicians, and, of course, writers started to depict people, scenery, and society of Taiwan. This caused immediately a major scare to the Continental Chinese literati. They criticized this trend as the reincarnation of Communist Socialistic Literature of China, which would menace the stability of KMT regime. Thus commenced the “Debate of Taiwanese

Nativist Literature.”

In the writing of nativist literature, the local languages caused problems to writers. They translated some Taiwanese terms in the dialogues into Chinese and transcribed them in Chinese characters, which made these works belong to “the modern Chinese Literature.” They didn’t have any idea about the Tâi-gí literature and, naturally, the Tâi-gí literature was never a theme for discussion.

Before the Mother Tongue Revitalization Movement, although ignored and disregarded by the mainstream literary circle, the Tâi-gí literature kept growing and spreading with the circulation of folk ballads and the ballad books, as well as lyrics of Taiwanese pop songs and scripts of Tâi-gí comedy records. All these facts demonstrate an alternative form between oral and written Tâi-gí literature. Many vocabularies used for literary writing by the poets at the beginning of the Mother Tongue Revitalization Movement were borrowed from or highly influenced by the lyrics of Tâi-gí pop songs. The intertextuality between them must not be overlooked when dealing with the history of Tâi-gí literature.

#### 4. Development of Taiwanese Literature after the awakening of the cultural awareness of mother tongue

From the 1980s, many social movements and demonstrations are held on the streets. People discussed issues, such as the environmental awareness, consumer’s awareness of rights, gender-equality perspective, and among them the Mother Tongue Revitalization Movement. It’s the first time for the Taiwanese to take the language for a theme of discussion and demonstration.

Many ethnic groups organized their own demonstration, but the Tâi-gí revitalization movement showed more zeal by expanding the issue from “speaking in Tâi-gí” to “writing in Tâi-gí,” and furthermore to “Tâi-gí literary creation.” In the strict sense, Tâi-gí literature couldn’t have developed without these Tâi-gí revitalization movements. In our days, Tâi-gí literature has been recognized as a literature category and research area. There’re more literatures of higher quality

and quantity, and it's not rare anymore to see scholar research and dissertations written in Tâi-gí. This progress requires an agreement to writing systems, overcoming the technological problems of computerization, establishing the subjectivity of Tâi-gí literature and institutionalizing its academic discipline area.

At the beginning of the Mother Tongue Revitalization Movement, all the groups were united appealing for the right to use the mother tongue. Disagreement occurred when the writing and education in elementary schools began. Each group has its own opinion about the writing system. Two main groups were the Hân-jī (Chinese character) school led by Âng Ūi-jîn and the POJ school led by Tē<sup>n</sup> Liông-úi, and both had many subgroups formed by their supporters. These subgroups argued about many minutial differences and couldn't get to an agreement. In year 2000, DPP won the presidential election and promised to grant more opportunity for mother tongue education. The MOE (Ministry of Education) integrated different opinions and released the "Taiwan Southern Min Romanization System" along with a list of recommended Chinese characters for Tâi-gí writing. This romanization system is thus used for teaching and Tâi-gí proficiency test. The Tâi-gí writing went through non-institutional movements into the educative institution. The spelling (orthography) being common, people accepted the mixed use of Chinese with romanized writing system. It's highly useful and helpful for creation of Tâi-gí literature.

The mother tongue revitalization movement not only had a lot of supporters, but also cultivated a number of Tâi-gí writers. These writers were originally members in different groups of Tâi-gí movement. They wrote as a idealist practice without thinking about becoming literary authors. They shared their works with writers supporting different writing systems, gathered friends together for literary activities. That's why most of the literary groups seemed heterogeneous in styles and interests. It's not unusual to see the cooperation and division between them.

*Tâi-bûn Thong-sìn* and *Tâi-gí Bûn-tiah* were two of the first publications for the authors at that time. *Tâi-bûn Thong-sìn* issued from an oversea Taiwanese



Tâi-gí media, and set up a general liaison office in Taiwan. It organized study groups and writing clubs in the name of “Readers’ Society of *Tâi-bûn Thong-sìn*” in Tâi-pak, Tâi-tiong, Chiong-hòa, etc. The liaison office in Taiwan published *Tâi-bûn Bóng Pò*, combined with the oversea journal in 2012 and became *Tâi-bûn Thong-sìn Bóng Pò*, which has many subscribers and readers. *Tâi-gí Bûn-tiah* is intent on the classical literary tradition and the inheritance of Tâi-gí. It’s comparatively less positive about the new literatures, and members of this group are free to submit their works to any publications.

Ńg Kèng-liân, poet from the Salt Zone, Tâi-lâm, began the Tâi-gí-bûn (Taiwanese language and writing) movement in southern Taiwan. He was influenced by Ńg Ũi-jîn when he invited Ńg to teach a Tâi-gí class in Tâi-pak earlier before he went back to Tâi-lâm. Ńg’s students held study groups and Ńg encouraged them to write and publish a Tâi-gí literature journal, henceforward the literature group “*Koann-bâng-hoe*.” After Ńg was engaged and worked at King-an Publication, he published *Hái-an Tâi-gí Bûn-hák Goéh-khan* (“*Whale of Taiwanese Literature*” Monthly), and formed a Whale Literature social group.

Png Iâu-khiân, issued from *Koann-bâng-hoe* associated Lím Iong-bín’s *Ka-tang* and writers of Sòng Tèk-lâi’s *Tâi-oân Sin Bûn-hák* (*Taiwan New Literature*),” and published “*Tâi-oân e Bûn-gē*,” the predecessor of *Tâi-bûn Chiàn-sòa*” (*Taiwanese Literature Battlefront*), which formed later a new literature group with other authors, including Ô Tiông-siông from Ko-hiông.

By the end of 2009, several Tâi-gí literature groups, led by Lí Khîn-hōa<sup>3</sup>, organized the Taiwanese Pen, with a view to participate in the PEN International as an author group of one language. This is a great opportunity for the integration of Tâi-gí literature writers.

From year 2000, departments of Taiwan Literature have been established in many universities. The integration of Taiwanese languages and literatures into education and research has been institutionalized. Taiwanese languages and literatures finally made great progress after 30 years’ Tâi-gí-bûn movements.

There are more and more Taiwanese writers, who used to compose in Chinese and now in Taiwanese languages. Many of them were trained in the departments of Taiwanese literature. The Tâi-gí literary works started with short Tâi-gí poems and proses first, then emerged the long novels. Diverse topics and styles have evolved and keep pace with the times. The communities of Tâi-gí literature and the research institutions keep growing gradually and advancing toward the complete revitalization. This is a remarkable achievement.

## 5. The vision of Taiwanese Literature

During the period of colonial rule, the most essential and important cultural engineering must be the revitalization of mother tongue and the restoration of collective historical memory through mother tongue literature which is the key to the rehabilitation of cultural subjectivity and self-confidence.

The sound development of Tâi-gí literature should attribute its success to the release from writing entirely in Chinese characters. The mixed use of romanized orthography with Chinese characters got rid of arguments about the writing systems. The tradition of POJ literatures was restored and continued. Liberated from the Chinese characters, Tâi-gí regained its position in Tâi-gí literature and broke away from the thoughts of Chinese literature subject to the Chinese characters. As compared with Chinese literature, of which the essentiality is “silent” characters, Tâi-gí literature is a literature of language and “voice.”

Reviewing the past thirty years’ efforts, optimistically speaking, the arguments and the distinction between writing systems are decreasing gradually. The input softwares are being invented and become more and more convenient and efficient for Tâi-gí writers to create and release their works online and discuss with readers. In fact, many new Tâi-gí writers start their literary pursuit on internet. In the academic institutions, the discipline area of Tâi-gí literature becomes increasingly important, the Tâi-gí works are well and deeply interpreted. The esthetic theories of Tâi-gí literature are established through zealous and persistent discussion and literary criticism. It’s no more regarded as simply a part

of Chinese literature. It's independent and unique.

However, pessimistically speaking, the education of mother tongues seems perfunctory. The government and schools are temporizing, and people are unenthusiastic, and all the mother tongues in Taiwan are losing their vitality. When the linguistic environment (Tâi-gí cultural community) disappears, the number of practical vocabularies will dwindle, too, for the proficiency of Tâi-gí will confront a serious generation gap and distinction. The survival will be hard and restrained, let alone the development. Serious disproportions between production (authors) and reception (readers) make literary creation insignificant. When Tâi-gí extincts, the existence of Tâi-gí literature will certainly become meaningless.

Therefore, the key to the development of Tâi-gí literature is its language, not the writing system. It must get rid of the entanglements with Chinese characters. The latter may be used to decode and analyze the Tâi-gí documents written in Hàn-jī, but it will never be adopted as a writing system for Tâi-gí. It's simply an auxiliary tool for learning, not the goal of education. It's Tâi-gí that we need to learn, not the Chinese characters.

Compared with the other language revitalization movements in the world, Tâi-gí is a rare case for not only the language is preserved but also the mother tongue literature has developed steadily. The development of Tâi-gí literature depends on the sustainable development of Tâi-gí. The revitalization of Tâi-gí ensures the future of Tâi-gí literature.





## Ùi無仝ê觀點界定越南語ê語詞kah詞素

阮善甲

越南國家大學附屬人文與社會科學大學

### 摘要

本文主要說明按怎ùì三種無仝ê觀點來界定越南語ê語詞kah詞素。第一是阮才謹（Nguyen Tai Can）ê觀點，伊認為詞素是越南語ê基本單位。阮才謹認為詞素就是音節，伊kā in號做“tiéng”就是詞素音節。一个獨立ê“tiéng”會當看做是一个獨立ê語詞。第二是高春浩（Cao Xuan Hao）ê觀點，伊認為“tiéng”是越南語ê基本單位。根據高春浩ê觀點，越南語ê一个音節ē-tàng當做一個語詞、一个詞素kah一个音素ê語法功能。第三ê觀點認為語詞是越南語ê基本單位。這個觀點得到大部分越南學者ê認同。毋閣到目前，針對越南語ê語詞kah詞素ê定義猶袂有共識。因此，chia-ê概念無一致、無合邏輯、對事實ê描述嘛無適當。筆者嘛認為語詞是語言ê基本單位，但是根據理論kah實際，已經kā越南語ê語詞kah詞素定出一个一致性ê規範。

關鍵詞：詞素、音節-詞素、語詞、越南語語法

收件日期2015.9.30/修訂日期2015.10.30/接受日期2015.11.15

# Various Perspectives in Defining Vietnamese Words and Morphemes<sup>1</sup>

Thien Giap NGUYEN

University of Social Sciences and Humanities

Vietnam National University

## Abstract

This article presents three different perspectives in defining Vietnamese words and morphemes. The first view is of Nguyen Tai Can who considers morphemes as basic units in Vietnamese. According to Nguyen, Vietnamese morphemes coincide with syllables. He called such morphemes *tiếng* (syllabeme) or morphosyllabemes. An independent *tiếng* could be regarded as a word. The second perspective, of Cao Xuan Hao, considers *tiếng* as a basic unit in Vietnamese. In his view, one syllable in Vietnamese can operate as a word, a morpheme, and also a phoneme. The third perspective considers words as basic units in Vietnamese. This view is shared by most Vietnamese scholars. However, there has been no consensus in the identification of Vietnamese words and morphemes. The concepts are therefore inconsistent, not logical, and inappropriate for describing the reality. The author also regards words as basic units of the language but has identified Vietnamese words and morphemes consistently in accordance with theories and Vietnamese practice.

Keywords: morpheme, morphosyllabeme, word, Vietnamese grammar

---

<sup>1</sup> This research is funded by Vietnam National Foundation for Science and Technology Development (NAFOSTED) under grant number VII2.1-2012.06

The differences in identifying Vietnamese words and morphemes are due to many causes, basically resulting from different theories on which researchers rely. Preliminarily, we have found three different views below:

## 1. The concept of morphemes as basic units in Vietnamese

The late professor Nguyen Tai Can called Vietnamese morphemes syllabemes and considered them as original units in Vietnamese grammar. In terms of material, morphemes in European languages are possibly phones, syllables or something bigger. However, in Vietnamese, Nguyen Tai Can asserts that Vietnamese morphemes coincide with syllables, which means that any syllable can become a morpheme. He, therefore, didn't call them syllables but syllabemes or morphosyllabemes.

Actually, to be able to see a syllable and a morpheme as one, Nguyen Tai Can did not completely adhere to the notions of morphemes in general linguistics. Everyone agrees that morphemes are the smallest meaningful units whereas Nguyen Tai Can thus defined: "morphemes are the smallest and most simple units in organization but they are valuable in terms of grammar" (Nguyen 1975:11). The reason came from a fact he found in Russian, such conjunctive affixes as *-o-* in *napo603* (*locomotives*), *nap* (*steam*), *603* (*pull*), are morphemes whose only usage is connecting the morphemes *nap* and *603*. Linguists do not neglect conjunctive affixes, but their number is too small (there are only two conjunctive affixes in Russian which are *-o-* and *-e-*) to be based on to change the whole concept of morphemes. That the change in morpheme definition has given way to turn all meaningless syllables, such as *may ô* (*undershirt*), *ô tô* (*car*), *pê ni xi lin* (*penicillin*)..., into morphemes as Nguyen Tai Can did, is more or less done reluctantly because that turns atypical characteristics into typical ones.

Nguyen Tai Can didn't identify syllabemes with words, but he took independent syllabemes as words. The categorization of independent syllabemes and dependent syllabemes is similar to L. Bloomfield's separation between unbound and bound morphemes. Therefore, the criteria of dependence or

independence were used by Nguyen Tai Can to differentiate words and morphemes.

As in American structural linguistics, units formed by the combination of syllabemes are called structures by Nguyen Tai Can. Structures are divided into fixed and free structures. The fixed structures are possibly Words, fixed group of words. The title of Nguyen Tai Can's book (*Vietnamese Grammar: Syllabemes - Composite Words - Phrases*) shows his intention: Syllabemes are basic units in Vietnamese grammar; composite words are fixed structures; phrases belongs to free structures. During his lifetime, professor Nguyen Tai Can assumed that the writer of the article precisely understood what he meant by saying: "Nguyen Tai Can did not set himself a task to define Vietnamese words but solely tried to prove the permanency of structures which used to be called *words*."

Notably, the term 'composite words', as used by Nguyen Tai Can, has different connotation from those of other linguists of Vietnamese. His "composite words" are fixed structures, including units like idioms and fixed groups of word. The boundary between composite words and fixed groups of word was not mentioned by Nguyen Tai Can.

It is easy to realize that the system of Vietnamese grammar in Nguyen Tai Can's study is profoundly influenced by American descriptive linguistics. Traditionally, words were considered basic units in a language but defining them in various languages has never been an easy task. Therefore, when Bloomfield's theory came into being, it was overwhelmingly welcome. Thus, the American descriptive linguistics is not accidentally influential in the international linguistics for nearly a century. As a matter of fact, the book on Vietnamese Grammar written by Professor Nguyen Tai Can was highly appreciated by the circle of Vietnamese linguists. Many people have applied it in describing other (ethnic) languages in Vietnam.

However, after its heyday, the American descriptive linguistics was criticized on many points. Many linguists realized that taking morphemes as



the basic linguistic units defied the dialectics of partiality and entirety, which obliterated the boundary between morphology and syntax. According to V. Z. Panfilov, morphemes do not have nominative function and thus are not related to any types of mentality. Words have the quality of higher level in linguistics so they are more flexible and free in the range of syntagma. To understand speech as a continuous chain of morphemic segments, and morphemes are “materials” to build up an utterance, distort the realistic picture of verbal communication process. This leads to the elimination of everything related to words as “containers of meaning” through which the system of socio-linguistic meaning is formed. Not seeing the restrictions of morphemes is the weakness of the American descriptive linguists. Many scholars found that describing words through morphemes omits the logicity and brings over only the common notion of words. Actually, this equates the quality of the higher phenomena with lower ones. However, in terms of quality content, the units of measurement herein do not correspond to the object being measured. Historically, viewing an utterance as an arrangement of morphemes in a certain way does not reflect the reality of the language. If morphemes are considered part of the completeness of a word, they can only be separated in the presence of the word. Being complete, a word is the pivotal element in defining the nature and contents of its components, for components must serve the perfect whole, not vice versa. V. M. Solnshev proved that words are compulsory units in a language while morphemes are anomaly units showing themselves on and off from time to time throughout linguistic history. Words are permanent units which are always present in the existence of a language. Scientists realized that words are realistic units of languages and therefore they have never been neglected by any linguistic notions. Had they been, there would have been risks of methodological deadlock and no scientific prospects.

## 2. The concept of “syllabemes” as basic units in Vietnamese

Cao Xuan Hao was vehemently against the trend of “Europeanization.” He

asserts that the mission of researchers and teachers of Vietnamese is to understand and present explicitly the knowledge that native speakers tacitly possess to speak in the way they do everyday. He fervently supported Nguyen Tai Can's view on morphemes' concurrence with syllables but went further by studying the hierarchical organization of the system of meaningful units and on how syntactic rules in Vietnamese differ from those in European languages. Cao Xuan Hao said: "In terms of linguistic psychology, the syllabemes in Vietnamese are equivalent to European words in the way that the units which are the most easily separable and clearly identified in these languages are words while in Vietnamese they are syllabemes" (Cao 1999:182). While Nguyen Tai Can bases on the criteria of "dependent/independent" to distinguish dependent syllabemes and independent syllabemes, and acknowledges words as independent syllabemes, Cao Xuan Hao treats each syllabeme as a word. Thus, to Cao Xuan Hao, syllables coincide with both morphemes and words. The criteria of being "dependent/independent" is now called "free/bound" by Cao Xuan Hao. In his opinion, the standardized rule of "free/bound" is impossible to relate to the linguistic position of words. Like many other standardized rules applied in descriptive linguistics, it is not interpreted from any basic justice regarded fundamental to the nature of signal, to the functions of linguistic communication, and to the hierarchical system of linguistic units. If "freedom" can be seen as an irregular but ordinary effect of the position and operation of words and word complexes (i.e., the nature of phrasal lexemes), it is difficult to figure out why "constraint" could make words lose the authority they own from their truly linguistic properties, their functional and structural properties which totally dominate the senses and the linguistic behaviours of native speakers. (Cao 1999:185)

Moreover, Cao Xuan Hao considers each syllabeme as a phoneme. In his article "The Problem of the Phoneme in Vietnamese" (*Vietnamese Studies* no. 40, 96-123) and in the book "Phonologie et linearite: Réflexions critiques sur les postulats de la phonologie contemporaine"<sup>2</sup> (Société d'Études Linguistiques

<sup>2</sup> The book was translated into Vietnamese and published in Vietnam. (Cao 2001)

et Anthropologiques de France, Paris, 1986), Cao Xuan Hao proved that in Vietnamese, the units having phonemic authority are not phones as in European languages but syllabemes. In his opinion, the reason why a syllabeme can be divided into phonemes is that to the current learners, phonemes are defined by nonlinguistic attributes that do not exist in reality but only in the European speakers' sense: the phones in a syllable are operated concurrently or nearly concurrently while the distinctive features of a phoneme are successive at least in phonetic aspect as shown in thousands of experiments in the last decades. Thus, he came to a conclusion that "in Vietnamese, a syllabeme is simultaneously a phoneme, a morpheme, and a word; and if we could imagine an European language operating on the mechanism of triple pivots of phonemes - morphemes - words, then Vietnamese adds them up in a single one: a unique axis of syllabemes" (Cao 1999:210)

Therefore, while Nguyen Tai Can's term of syllabemes shows merely the coincident characteristics of Vietnamese phonemes with syllables with which Vietnamese morphemes are called morphosyllabemes, Cao Xuan Hao's term of syllabemes turns Vietnamese into a "specialty" in which units with syllables as materials can operate as words, morphemes and phonemes. This very phenomenon is mentioned as "Trinity" in Vietnamese.

We assume that in spite of having various characteristics, languages share something in common. On one hand, Vietnamese features should be emphasized, on the other hand, its description should start from the common characteristics that Vietnamese shares with others. This is also the strategy for global integration.

### 3. The concept of words as Vietnamese basic units

As analyzed above, on defining Vietnamese words and morphemes, besides Nguyen Tai Can's view of morphemes (he called the syllabemes) as basic units in Vietnamese and Cao Xuan Hao's concept of syllabemes as basic units simultaneously operating as words, the majority of Vietnamese linguists consider words as basic units of language. Among these scholars, there are many famous

names such as Le Van Ly, Truong Van Chinh, Nguyen Kim Than, Nguyen Van Tu, Hoang Tue, Do Huu Chau, and Ho Le...

Traditional European linguistics using words as basic units in a language requires words to be scrutinized in all aspects of phonology, semantics, grammar and orthographic writing. Inspired by traditional European linguistics, Nguyen Kim Than said “words are available materials in a language, and are the most realistic units”, “among units in a language, words are basic ones” (Nguyen 1997:33). He defined words as followed: “In a language, a word is a basic unit, separable from the others in a speech to manipulate independently, and completely blocked in terms of (vocabulary or grammar) meaning and composition” (Nguyen 1997:33). Do Huu Chau had a different definition: “Vietnamese words are composed by one or several fixed and permanent syllables, bearing certain grammatical traits, belonging to given structural types, corresponding to a certain type of meaning, the largest units in the language but the smallest in making a sentence” (Do 2009:16). Ho Le put it another way: “Words are linguistic units functioning as a non-realistic linkage nomination or sound simulation, which have the competence of spontaneous combination and are structurally solid and integrated in meaning” (Ho 1976:104). Le Van Ly didn’t define words in general but focused on specific categories. For a single word, he said: “Vietnamese words (then) are manifested as sound symbols of which the forms may start from a single phoneme (...) or a combination of many phonemes, and their sound manifestation is only a single pronunciation or just one syllable; in writing, they are shown in separate units with understandable meanings.” For composite words, he wrote: “Composite words nominate unique concepts. They are phonetically integrated entities that are inseparable” (Le 1948: 130). Other linguists did not give their own definitions of Vietnamese words but merely applied one of the available definitions in general linguistics. For instance, Hoang Tue adopted A. Meillet’s definition saying: “Words results from a combination of a certain notion and a certain phonetic entity, which is able to operate a certain grammatical function” (Hoang 1962:143). Nguyen Van Tu



adopted R. A. Budagop's definition of the word, saying: "Words are the smallest and independent units with physical forms (sound coating and pattern) and dialectical and historical significance" (Nguyen 1976:34). These linguists shared one common view of theory: that words are basic units in the language, and it is necessary to define words comprehensively in terms of phonology, semantics, grammar and orthographic writing.

It is important to count on phonetic and orthographic characteristics for the definition of *words* because these characteristics help to separate them (words) from other units. In Russian, for instance, each word has an accent<sup>3</sup>, and in writing it is a block of letters. Nguyen Kim Than and Ho Le did not take the standards of phonetics and writing into account in their definitions of words. The definitions of words compiled by Nguyen Van Tu and Hoang Tue mentioned phonetic and form standards but just in a generic way, which was unworthy for differentiation. Do Huu Chau's definition seems more specific as he considered the characteristics of the Vietnamese's phonetic word as "one or several syllables." Yet under this standard, it is impossible to distinguish words, phrases and sentences. Le Van Ly is the only one mentioning explicitly the phonetic and orthographic writing criteria. Unfortunately his standards are impossible to apply for the units that he called the composite words. Possibly, the units considered as words by the above linguists only meet the standards of global words and dictionary words rather than meeting the standards of phonetic word and orthographic word.

Although the linguists of Vietnamese are very conscious in distinguishing such units as composite words and free groups of words, few have noted the distinction between composite words and fixed groups of words (idioms, habitual collocations).

In cases where the standards they have given are consistently applied, not only complexes are called composite words but also fixed groups of words and idioms are considered words as all of them possess stability and idiomaticity. In fact, syllabeme complexes bear both stability and idiomaticity, but some are

---

<sup>3</sup> Exception: Form words do not have accent, so their status may be specified by other criteria.

called composite words, others are said to be fixed phrasal lexeme or idioms.

Composite words		Fixed phrasal lexeme	
<i>bạn đọc</i>	(reader)	<i>bạn nói khó</i>	(bosom friend)
<i>mắt bão</i>	(storm's eye)	<i>mắt lá răm</i>	(beautiful eyes – eyes shaped as persicaria leaves )
<i>mặt bằng</i>	(site/ field)	<i>mặt như chàm</i>	(indigo face – very frightened)
<i>thẳng cánh</i>	(sightseeing)	<i>thẳng ruột ngựa</i>	(straight as a horse' gut - straight forward)
<i>dai sức</i>	(durable)	<i>dai như đĩa</i>	(stick to sth firmly as a leech – persistent)
<i>chạy làng</i>	(take to flight)	<i>chạy long tóc gày</i>	(run one's hair off – run like a deer)
<i>ra mặt</i>	(show oneself)	<i>ra ngô ra khoai</i>	(separate corn ears out of potatoes – make things distinctively different)
<i>trẻ măng</i>	(juvenile)	<i>trẻ như măng</i>	(as young as a sprout)
<i>ngang ngạnh</i>	(stubborn)	<i>ngang cành búa</i>	(grow horizontally - very stubborn)
Composite words		Idioms	
<i>lang bạt</i>	(wander)	<i>lang bạt kỳ hồ</i>	(wander around the world)
<i>du kích</i>	(guerilla)	<i>du thủ du thực</i>	(beggar)
<i>thiên địa</i>	(world)	<i>thiên la địa võng</i>	(divine justice)
<i> dĩ nhiên</i>	(of course)	<i> dĩ thực vi thiên</i>	(owe Heaven for one's food)
<i>son hà</i>	(country)	<i>hằng hà sa số</i>	(multitudinous)
<i>viễn thị</i>	(long-sighted)	<i>kính nhi viễn chi</i>	(admire sb from a distance)
<i>tử sinh</i>	(fatal)	<i>thập tử nhất sinh</i>	(within an inch of one's life)
<i>son cước</i>	(mountainous)	<i>son hào hải vị</i>	(delicacy from the mountain and the sea)
<i>oan trái</i>	(injustice)	<i>tiền oan tức trái</i>	(injustice)

The complexes regarded as composite words are those equivalent to foreign ones. For example:

<i>Vietnamese</i>	<i>French</i>
<i>dân chủ</i>	<i>démocratie</i>
<i>tập trung</i>	<i>centralisation</i>
<i>tổ chức</i>	<i>organisation</i>
<i>hiện đại hóa</i>	<i>moderniser</i>
<i>xe đạp</i>	<i>bicyclette</i>
<i>xe đạp máy</i>	<i>cyclomoteur</i>
<i>đã đọc</i>	<i>lisais</i>
<i>Vietnamese</i>	<i>English</i>
<i>dân số</i>	<i>population</i>
<i>chim sáo</i>	<i>blackbird</i>
<i>phòng học</i>	<i>classroom</i>
<i>giá sách</i>	<i>bookcase</i>
<i>máy bay</i>	<i>aeroplane</i>
<i>máy chữ</i>	<i>typewriter</i>
<i>Vietnamese</i>	<i>Russian</i>
<i>nông trang tập thể</i>	<i>колхоз</i>
<i>Đoàn thanh niên cộng sản</i>	<i>комсомол</i>

It is necessary to base on the systematic relationships in Vietnamese, not on foreign standard to decide which units are Vietnamese words.

Many linguists of Vietnamese, having realized that the complexes thought to be words are incomplete in orthographic writing, suggest a rule for single written blocks of word. For example: *dân chủ* (*democracy*) → *dân chủ*, *máy chữ* (*typewriter*) → *máy chữ*, *nông trang tập thể* (*collective farm*) → *nông trang tập thể*, ...The suggestion ignored the abnormality of *ô mai* (*sweetened dried fruit*) as written *ô mai* may turn into *ôm ai* (*hug whom*), *thị thành* (*metropolis*) when written *thị thành* may be understood as *thịt hành* (*meat*

*onion*). Moreover, although it is possible for *lả loi* (*inviting*) to be written as *lảloi* but it is impossible for *lả* and *loi* in *Biết bao bướm lả ong loi* (*Myriad inviting bees and butterflies*) to be written as one; *xun xoe* (*smarm*) may be written as *xunxoe* but *xun* and *xoe* in *Nó cứ xun cứ xoe* (*He continues smarming*) cannot be written seamlessly.

Actually, all the complexes taken as words are groups of words, so in spite of having been proposed many times, the single written blocks of words have not been widely accepted.

Vietnamese lexicographers probably realize that fixed phrases and idioms are not semantically and grammatically different from words as they have annotated them by certain part of speech. However, they still take them as fixed phrasal lexemes or idioms. For instance:

*đái đường* (*diabetes*), *uốn ván* (*tetanus*), ...are nouns  
*đái rắt* (*strangury*), *đái tháo* (*diabetes*), ...are nouns  
*bơi bướm* (*butterfly*), *bơi ếch* (*breaststroke*), *bơi chó* (*dog paddle*)...are nouns  
*thâm sơn cùng cốc* (*remote area*), ... are nouns  
*thay lòng đổi dạ* (*change of heart*), ...are verbs  
*nhắm mắt xuôi tay* (*Eyes closed hand down – die*), ...are verbs  
*ăn gỏi nằm nhờ* (*sponge on others*), ...are verbs  
*ăn không ngồi rồi* (*idle*), ...are verbs

Perhaps, only words should belong to certain parts of speech. Part-of-speech annotating for fixed groups of word and idioms is an irregular phenomenon.

The view of taking words as basic units in a language tacitly accepts words as natural existing units available in the language, and morphemes as resulted from the division of the so-called words. In order to obtain morphemes, there should be words. Morphemes are part of a word, which are the smallest components in terms of meaning. In such notion, morphemes are called word components.

Accepted as basic units in Vietnamese, words must be defined first and foremost in the language's vocabulary and grammar. On the basis of the defined



words, more analyses can be made on their components which are morphemes (word components). A lot of linguists of Vietnamese followed the opposite direction: initially defining the smallest units of meaning which they called original elements, linguistic components or word components, then describing the combination methods to turn them into words. The approach is under the impact of the linguistics school initiated by L. Bloomfield - the American distributionalism which was greatly influential to the linguistics worldwide as well as Vietnamese linguistics for a long time. It should be noted that though sharing the name morphemes, those in European traditional linguistics are the smallest units with meanings to form words, but those in American distributionalism are the smallest meaningful units in a language (which can be called linguistic components). In American distributionalism, it is morphemes, not words, that are basic units in a language that consists of three levels: phonemes, morpheme and structures. Due to the inconsistency in theory (applying the European definition of words as basic units in a language but defining morphemes in American way), many linguists of Vietnamese have shown lots of contradictions and irrationalities in their description.

Do Huu Chau thinks that morphemes are elements constructing words. He defines them as: “the elements constructing words are smallest phonetic forms with meanings, i.e., they can not be further separated into smaller meaningful elements, used to form words in accordance with Vietnamese word composition methods” (Do 2009:27). Therefore, if an element is considered to be a morpheme, it must be proved meaningful; and the combination of these elements makes up a word. Do Huu Chau has not proved that the combinations of single elements making words, so such elements cannot be regarded as morphemes. More precisely, the elements meet the standards of morphemes in the view of American distributionalism linguists but not Do Huu Chau’s.

Do Huu Chau also wrote: “Word formation method is the way linguistics impacts on morphemes to create words. Vietnamese uses three methods as

followed: conversion of morphemes into words, combination of morphemes, and reduplication of morphemes” (Do 2009:27). People may ask: Do Huu Chau hadn’t proved that the complexes of morphemes are words, so what foundation did he base on to come to a conclusion of the three methods of Vietnamese word formation? The so-called morphemes that Do Huu Chau defined are actually linguistic elements, not word elements. According to L. Bloomfield’s theory, free morphemes are words; combined morphemes do not only create words but also groups of words and sentences. Because Do Huu Chau hasn’t proved that the combination and duplication of morphemes are methods of word formation, it is impossible to deliberately decide that the complexes formed by combination and duplication are words.

Normally, words are extracted into morphemes. Thus, some linguists of Vietnamese transcendently and unrealistically assigned morphemes to a level lower than words.

Tran Ngoc Them wrote: “Today, the concept of ‘words formed from two or more morphemes’ has become such a serious prejudice that researchers forget that they still speak *mua* (rain) as a sentence which coincides with the word, the morpheme and the syllable of *mua* (rain).” The difference between levels here are not quantitative but qualitative - emphasized Reformatskij. The difference in quality between a syllable and a morpheme, between a morpheme and a word, shows the independence of syntax. The difference in quality between a word and a sentence manifests the intonation and the situation. Neither approving the morpheme *mua* (rain) following Boduen’s concept nor accepting *mua* (rain) as “word as well as morpheme” in conformity with Bloomfield’s theory is satisfying. Both are consequences of neglecting these differences (Tran 1984).

Ho Le did not use Tran Ngoc Them’s 4 levels but came up with 5 levels, which are: phonemes, syllables, monemes, words and sentences. He wrote: The level-hierarchy of linguistic structural units - are not dependent on the history of linguistic units. In fact, words came into existence before monemes; but in the level-hierarchical system, monemes are low-level structural units from

which higher level of structural units are constituted. This incidence does not depend on any analytical perspectives but is backed up by a temporarily confined practice. For example: “*mua (rain)!*” can be analyzed as a sentence “*mua (rain)*” → a word “*mua (rain)*” → phonemes / *m* /, / *u* /, / *a* /. However, in the level-hierarchical system, between the word of “*mua (rain)*” and the phonemes of / *m* /, / *u* /, / *a* /, there are two types of units: the moneme “*mua (rain)*” and the syllable “*mua (rain)*”. In short, the kinds of standard units in a language system must be determined by the level - hierarchical method. (Ho 1985)

As known, the difference between the ranks<sup>4</sup> is qualitative, i.e., the difference in function. People often distinguish 4 levels which are phonemes, morphemes, words and sentences; phonemes function as sense receptors and meaning distinguishers; morphemes function in semantics; words function in nomination and semantics; and sentences have notification function. F. de Saussure distinguished form from material. Syllables belong to material so in linguistics no one considers them of a lower rank than words.

Relation between the ranks is mutual: the lower units are within the higher ones, in contrary, the higher units “include” lower-level units, not just in one direction from low to high as Ho Le mentioned. Saying that units of higher rank include those lower does not mean that a word must have at least two morphemes. Saying “*mua (rain)!*” with just one word doesn’t mean “*mua (rain)*” concurrently functions as a word and a sentence.

Those who affirm that “a word is constituted from at least two morphemes,” or “*mua (rain)*” is concurrently a word and a morpheme at the same time as Tran Ngoc Them did, do not understand the nature of the issue.

The rank shouldn’t be mistaken for the recognition of leveled units. According to Do Huu Chau’s and Tran Ngoc Them’s theories on morphemes, with such a morpheme as “*mua (rain)*”, we must imagine that initially there exists a morpheme *mua (rain)*, then in the word formation, the morpheme

---

<sup>4</sup> We call the discussed phenomenon rank, and the term “evel” is used for study aspects. (Nguyen 2010)

becomes the word *mưa* (rain) as argued by Do Huu Chau; or the morpheme *mưa* (rain) combined with syntactic independency becomes the word *mưa* (rain) as argued by Tran Ngoc Them's. The arguments are so metaphysical and unrealistic. Do Huu Chau, Tran Ngoc Them and Ho Le identified words and morphemes separately (in each level) and only on abstract aspect. The identification of words and morphemes can be neither implemented in isolation without considering the relationship between lower level units and the higher simultaneously, nor proceeded by abstract interpretations with no basis of reality. In fact, such syllabemes as *nhà* (house), *đá* (ice), *ăn* (eat), *học* (study), *đẹp* (beautiful), *cây* (tree), ...works primarily as words. The structures like *nhà đá* (prison), *học phí* (tuition), *cây cối* (trees), *đẹp đẽ* (beautiful), ...is the post-process products. No one sees any "word formation process of morphemes" but the process of decreasing word quality and increasing morpheme quality of the syllabemes. Even Ho Le realized that: "Right from the beginning of language formation, humans emitted signals as sentences. At first, words were born simultaneously with sentences. Then, [at] a certain stage, the new society knew how to combine words to make a sentence. The relation between morphemes and words are not single dimensional. Initially, humans didn't immediately have a "warehouse" of morphemes to construct words. On the contrary, at first, the society knew words before morphemes. To a certain development, it came to know how to separate morphemes from words and then use morphemes to form new words" (Ho 1985). V. M. Solncev also thought that morphemes resulted from the division of such units as words. He wrote: "Composite units are composite words and reflective words. Single units in the construction of composite units losing their syntactic independency are morphemes" (Solncev 1990). V. M. Solncev's concept is suitable to the reality. But the problem for further discussion herein is: single units in the composition of composite ones actually lose their syntactic independency but do they come down to the level of morphemes?

Luu Van lang, Do Huu Chau, and Ho Le, ...who didn't identify morphemes by analyzing words, came to contradiction in their description.



Firstly, all of them claimed that morphemes required meanings but considered meaningless syllabemes as Vietnamese morphemes. Luu Van Lang asserted that the basic units in Vietnamese grammar were syllabemes including those he said to be meaningless, such as *gàng* in *gọn gàng* (*neat*), *ni* and *long* in *ni long* (*nylon*), ... In Do Huu Chau's three types of morphemes, there was one type of "meaningless morpheme", for example *burou* in *ốc burou* (*medium-sized edible snail*), *hâu* in *diều hâu* (*eagle*), *xít* in *bọ xít* (*stink bug*) *net* in *bọ net* (*silverspotted tiger moth*), *róm* in *sâu róm* (*light knotgrass moth*), *dàng* trong *dễ dàng* (*easy*), *lúng* in *lúng túng* (*embarrassed*), ...; Ho Le also considered the syllabeme *qué* in *gà qué* (*chickens*), *pheo* in *tre pheo*, and meaningless syllabemes in some phonetically transcribed words such as *cà* and *ph* *Sê* in *cà phê* (*coffee*), ... are monemes.

Secondly, one single syllabeme is considered a word sometimes, and a morpheme other times. For instance, *bạc* (*ungrateful*) in *thời đời ăn ở bạc* (*life is ungrateful*) is a word, but that very word in *bạc phận* (*unlucky destiny*), *bạc đức* (*immoral*), *bạc màu* (*exhausted*), ... is considered a morpheme; *bay* (*fly*) in *chim bay* (*the bird flies*) is a word, but *bay* (*fly*) in *máy bay* (*plane*) is a morpheme; *đả* (*hit*) in *đả đảo* (*oppose*), *đả phá* (*fight*), ... is a morpheme, but *đả* (*hit*) in *phải đả cho nó một trận* (*we should give him a good beat*) is a word; *gia* in *gia đình* (*family*), *gia tộc* (*family*), *quốc gia* (*country*), ... is considered a morpheme, but *gia* (*household*) in *Ấp ấy có 30 nóc gia* (*The hamlet has 30 households*) is a word; *lộ* (*route*) in *quốc lộ* (*national highway*), *xa lộ* (*highway*), *lộ trình* (*itinerary*) is thought to be a morpheme, but *lộ* (*route*) in *Lộ ấy giặc hay phục kích lắm* (*The route is always ambushed by the enemy*) is a word. In our document, 63% of the total syllabemes in Vietnamese are in the same situation. As we have known, morphemes do not change their meaning value in use, but words may. Therefore, in the phenomenon of one syllabeme with changeable usage, though its meaning may change, as long as it keeps close relationship with its original meaning, it should be regarded as a word. That will help to avoid the resolution of "same meaning, same origin, different level" (Nguyen 1978) which is strange

to linguistic theories. For example, *học* (*study*) is a word. It can directly construct a sentence, such as *Tôi học bài* (*I study*), *Tôi đi học* (*I to go school*), ...; and can also combine with other words to create new vocabulary units, for example: *học bạ* (*school report*), *học phí* (*tuition*), *văn học* (*literature*), ... This phenomenon is quite common in every language.

Thirdly, after assigning certain parts of speech to morphemes, the syntactic relations are used to describe the relations among morphemes. As we all know, morpheme are segmented into word-formation morphemes and inflexions. The word-formation morphemes include roots and affixes. The affixes are broken into prefixes, suffixes, infixes, and conjunctive affixes (Nguyen 2014). The morphemes in a word have mutual relation in meaning, not in syntactics. Only words are classified into parts of speech and the relations between them are syntactic. Despite the fact, those accept the existence of composite words in Vietnamese put part-of-speech labels on the components of composite words and describe the relations between such components as syntactic ones. Their descriptions are as follows:

- Words composed in coordinated relations, for example: *xe cộ* (*vehicle*), *áo xống* (*clothes*), *báo chí* (*newspaper*), *hỏi han* (*inquire after*), *tuổi tác* (*age*), ...
- Words composed in subordinate relations, for example: *ái quốc* (*patriot*), *thanh danh* (*good reputation*), *cao điểm* (*peak*), *văn học* (*literature*), *xe đạp* (*bicycle*), ...
- Words composed in subject-verb relations, for example: *nhân tạo* (*artificial*), *thiên tạo* (*natural*), *gà gáy* (*cock-crow*), *dân chủ* (*democracy*), ...

Some researchers break the subordinate relation into:

- Restricted relation, for example: *học trò* (*pupil*), *hải quân* (*navy*), *bệnh viện* (*hospital*), ...
- Verb-complement relation, for example: *vệ sinh* (*hygiene*), *phòng bệnh* (*disease precaution*), *cứu thương* (*first aid*), ...
- Verb-adverbial relation, for example: *cải tiến* (*improve*), *đả đảo* (*oppose*),

*lạc hậu (backward), ...*

Some researchers subdivide the subordinate relation into:

- Noun + noun: *gấu ngựa (Tibetan bear), giếng nước (water well), táo tàu (Chinese apple), thuốc lào (tobacco), dao cau (knife), đường đời (life road), ...*
- Noun + adjective: *thuốc đỏ (red medicine), bí xanh (squash), đục tròn (round chisel), đậu đen (black bean), nhạc vàng (yellow music), suối vàng (nether world), ...*
- Noun + verb: *bánh trung (square cake), máy bay (aeroplane), dao cạo (razor), áo choàng (overcoat), ...*
- Verb + noun: *cướp cò (discharge accidentally), trả lời (respond), ăn khớp (match), ...*
- Verb + verb: *ăn cướp (rob), bắt chẹt (overcharge), đánh cắp (steal), ăn hại (live as a parasite), ...*
- Verb + adjective: *ăn bản (make profit in improper way), ăn mừng (celebrate), chứa hoang (pregnant without marriage), xơi tái (eat sb up), ...*
- Adjective + noun: *cao mưu (clever plot), mắt tay (skilful), vui tính (easy going), bẽ mặt (lose one's face), bằng vai (of the same rank), ...*
- Adjective + verb: *đen thui (coal black), êm ru (very soft), khó coi (unsightly), ...*
- Adjective + adjective: *sắc ngọt (very sharp), dốt đặc (completely ignorant), đau điếng (stabbing pain), ...*

#### 4. Which view point should be followed in defining Vietnamese words and morphemes?

In the very first place, we support the point of view which take words as basic units in the language, i.e., we have the same theoretical departure like most linguists of Vietnamese as Nguyen Kim Than, Hoang Tue, Do Huu Chau, ...The reason for our choice is that after the era of L. Bloomfield, almost all

linguists agreed on the fact that words are basic units in a language. However, we also realize the inconsistency, illogicality and unsuitability to the reality of the word and morpheme identification of those linguists of Vietnamese. In the book *Vietnamese Vocabulary* (published by Hanoi University in 1998) as well as in other successive works like *Vietnamese Lexicology* (The University and Professional College Publishing House, Hanoi, 1985), *Words and Vietnamese word identification* (The Education Publishing House, Hanoi, 1996) and *The Issue of “Words” in Vietnamese* (The Education Publishing House, Hanoi 2011), we have tried to prove that if words are thought to be basic units in Vietnamese, they must be identified consistently and appropriately to reality.

On defining Vietnamese words, we follow comprehensiveness, i.e., we rely on the foundation of many aspects of linguistics, such as phonetics, orthography, grammar and semantics. According to the comprehensive perspective, such syllabemes as *bàn* (table), *ghế* (chair), *đi* (go), *cười* (smile), *đẹp* (beautiful), *tốt* (good), ...are words, whereas other lexical units constituted by combined syllabemes such as: *xe đạp* (bicycle), *máy tiện* (lathe), ...are not considered as words<sup>5</sup>. So, Vietnamese words are defined as the following: “Vietnamese words are the smallest meaningful units specified by their completeness and the ability of separating themselves from other units; each is formed by one syllable and written in a seamless word block”. (Nguyen 2011:125)

If morphemes are considered as the smallest meaningful units in a language, Vietnamese words will coincide with morphemes. Thus, it is possible to say Vietnamese words coincide with morphemes and syllables while not all

<sup>5</sup> Nguyen Kim Than, Do Huu Chau and many other linguists of Vietnamese consider words as basic units in the language, and as specifying Vietnamese words, they affirm to follow comprehensive perspective. However, taking units formed by combined syllabemes such as *xe đạp* (bicycle), *cà chua* (tomato), ... means that these linguists go far from the comprehensive perspective, the units they thought to be words satisfy only standards of complete words or lexicographical words. Furthermore, many complexes having completeness and idiomaticity like *xe đạp* (bicycle), *cà chua* (tomato), ...are not taken as words, such as *nước đổ lá khoai* (water off a duck's back), *xanh vỏ đỏ lòng* (green cover red kernel), ...



syllables function as words and morphemes. Meaningless syllables can neither be considered words, nor morphemes. This makes our concept different from Nguyen Tai Can's and Cao Xuan Hao's. In our description system, the complexes of meaningless syllabemes such as a *xít* (*acid*), *may ô* (*undershirt*), *bù nhìn* (*puppet*), *cà phê* (*coffee*), ...are categorized in a group called irregular words and phrases.

Besides words, in any language there are other lexical components constructed by words named as idioms or fixed groups of words. These units are collected and explained as words in dictionaries. We call such units formed by the combination of syllabemes as phrasal lexemes. The phrasal lexemes are ready-made phrases in Vietnamese which are valued equivalents to words and share many characteristics as words. For instance:

- They can appear in utterance like words.
- They can function as sentence components, i.e., they have syntactic independence.
- They can be used to express phenomena of the reality relating to various human activities.

In Vietnamese as well as in other languages, there are phenomena in which words involving in more complicated lexical units fade or lose their meanings in usage. The phenomena results from the communication in which the realistic complete meanings of the units, other than the components', are emphasized. Additionally, being in the complex, words may more or less lose their independence. Due to the contradiction in meanings, some words are no longer used independently. The fact that the meaning of many components in fixed groups of word and idioms in a language are fading or becoming lost doesn't mean that they are not words any longer.

In word recognition, the requirement is not realizing one special attribute but identifying the whole particularly different characteristics which are typical. Those with all the specific features are typical words. They are words with the most word characteristics. Others, in spite of lacking lots of natural



characteristics of typical words, still are considered as such provided that they own certain minimal features of words. Certainly, each different type of words requires different minimal features, but the nature of comprehensively defined features in words is completely absent in other linguistic units.

Generally, we recognize all lexical units as other linguists of Vietnamese do: words, composite words, reduplicate words, idioms, habitual collocations. The difference we stress is that while other linguists merge words, composite words, or reduplicate words into one word category in contrast to the rest of fixed groups of words, we realize that such units as duplicate words, composite words are more similar to those named idioms and fixed groups of word. Therefore, we assert that only lexical units having phonetic cover that coincides with syllables are Vietnamese words, and other lexical units with more material than syllables are phrasal lexemes.

Our explanatory theory not only conforms with the theories in general linguistics but also in traditional philology. The first tradition is in lexicology, taking words as basic units for description and explanation. The second is the literary tradition using syllabemes as basic units in puns and joining rhymes. In practice, the theory contributes to clarifying the characteristics of the typology of Vietnamese and the nature of the process in Vietnamizing Vietnamese words and phrases. In education, our theory may omit some insignificant concepts in teaching Vietnamese to pupils, and at the same time stimulate further study on opaque or emptiness in meaning. Our theory can avoid the inconsistencies and contradictions and inappropriateness with reality that other theories have.

Last but not least, our explanatory theory proves that, though each language has its own colour, there is something in common among them. On the one hand, it is necessary to highlight the features distinctive to Vietnamese; on the other hand, it is important to describe the language on the foundation of the common features that Vietnamese shares with others. This is the way to global integration.

## Correspondence

Any correspondence should be directed to Thien Giap NGUYEN  
(gs.nguyenthiengiap@gmail.com).

## References

- Cao, Xuan Hao. 1975. The Problem of the Phoneme in Vietnamese. *Vietnamese Studies* 40.
- Cao, Xuan Hao. 1986. Phonologie et linéarité: réflexions critiques sur les postulats de la phonologie contemporaine [Phonology and linearity: critical reflections on the postulates of contemporary phonology]. *Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologiques de France* [Linguistic and Anthropological Studies Society of France], Paris.
- Cao, Xuan Hao. 1999. *Tiếng Việt: mấy vấn đề ngữ âm, ngữ pháp, ngữ nghĩa* [Vietnamese: some issues on phonetics, grammar, semantics]. Ha Noi: NXB Giáo dục.
- Do, Huu Chau. 2009. *Từ vựng – ngữ nghĩa tiếng Việt* [Vietnamese Vocabulary and Semantics], Ha Noi: NXB Đại học Quốc gia Hà Nội.
- Ho, Le. 1976. *Vấn đề cấu tạo từ của tiếng Việt hiện đại* [Word formation in modern Vietnamese], Hanoi: NXB Khoa học xã hội.
- Ho, Le. 1985. Vị trí của âm tiết, nguyên vị và từ trong tiếng Việt [Position of syllables, monemes and words in Vietnamese], *Ngôn ngữ học 2* [Linguistics].
- Hoang, Tue; Le Can and Cu Đình-Tu. 1962. *Giáo trình Việt ngữ* [Vietnamese Coursebook], tập 1, Hanoi.
- Le, Van Ly. 1948. *Le Parler Vietnamien* [The Vietnamese Language], Paris: Huong Anh.
- Nguyen, Kim Than. 1997. *Nghiên cứu ngữ pháp tiếng Việt* [Study on Vietnamese grammar]. Hanoi: NXB Giáo dục.

Nguyen, Tai Can, *Ngữ pháp tiếng Việt: Tiếng – Từ ghép – Đoản ngữ* [Vietnamese grammar: Morpheme - Compound word - Phrase], Hà Nội: NXB Đại học và Trung học chuyên nghiệp.

Nguyen, Van Tu. 1976. *Từ và vốn từ tiếng Việt hiện đại*. [Modern Vietnamese words and lexicon], Hanoi: NXB Đại học và Trung học chuyên nghiệp.



冊  
評

## Artice Review:

“A Reluctant Identity: The Development of Holo Identity in Contemporary Taiwan,”<sup>1</sup>

Bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup> Tō-thòk:

“M̄-chêng-goān ê sin-hūn jīn-tông: tong-tāi Tâi-oân Holo jīn-tông ê hoat-tián”

Peter KANG

Department of Taiwan & Regional Studies

National Donghua University

Pôe-tek KHNG

Kok-lip Tong-hôa Tâi-hák Tâi-oân Bûn-hôa Hák-hē



“M̄-chêng-goān ê sin-hūn jīn-tông: tong-tāi Tâi-oân Holo jīn-tông ê hoat-tián (A Reluctant Identity: The Development of Holo Identity in Contemporary Taiwan)” sī Ông Hú-chhiong (王甫昌) kàu-siū tī 2014 nî 7 goèh Eng-kok Lùn-tun keng-chè hák-ī<sup>n</sup> Tâi-oân gián-kiù kè-ōe (Taiwan Research Programme, London School of Economics) chhut-pán ê tē 5 kī *Pi-kàu koan-tiám hā ê Tâi-oân* (*Taiwan in Comparative Perspective*) chit-pún hák-sùt kī-khan lâi-bīn ê lūn-bûn. Ông Hú-chhiong sī Tiong-iong gián-kiù-ī<sup>n</sup> siā-

hōe gián-kiù-só ê gián-kiù-oân.

“M̄-chêng-goān ê sin-hūn jīn-tông” chit-phi<sup>n</sup> lūn-bûn, chú-iàu thó-lūn Tâi-oân ê

<sup>1</sup> Fu-chang Wang, “A Reluctant Identity: The Development of Holo Identity in Contemporary Taiwan,” *Taiwan in Comparative Perspective*, Vol. 5, July 2014, pp. 79-119 (Taiwan Research Programme, London School of Economics). ISSN 1752-7732

Holo sin-hūn jīn-tông sī án-nóa hông chhòng-chō chhut--lái. Tī sin-hūn jīn-tông chit-ê gī-tê í-gōa, mā kau-chhap tiòh gí-giân chit-ê gī-tê, tèk-piát sī Tâi-gí.

Ông Hú-chhiong ê lūn-būn tiōng-tiám sī thàm-thó Tâi-oân Holo sin-hūn jīn-tông tī 1950 nî-tāi kah 1990 nî-tāi chit 2 kái cheng-lūn tang-tiong ê piàn-hòa. 1950 nî-tāi ê cheng-lūn khí-thâu hoat-seng tī 1958 nî ê *Tâi-pak būn-bút* (台北文物) chit-pún chấp-chì. Hit tong-sī būn-jīn cheng-lūn ê sī tàu-té sī ài-iōng “Hok-ló” (福佬), “Hô-lòk” (河洛), iáh-sī “Bân-lâm” (閩南) ê chheng. Ông Hú-chhiong jīn-úi hit tong-sī ê miá-chheng cheng-lūn, kī-sit ũ chit-ê am-khàm ê gī-tê: tiòh-sī tùi Tâi-oân bîn-chòk bô-kâng ê siū<sup>n</sup>-hoat, tèk-piát sī chiàn-āu Tiong-kok kok-bîn-tóng sóa-lái Tâi-oân kiàn-lip in ê thóng-tī chheng-koân liáu-āu, Tâi-oân-lâng án-nóa khòa<sup>n</sup> kó-chá sian-chó<sup>n</sup> ê Tng-soa<sup>n</sup> pōe-kéng kah ka-kī ê koan-hē. M̄-koh, tong-sī ê cheng-lūn pēng bô kiat-lūn, hit tong-sī ê būn-jīn bô hoat-tō iōng ka-kī kah-í ê miá-chheng “Tâi-oân-ōe” (台灣話) lâi chheng-hō ka-kī kóng ê gí-giân, chí-hó bián-kióng hō kī-tha ê chheng-hō kè-siok sú-iōng lòh-khi.

Tē 2 kái ê cheng-lūn hoat-seng tī 1990 nî-tāi, chit-chūn ê sī-tāi pōe-kéng sī Tâi-oân-lâng tī kài-giâm liáu-āu tùi Tâi-oân bîn-chòk chiàn-tō ê cheng-lūn. Tong-sī chhai-ia siōng-tōa ê hoán-tùi-tóng Bîn-chú-chìn-pō-tóng, in-úi tiā<sup>n</sup>-tiā<sup>n</sup> hō-lâng bù-lōa chò sī chit-ê Holo soa-būn chú-gī ê chheng-tóng, kóng Bîn-chìn-tóng pàng kù-chhai in ê kī-chân chi-chhi-chiá kan-ta ká kóng Tâi-gí ê lêng tòng-chò sī Tâi-oân bîn-chòk, pài-tū kī-tha chòk-kùn tùi Tâi-oân bîn-chòk ê chham-ú. Bîn-tùi chia-ê chí-khòng, Bîn-chìn-tóng thèh-chhut goân-chū-bîn, sin-chū-bîn, Kheh-ka, kah Holo ê “sì tōa chòk-kùn” (四大族群) kóng-hoat. M̄-koh, Ông Hú-chhiong jīn-úi chit-ê cheng-gī iū-goân bô kái-koat, kan-ta tãi-piáu sī hō lêng kiò-chò Holo ê lêng, lak jip-khi lēng-gōa chit-ê m̄-sī ka-kī pún-lâng goân-ì chiap-siū ê sin-hūn jīn-tông chheng-hō lăi-té, sī chit-ê pát-lâng kiông-ngē khng-tī seng-khu téng--ê, sng-sī m̄ chheng-goân ê sin-hūn jīn-tông chheng-hō.

Ông Hú-chhiong chit-phi<sup>n</sup> būn-chiu<sup>n</sup> ê hák-sút ì-gī, sī iōng chin-chē sú-liáu chò chheng-kù, pau-khoat hit tong-sī chham-ka cheng-lūn ê būn-jīn siá ê būn-chiu<sup>n</sup> kóng-hoat; mā iōng tiòh siong-koan ê thóng-kè chu-liáu chìn chit-pō kui-láp chhut kiat-lūn, chhin-chhiū<sup>n</sup> kúi-nā chấp-ní lâi pò-chóa téng-bîn iōng-sú ê piàn-hòa thóng-kè. Thâu-chêng ê lē, pí-jū-kóng, 1950 nî-tāi ê cheng-lūn tū-liáu chiam-tùi hit tong-sī ê būn-jīn kóng-hoat í-gōa, koh ín-iōng tiòh Jit-pún sī-tāi Tâi-oân hák-chiá Koeh Bêng-khun (郭明



昆) ê *Tiong-kok ka-chók chē-tō kah gí-giân ê giân-kiù* (中國の家族制及び言語の研究) lâi-bīn ê kóng-hoat: Hok-ló (福佬/福老) (iáh 83), iáh-sī 1907 nî Kóng-tang hák-chiá Ng Chiat (黃節) tī *Kóng-tang hiong-tó tē-lí kàu-kho-su* (廣東鄉土地理教科書) lâi-té kóng tiòh Kheh-lâng kah kóng lán-lâng-ōe ê Tiô-chiu-lâng m̄-sī Hàn-jīn, mā m̄-sī Oát-lâng ê chéng (廣東種族有曰客家、福佬族，非漢種亦非粵種), lâi-bīn iōng ê hàn-jī jī-pêng sī t̄i-piáu “iá-siù” ê 佬 (iáh 85). Thàu-kòe chhōe-chhut 1950 nî-tāi cheng-lūn ê goân-thâu, Ông Hú-chhiong cheng-bêng hit tong-sí thêh-chhut “Hô-lók” (河洛) kóng-hoat ê bûn-jīn, kī-sit sī ka-kī chhoàn-kái goân-pún chok-chiá ê “Hô-ló” (河老) hām “Hok-ló” (福老) kóng-hoat, in-ūi chia-ê bûn-jīn siū”-kóng sú-iōng “Hok-ló” (福佬) t̄i-piáu kā Tâi-oân-lâng tī *Tiong-kok Hok-kiàn* ê sian-chó tòng-chò Pah-oát-chók (百越族), m̄-sī Hàn-jīn, sī thiau-tī kā Tâi-oân-lâng kah *Tiong-hôa-bīn-chók hun-khui*, sī siàu-siū<sup>n</sup> beh hām 1956 nî Liâu Bûn-gī (廖文毅) tī *Jit-pún hoat-khí* ê Tâi-oân tók-lip ūn-tōng ê lūn-tiám hō-siong phòe-háp (iáh 86).

Ông Hú-chhiong jīn-ūi 1950 nî-tāi ê miá-chheng cheng-lūn, kī-sit ài tui chiàn-āu liú-bông lái Tâi-oân kiàn-lip cheng-koân ê *Tiong-kok kok-bīn-tóng cheng-hú chit-ê pōe-kéng*, chiah ū hoat-tō liáu-kái cheng-lūn ê pún-chit. Kian-chhi beh iōng “Hô-lók” (河洛) iáh-sī “Bân-lâm” (閩南) chit n̄ng-ê chheng-hō ê bûn-jīn, chú-iàu beh kiông-tiâu Tâi-oân-lâng kah *Tng-soa<sup>n</sup>* sian-chó, iáh-sī Tâi-oân-ōe kah *Tiong-kok kó-gú* ê bûn-hòa lián-kiat. Chi-chhi chit-ê lip-tiū<sup>n</sup> ê bûn-jīn, chhan-chhiū<sup>n</sup> Ngô Hoài (吳槐), tiòh tōa-liōng in-iōng *si-keng* (詩經), *siōng-su* (尚書), *lé-ki* (禮記) kah *su-keng* (書經) lâi-té ê *Tiong-kok kó-bûn*, lái cheng-bêng Tâi-oân-ōe lai-bīn pó-liú chin-chē *Tiong-kok kó-tián iōng-sū*. Lēng-gōa chit-hong-bīn, chàn-sêng iōng “Hok-ló” (福老/福佬) chheng-hō ê lāng, chhin-chhiū<sup>n</sup> sī Lâm Pún-goân (林本元), tiòh thàu-kòe tiau-cha kah siu-chip Tâi-oân bô-kāng só-chāi ê gān-gú, koa-iâu kah siók-gí, cheng-bêng Tâi-oân-ōe bat hō bô-kāng ê bûn-hòa kah gí-giân éng-hióng, í-kēng hoat-tián chhut tēk-piát ê gān-gú kah iōng-sú (iáh 87-90).

Thóng-kè chu-liâu kui-láp ê lūn-tiám pō-hūn, “M̄-chêng-goân ê sin-hūn jīn-tōng” iōng 1950 nî-tāi kàu 1980 nî-tāi ê *Liân-háp-pò* (聯合報) téng-bīn ê bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup> kah sin-bûn pò-tō chò-lē, múi cháp-nî chò chit-ê kai-tōa<sup>n</sup>, thóng-kè “Hô-lók” (河洛), “Hok-ló” (福佬), “Bân-lâm” (閩南), “Tâi-gí” (台語) kah “Tâi-oân-ōe” (台灣話) chit gō-

ê iōng-sū ê chhut-hiān sò-liōng chhu-sè piàn-hòa. Ông Hú-chhiong hoat-kak “Tâi-gí” chit-ê kóng-hoat chiàm siōng-chê, tī 1970 nî-tâi í-lâi chiah chiām-chiām sò-liōng ùn-ùn-á kàng--lòh-lâi, m̄-koh iū-goân sī chiàm siōng-chê ê. Sò-liōng kàng--lòh-lâi ê goân-in sī in-ūi hái-gōa Tâi-oân tók-lip ùn-tōng tī 1970 nî-tâi ê sia<sup>n</sup>-sè tng iā<sup>n</sup>, Kok-bîn-tóng cheng-hú khai-sí beh ap-chè Tâi-oân jīn-tōng ê siong-koan bûn-hòa hū-hō, “Tâi-gí” sī kî-tiong chi-it. Nā-sī chìn chit-pō hun-sek “Bân-lâm-lâng” (閩南人) tī pò-chóa téng-bīn ê iōng-hoat, 1950 kàu 1960 nî-tâi, “Bân-lâm-lâng” chí ê sī Hok-kiàn lâm-pêng lâi ê gōa-séng-lâng, sian-chó sī Bân-lâm tē-khu sóa-khì ê hái-gōa Hōa-jīn, iáh-sī Tâi-oân-lâng tui Bân-lâm tē-khu lâi ê sian-chó; “Bân-lâm-lâng” chit-ê chheng-hō bē iōng-lâi kóng Tâi-oân-lâng. M̄-koh, mā-sī tī 1970 nî-tâi khai-sí, nā-sī kóng tiòh Tâi-oân-lâng, tiòh lóng kái-iōng “Bân-lâm-lâng” chit-ê miá-chheng (iáh 92-93).

Ông Hú-chhiong jīn-ūi chit-ê piàn-hòa, hām Kok-bîn-tóng cheng-hú tī 1966 nî khai-sí chhui-sak ê “Tiong-hòa bûn-hòa hòk-heng ùn-tōng” (中華文化復興運動), 1968 nî khai-sí thau-kòe kok-lip pian-ék koán (國立編譯館) khòng-chè kàu-kho-su, choân-bīn tui Tâi-oân-lâng sé-náu Tâi-oân kah Tiong-kok ê koan-hē. Tī chit-ê Tiong-kok-hòa ùn-tōng pōe-kéng ē-bīn, 1970 nî Soa<sup>n</sup>-tang-chèk ê lip-hoat úi-goân Iū<sup>n</sup> Pó-lim (楊寶琳) tī kàu-iók úi-goân-hōe thê-àn kàng-kē tiān-sī hòng-sàng Tâi-gí chiat-bók ê sí-sò, 1971 nî khai-sí Kok-bîn-tóng cheng-hú tī hák-hāu koh-khah giâm-keh kìm-chí Tâi-oân hák-seng kóng Tâi-gí. Sīm-chì tī 1971 nî, 20 ê Tâi-oân séng-gī-hōe gī-oân tī 7 goeh chhe 7 Jit-pún kah Tiong-kok tī 1937 nî hoat-seng tãi-chiàn ê kî-liām-jit hit-kang, thê-àn iau-kiú siu-kái hō-chèk-hoat (戶籍法), ká Tâi-oân-lâng ê hō-chèk cheng-ka teng-kì sian-chó tī Tiong-kok ê “chó-chèk” (祖籍), siau-tú Tâi-oân-lâng kah gōa-séng-lâng ê hun-piát (iáh 94-95)<sup>2</sup>. kàng-khoán siū-tiòh chit-ê khi-hun éng-hióng, chit-ê sí-tâi chhut-pán Tâi-gí gián-kiú iáh-sī jī-tián ê chok-chiá, chhin-chhiū<sup>n</sup> Lâm Kim-chhau (林金鈔), Tân Koan-hák (陳冠學) iáh-sī Ng Kèng-an (黃敬安) téng-téng, tōa to-sò lóng-iōng “Bân-lâm-gí” (閩南語) iáh-sī “Hô-lòk-ōe” (河洛話) lâi tãi-piáu Tâi-gí, mā lóng tī-leh kiông-tiâu Tâi-gí kah kó-tián Tiong-bûn ê koan-hē (iáh 95).

<sup>2</sup> 1971 nî 7 goeh chhe 7 Tâi-oân séng-gī-hōe gī-oân ê thê-àn pēng bô cheng-sek sit-si. Thê-àn ê tiâu-bûn pún-sin mā chò-hóe iau-kiú hō gōa-séng-lâng tī Tâi-oân siat “pún-chèk” (本籍). Ì-sù sī beh siau-tú Tâi-oân-lâng kah gōa-séng-lâng tī koa<sup>n</sup>-hong sin-hūn cheng-bêng bûn-kiā<sup>n</sup> téng-bīn ê chha-piát.

Tiòh-sî tī 1970 kah 1980 nî-tāi chit-tōa<sup>n</sup> kā Tâi-oân bûn-hòa ê kái-sek sak hiòng Tiong-kok-hòa ê khi-hun chi-hā, Âng Ūi-jîn (洪惟仁) tī 1985 nî thèh-chhut “Hô-ló” (河佬) chit-ê miâ-chheng, siū<sup>n</sup>-beh chhú-tāi “Hô-lók” (河洛) kah “Hok-ló” (福佬) chit nng-ê siók-tī bô-kâng ì-sek-hêng-thài pōe-kéng ê chheng-hō. Chit-nî liáu-āu, tī 1986 nî i kái kóng kun-kù gú-im hē-thóng (phonology) kah kó-tián bûn-hián, eng-kai sī “Hok-lo” (貉獠), m̄-koh in-ūi chit nng-jī bân-î ê bī siu<sup>n</sup>-tāng, só-í i kái-iōng “Hók-ló” (鶴佬). Âng Ūi-jîn chìn chit-pō thèh Hiong-káng-lâng kiò Tiô-chiu-lâng sī “Hók-ló” (鶴佬) chò-lē, thè i ê kóng-hoat pōe-su (iáh 97).

1990 nî-tāi sī siā-hōe thoân-thé kah chāi-iá hoán-tùi-tóng kā Tâi-oân jîn-tông kah bîn-chòk tēng-ūi chiām-chiām thàu-kòe soan-gián, hoat-tiáu, kui-chiong hoat-tián-hòa (codified) ê sî-tāi. Bîn-tùi káng-khoán sī cheng-chhú Tâi-oân kián-kok ê Kheh-lâng kah gōa-séng-lâng tùi Tâi-oân-lâng iáh-sī Tâi-oân-ōe chit-ê chheng-hō ê chit-gí, Bîn-chìn-tóng tī 1993 nî ê cheng-chhek pèh-phôe-su (民主進步黨政策白皮書) lâi-té, thèh-chhut tē-it hūn ê chòk-kûn kah bûn-hòa cheng-chhek kong-léng (族群與文化政策綱領), lâi-té kóng tiòh Tâi-oân bîn-chòk pau-koat goân-chū-bîn-chòk kok chòk (原住民族各族), Bân-lâm-lâng (閩南人), Kheh-ka-lâng (客家人), kah gōa-séng-lâng (外省人). 1994 nî Tâi-oân kàu-siū hiáp-hōe (台灣教授協會) hoat-khí ê tē-jī chhù jîn-bîn chè-hián hōe-gī (第二次人民制憲會議), hōe-gī chè-tēng ê Tâi-oân kiōng-hô-kok hián-hoat chhó-àn (台灣共和國憲法草案) tē káu chiu<sup>n</sup> tē chit-pah tiâu kóng tiòh Tâi-oân-lâng pau-koat goân-chū-bîn (原住民), sin-chū-bîn (新住民), kheh-ka (客家), Holo sī tōa chòk-kûn. In-ūi chham-ka hōe-gī ê tai-piáu, ték-piát sī chòk-gí sī Tâi-gí ê tai-piáu tùi “Hô-lók” (河洛), “Hok-ló” (福佬), “Bân-lâm” (閩南) iáh-sī “Hók-ló” (鶴佬) chia-ê miâ-chheng lóng bô hoat-tō tát-sêng kiōng-sek, iū-koh bē-sái iōng í-keng koàn-si ê Tâi-oân-lâng chit-ê miâ-chheng, chí-hó tī tiâu-bûn téng-bîn iōng “Holo” piau-sī (iáh 100-103).

“Holo” chit-ê kan-na lô-má-jī ê miâ-chheng sui-bóng bô tī Hàn-jī soa-bûn chú-gī ê Tâi-oân siā-hōe siū-tiòh tiōng-sī, m̄-koh tī 2000 nî Bîn-chìn-tóng thèh-tiòh tiong-iong chip-cheng-koân liáu-āu, tī 2003 nî ê kàu-iók-pō kok-gí chhui-hêng úi-goân-hōe (教育部國語推行委員會) chè-tēng ê gí-gián pêng-téng-hoat chhó-àn (語言平等法草案) tē-jī tiâu tē-sa<sup>n</sup> hāng lâi-té, “Ho-lo” ōe hōe lêng ki-lók chò kok-ka gí-gián ê chit-chióng.

Bîn-chìn-tóng chip-chèng ê hêng-chèng-tī tī 2004 nî 10 goeh tiâu-khui chòk-kùn hām bûn-hòa hoat-tián hōe-gī (族群和文化發展會議), hōe-gī gī-hāng (proceedings) lâi-bīn tû-liáu iōng “Tâi-gí” (台語) chit-ê chheng-hō í-gōa, mā-ū iōng “Hô-lòk” (河洛), “Hok-ló” (福佬/福老), “Bân-lâm” (閩南/閩), “Hòk-ló” (鶴佬/鶴老), “Holo”, sīm-chì “Hok-tâi-gí” (福台語) chit-ê sin sū (iáh 104-106).

Ông Hú-chhiong jīn-ûi, lô-má-jī “Holo” sui-bóng chiām-sî hông tòng-chò Tâi-gí ê thè-tâi miâ-chheng, m̄-koh Hàn-jī án-nóa siá, iû-oân sī sùi-lâng piáu-tát. Chiàu-lí-kóng “Tâi-gí” (台語) iáh-sī “Tâi-oân-ōe” (台灣話) chit n̄g-ê miâ-chheng sī tī Jit-pún sít-bîn kah chiàn-āu Kok-bîn-tóng gōa-séng-lâng thóng-tī hā, chheng-tī koân-lī sng chió-sò ê bîn-chòk chū-jiân se<sup>n</sup>-séng ê miâ-chheng. Nā-sī “Holo” chit-ê chheng-hō sī Kheh-lâng hō ê gōa-chheng (exonym), sī Tâi-gí jīn-kháu bīn-tùi chió-sò ê Kheh-lâng sī chiah-ē chhut-hián ê miâ-chheng, sī tòa tióh “sūi-ki sèng-chit” iáh-sī “tòe kiók-sè ē choán-piàn” ê sin-hūn (situational identity). M̄-koh, tī-leh Tâi-oân kiàn-kok kòe-têng tiong-kan, “Tâi-gí” iáh-sī “Tâi-oân-ōe” chia ê miâ-chheng soah-lâi thòe-niū, ōa<sup>n</sup>-lâi ê “Holo” chheng-hō, sī phiau-chún ê m̄-chêng-goān ê sin-hūn jīn-tông (iáh 108).

Chéng-thé kóng--lâi, “M̄-chêng-goān ê sin-hūn jīn-tông” chit-phi<sup>n</sup> bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup> tī biâu-siá kah thó-lūn Tâi-gí, Tâi-oân-lâng chia-ê miâ-chheng án-nóa hông tòng-chò ū bûn-tê, bōe-sái sú-iōng, soah piàn-séng “Holo” chit-ê gōa-chheng, thê-kiong chin siōng-sè ê chu-liâu, mā thê-chhut bô-kâng chân-chhū ê kái-soeh. Sī chit-phi<sup>n</sup> ē-sái hō lán liáu-kái chit-ê “m̄-chêng-goān” ê kòe-têng ê hó bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup>. M̄-koh, bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup> lâi-bīn chit-kóa kái-soeh sió-khóa ū cheng-gī. Phí-jū tē 108 iáh kóng tióh Kok-bîn-tóng cheng-hú kè-ōe iōng “Bân-lâm-ōe” chheng-hō lâi chhú-tâi “Tâi-gí”, sīm-chì āu-lâi iōng “Bân-lâm-lâng” chheng-hō lâi chhú-tâi “Tâi-oân-lâng” ê kái-soeh, Ông Hú-chhiong jīn-ûi che tãi-piáu Kok-bîn-tóng cheng-hú beh kā Tâi-oân-lâng khng-tī in ê Tiong-kok bîn-chòk chú-gī ì-sek hêng-thài kiát-kò ē-kha, sī “beh kàng-kê Tâi-oân-lâng kah tãi-liók-lâng tī chá-kî chiap-chhiók kòe-têng nih ê bô sin-jīm kám kah chhiong-tút pi-kiók ín-khí ê kín-tiu<sup>n</sup> kiók-sè” (... , in order to reduce rising tensions caused by mutual misunderstanding and the tragic conflicts that occurred during the initial contacts between Taiwanese and Mainlanders). Chit-tiám kái-soeh eng-kai sī siu<sup>n</sup> piàn-bīn, bô chù-ì tióh Kok-bîn-tóng kî-sít tī chiàn-āu Tâi-oân mā ū khì-jit-pún-hòa (de-Japanization), chà-tiong-kok-hòa



(re-sinicization), sīm-chì sī hoán Tâi-oân kiàn-kok ê si-chèng pōe-kéng. Siau-tú chòk-kûn tiong-kan ê kín-tiu<sup>n</sup> kiòk-sè, pēng m̄-sī Kok-bîn-tóng cheng-hú ká Tâi-oân-lâng iáh-sī Tâi-oân-ōe “Bân-lâm-hòa” ê tã-seng bók-phiau.

“M̄-chêng-goân ê sin-hūn jīn-tông” chit-phi<sup>n</sup> bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup> kâng-sī chhú-lí gí-giân kah chòk-kûn miâ-chheng, sui-bóng in n̄ng-ê sī hō-siōng éng-hióng, chhin-chhiū<sup>n</sup> gīn-kak-á ê chià<sup>n</sup>-pēng kah tò-pēng n̄ng-bīn, bô-hoat-tō oân-choân hun-khui thó-lūn. M̄-koh, tui koan-sim Tâi-gí gī-tê ê thòk-chiá lâi kóng, eng-kai sòa lóh--lâi ū chit-kóa gī-tê siū<sup>n</sup>-beh chhin chit-pō liáu-kái iáh-sī hun-sek. Chhan-chhiū<sup>n</sup> bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup> tī tē 95 iáh kóng--tiòh Kok-bîn-tóng cheng-hú kè-ōe iōng “Bân-lâm” chhiū-tâi “Tâi-oân” ê sī, 1962 nî tē-it-chhut Tâi-gí liân-siòk-kiòk sī kiò chò “Bân-lâm-gú tiān-sī-kiòk” (閩南語電視劇), 1979 nî tē-it-ê Tâi-gí tiān-sī sin-bûn kiò chò “Bân-lâm-gú sin-bûn” (閩南語新聞). Tū-liáu miâ-chheng ê piàn-hòa í-gōa, Kok-bîn-tóng cheng-hú sī-m̄-sī tī Bân-lâm-gú chheng-hō chi-hā gí-sū ê soán-iōng, chhin-liōng soán-iōng Tiong-kok Bân-lâm-gú iōng ê gí-sū, bô-ài iōng Tâi-gí pún-tê tī-leh iōng ê Jit-gí gōa-lâi-sū? Chhan-chhiū<sup>n</sup> “o-tó-bái” (オートバイ), tiòh kái chò ū Hàn-jī thang-hó phòe ê “ki-chhia” (機車)? “tho-la-khū” (トラック) piàn chò “kha-chhia” (卡車)? “la-jī-ō” (ラジオ) piàn chò “siu-im-ki” (收音機)? “ne-khú-tái” (ネクタイ) piàn chò “niá-tò” (領帶)? Iáh-sī “sng-sò” (酸素) piàn chò “iōng-khì” (氧氣)? “ùn-chiàng” (運將) piàn chò “su-ki” (司機)? Kám mā-ū thau-kòe tiān-sī jī-bō ê sú-iōng, hō Tâi-gí pún-tê ê gí-sū piàn chò ài phòe-háp Hōa-gí ê jī-bō? Chhan-chhiū<sup>n</sup> Tâi-gí pún-tê ê “kóe-chí” (果子) chiām-chiām thau-kòe hòng-sàng soah piàn chò “chúi-kó” (水果), “chhe<sup>n</sup>-âng-teng” (青紅燈) soah piàn chò “âng-lék-teng” (紅綠燈) téng-téng? Bân-bân chō-sêng Tâi-gí iōng-sū choán-hiòng, choán hiòng kah óa khi Hōa-gí gí-sū ê hong-hiòng?

Bé--á, Tâi-gí tī hiān-chhú-sī ê Tâi-oân cheng-tī siā-hōe khi-hun ē-kha, tàu-té ài án-nóa chheng-hō chia<sup>n</sup> ē “cheng-tī cheng-khak”? “M̄-chêng-goân ê sin-hūn jīn-tông” chit-phi<sup>n</sup> bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup> pēng-bô hō lán chit-ê khó-lêng ê tap-àn. Cháu-chhōe sè-kài bô-kâng só-chhāi siong-koan ê iōng-hoat, “Hók-kiān-ōa” (Hokkien/福建話) sī tī Sin-ka-pho kah Má-lâi-se-a ê kóng-hoat, m̄-koh Tâi-oân-lâng hiān-chhú-sī eng-kai bē chiap-siū chit-chióng iōng Tiong-kok tē-miâ ê miâ-chheng, sui-bóng i bô chhan-chhiū<sup>n</sup> “Bân-lâm-gú” kâng-khoán, sī tòa tiòh Tiong-kok bîn-chòk chú-gī kài-liām ê chheng-hō; “Hók-kiān-ōa”



sī Tang-lâm-a chāi-tē hoat-tián chhut-lâi ê miâ-chheng. Tū-liáu kóng Tâi-gí jîn-kháu siū<sup>n</sup> beh thàu-kòe miâ-chheng lâi giú-kīn hām Sin-ka-pho kah Má-lâi-se-a kóng Hók-kiān-ōa jîn-kháu ê koan-hē, nā-bô, eng-kai bē kái-iōng chit-ê chheng-hō.

Tī Bí-kok tōa-hàn ê Tâi-oân î-bîn āu-tâi Philip T. Lin tī 2015 nî chhut-pán ê *Tâi-gí bûn-hoat: bêng-khak ê chham-chiàu* (*Taiwanese Grammar: A Concise Reference*), thèh-khí “Lán-lâng-ōe” (咱人話) chit-ê miâ-chheng, sī Húi-lùt-pin tong-tē ê chheng-hō<sup>3</sup>. Bô chhin-chhiū<sup>n</sup> kî-tha ê miâ-chheng m̄-sī iōng Tìong-kok tē-miâ tiòh-sī gōa-lâng ê chheng-hō, “Lán-lâng-ōe” tèk-piát ê só-chāi sī iōng chòk-kūn ê chū-chheng chò miâ, chhan-chhiū<sup>n</sup> Tâi-oân goân-chū-bîn-chòk lâi-tē ê Tayal (泰雅) iáh-sī Cou (Tsou 曹/鄒) kâng-khoán, iōng chòk-gí ê “lâng” tãi-piáu bîn-chòk ê miâ-chheng. “Lán-lâng-ōe” ê “lán”, lūi-sū Kheh-lâng tī Oát-lâm koa<sup>n</sup>-hong sī teng-kì chò “Ngāi” chòk, iōng Kheh-gí ê “góa” tē-it jîn-chheng chò bîn-chòk ê miâ-hō, m̄-sī iōng kó-chá Tìong-kok hông-tè ūi-tiòh tè-kok ê hù-sòe chè-tō hoat-tián chhut-lâi ê “Kheh-ka” chit-ê gōa-lâi-sú. Tâi-oân-lâng kám-ū hoat-tō chiap-siū “Lán-lâng-ōe” tãi-piáu “Tâi-gí”? Iáh-sī kan-nā ká “Lán-lâng-ōe” tòng-chò sī Tâi-gí, Ē-m̄ng-ōe, Má-lâi-se-a Hók-kiān-ōa chia hō-siōng ē thong ê ōe-gí ê téng-bīn chip-chheng?

Sui-bóng “M̄-chêng-goān ê sin-hūn jīn-tōng” chit-phi<sup>n</sup> bûn-chiū<sup>n</sup> bô-hoat-tō hōe-tap téng-bīn chia ê bûn-tê, m̄-koh chok-chiá thàu-kòe chē-chē ê sú-liáu kah thóng-kè sò-jī, hō lán liáu-kái chit-ê “m̄-chêng-goān” ê goân-thâu tī tah, kah i ê lèk-sú hoat-tián kòe-têng.

Thòk-chiá hōe-èng

Jīm-hô phōe-phêng chí-kàu, hoan-gêng email: kang@mail.ndhu.edu.tw, Khng Pôe-tek siu.

<sup>3</sup> Philip T. Lin, *Taiwanese Grammar: A Concise Reference* (Greenhorn Media, 2015), p. 2. ISBN: 978-0996398206

# Conference Speech

## 2015台灣文學外譯國際研討會演講

### A Taiwanese American Talks

#### on Taiwanese Literature Translation

#### 台美人談台灣文學外譯

Binsiong OU

台文作家

Professor Chiu<sup>1</sup> Ūi-bûn invited me to give a keynote speech, and I accepted it enthusiastically. Later on I realized it could be problematic -- what can I talk about? Fortunately, I am an engineer by profession, and it is second nature for an engineer to calmly face the problem and search for ways to solve it. Then an engineer would start to gather resources that could be used in solving the problem. To me, the profound resources are residing in myself, Ou Binsiong. And you may well ask “who is Ou Binsiong, after all?”

蔣為文教授邀請我專題演講，阿莎力答應了後，問題來啦，欲講啥？好佳哉，我專業工程，工程師習慣冷靜面對問題，清點有佻濟資源通用。我上大ε資源是我胡民祥本人，啊，恁會問：siáng是胡民祥咧？

Ou Binsiong, who was born in 1943 at Ou Chhuliau, Anting Town, Shinhoa County, Tainan State, left his beautiful home in 1967, for North America when he was 24 years old, to pursue graduate study. Until his retirement in 2011, he had been a professional engineer for 40 years, and has been writing for nearly 40 years. Until now, he has resided in America for 48 years. A Taiwanese proverb says: “The place where I have lived for long time is my hometown.” And now, I am a Taiwanese American, commonly known as Tai-bi-jin.

胡民祥，1943年出世佇台南州新化郡安定庄胡厝寮。1967年我24歲，離開向時Siraya族ε美麗故鄉，去到遙遠ε北美洲留學。2011年退休，專職工

程師40年，寫作欲40年。到今，佇美國拄仔好，有48年。台灣俗語講：「他鄉倚久是我鄉」。今，我是台灣裔美國人，俗稱台美人。

Today, it is a great honor for me to give a talk on Taiwan Literature translation. I would like to speak from both the viewpoint of a Taiwanese American and the angle of a writer.

As a Taiwanese American, to cure my homesickness, I started to read works of Taiwan Literature and to search its history. Thus I realize that there have been myths and folklores of Austronesian people in oral form, and literary works written in many languages, such as the old Han-language, Japanese, Chinese, Taiwanese, Hakka-language, even western European languages. For 30 years, I have been using the Taiwanese language to write essays, poetry, critiques and novels. As far as the written language is concerned Taiwanese Literature is a newcomer among the family of the Taiwan literary works, and is very alive. Therefore, it is very timely for me to concentrate my talk on Taiwanese Literature translation.

誠榮幸，佇遮講台灣文學外譯。我欲以台美人觀點，寫作人角度，來講起。

台美人因為思鄉，入去讀台灣文學作品，探究台灣文學史。所致知影，咱自古就有口傳ê南島語族神話傳說，書面方面有漢語文學、日語文學、華語文學、台語文學、客語文學，甚至有西歐語文學。30年來，我用台語寫散文、詩、評論、小說。台語文學是誠新ê語文形式，誠活跳ê台灣文學。所致，我就專心講台語文學外譯。

An engineer is good at using his left-side brain and a writer his right-side one. My left brain has been curious at what literature really means. After 40 years of searching for the meaning of literature, Eureka! I think that I discovered a very important aspect in literature translation that I will discuss in detail herein.

工程師gâu用倒pêng腦，寫作人活用正pêng腦，倒腦誠hò<sup>n</sup>-hiân文學是啥？40年落來，揣著矣！我認為其中一項，對文學外譯誠重要。

好酒沈甕底，請恁khoan-khoan-á聽。

Literature is an art of communications in three-dimensional thinking that

involve the author, the work and the reader. In 1967, Roland Barthes published *The Death of the Author*; In it, Barthes meant to deemphasize the authority of the author and to encourage the reader's participation in interpreting the work.

文學牽聯「作者、作品、讀者」，in可比是數學上ê「三度空間」，所致，文學通看作是：「三度空間」思維ê交流藝術。佇1967年，羅蘭巴特發表：《作者的死亡》，巴特本意是：破除作者權威，鼓勵讀者來解讀作品。

Indeed, a reader, who reads a work, is dialoging with the author through that pile of quiet scripts, with the context of the society, history and culture associated with the works, and with the language behind the scripts and coding of the work. Both dialoging and thinking communicate deeply in the romantic style of life, reason, thought and spirit of the author. Both dialoging and thinking communicate also directly with those scripts of the work, and the organic relationship among the scripts. Both dialoging and thinking communicate to capture the context and find its meaning in the society, history and culture. Both dialoging and thinking communicate with the scripts and codes, digging out its structural aesthetics. Phenomenon criticism, which originates from the reader's experiences, also enters into the great communication river of dialoging and thinking.

窮實，「讀者」閱讀一篇作品，伊是透過hit堆「恬恬ê文字」，參「作者」咧對話，參作品裡ê「語文情境」咧對話，參文字相對ê語言咧對話。對話思維探討：「作者」佇生活上、理智思想上、精神層次等等ê浪漫風格；對話思維直探「作品」ê語詞參語詞之間ê有機聯系；對話思維對「語文情境」出發，掠出它ê「社會歷史文化」ê意涵；對話思維針對文字「記號」，深挖in ê「結構美學」；「讀者經驗」所產生ê「現象批評」，嘛流入去「對話思維交流」ê大河。

What is the result of the above described intensive communication through dialoging and thinking? A vivid text with sound and colors evolves out of that pile of quiet scripts of the work. In 1971, Roland Barthes published his famous article: *From Work to Text*, introducing the innovative concept of literary text.

綿密思維交流ê結果是啥？就是一幅活跳ê「文本」浮起來，ùi作品hit堆「恬恬ê文字」裡活起來，有聲嗽有光彩，佇咱頭殼底盡情扮演。佇1971年，羅蘭巴特彼篇有名ê〈唯作品夠文本〉，就是咧紹介文本觀。

What big talk! Why not give an example for reference? Well, here is my critique article on a 228-incident story by Oo Tiong-siong: Three-dimensional Thinking of “The Gunshots” (*Taiwanese Literature Battlefield*, no. 12, 2008.10, pp. 35-55). The Gunshots consists of six sections, and each section is comparable to a layer of an onion, and each layer can be peeled off to read. What will happen to your eyes if you do so? Well, we all know it! Once all six are peeled off, you can imagine the consequence.

咱來看一个實例，he是我對胡長松二二八小說〈槍聲〉ê評論文：〈槍聲〉的三度思維空間〉（《台文戰線》，第12期，2008.10，頁35-55）。〈槍聲〉有六節，每一節可比是一片洋蔥，會使一片一片剝落來讀。剝洋蔥明珠會按怎？咱攏知！六片剝落來，是啥情景？想嘛知。

The Gunshots reveals the brutal massacre at Kohiong City Parliament ordered by the Kohiong Siu-soan fortress commander Peng Meng-ji. Through memories of the protagonist Khou Cheng-hiong, a dentist, the butcher's cruel face floats over pages. Dr. Khou's father, a parliament senator, was shot to death. Dr. Khou himself was kept at the fortress detention center. Dr. Khou escaped death just because the fortress commander's mother suffered from the pain of a decayed tooth, and needed treatment by her dentist, Dr. Khou. The commander acted out of personal advantage at the sacrifice of the military rules. Thus a strange meeting played out at the Kohiong City Hospital between Khou Cheng-hiong and the commander's mother. During the bleeding process of pulling the decayed tooth out of the old lady's mouth, a video was playing inside Dr. Khou's head: pain appeared frame after frame, and the bloody red scenes were everywhere. Whom he faced was a kind old lady yet the contrast was a butcher-like son with a cruel mind. He thought to ask her “why so?” After experiencing the massacre, he was so fearful! He dared not ask after all, and there was noway to ask anyway.



這篇〈槍聲〉掀開高雄壽山要塞司令彭孟緝，二二八事件時，佇高雄市議會屠殺。透過小說主角許正雄齒科醫師記持，屠夫凶殺面相浮上字紙，許醫師老爸高雄市參議員著槍籽身亡，許醫師家已hōng關入要塞看守所。要塞司令老母蛀齒痛，佇「公器私用」之下，許正雄死裡逃生；許正雄參彭司令老母，佇高雄市立病院，演一齣二二八離奇相會記。佇挽齒血流過程中，許醫師頭殼咧放錄影帶：痛苦一幕過一幕，場景處處紅紅紅；面對是慈祥的老夫人，對照是一個凶殺屠夫後生。想欲問老夫人，那會按呢生？經歷屠殺，驚破膽！煞毋敢問，事實上，嘛無地問起。

Finally, Dr. Khou quietly stood up and sent the old lady to a car that took her away from the hospital. Dr. Khou raised his head and his eyes focused and disappeared into the dark green shadow of the distant Mt. Siu-soan under the rain; at the shower that dropped down at every tiny corner of the harbor city. The peeling of The Gunshots onion came to an end and on the ninth day of March, 1947 in Kohiong city, all were in tears like that shower, and none stopped.

最後，許醫師恬恬起身，送老夫人上車離開病院。許醫師舉頭，目光消失佇雨中、遠遠壽山墨綠色暗影；一陣雨，落佇港都每一個小角落。〈槍聲〉洋蔥剝到 chia，親像「彼陣雨」，佇1947年三月初九，全高雄人，攏咧流目屎！流袂停。

After the intensive communications through the dialoging and thinking within the three-dimensional space of the author, the work and the reader, The Gunshots painted one frame of picture in my head with following The Gunshots quote:

Like a scalpel, The Gunshots cuts a slice of the Taiwanese deep sorrow, and the Taiwanese survived with disgrace under the dilemma of nobody to ask and dare-not to ask; the Taiwanese had lived through a miserable and quiet time over 40 long years. The Taiwanese who enjoyed the modern and advanced civilization of law abiding culture encountered the Chinese who lived under an old and outdated civilization of man-ruling culture, therefore, it unfortunately resulted in the 2-2-8 tragedy, in 1947. History has been full of ironies as it tested the Taiwanese, shaping them with fire and toughening their characters of steel-like

strength yet unbreakable softness.

胡長松〈槍聲〉小說，經過「作者、作品、讀者」這款「三度空間」ê 綿密思維交流，我頭殼底浮起來一幅〈槍聲〉文本：

〈槍聲〉剝開一片台灣人深沈的悲哀，台灣人忍辱生存落來，佇無地問，嘛唔敢問的困局裡，活過長長長40年苦悶無聲的時代。台灣人新而進步的法治文化文明，拄著中國人舊而落伍的人治文化文明，不幸產生1947年的二二八悲劇。歷史誠實反諷，一再咧試探火煉鋼勇柔韌的台灣人。

Translation of literary works is like reproducing a painting, such as a portrait, a vivid dragon painting, or a fearsome tiger painting. What is the key to do so? My Siraya brothers and sisters! The key resides in mata that means eyes in Sincan Language spoken by the Siraya people in the old Tainan area. An inaccurate touching on the eyes is fatal, as then gentleman becomes bandit, the dragon becomes a snake with legs, or the tiger becomes a dog. Where do you touch on the eyes during the translation of a literary work? The text that is the spiritual window of the works is the eyes of the work.

文學作品外譯若像咧模仿一幅人物畫、一幅活龍圖、抑是一幅威虎相，in ê關鍵是啥？Siraya ê兄弟姊妹啊！關鍵攏佇Siraya族新港語ê mata，目珠！目珠點無好勢，煞是「紳士變土匪」矣，「龍變蛇有腳」矣，「畫虎不成煞那狗」矣。啊！文學作品外譯ê mata、目珠，佇佗位？就是佇文本啊！文本就是作品ê靈魂之窗啊！

The key to translating a Taiwanese story to English is to first search for its spiritual window -- the text, and it would become smooth in translating the scripts into the corresponding English scripts, patterns and styles as well as translating the context to fit in with the English country's society, history and culture. Therefore, the translation would be accurate and it won't happen that the tiger turns out to be a dog.

台語小說外譯到英語文，若是掠出它ê文本，落手翻譯作品ê語文，就會掠著貼俁ê英語語文形式，全時，小說ê語文情境自然會貼俁著英語國家相對應ê社會歷史文化。按呢來，外譯著袂走精啊，就袂虎變狗矣。

Let's discuss the translation of context a little further with a historical case.

In 1957, at a campaign rally in Taipei, Chinese mainlanders shouted out “no speaking in Taiwanese,” and State Senator Koeh Kok-ki responded with “khit-chiah-koan-bio-kong,” which literarily means “The Beggar drives away the temple guardian.” If you understand the context of the Taiwanese society, history and culture, you would naturally find its Chinese equivalent saying as “Xuan-bin-duo-zhu,” which literarily means “Noisy guest overwhelms host.” And yet what is its equivalent saying in English? We could dig into the American society, history and culture, and we found that, after the Civil War, there were northerners who flooded into the defeated South, and these people chased after opportunities, grasping power and making a fortune. These people all carried a convenient but vulgar carpet-made bag and appeared like beggars walking into the South, thus the term “carpetbagger” seems to be comparable to “khit-chiah-koan-bio-kong.”

繼咧，舉一个實例來談語文情景ê社會歷史文化。

1957年佇台北一場演講，外省人喝袂使講台語，省議員郭國基回in一句「乞食趕廟公」。若是掠著這句話ê台灣社會歷史文化ê語文情境，自然就會揣著華語文ê「喧賓奪主」。啊，英語文呢？Ûi美國社會歷史文化落手，咱發現美國南北戰爭之後，有北方人湧入去到夠戰敗ê南方，揣機會，掌權勢，大發橫財。這款人攏是揸一kha簡便粗俗ê地毯（Carpet）袋仔（Bag），一籬人若像乞食行到南方。人khau-sé in是“Carpetbagger”，這字可比是台語ê「乞食趕廟公」。

Indeed, translating literary works is not just translating scripts; one also has to translate its text, too. Grasping the text would then make it smooth in translating the works, and then it could reach the traditional ideal of the so-called “credibility, fluency, elegance,” or the newly modified saying “credibility, fluency, beauty”, or “credibility, fluency, accuracy.”

啊！窮實，文學作品ê外譯，不止仔是咧翻譯語文nā-tiān，嘛著愛翻譯文本。掠著文本，外譯就會誠順手，就會貼近傳統所謂ê「信、達、雅」，抑是近來新講法ê「信、達、美」、或者是「信、達、準」ê譯文境界。

Next, let’s talk about publishing the translated works using different countries’ rules and customs in the interior formatting of a book. When we

publish Taiwanese literary works in English for readers in English speaking countries we had better follow the English customs. If not the English reader could reject the book as it would appear odd to them.

繼咧，咱來談作品外譯出版時，有啥規矩參習慣？

針對英語文國家ê讀者來講，台語文學作品外譯出版，著愛遵守英語文ê內文編排ê規矩參習慣；若無遵守，讀者會排斥這款無合規矩ê冊，因為看來怪怪袂順眼。

Now, let's talk about what I have learned of the customs in the interior formatting.

This year, in order to self-publish a collection of my Taiwanese short stories titled *The Lovesick Cicada*, I opened an account with the “CreateSpace” platform, a subsidiary of Amazon bookstores. There I learned the minute details of the interior formatting of books in English. There are the so-called “no widow” and “no orphan.” If the last line of a paragraph becomes the first line on a page, this line is then named widow, and it is not proper if there are widows in a book, which could then be rejected by readers. As I know there is generally no such rule for book published here in Taiwan. If the first line of a paragraph becomes the last line on a page, this line is then named orphan, and it is not proper either if there are orphans in a book.

我來講我親身學著一寡規矩習慣。

今年，為著家己出版小說集：《相思蟬》，我入去Amazon分公司CreateSpace網路平台，學內文編排ê眉眉角角。英語文書ê內文有所謂的：「無守寡」、「無孤兒」。一節文ê最後一綴若是變作一頁ê第一行，這綴道叫作「守寡者」，一本冊有守寡者是無合規矩。就我了解，台灣出冊編排普遍無這款禁忌。一節文ê第一綴若是變作一頁ê上尾仔一行，這綴就叫作「孤兒」，一本冊有孤兒嘛是無合英文書ê規矩。

In addition, English books have a custom for using the so-called “Drop Cap” -- that is an artistic design for the first capital alphabet of the beginning word in each chapter. Again, there is generally no such custom here in Taiwan. Of course, there are many other rules in publishing a book in English.



另外，英語文書有所謂裁頭（Drop Cap），佇每一章ê起頭語ê頭一个字母，作出大寫ê美術編排，這款美編大寫字母叫作裁頭。台灣出冊普遍無chit款習慣。當然，猶有濟濟參台灣出冊無全款ê規矩。

Now, let's talk about publishing the translated works using new media for quick, inexpensive, efficient and wide distribution. Compared to traditional publishing, the internet publishing is a new media. Let me share with you what I learned from publishing my fiction book *The Lovesick Cicada* through an internet publishing platform: the above mentioned "CreateSpace," a subsidiary of Amazon bookstores. The platform operates 24 hours a day with staff to answer questions in book cover design, and interior formatting. Upon mutual approval from me and the CreateSpace, *The Lovesick Cicada* was finally published.

繼咧，咱來講外譯作品出版時，上界好是透過網路新媒體，mài用平面印刷這款傳統媒體，網路出版有「快速、省錢、高效率、行銷網潤」ê好處。我出版小說集《相思蟬》是透過Amazon網路書店ê "CreateSpace" 平台，佇平台裡，每工24小時，隨時有人員答覆內文編排ê問題。當我編好《相思蟬》，隨透過Amazon發行全世界，顧客訂單一來，CreateSpace平台「買隨印」、「隨裝訂」、「隨寄書」。

The CreateSpace prints the book immediately once customer places an order. This is the so-called "Print on Demand (POD)," which has many benefits as there is no storage issue, we all know that the traditional publishing has to immediately print several hundred or thousand copies and face the storage issue. It is almost no cost for an author to publish a book through the POD. Amazon will pay royalty to the author for books sold. In addition, under the arrangement without royalty, the author can order copies at near-cost price for distributing himself; he may order as many copies as he wants.

這款「買隨印」叫作Print on Demand（POD），好處誠濟：毋免一擺就印幾百幾千本，就無庫存ê問題，作者出版通講是免資金。讀者買冊，Amazon會付作者版稅。另外，佇無版稅ê情形之下，作者會當向印刷平台訂書家己行銷，數量隨意，價數近印刷成本。



For me, as an author, I ordered 200 copies of *The Lovesick Cicada*, and I sent autographed copies to Taiwanese Americans either by mail or in person. I signed autographs at the end of June at the Pittsburgh Taiwanese Bible Study meeting, at the Taiwanese American Summer conferences in early July in the East Coast and near mid-July in the Midwest, and at the Moon Festival gathering at the Pittsburgh Chapter of the Taiwanese American Association.

親像我，以作者身分，定200本《相思蟬》，簽送予各地台美人，是用郵便，koh有親身ê。親像佇六月底，佇匹茲堡台語查經班簽送，七月初佇美東台灣人夏令會，欲6a七月中佇中西部台灣人夏令會，佇匹茲堡台灣同鄉會ê中秋聚會。

The Amazon CreateSpace platform also offers eBook publishing, and for an author, this is zero cost. The Amazon eBook can be downloaded to the Kindle tablet for reading. And the eBook is even cheaper than the POD paper book, and the market for eBooks is huge. The market of the traditional print-media paper book is shrinking, yet the eBook market is getting bigger by the day. In today's Internet age, it is a good idea to simultaneously publish the POD paper book and the eBook as the Internet provides a much faster, cheaper and more efficient way to distribute books worldwide.

Amazon ê CreateSpace平台，嘛出版電子冊，對作者來講，是零成本。參Amazon網路書店相通ê電子冊，通好掠落來khng佇Kindle閱讀板，快速方便。電子冊價數比紙本koh較俗，市場誠大。傳統平面紙本市場愈來愈小，電子冊一日一日大起來。佇網路ê時代，咱發行台語文學作品ê英語文版，應該全時出版「買隨印」ê紙本冊參電子冊，因為伊有「快速、省錢、高效率、行銷網潤」ê好處。

Self-publishing via the Internet involves the cover design and interior formatting that can be done at home on the computer. In our Taiwanese Literature circle, there are many Internet experts who can quickly acquire this skill. They can republish the already published Taiwanese literary works in English from the traditional print-media publishing to the web publishing both in eBook and the POD paper book. For examples, they may assist in publishing the following

Taiwanese literature works already translated into English: *The 2013 annals of Taiwanese Pen*, *The 2014 annals of Taiwanese Pen*, the novel *My Name is Young Yellow*, and poetry *The Tracks of the Day* by Louise Lee Hsiu, and poetry *Tayouan Paipai* by Yaw-Chien Fang.

網路出冊，封面設計到內文編排，全部手續攏通佇厝裡電腦完成。咱台語文學界內底，誠濟網路高手，有才調用「買隨印」出版手藝，再版現有台語文學外譯英文冊。親像：《台文筆會2013年刊》、《台文筆會2014年刊》；李秀小說《我的名叫小黃》、詩集《日子的證據》；方耀乾詩集《台窩灣擺擺》等等，全時出「買隨印」紙本冊參隨時會當掠電子冊。

Next, let's talk about translators. A translator can't survive if his wok is often hung on the wall and his stomach constantly empty. What kind of financial support is available for the translator of Taiwan literature translation? I made a little search and got certain answers as follows:

1. The Taipei Chinese PEN has continued publishing *A Quarterly Journal of Contemporary Chinese Literature from Taiwan*, since 1972 by Ms. Yin Zhang Lan-xi. The quarterly has been distributed to more than 120 international pen members, countries, libraries and cultural communities around the world.
2. The Chinese Literature Translation program (1990-2009), sponsored by the Council of Cultural Affairs, had published more than 240 volumes outside Taiwan, in English, Japanese, French, Dutch, Korean, Swedish, Russian, Mongolian, and Czech.
3. National Museum of Taiwan Literature took over the Culture Affairs' Chinese Literature Translation program in 2010, began in 2011 to solicit the Translation projects for subsidizing and cultivating translation talents, and in 2012 created its Taiwan Literary Translation Center, and began in 2013 to sponsor International Conference on Taiwan Literature Translation.
4. At the sponsorship of the Taiwan's Council of Culture Affairs, Professor

Kuo-ching Tu chaired *Taiwan Literature English Translation Series* (1996-2010), at the University of California, Santa Barbara campus, and until January 2010 the series has published a total of 26 issues. In January 2010, Professor Tu then established the US-Taiwan Literature Foundation to continue the translation projects.

5. Professor Dewei Wang chaired the Chinese Literature Translation Series (1998-2008) at Columbia University.
6. *Taiwanese Pen* published annals (2013-) in Taiwanese and English for works of poetry, essays and novels by members.
7. Taiwanese literature translation by organizations such as Association for Taiwanese and Vietnamese Cultural Exchange, which has supported translation of Taiwanese literary works into Vietnamese.
8. Other occasional translations through individual authors, international conferences and foreign publishers.

繼咧來講翻譯人，一个翻譯人若是定定吊鼎，時時空腹肚，伊是無氣力作翻譯啦。台灣文學外譯ê翻譯人有啥款資金咧支持呢？我小寡作一个了解，得著一寡答案如下：

- 一、殷張蘭熙女士創辦《中華民國筆會英文季刊--當代台灣文學英譯》(1972-)。外譯華語台灣文學，誠有成績。
- 二、文建會推動台灣文學的「中書外譯(1990-2009)」，誠有成績，佇國外出版有240外本，外譯語文包括英文、日文、法文、荷文、韓文、瑞典文、俄文、蒙古文、捷克文等等。
- 三、文建會「中書外譯」佇2010年移交予國立台灣文學館，2012成立「台灣文學外譯中心」，到今，誠有成績。2011年起，對外徵求「翻譯」項目，補助培訓台灣文學外譯人才。2013年起舉辦台灣文學外譯國際學術研討會。
- 四、加州大學聖塔芭芭拉分校ê《台灣文學英譯叢刊》(1996-2010)，文建會贊助，由杜國清教授主持，這份半年刊到2010年一月總共出26集。2010年一月杜國清發起成立「美國台灣文學基金會」，繼續台灣文學外譯ê長遠工程。

- 五、哥倫比亞大學中書外譯系列（1998-2008），由王德威教授主持。
- 六、台文筆會年刊（2013-），翻譯會員ê台語文學作品：詩、散文、小說，譯做英語文。
- 七、學會支持ê外譯，親像台越文化協會，kā台語文學作品翻譯做越南語文。
- 八、其他偶發性ê外譯，由作者、國際會議、外國出版社等等方式進行。

It appears that there are available supporting channels, which are involved in literary associations, academic entities or governmental units. They could continue to provide resources for translation.

看來，管道猶有寡，差不多攏是文學團體本身、學術機構、政府單位等等ê支持，攏會使繼續進行落去。

In line with this conference theme: Taiwanese Literature Translation in The Globalization Era, I suggest a totally different road: that is, through the worldwide Taiwanese businessmen (Taisiong). Well, as a Taiwanese American, I have had certain beautiful encounters with Taisiong.

順著今年「台灣文學外譯國際學術研討會」ê主題：全球化下ê台灣文學外譯，佇遮，我建議一條全新ê、斬然無全ê「全球台商之路」。作一个台美人，我有一寡台商接觸ê美好經驗。

Some of you might be a member of Han Chi Poetry Association established in 1991. This poetry club is an important milestone in the Taiwanese Literature movement. In 1992 I invited the association president Lim Chong-goan and editor-in-chief Ng Keng-lian to America for a tour to promote Taiwanese Literature. I presided over a forum of Taiwanese poetry at the Taiwanese Summer Conference at East Coast. The forum included poetry reading by poets: Lim Chong-goan, Ng Keng-lian, Li Khin-hoan, and Ou Binsiong. Hearing poems read in their Taiwanese mother tongue deeply moved the audience's hearts. Immediately at the end of the forum, I received a check of US\$1,000 from a Taisiong, Mr. Tan, a big hand in supporting Han Chi Poetry Association.

在座大概有人參加過1991年成立ê《蕃薯詩社》，這個詩社是台語文學



運動史上重要里程碑。1992年熱人，我安排社長林宗源、總編輯黃勁連，作伙去美國介紹台語文學，佇美東台灣人夏令會，我主持一場台語詩座談會，林宗源、黃勁連、李勤岸、胡民祥唸in家己ê詩篇。台語詩打動眾人ê心肝窟仔，一結束，我隨收著台商陳先生一張支票，票面一千箍美金，大出手贊助《蕃薯詩社》。

In 2006, a graduate student in Taiwanese Literature at Ching Hua University went to America to present a conference paper. At my recommendation this student applied to the Taiwanese Import and Export Association in New York, and they provided a financial support of US\$1,500 to this student. In fact, Taisiong has also been very generous in providing scholarships to Taiwanese graduate students in American universities. The receivers included certain scholars now in academic arena and legislators in the Legislative Yuan. In addition, I would like to mention the story of Louise Lee Hsiu who is a painter, pianist and writer, who applied for immigration to Canada in 2001. The immigration interviewer questioned her on her ability, as a Chinese writer, to survive in the English speaking Canada. Fortunately she got assistance from a Taisiong who was the board chairman of Radisson Hotel Vancouver Airport. The chairman arranged a writing contract with a Chinese publishing house for Louise. Eventually she was successful in getting a permanent visa and landed at Vancouver in January 2002. Louise returned to school to study English and English writing, and then began to write in English. She translated her famous Chinese novel *Penghu Moon in the Well* into English and published it in 2012. In 2009, Louise began to write in Taiwanese -- poetry, essays and novels. In 2014 Louise gave a lecture during an Alaskan cruise at the invitation of President An-bang Lee of the North America Federation of Taisiong Association, and Louise talked about the beauty of the Taiwanese mother tongue literature to the Taisiong. As a matter of fact, if you probe deeper, you will find many other beautiful and generous acts by Taisiong.

2006年，清華大學一位台語文學研究生，去美國發表論文，佇我推薦之下，紐約台灣人進出口公會慷慨贊助，出旅費美金一千五百箍。台商嘛贊助在美台灣留學生獎學金，受益者包括一寡台語文學ê學者、立法委



員。另外，來講李秀，她是畫家、鋼琴家、作家，2001年，她申請移民加拿大，移民官質疑華語作家佇英語世界生活ê能力，誠幸運拄著溫哥華機場邊ê賴迪順大旅社ê總裁，這位台商為她安排一張加拿大華文出版社ê寫作契約，成功取著永久居留簽證。她再度苦學英語數年，然後用英文寫作，嘛將她ê華文名小說《井月澎湖》ü華文外譯做英文，2012出版。她2009年開始寫台語詩、台語散文、台語小說。2014年她參加北美台商總會阿拉斯加郵輪旅遊，總會會長李安邦請她主講文學，紹介台語文學之水。窮實，深入去看，台商大方美事講未了！

Five thousand years ago, our Austronesian ancestors sailed with Bankas (Canoes) across oceans and spread over all of the Pacific islands. For several hundreds of years, Formosans (Taiwanese) who inherited the Austronesian gene stepped on all parts of the world exporting goods. During the 1970s, Taisiong carried their product samples in their luggage along with instant noodles. Samples were products made through production lines by women laborers and machine operators, and instant noodles were life savers in stopping hunger. Taisiong wasn't able to speak even a simple word, "thank you," however, they were very smart! They chose to go in summer, hiring Taiwanese graduate students in America as their drivers and translators. In addition to America, Taisiong reached all other parts of the world to negotiate and bring back orders, and thus machine operators, woman factory laborers, and Taisiong jointly brought about a Taiwan economy miracle in the 1980s. It was said that Taiwanese banknotes flooded everywhere and piled up to ankle-height.

五千年前，咱南島語族祖先，駛孤帆艋舺，漂洋過海，炭到規个太平洋大大細細ê島嶼。數百年來，Formosa台灣人流著先祖南島語族ê基因，踏腳全球作生理。20世紀70年代，中小企業台商kōa<sup>n</sup>-kha旅行袋，khng樣品參泡麵，樣品是台灣烏手參女工ê成品，泡麵是止柸ê仙丹，台商一句“Thank you”嘛講未輪轉，不而過，卻是誠巧！In暑假去，請台灣留學生作司機兼外譯。台商行遍世界接訂單，烏手、女工、台商共同創造台灣經濟奇蹟，一時台灣錢淹腳目。

Entering the 21st century, Taisiong spreads over six continents. As of now,

Taiwan has maintained diplomatic relations with only twenty two countries, however, Taisiong has been our secret ambassadors who have no titles yet function well as usual. Taiwan maintains economic relations to do business with all countries around the world; Taisiong firmly erect the Taiwan economy pillar, and they hold the key to the Taiwan nation's existence!

來到21世紀，台商生澁世界六大洲。當今，台灣政治外交chhun 22國nā-tiā<sup>n</sup>，但是，台商是咱ê秘密外交大使，台灣無國不來往；台商是台灣經濟大柱，in是台灣民族生存不敗ê秘訣！

Taisiong is the export master of Taiwanese goods, and we can follow the export webs of Taisiong to export the translated Taiwanese literary works. The Taiwanese goods are great in volume and high in quality worldwide, and by teaming with the worldwide Taisiong, Taiwanese literature can also reach the worldwide audience. Taisionsg are not aliens, they are the treasure for Taiwanese Literature!

台商是台灣製外銷ê高手，台語文學欲外譯外銷，可以聯合台商外銷網路；台灣製商品量大質精，結合全球台商，台語文學外譯全款會使量大品質嬌。台商毋是外星人，台商咱台語文學ê寶貝！

As a matter of fact, Taiwanese Pen can take one more step to establish a Taiwanese literature translation group with goals of winning the Taisiong support for cultivating translators. In addition, the international Taisiong has the advantages of the locality, bilingual and even multilingual capability, and they can communicate directly with the local international communities, hold literary discussion forums, cooperate with local schools, to promote the reading of Taiwanese literary works. They can offer “buy one get one free” -- buy one Taiwanese product and get one Taiwanese literary work for free. As a matter of fact, literary works can co-exist with merchandise.

窮實，台文筆會會當koh踏前一步，成立台語文學外譯組，爭取台商合作，培訓外譯人才。台商有地緣ê優勢，雙語，甚至多語文ê能力，可以直接交陪當地人，舉辦文學座談會，參當地學校合作，獎勵閱讀台語文學作品；買台灣製商品送台灣文學作品，文學參商品是會當共生共存ê。

Finally, let's encourage ourselves to learn from our Austronesian ancestor who fearlessly crossed the oceans. Let's also learn from them in mastering the Banka-canoe with the simple sail and oar to conquer the Pacific islands, large and small. Siraya brothers and sisters! Let's march without widows, without orphans and heads held high! Let's grasp the spiritual windows, the eyes, texts of the newly developing Taiwanese literary works firmly. Let's sail into the huge Internet ocean with our worldwide Taisiong. Let's work hand in hand in translating and sharing our Taiwanese literature with the world community.

最後，咱互相勉勵，學咱南島語族先祖，學in茫茫大海駛艋舨，攏無咧驚；學in孤帆行船，征服太平洋大大細細島嶼ê精神。Tagiapara tī Siraya！Siraya ê兄弟姊妹啊！咱新興ê台語文學作品，無守寡，無孤兒，頭著栽互在；參咱全球台商手牽手，相準靈魂之窗、mata、目珠、文本，駛入網路ê大海，將台語文學外譯，外銷到全球！

【本文是2015年11月7-8日「台灣文學外譯國際研討會」ê專題演講。研討會網址：<http://cvs.twl.ncku.edu.tw/conf/2015/>】





## Conference Speech

### 2015台灣文學外譯學術研討會專題演講

#### 日本における台湾原住民文学

#### —果たして読まれているのだろうか？

Tī Jit-pún ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák

Jit-pún Thók-chiá Kám Thák ah?

下村作次郎

天理大學

Shimomura Sakujiro

翻譯：王惠珍，林美雪

#### 1. はじめに—1980年代から90年代へ

筆者が1980年代初期に台湾文学の研究をはじめて以来、早や35年を数える。しかし、いつの頃からか台湾原住民族文学の研究者と呼ばれることが多くなった。ただ自分自身は、研究者としての属性をどちらか一方に定めたことはないが、台湾原住民文学の研究者と呼ばれることを誇らしく思う。

#### 1. Ōe-thâu: Ûi 1980 nî-tāi kàu 90 nî-tāi

Pit-chiá chēng 1980 nî-tāi chho-kî khai-sí gián-kiù Tâi-oân bûn-hák kàu-ta<sup>n</sup>, sng--khí-lâi mā ū 35 tang ah. M̄-koh, m̄-chai tang-sî khai-sí hông kóng góa sī Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chòk bûn-hák gián-kiù-chiá. Sī-kóng ka-kī chiá<sup>n</sup>-chò gián-kiù-chiá ê siók-sèng mā bô kóng hân-tiā<sup>n</sup> tī toh chit-khoán, put-jî-kò hông kiò-chò Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák gián-kiù-chiá mā kám-kak chiá<sup>n</sup> iāng.



筆者の台湾原住民文学との出会いは、1992年に田畑書店より刊行された『悲情の山地』の翻訳に、監訳という立場に関わったことにはじまる。<sup>1</sup> 筆者が台湾文学をはじめた80年代は、もっぱら漢民族の作家の台湾文学を知ること夢中で、党外雑誌などの蒐集にも務め、民主化運動の動向に注目していた。しかし、正直なところ、台湾原住民(族)権利促進運動には注意が及ばず、ましてや台湾原住民文学の存在についてはほとんど知るところがなかった。そんな筆者を台湾原住民文学研究の道へと導いたのは、この『悲情の山地』の翻訳の仕事であった。筆者は80年代に台湾文学に出会い、90年代には台湾原住民文学と出会った。こうして、台湾の豊かな文学風土のなかで、台湾文学と台湾原住民文学の研究にたずさわることになったのである。

Pit-chiá tú khai-sí kap Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák sio-tŭng sī ùi 1992 nî ēng kàm-ék ê sin-hūn chham-ú Tabata chheh-tiàm hoan-ék ê “Pi-chêng ê Soa<sup>n</sup>-tē” ê chhut-pán<sup>1</sup> khai-sí. Pit-chiá ùi 80 nî-tāi khai-sí chò Tâi-oân bûn-hák ê gián-kiù, chin pià<sup>n</sup>-sè ùi Hàn-jîn chok-ka ê chòk-phín lâi gián-kiù Tâi-oân bûn-hák, koh siu-chip tóng-gōa cháp-chì, mā koan-sim bîn-chú-hòa ūn-tōng ê kiá<sup>n</sup>-hiòng. M̄-koh láu-sit kóng góa pēng-bô tì-ì Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn (chòk) koân-lī chhiok-chìn ūn-tōng, sīm-chì tō m̄-chai ū Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê chûn-chāi. In-ūi hoan-ék “Pi-chêng ê Soa<sup>n</sup>-tē” ê kang-khòe, chiah ín-chhōa pit-chiá kiá<sup>n</sup> jip gián-kiù Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê lō. Pit-chiá tī 80 nî-tāi gū-tiòh Tâi-oân bûn-hák, tī 90 nî-tāi kap Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák sio-tú. Só-tì, tī Tâi-oân phong-phài ê bûn-hák hong-thó lâi-té, pit-chiá khai-sí chò Tâi-oân bûn-hák kap Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê gián-kiù.

さて、筆者の台湾文学研究に大きな影響を及ぼした『悲情の山地』の原書は、呉錦発編著の『悲情的山林』（星晨出版社、1987年）である。筆者は監訳者として翻訳にひと通り目を通し、解説を書く段階になって、呉錦発の紹介を得てモーナノンとトパス・タナピマを訪ね、そこではじめて原住民族の小説家と詩人に出会ったのである。

<sup>1</sup> 該書の下訳は呉薰と山本真知子の両氏による共訳であり、筆者は監訳という立場で翻訳に携わった。

Chit pún chheh sī Ngō Hun (吳薰) kap 山本真知子<sup>2</sup> ê chò-hóe hoan-ék, pit-chiá khiá kàm-ék ê lip-tiù<sup>n</sup> kā hiáp-chō.

“Pi-chêng ê Soa<sup>n</sup>-tê” goân-tù sī Ngô Gím-hoat pian-tù ê “Pi-chêng ê Soa<sup>n</sup>-nâ” (Sîn-chhi<sup>n</sup> chhut-pán-siā, 1987). Chit pún chheh tùi pit-chiá ê Tâi-oân bûn-hák gián-kiù éng-hióng kài tōa. In-ūi tam-tng kàm-ék ê khang-khòe, tng góa sió iá<sup>n</sup>-kòe hoan-ék-bûn beh siá phêng-kài ê sī, tit-tiòh Ngô Gím-hoat ê siāu-kài, khi pài-hóng Monaneng kap Tuobasi Tamapima, che sī góa thâu-pái kap Goân-chū-bîn-chòk ê siáu-soat ka, si-jîn kì-bīn.

ところで、台湾原住民文学は、『悲情的山林』が上梓された頃は「山地文学」と呼ばれていた。台湾原住民族の最初の新聞『原報 (Aboriginal Post)』(1988年11月創刊、全24期)でも「山地文学」と称していた時期である。ところが、日本で翻訳書を出す1992年になると、状況は大きく変化しはじめていた。そうした時代状況を反映させて、原書では副題が「台湾山地小説」となっていたものを、翻訳書では「台湾原住民小説選」と訳出した。もちろん、出版社でもこれでゴーサインが出た。今から振り返ると、該書は日本における台湾原住民文学受容において、画期的な翻訳書であった。ただ当時はまだ、日本の文化界や読書界には全体として台湾原住民文学を受け入れる土壌がなく、一部の台湾文学研究者や人類学者から注目されるに止まり、広く読者を獲得するには至らなかった。

Hit-chūn “Pi-chêng ê Soa<sup>n</sup>-nâ” chhut-pán ê sī, Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák sī hông kiò-chò “Soa<sup>n</sup>-tê bûn-hák”, liân Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chòk siōng chá ê pò-chóa “Goân Pò (Aboriginal Post)” (1988 nî 11 goèh chhòng-khan, lóng-chóng 24 kí) téng-bīn mā-sī kiò “Soa<sup>n</sup>-tê bûn-hák”. M̄-koh kàu kah 1992 nî hoan-ék chòe Jit-bûn chhut-pán ê sī, chōng-hóng tō khai-sí tōa kái-piàn ah. Ūi-tiòh hoán-èng sī-tāi ê chōng-hóng, hoan-ék pún kā goân-tù ê hù phiau-tê “Tâi-oân Soa<sup>n</sup>-tê Siáu-soat” hoan-ék chò “Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Siáu-soat Soán”. Tong-jiân chhut-pán-siā mā tông-ì. Chit-má kā siū<sup>n</sup> khí-lâi, Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák tī Jit-pún hō lāng chiap-siū, chit pún chheh kai-tong sī chhōa-thâu kái-piàn ê ék-pún. Put-jī-kò hit-chūn Jit-pún ê bûn-hòa kài kap thák-chheh kài iáu m̄-sī choân-jiân chiap-siū Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák, kan-ta ū chit-kóa Tâi-oân bûn-hák gián-kiù-chiá kap jîn-lūi hák-ka kah tùi-tiōng niá, iáu siá<sup>n</sup> bē-tiòh chē-chē ê thók-chiá.

『悲情の山地』には、漢民族作家7人7編、原住民族作家2人4編の計9

名11編の作品が収められている。以下に、『悲情の山地』の邦題を掲げておく。なお、原住民族作家は、ブヌン族の田雅各（トパス・タナピマ）とパイワン族の陳英雄（コワン・タラル）である。

“*Pi-chêng ê Soa<sup>n</sup>-tē*” ū siu 7 ūi Hàn-jîn ê chok-ka 7 phi<sup>n</sup>, Goân-chū-bîn--ê 2 ūi 4 phi<sup>n</sup>, lóng-chóng 9 ê 11 phi<sup>n</sup> chok-phín. Ē-kha liat “*Pi-chêng ê Soa<sup>n</sup>-tē*” Jit-gí ê êk-pún phi<sup>n</sup>-miâ phiau-tê, kap Goân-chū-bîn chok-ka Bunun ê Tiân Ngá-kok kap Payuan ê Tân Eng-hiông.

吳錦發「日本語版のための序」

吳錦發「序」／鍾理和「山地の女（假黎婆）」／鍾肇政「熊狩りに挑む男たち（獵熊的人）」／田雅各「最後の獵人（最後の獵人）」／胡台麗「吳鳳の死（吳鳳之死）」／田雅各「マナン、わかった（馬難明白了）」／李喬「パスタアイ考（巴斯達矮考）」／田雅各「小人族（侏儒族）」／古蒙仁「碧岳村遺事（碧岳村遺事）」／陳英雄「ひな鳥の涙（雛鳥涙）」／吳錦發「燕が鳴く小道（燕鳴的街道）」／葉智中「佳霧に住む友（我的朋友住佳霧）」／「附録 山地問題座談会」

Ngô Kím-hoat “Ūi-tiòh Jit-bún pán ê sū-bún”

Ngô Kím-hoat “Sū” / Chiong Lí-hô “Soa<sup>n</sup>-tē ê Cha-bó-lâng” / Chiong Tiâu-chèng “Liáh Hím ê Lâng” / Tiân Ngá-kok “Siōng Bóe ê Láh-jîn” / Ô Tâi-lê “Ngô Hōng ê Sī” / Tiân Ngá-kok “Mana Liáu-kái ah” / Lí Kiâu “Pasutaai Gián-kiù” / Tiân Ngá-kok “É-lâng-chòk” / Kó Bông-jîn “Phek-gák-chhoan Ūi-sū” / Tân Eng-hiông “Chhu-chiáu Lūi” / Ngô Kím-hoat “T<sup>n</sup>-á Kiò ê ke-lō” / Iáp Tì-tiong “Góa ê Pêng-iú Tò Ka-bū” / “Hù-liók: Soa<sup>n</sup>-tē Būn-tê Chō-tâm-hōe”

下村作次郎「解説 台湾原住民族の詩と文学」

さて、該書の出版後、日本で台湾原住民文学に関心を寄せた出版社が草風館であった。次に述べるように、草風館から『台湾原住民文学選』の刊行がはじまったのは2002年12月である。

Shimomura Sakujiro “Kái-soeh Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chòk ê Si kap Būn-hák”

Chit pún chheh chhut-pán liáu, siâ<sup>n</sup>-sîn Jit-pún chhut-pán-siâ Sofukan tui Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn būn-hák ê chhù-bī. Chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha kóng--ê, Sofukan ùi 2002 nî 12 goèh khai-sí khan-hêng “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Būn-hák Soán*”.

## 2. 『台湾原住民文学選』全9巻の刊行

周知のように、『台湾原住民文学選』は草風館から刊行された。草風館は日本ではアイヌ民族関係書を最も多く出している在京の出版社であるが、当時、内川千裕（2008年8月4日没）が台湾原住民文学に関心を持ったのは、孫大川との出会いであったと聞く。孫の案内で台湾研究者の戴国輝（2001年1月9日没）と共に、プユマ族の部落である台東県の卑南郷下賓朗（ピナスキ）を訪れたのが一つのきっかけであったようだ。下賓朗は孫大川の故郷である。こうして台湾原住民文学に関心を持った内川は、『悲情の山地』を監訳した筆者に作品の選択と翻訳を依頼してきたのである。

## 2. “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” Choân 9 Koân ê Khan-hêng

Chhiū<sup>n</sup> chêng-lâng chai-ia<sup>n</sup> ê “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” sī Sofukan khan-hêng ê. Sofukan siat tī Tang-kiā<sup>n</sup> sī Jit-pún chhut-pán siōng chē Ài-lô bîn-chòk siong-koan ê chheh ê chhut-pán-siā. Thia<sup>n</sup> kóng hit-chūn Uchikawa Chihiro (2008 nī 8 goeh chhe 4 kòe-sin) ē tui Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ū chhū-bī sī in-ūi kap Sun Tâi-chhoan sèk-sāi. Ū chit-pái in-ūi tī Sun--ê ê tō-lám kap Tâi-oân gián-kiù-chiá Tè Kok-hui (2001 nī chia<sup>n</sup> goeh chhe 9 kòe-sin) chò-hóe khi Tâi-tang koân Pi-lâm hong pài-hóng Pinuyumayan ê pō-lók: Pinaski, Pinaski sī Sun Tâi-chhoan ê kò-hiong. Uchikawa tui Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák chiá<sup>n</sup> ū chhū-bī, in-ūi án-ne tō úi-thok kàm-ék “*Pi-chêng ê Soa<sup>n</sup>-tē*” ê pit-chiá khi keng chok-phín kap hoan-ék.

このことについてはすでに『図書新聞』（後掲）に書いたが、筆者が選んだ作品は6、7巻規模の選集になった。草風館はアイヌ文学の出版を手がけ、エスニックマイノリティの文学に深い理解を有しているはずだが、筆者の案には、その規模の大きさに驚いたようであった。「アイヌ文学では一冊もできないくらいなのに、台湾原住民文学はそんなに盛んなのか」（同注5）と。しかし、内川はそう言いながらも、「わかっ



た。それではやろう」ということになり、筆者の企画をほぼ容認する形で選集の翻訳がはじまった。

Koan-hē chit hāng tāi-chi lóng siá tī ē-kha ū kóng--tiòh ê “*Tosho Shinbun*”, m̄-koh pit-chiá kéng ê chok-phín ū 6, 7 koàn kui-bô ê soán-chip. Uchikawa ka-kī chò Sofukan Ainu bûn-hák ê chhut-pán, èng-tong tui chió-sò bîn-chók ê bûn-hák ū kai chhim ê lí-kái chiah tiòh, m̄-koh i soah hō pit-chiá kè-ōe ê kui-bô hiah tōa kia<sup>n</sup> chit-tiò. I kóng, “Ainu bûn-hák lián beh pian chit-phō to bô chài-tiâu, m̄-koh Tāi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák kám ah ū hoat-tō hiah-nī phong-phài.” (kap chù 5 kâng) Uchikawa sui-bóng chhui án-ne kóng, m̄-koh mā-sī chiàu pit-chiá khi-ōe--ê khai-sí hoan-ék soán-chip.

この機会に、当時の企画書を探し出してみると、最初は『祭典文学集』、『モーナノン・トパス・タナピマ集』、『ワリス・ノカン集』、『シャマン・ラポガン・リカラツ・アウー集』、『諸作家集』、『口承文芸・現代の言説集』の全6巻となっている。ここで最初にあがっている『祭典文学集』は孫大川のアイデアであったが、最終的にはこのアイデアは十分に活かされなかった。結局は、第1巻『モーナノン集／トパス・タナピマ集』、第2巻『リカラツ・アウー集／シャマン・ラポガン集』、第3巻『ワリス・ノカン集』、第4巻『十一民族作品集』、第5巻『神話・伝説・昔話集』の全5巻となった。

Pit-chiá chioh chit ê ki-hōe khi chhōe hit-chūn-á ê khi-ōe-su, siōng khi-thâu ê kè-ōe sī “*Chè-tián Bûn-hák Chip*”, “*Monaneng, Tuobasi Tamapima Chip*”, “*Walis Nokan Chip*”, “*Syaman Rapongan, Liglav A-wu Chip*”, “*Kok Chok-ka Chip*”, “*Kháu-sêng Bûn-gē, Hiān-tāi Ōe-gí Chip*” lóng-chóng 6 koàn. Chia siōng chá kóng tiòh ê “*Chè-tián Bûn-hák Chip*” sī Sun Tāi-chhoan ê siū<sup>n</sup>-hoat, m̄-koh lō-bóe bô cháp-chhng hoat-hui chit ê siū<sup>n</sup>-hoat. Bóe--á pi<sup>n</sup>-chò thâu koàn “*Monaneng Chip/Tuobasi Tamapima Chip*”, tē 2 koàn “*Liglave A-wa Chip / Syaman Rapongan Chip*”, tē 3 koàn “*Walis Nokan Chip*”, tē 4 koàn “*Cháp-it Bîn-chók Chok-phín Chip*”, tē 5 koàn “*Sîn-ōe, Thoân-soat, Kó-chá-kó Chip*” lóng-chóng 5 koàn.

全5巻の構想は、第1巻は、台湾原住民族権利促進運動を象徴する二人、詩人と小説家の作品を収める、第2巻は、台湾原住民文学は個人の作品集を編むことができるほどに力量ある文学世界であることを示すため



に、ワリス・ノカンの個人作品集とする（実際は、翻訳の遅れで第3巻と入れ替わった）、第3巻は女性作家と海を描く作家を組み合わせ、従来の台湾文学にはない個性豊かな作品集とする、第4巻は、台湾原住民文学は全島・全民族に広がった豊かな文学世界であること証明する作品集とする、第5巻は新しい現われた台湾原住民文学を理解するために、いにしえより伝わる豊かな神話伝説と口承文芸を集めた巻とする、というものであった。

Chit 5 koàn ê kò-sióng sī, thâu koàn siu siōng-teng Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chòk koân-lī chhiok-chìn ūn-tōng ê 2 ê si-jîn kap siáu-soat-ka ê chok-phín. Tē 2 koàn sī ūi-tiòh tián-hiân Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ū kàu-lát thang pian-siá kò-jîn ê chok-phín chip ê bûn-hák sè-kài, siu Walis Nokan kò-jîn ê chok-phín chip (sit-chè sī in-ūi hoan-ék khi chhiân--tiòh, ōa<sup>n</sup> khi tē 3 koàn). Tē 3 koàn sī lú-sèng chok-ka kap siá hái-iū<sup>n</sup> ê chok-ka in ê cho-háp, siu-liòk í-chá Tâi-oân bûn-hák m̄-bat khòa<sup>n</sup> kòe ū kò-jîn tèk-chit ê chok-phín chip. Tē 4 koàn sī ūi-tiòh beh chêng-bêng Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák kui Tâi-oân-tó lóng ū, kui-ê bîn-chòk phong-phài ê bûn-hák sè-kài ê chok-phín chip. Tē 5 koàn sī ūi-tiòh beh lí-kái sin chhut-hiân ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák, khi siu-liòk liū-thoân kàu ta<sup>n</sup> hong-hù ê sîn-ōe thoân-soat kap káu-thoân bûn-gē ê chok-phín chip.

このように構想された作品集は、書名は『台湾原住民文学選』と名付けられ、全5巻からスタートしたが、途中で10巻へと拡大し、最終的には全9巻で完結をみたのである。先述したように、2002年12月に第1巻の出版がはじまり、最後は、巻号前後するが、2009年4月に第7巻が刊行されて全9巻が完結した。6年4か月の時間が費やされたわけだが、準備段階から振り返ると、優に8年かかっている。

Chit phō hō-miâ chò “Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán” ê soan-chip, goân-pún ê kò-sióng sī chhut 5 koàn, tiong-tô liòng-tōa pian kah pì<sup>n</sup> 10 koàn, m̄-koh bók-á choân-pō sī 9 koàn. 2002 nî 12 goèh khai-sí chhut-pán thâu koàn, lō-bók tiâu-chéng chêng-āu ê sūn-sī, 2009 nî 4 goèh tē 7 koàn chhut-khan liáu, choân-pō 9 koàn chiah chhut soah. Lóng-chóng 6 tang 4 kò-goèh, m̄-koh nā ùi chún-pī kai-tōa<sup>n</sup> khai-sí sng lóng-chóng sī 8 tang ê sí-kan.

このように『悲情の山地』が出版されてのち、『台湾原住民文学

選』全卷刊行までに10年待たねばならなかった。この間、台湾原住民文学が、日本の学术界、文化界で次第に知られるようになっていった過程とその翻訳状況については、筆者はこれまでも報告してきた。

Ùi “*Pi-chêng ê Soa<sup>n</sup>-tē*” chhut-pán kàu “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” kui koàn chhut-khan lóng-chóng tán 10 tang. Chit tōa<sup>n</sup> kî-kan Jit-pún ê hák-sút kài, bûn-hòa kài tauh-tauh-á tùi Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ū jīn-bat, pit-chiá í-chá bat pò-kò kòe chit ê kòe-thêng kap hoan-ék ê chōng-hóng:

- (1) 「簇出する海と山の文学原住民族の魂の叫びにふれる」、『図書新聞』、2002年11月30日
- (1) Hái-san ê Bûn-hák Chhiok-tiòh/tōng Goân-chū-bîn-chòk Lêng-hùn ê Hán-hoah. *Tosho Shinbun*, 2002 nî 11 goèh 30.
- (2) 「台湾の心映す「原住民文学」 抑圧の歴史乗り越えた傑作、日本語で刊行」、『日本経済新聞』（文化欄）、2003年3月4日
- (2) Hoán-èng Tâi-oân sim ê Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák khek-hòk hông ut-tiâu ê lèk-sú ê kiát-chok ēng Jit-gí khan-hêng. *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, bûn-hòa nôa, 2003 nî 3 goèh chhe 4.
- (3) 「（口頭発表）日本における台湾原住民文学研究—翻訳・出版、研究論文、学会・シンポジウム—」、国立東華大学主催「台湾原住民族文学国際研讨会」（於花蓮市）、2005年9月2日
- (3) (Kháu-thâu pò-kò) Tī Jit-pún ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák gián-kiù: hoan-ék, chhut-pán, gián-kiù lūn-bûn, hák-hōe, gián-thó-hōe. Kok-lip Tang-hōa Tâi-hák chú-pān “Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chòk bûn-hák kok-chè gián-thó-hōe”. tī Hoa-lian chhī, 2005 nî 9 goèh chhe 2.
- (4) 「（口頭発表）山海的文学相逢—台湾原住民文学的日訳與研究」（於静宜大学）、2005年12月27日
- (4) (Kháu-thâu pò-kò) Soa<sup>n</sup> hái kap bûn-hák ê siong-hông: Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák hoan-ék chò Jit-bûn kap gián-kiù. Tī Chēng-gī Tâi-hák, 2005 nî 12 goèh 27.
- (5) 「日本における台湾原住民文学研究—翻訳・出版と書評を中心に—」、『中国文化研究』第22号、2006年3月

- (5) Tī Jit-pún ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák gián-kiù--hoan-ék, chhut-pán kap chheh-phêng ùi-chú, “*Tiong-kok Bûn-hòa Gián-kiù*” tē 22 hō, 2006 nî 3--goèh.
- (6) 「【解説】台湾原住民文学をめぐる原住民族知識人の言説」、『台湾原住民文学選8 原住民文化・文学言説集 I』、2006年11月
- (6) Kái-soeh Goân-chū-bîn tì-sek hūn-chú koan-hē Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê lūn-sút, “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán 8. Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hòa, Bûn-hák Lūn-sút Chip I*”, 2006 nî 11--goèh.
- (7) 「『台湾原住民文学選』（全九卷）完結に寄せて 世界少数先住民族文学のなかでも注目すべき作品の集成」、『図書新聞』第2939号、2009年10月31日
- (7) Kià hō “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” (choân 9 koàn) ê oân-kiat kai-tong siū-tiōh koan-chū ê sè-kài chió-sò sian-chū-bîn chók-kûn ê chok-phín lâi-té ê chhī-sêng. “*Tô-su Sin-bûn*” tē 2939 hō, 2009 nî 10goèh 31.
- (8) 「（口頭発表）従翻訳来看台湾原住民文学（翻訳で読む台湾原住民文学）」、第20回天理台湾学会（於国立台湾大学）、2010年9月10日
- (8) “(kháu-thâu pò-kò) Thàu-kòe hoan-ék khòa” Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák, tē 20 kái Tenri Tâi-oân Hák-hōe. Tī Kok-lip Tâi-oân Tâi-hák, 2010 nî 9 goèh chhe 10.
- (9) 「翻訳で読む台湾原住民文学」、『天理台湾学会年報』第20号、2011年7月
- (9) Thàu-kòe hoan-ék thak Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák, “*Tenri Tâi-oân Hák-hōe Nî-pò*” tē 20 hō, 2011 nî 7 goèh.

こうして改めて振り返ってみると、盛んな日台学術交流のなかで、台湾原住民文学は国際シンポジウムの開催や学会発表、さらに翻訳書の出版や書評による紹介などを通じて、着実に日本に伝えられてきたといえそうである。ただ、台湾原住民文学の研究者が、いまだ少数であるところに今後の課題が存在する。

Hoan-thâu khi khòa<sup>n</sup> leh sî-kiâ<sup>n</sup> ê Jit Tâi hák-sút kau-liû, Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák án-chóa<sup>n</sup> ùi pân kok-chè hák-sút gián-thó-hōe, hák-hōe hoat-piáu, siâu-kài

hoan-ék pún ê chhut-pán kap chheh-phêng siâu-kài chia--ê, chit pō chit kha-in tī Jit-pún thoân-sàng. Chóng-sī gián-kiù Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê lêng kàu ta<sup>n</sup> iáu sī chió-sò, che sī ài bīn-tùi ê bûn-tê.

ここで全9巻の書誌情報を掲げておきたい。

Chia siū<sup>n</sup> beh liát choân 9 koân ê chheh ê chu-sìn.

編者：下村作次郎、孫大川、土田滋、ワリス・ノカン

装丁者：菊地信義<sup>2</sup>

発行者：内川千裕

発行所：草風館

『台湾原住民文学選』全9巻の各巻の著者、訳者、解説者、発行年月は、次の通りである。

“Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák soán” choân 9 koân tàk koân ê chok-chiá, êk-chiá, kái-soeh-chiá, hoat-hêng ê nî goéh, chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha án-ne:

第1巻：『名前を返せ モーナノン集／トパス・タナピマ集』2002年12月  
下村作次郎編訳・解説

〔解説〕下村作次郎「台湾原住民文学とはなにか」

Tē 1 koân: “Hêng Góa ê Miâ Monaneng Chip” 2002 nî 12 goéh

Shimomura Sakujiro pian-ék, kái-soeh

“Kái-soeh” Shimomura Sakujiro: “Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Sī Sím-mih”

第2巻：『故郷に生きる リカラッ・アウー集／シャマン・ラポガン集』2003年3月

魚住悦子編訳・解説

〔解説〕魚住悦子「部落に生きる原住民作家たち」

2 日本の著名な装幀家。中上健次や古井由吉、俵万智、金原ひとみなど1万2000冊以上もの書籍の装幀をてがける。1984年、第22回藤村記念歷程賞受賞。1988年、第19回講談社出版文化賞ブックデザイン賞受賞。

Jit-pún chhut-miâ ê chong-cheng-ka. 中上健次, 古井由吉, 俵万智, 金原ひとみ chia ê chong-cheng chhiau-kòe 1 bān 2000 pún. 1984 nî tiòh-tiòh tē 22 kài 藤村 ki-liām lèk-têng siú<sup>n</sup>. 1988 nî tiòh tē 19 kài Káng-tâm-siá chhut-pán bûn-hòà siú<sup>n</sup> chheh ê siat-kè chióng.

- Tē 2 koàn: “*Kò-hiong ê Seng-oáh: Liglave A-wa/Syaman Rapongan Chip*” 2003 nî 3 goèh Uozumi Etsuko pian-ék, kái-soeh  
“Kái-soeh” Uozumi Etsuko: “Tī Pō-lòk Seng-oáh ê Goân-chū-bîn Chok-ka”
- 第3卷：『永遠の山地 ワリス・ノカン集』2003年11月  
中村ふじゑ、三宅清子、中古苑生、内山加代、新井リンドカおり、山本芳美編訳 小林岳二解説  
〔解説〕小林岳二「ワリス・ノカンが綴る近現代史」
- Tē 3 koàn: “*Éng-oán ê Soa<sup>n</sup>-tē: Walis Nokan Chip*” 2003 nî 11 goèh Nakamura Hujie, Miyake Kyoko, Chyuko Sonoó, Uchiyama Kayo, Arai Rindakaori, Yamamoto Yoshimi pian-ék Kobayashi Gakuji kái-soeh  
“Kái-soeh” Kobayashi Gakuji: “Walis Nokan Biáu-siá ê KĪn-hiān-tāi-sú”
- 第4卷：『海よ山よ 十一民族作品集』2004年3月  
柳本通彦、松本さち子、野島本泰、安場淳、山本由紀子、中村平編訳 柳本通彦解説  
〔解説〕柳本通彦「木霊する生命の歌」
- Tē 4 koàn: “*Soa<sup>n</sup> ah Hái ah: Cháp-it Bîn-chók Chok-phín Chip*” 2004 nî 3 goèh Yanagimoto Michihiko, Matsumoto Sachiko, Nojima Motoyasu, Yasuba Jun, Yamamoto Yukiko, Nakamura Taira pian-ék Yanagimoto Michihiko kái-soeh  
“Kái-soeh” Yanagimoto Michihiko: “Sè<sup>n</sup>-miā Chi Koa ê Hôe-hióng”
- 第5卷：『神々の物語 神話・伝説・昔話集』2006年8月  
紙村徹編・解説  
〔解説〕紙村徹「地層としての神話的世界」
- Tē 5 koàn: “*Sîn-sian ê Kò-sū: Sîn-ōe, Thoân-soat, Kó-chá-kó Chip*” 2006 nî 8 goèh Kamimura Tooru pian, kái-soeh  
“Kái-soeh” Kamimura Toor: “Tē-chân Hêng-sêng ê Sîn-ōe Sè-kài”
- 第6卷：『晴乞い祭り 散文・短編小説集』2008年6月  
下村作次郎編・解説  
〔解説〕下村作次郎「編者後記」
- Tē 6 koàn: “*KĪ-kiú Hó-thi<sup>n</sup> ê: Chè-tián: Sàn-bûn, Té-phi<sup>n</sup> Siáu-soat Chip*” 2008 nî 6 goèh



Shimomura Sakujiro pian, kái-soeh

“Kái-soeh” Shimomura Sakujiro: “Pian-chiá Āu-ki”

第7卷：『海人・獵人 シャマン・ラポガン集／アオヴィニ・カドウス  
ガヌ集』2009年4月

魚住悦子、下村作次郎編訳・解説

〔解説〕魚住悦子「シャマン・ラポガンと海に生きる人々」下村  
作次郎「アワ文化と狩猟生活—『野のユリの歌』礼賛」

Tē 7 koàn: “*Thó-hái lāng/Phah-láh lāng: Syaman Rapongan Chip / Auvini Kadresengan  
Chip*” 2009 nî 4--goèh

Uozumi Etsuko, Shimomura Sakujiro pian-èk, kái-soeh

“Kái-soeh” Uozumi Etsuko: “Syaman Rapongan kap Tī Hái-nih Seng-oáh  
ê Lāng”; Shimomura Sakujiro: “Awa Būn-hòa kap Phah-láh Seng-oáh--“*Iá-  
pek-háp ê Koa*” Lé-chàn”

第8卷：『原住民族文化・文学言説集Ⅰ』2006年11月

孫大川、浦忠成、ワリス・ノカン、リカラッ・アウー、董恕明  
著 下村作次郎、魚住悦子、山本由紀子、小林岳二訳

下村作次郎編・解説

〔解説〕下村作次郎

「台湾原住民文学をめぐる原住民族知識人の言説」

Tē 8 koàn: “*Goân-chū-bîn-chók: Būn-hòa, Būn-hák Lūn-sút Chip I*” 2006 nî 11 goèh

Sun Tāi-chhoan, Phó Tiong-sêng, Walis Nokan, Liglav A-wu, Táng Sù-bêng tū

Shimomura Sakujiro, Uozumi Etsuko, Yamamoto Yukiko, Kobayashi Gakuji èk

Shimomura Sakujiro pian, kái-soeh

“Kái-soeh” Shimomura Sakujiro: “Éng-hióng Tāi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Būn-  
hák ê Goân-chū-bîn tì-sek-hūn-chú ê giân-lūn”

第9卷：『原住民族文化・文学言説集Ⅱ』2007年6月

孫大川、楊渡、彭小妍、陳昭瑛、傅大為、杜國清、楊翠、魏貽  
君、彭瑞金、廖咸浩、王應棠、邱貴芬、陳雨嵐、李王癸著

下村作次郎、魚住悦子、橋本恭子、松本さち子、松尾直太、井  
手勇、山本由紀子、石丸雅邦、多田恵訳

下村作次郎編・解説

〔解説〕下村作次郎「『他者』は台湾原住民文学をいかに読むか」

Tē 9 koàn: “*Goân-chū-bîn-chók Bûn-hòa, Bûn-hák Lûn-sút Chip II*” 2007 nî 6 goèh  
Sun Tāi-chhoan, Iû<sup>n</sup> Tō, Phê<sup>n</sup> Sió-giân, Tân Chiau-eng, Pò Tāi-ûi, Tō Kok-  
chheng, Iû<sup>n</sup> Chhùi, Gūi Í-kun, Phê<sup>n</sup> Sūi-kim, Liâu Hâm-hō, Ông Èng-tông,  
Khu Kùì-hun, Tân Ú-lâm, Lí Jím-kúi tù, Shimomura Sakujiro, Uozumi  
Etsuko, Hashimoto Kyoko, Matsumoto Sachiko, Matsuo Naota, Ide Isamu,  
Yamamoto Yukiko, Ishimaru Gaho, Tada Kei èk  
Shimomura Sakujiro pian · kái-soeh

“Kái-soeh” Shimomura Sakujiro: “*Tē 3 chiá án-chóa*” kái-thòk Tāi-oân Goân-  
chū-bîn Bûn-hák”

以上の全9巻のうち、第1巻から第4巻および第6巻、第7巻には、  
小説・詩・散文などの作品が邦訳されているが、作者を列記す  
ると次の通りである。

Téng-koân 9 koàn ùi thâu koàn kàu tē 4, tē 6, tē 7 koàn lóng-sī hoan-ék chò Jit-bûn  
ê siáu-soat, si, sán-bûn chia--ê ê chok-phín, chok-chiá chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha liat--ê:

第1巻：モーナノン、トパス・タナピマ

第2巻：リカラツ・アウー、シャマン・ラポガン

第3巻：ワリス・ノカン

第4巻：孫大川、ワリス・ロカン、アタウ・バラフ、ロゲ・リヴオク、ユ  
パス・ナウキヒ、マサオ・アキ、アオヴィニ・カドリスガン<sup>3</sup>、ホ  
スルマン・ヴァヴァ、ブクン・イシマハサン・イシリトアン、  
サキヌ、バタイ<sup>4</sup>、リムイ・アキ、ヴァツク、ネコツ・ソクルマ  
ン、イティ・ダオス、パイツ・ムクナナ、シナン・シユムクン

<sup>3</sup> 第7巻で「野のユリの歌」を訳出したときには、土田滋先生のご教示を得て「アオ  
ヴィニ・カドウスガヌ」と表記した。

Teh hoan-ék tē 7 koàn ê “*Iá-pek-háp ê Koa*”, chhêng-kàu 土田滋sian-si<sup>n</sup> chiah iōng “Auvini  
Kadresengan” kì.

<sup>4</sup> 『タマラカウ物語』では、「パタイ」と表記されている。

Tamalakao ê kò-sū” lāi-té iōng “Pa Dai” lāi kì.

第6卷：ホスルマン・ヴァヴァ、陳英雄、バタイ、リムイ・アキ、林俊明、甘焯文、李永松、ネコツ・ソクルマン、パイツ・ムクナナ、孫大川、サキヌ、アビヨン、イティ・ダオス

第7卷：シャマン・ラポガン、アオヴィニ・カドゥスガヌ

取りあげた原住民族作家は、全部で27名に上る。日本における出版事情を考えると、世界のエスニックマイノリティ文学のなかでも『台湾原住民文学選』全9巻の刊行は決して小さな規模ではない。津島佑子は、まだ刊行の途上にあつた『台湾原住民文学選』の出版について、2005年10月16日付け『日本経済新聞』で「（半歩遅れの読書術）台湾の原住民文学—アイデンティティの力強さ—」と題するコラムを書き、そのなかでこのように述べている。

Lāi-té ū kóng tiòh ê Goân-chū-bîn chok-ka ū 27 ūi. Nā khó-lū Jit-pún chhut-pán ê chōng-hóng, choân sè-kài chió-sò bîn-chòk bûn-hák, “Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán” choân 9 koân ê chhut-pán kui-bô choát-tùi bê sè. Tsushima Yuko tī chhut-khan kî-kan, tī 2005 nî 10 goèh 16 ê “Nihon Keizai Shinbun” (Jit-pún Keng-chè Sin-bûn) ê choan-nôa ū siá 1 phi<sup>n</sup> “Bân Pò<sup>n</sup>-pō ê Thák-chheh sùt: Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák--kiông koh ū lát ê ì-sek hêng-thài”, lāi-té ū kóng--tiòh:

「それにしても台湾全体の現代文学ですら、じつはこの日本であまり読まれているとは思えないのに、そのなかで、原住民たちによる新しい文学だけを全五巻もの分量で翻訳出版しようというのだから、無茶というか、ふつうの資本主義の論理からは考えられない企画だったにちがいない。もう日本の出版界は儲け主義に走り最悪の状態だ、と日頃、嘆いてばかりいるのだが、こんな例を見ると、まだまだ日本の出版も捨てたものではないと考え直したりする。」

Sui-jiân tī Jit-pún hiân-chhú-sí liân Tâi-oân kui-ê hiân-tâi bûn-hák bô sa<sup>n</sup> lāng thák ê chōng-hóng chi-ha, goan-hē Goân-chū-bîn ê sin bûn-hák tō hoan-ék chhut-pán 5 koân ê hūn-liōng, kám ē siu<sup>n</sup> o-pèh lái? Ûi chu-pún chú-gí ê lí-lūn lái khòa<sup>n</sup>, chit-khoán ê khi-ōe àn bô-gí-gō sī bê khi khó-lū--ê. Tng góa leh kám-thàn Jit-pún ê chhut-pán kài í-keng kan-na thàn-chi<sup>n</sup> tē-it ê sí, siāng-sí-chūn khòa<sup>n</sup> tiòh chit ê lē, hō-góa tui Jit-pún ê chhut-pán iáu-bōe thiat-té chhìn-sim.

『台湾原住民文学選』は、引用文に言うように「全五巻」では終わらず、その後も継続して刊行され、2009年4月に全九巻で完結した。その際、筆者は『図書新聞』編集部よりインタビューを受け、「『台湾原住民文学選』（全九巻）完結に寄せて 世界少数先住民族文学のなかでも注目すべき作品の集成」（前掲）のタイトルで記事が掲載された。<sup>5</sup> こうして台湾原住民文学は着実に日本の文学界に進出していった。

“Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán” chhiū in-bûn kóng--ê “choân 5 koân” pēng bô kàu chia tō soah, liáu-āu mā koh kè-siok chhut-khan, kàu kah 2009 nî 4 goeh choân 9 koân chiah kiak-sok. Hit-chūn “*Tosho Shinbun*” khan-teng góa ê chhái-hóng, piau-tê: Siá-tī “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” (choân 9 koân) chhut-kan chin-chêng--l phō tī sè-kái chió-sò bîn-chók bûn-hák lín eng-kai siū-tiòh chù-bák ê chhut-pán-phi<sup>5</sup>. Chit tang-chūn Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák kha-pō í-keng chāi-ún kiá<sup>n</sup>-jip-khì Jit-pún ê bûn-hák kài.

### 3. 日本における台湾原住民文学

台湾原住民文学が日本でどのように受け入れられてきたかについては、『台湾原住民文学選』への反応・反響を中心にして、天理台湾学会の第20回国際学術記念大会で行った記念講演「翻訳で読む台湾原住民文学」（前掲）のなかで詳しく述べたことがある。

### 3. Tī Jit-pún ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák

Koan-hē Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák tī Jit-pún hông chiap-siū ê chêng-hêng, pit-chiá chù-bák tī “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” ê hoán-èng kap éng-hióng, tī Thian-lí Tâi-oân Hák-hōe tē 20 kài kok-chè hák-sút kì-liām tãi-hōe ê ián-káng: “Thàu-kòe Hoan-ék Thák Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák”, í-keng bat siông-sè soat-bêng ah.

<sup>5</sup> 『台湾原住民文学選』を中心とした台湾原住民文学関係の出版により、草風館と筆者は、2012年12月、台湾の行政院原住民族委員会の「一等原住民族專業賞」を受容した。

“*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” chò chú-iàu ê koan-hē Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák chhut-pán ê in-toa<sup>n</sup>, Chhó-hong-koán kap pit-chiá tī 2012 nî 12 goeh tiòh-tiòh Tâi-oân Hêng-chèng-ĩ<sup>n</sup> Goân-chū-bîn-chók úi-oân hōe pan-hoat ê “It-téng Goân-chū-bîn-chók choan-giap chióng”.



そのときの調査では、『悲情の山地』を含めて書評・コラムは23編を数えた。<sup>6</sup>この数字は筆者の管見するところ、決して少なくなく、台湾原住民文学はかなり高い関心を持って迎えられたと考えられる。執筆者の名前をあげると、澤井律之、武藤功、野田正彰、矢吹晋、村井紀、西倉一善、姜信子、柳本通彦、野林厚志、笠原政治、松永正義、王恵珍、西垣勤、小田実、津島佑子、佐藤浩司の人々である。よく見ると、この執筆陣にも大きな特色がある。評者は台湾文学研究者だけではなく、中国研究者や日本文学研究者、そして人類学者、ジャーナリスト、さらには著名な作家たちが大きな関心、好意的な関心を寄せていることである。著名な作家とは、野田正彰、姜信子、小田実、津島佑子である。中でも野田正彰は『京都新聞』、『信濃毎日』、『熊本日日新聞』に6編のコラムを書き、台湾原住民文学に最も早くから注目した作家である。また津島佑子は、近年、霧社事件を描いた『あまりに野蛮な』（講談社、2008年）を出版しており、台湾、とりわけ台湾原住民族への関心が深い。シャマン・ラポガンとの交流もあり、「黒い胸びれ」（魚住悦子訳、『台湾原住民文学選』2巻収）に魅せられて蘭嶼にシャマン・ラポガンを訪ねている。

Kun-kù hit-chūn-á ê tiāu-cha, pau-hâm “*Pi-chêng ê Soa<sup>n</sup>-tē*” chāi-lāi ê chheh-phêng, choan-nôa lóng-chóng ū 23 phi<sup>n</sup>.<sup>6</sup> Chiàu pit-chiá kā khòa<sup>n</sup> chit ê sò-jī sng bē chió ah, ē-tàng kóng Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák í-keng siū-tiòh ko-tō ê koan-chù. Nā kí chok-chiá ê miâ: Sawai Noriyuki, Muto Isao, Noda Masaaki, Yabuki Susumu, Murai Osamu, Nishikura Kazuyoshi, Kyo Nobuko, Yanagimoto Michihiko, Nobayashi Atsushi, Kasahara Masaharu, Matsunaga Masayoshi, Ông Hūi-tin, Nishigaki Tsutomu, Ota Makoto, Tsushima Yuko, Sato Koji chia--ê. Nā khòa<sup>n</sup> khah chin--ê, chiah ê chok-chiá ū chiá<sup>n</sup> tōa ê tèk-sek, tō-sī phêng-lūn-chiá m̄-nā ū gián-kiù Tâi-oân bûn-hák--ê,

<sup>6</sup> この23編の書評については、その論点を比較的詳しく分析したことがある。それについては、「日本における台湾原住民文学研究—翻訳・出版と書評を中心に—」、「『中国文化研究』第22号、2006年3月参照。

Koan-hē chit 23 phi<sup>n</sup> ê chheh-phêng, pit-chiá bat siông-sè pí-kàu hun-sek lāi-té ê lūn-tiám. Lô-hoân chham-khó “日本における台湾原住民文学研究—翻訳・出版と書評を中心に—”, “Tiong-kok Bûn-hòa Gián-kiù” tē 22 hō, 2006 nî 3 goéh.



gián-kiù Tiong-kok bûn-hák--ê, gián-kiù Jit-pún bûn-hák--ê, jîn-lūi-ka, mùi-thé kì-chiá, koh ũ chhut-miâ ê chok-ka lóng kā chiá<sup>n</sup> chē ê koan-chù kap hó-ì ê koan-sim Khng-tī Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák. Chhut-miâ ê chok-ka tō-sī Noda Masaaki, Kyo Nobuko, Ota Makoto, Tsushima Yuko. Kî-tiong Noda Masaaki tī “*Kyoto Shinbun*”, “*Shinano Shibun Mainichi*”, “*Kumamoto Hikaru Shinbun*” tō siá 6 phi<sup>n</sup> ê choân-nôa té-bûn, sī siōng chá chù-ì Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê chok-ka. Koh lâi tō-sī Tsushima Yuko, i chit kúi nî chhut-pán biô-siá Bū-siá sū-kiā<sup>n</sup> ê “*Siu<sup>n</sup>-kòe Iá-bân*” (Koodan shia, 2008 nî), tui Tâi-oân tèk-piát sī Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn chòk chiá<sup>n</sup> ũ chhù-bī. I mā kap Syman Rapongan ũ lâi-khì, hō “O ê Sit-á” (siu tī Uozumi Etsuko hoan-ék, “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” tē 2 koàn) siá<sup>n</sup>--khì, bat khi Lân-sū pài-hóng Syman Rapongan.

このように『台湾原住民文学選』は、多方面の分野の識者からの関心が集まり、一定の注目を浴びて一部からは高い評価を得たといえる。

とりわけ、シャマン・ラポガンの「黒い胸びれ」は、津島佑子と高樹のぶ子の関心をひいた。高樹のぶ子は九州大学特任教授として、アジアの作家10人を訪ねるプロジェクト「アジアに浸る (Soaked in Asia, SIA)」を主催したが、2007年3月には台湾の作家としてシャマン・ラポガンを取り上げている。シャマン・ラポガンはまた、2010年の9月23日から26日まで、東京で開催された国際ペンクラブ東京大会に、台湾の作家では初めて招待されている。

“*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” hōe-chip tàk-ê léng-hék ũ kiōng-sek ê lâng ê chù-bák, mā ũ kóa chiá<sup>n</sup> koân ê phêng-kè. Tèk-piát sī Syman Rapongan ê “O ê Sit-á”, hō Tsushima Yuko kap Takagi Nobuko chiá<sup>n</sup> ũ chhù-bī. Takagi Nobuko sī Kiú-chiu Tâi-hák tèk-jīm kàu-siū, bat pân kòe pài-hóng A-chiu 10 ê chok-ka ê kè-ōe “*Chìm-thàu A-chiu*” (Soaked in Asia, SIA), 2007 nî 3 goèh kéng Tâi-oân chok-ka Syman Rapongan <sup>7</sup>.

7 このときに取りあげられたシャマン・ラポガンの作品「神様の若い天使」「天使の父親」は、魚住悦子訳で2007年4月号の『新潮』に掲載されている。本編は、台湾原住民文学が日本の大手の文芸誌に掲載された初めての小説である。のちに高樹のぶ子編『天国の風 アジア短篇ベスト・コレクション』に収録されて出版されている。Chit-chūn kóng-tiōh Syman Rapongan ê chok-phín “神様の若い天使 (Siōng-tè ê Siàu-liân Thi<sup>n</sup>-sài)”, “天使の父親” (Thi<sup>n</sup>-sài ê Lâu-pē) sī Uozumi Etsuko hoan-ék--ê, khan tī 2007 nî 4 goèh hō ê “新潮” (*Sin-tiâu*). Chit phi<sup>n</sup> sī Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák thâu pái tī Jit-pún chú-liū bûn-gē cháp-chì téng-koân khan chhut-lâi ê siáu-soat. Liáu-âu, siu tiàm Takagi Nobuko pian ê “*Thian-kok ê hong: A-chiu té phi<sup>n</sup> cheng-soán-chip*” lâi chhut-pán.”

Syman Rapongan mā chiá<sup>n</sup>-chò thâu chit-ê hông iau-chhiá<sup>n</sup> chham-ka ùi 2010 nî 9 goèh 23 kàu 26, tī Tang-kiá<sup>n</sup> pān ê Kok-chè Pit-hōe Tang-kiá<sup>n</sup> Tâi-hōe ê Tâi-oân chok-ka.

#### 4. 台湾原住民文学史の執筆

台湾原住民族の現代創作（書写）文学は、すでに30年の歴史を有し、いわば「而立」した文学世界を確立しはじめている。それゆえ、台湾ではすでに二人の台湾原住民文学研究者によって台湾原住民文学史が書かれている

#### 4. Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hà'k-sú ê Siá-chok

Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chòk hiân-tâi chhòng-chok (su-siá) bûn-hà'k í-keng ũ 30 tang ê lèk-sú ah, mā khak-lip tī bûn-hà'k sè-kài ê tē-ūi. Só-ti Tâi-oân í-keng ũ 2 ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hà'k gián-kiù-chiá leh siá Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hà'k-sú.

最初に台湾原住民文学史を著したのは、2009年に里仁書局から出版された浦忠成『台湾原住民族文學史綱』である。上・下2巻で、1185頁もある大著である。本書の構成は、次のようになっている。

Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hà'k-sú siōng chá sī 2009 nî Lí-jîn chheh-kiòk chhut-pán ê Phó Tiong-sêng siá ê “Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chòk Bûn-hà'k sú-kong”, ũ téng, ē 2 koàn, lóng-chóng 1185 iáh ê tâi-chòk. Chit pún chheh ê ki-kut-á bók-liòk chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha án-ne:

上巻：序論「国家と原住民族文学史」／第一巻「口承文芸口時期」、第一講「混沌期の神話叙述」、第二講「洪水暴威の記憶」、第三講「家族部落の建設と文明の起源」、第四講「山川の名称と文学創造」、第五講「異人と世界」、第六講「部落戦争の物語」、第七講「伝奇的人物と物語」、第八講「動物植物と人類」、第九講「接触と探求の時代」

下巻：第二巻「文字を使い始めた原住民族」（新しい環境で思考と共生モデル／多様で賑やかな文学表現）、第十五講「原住民族文学の過去、現在、未来」（物語と文学に対する部落の認知／原住民族物語の調査研究／原住民作家文学の出版と研究／未来を見

つめて)

Siōng koàn: Sū-lūn “Kok-ka kap Goân-chū-bîn-chòk Bùn-hák-sú”/Tē 1 koàn “Kháu-thoân Bùn-hák Sî-kî”, tē 1 káng “Hūn-tūn Sî-kî ê Sîn-ōe Sū-sút”, tē 2 káng “Tōa-chúi jiông--kòe ê kî-tí”, tē 3 káng “Ka-chòk Pō-lòk ê Kiàn-lip kap Bùn-bêng Khí-goân”, tē 4 káng “San-chhoan miá-chheng kap Bùn-hák Sióng-siōng”, tē 5 káng “Kî-jîn kap Sè-kài”, tē 6 káng “Pō-lòk Chiàn-cheng ê Kò-sū”, tē 7 káng “Thoân-kí Jîn-bút kap Kò-sū”, tē 8 káng “Tōng-bút Sít-bút kap Lâng”, tē 9 káng “Chiap-chhiok kap chhiau-chhōe ê Sî-tāi”

Hā koàn: Tē 2 koàn “Sú-iōng Bùn-jī Liáu-āu ê Goân-chū-bîn-chòk Bùn-hák”, tē 15 káng “Goân-chū-bîn-chòk Bùn-hák ê Kòe-khì, Hiān-chāi kap Bī-lāi” (pō-lòk tui kò-sū kap bìn-hák ê jīn-ti/Goân-chū-bîn-chòk kò-sū ê tiâu-cha gián-kiù/Goân-chū-bîn chok-ka bìn-hák ê chhut-pán kap gián-kiù/khò<sup>a</sup> tiòh bī-lāi)

上記のように、浦忠成は『台湾原住民族文學史綱』上巻で「口承文芸時期」の台湾原住民族文学を、下巻で「文字使用後の原住民族文学」を扱い、無文字時代の口伝文学と、文字を使用するようになってからの書写文学を通史としてまとめあげる壮大な文学史となっている。『台湾原住民族文学選』の読者にとっては、上巻を読むうえで、『台湾原住民族文学選』の第5巻『神々の物語 神話・伝説・昔話集』が参考書となる。本書も、紙村徹によって次のように七部構成でテーマごとにわけられている。

Chhiū<sup>n</sup> téng-koân liat--ê, Phó Tiong-sêng ê “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chòk Bùn-hák-sú Kong*” ê téng-koân chhú-lí “kháu-thoân bìn-gē sî-kî” ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bìn-hák, ē hā-koân chhú-lí “Sú-iōng bìn-jī liáu-āu ê Goân-chū-bîn bìn-hák”, kā bô bìn-jī sî-tāi ê kháu-thoân bìn-hák kap iōng bìn-jī kî-lòk ê su-siá bìn-hák chhoân-liân, chéng-lí chiá<sup>n</sup>-chò khòng-khoah ê bìn-hák-sú. Tui “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bùn-hák Soán*” ê thòk-chiá lâi kóng, leh thak téng-koân ê sî, “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bùn-hák Soán*” tē 5 koàn ê “*Sîn-sian ê Kò-sū: Sîn-ōe, Thoân-soat, Kó-chá-kó Chip*” tō sī chham-khó chheh. Kamimura Tooru mā kā chit pún chheh ê chú-tê pun chò 7 ê pō-hūn:

第一部「創世記 人類・部族そして部落の始まり」／第二部

「創世記外伝」／第三部「異郷訪問譚」／第四部「異人・もののけ・妖怪」／第五部「英雄列伝」／第六部「頭目家列伝」／第七部「世話物」

Tē 1 phō “*Chhòng-sè-kì Jîn-lūi · Pō-chók kap Pō-lók ê Khí-goân*”/Tē 2 phō “*Chhòng-sè-kì Gōa-toān*”/Tē 3 phō “*Ī-hiong Hóng-m̄ng tâm*”/Tē 4 phō “*Kî-jîn, Mô-sîn-á, Iau-koài*”/Tē 5 phō “*Eng-hiông Liát-toān*”/Tē 6 phō “*Thâu-bak Liát-toān*”/Tē 7 phō “*Seng-oáh sū*”

また、『文學史綱』下巻を理解するには、『台湾原住民文学選』の1巻から7巻まで（5巻を除く）が大いに役立つ。さらに台湾原住民文学の誕生から「史」を形成するまでの発展の過程を知るには、台湾原住民族による理論構築のための構想とその苦闘の跡を知り、同時に他者である漢民族の台湾原住民文学観を理解する必要がある。そのための代表的な言説が、それぞれ8巻、9巻の『原住民族文化・文学言説集』（Ⅰ・Ⅱ）に収められている。

“*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” ùi thâu koàn kàu tē 7 koàn (tē 5 koàn liáh-gōa), tui-tī lí-kái “*Bûn-hák-sú Kong*” ē-koàn ê lâi-iông ũ chin-tōa ê pang-chān. Nā-sī beh chìn 1 pō chai-ia<sup>n</sup> Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ùi khí-khiàn kàu hêng-sêng “sú” ê hoat-tián kòe-têng, án-ne, tiòh ài khí liáu-kái Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chók só kiàn-kòe ê lí-lūn siū<sup>n</sup>-hoat kap in khùn-khó phah-pià<sup>n</sup> ê kha-jiah, siang-si mã ài chai-ia<sup>n</sup> tē 3 chiá Hàn-bîn-chók ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák-koan. Chia tãi-piáu-sêng ê lūn-sút siu tī tē 8 kap tē 9 koàn: “*Goân-chū-bîn-chók Bûn-hòe, Bûn-hák Lūn-sút Chíp*” (Ⅰ, Ⅱ).

ここで『台湾原住民族文學史綱』に取りあげられた文学関係者を列記してみると、次のように37名の名前があがっている。

Lán ká “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chók Bûn-hák-sú Kong*” lâi-té kóng--tiòh ê bûn-hák siong-koan jîn-sū liát tī chia, chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha chit 37 ê lâng.

バリワクス（陸森宝）、林瑞昌、高一生、黄貴潮、陳英雄、曾月娥（女作家）、胡德夫、イチャン・バルー、郭建平、黄修栄、イヴァン・ノカン、ユハニ・イスカカフ、莫那能、タイパン・ササラ、麗依京・尤瑪（女作家）、トパス・タナピマ、孫大川、ワリス・ノカン、シャマン・ラポガン、シャプン・奇伯愛雅、リカ



ラッ・アウー（女作家）、ユパス、アオヴィニ・カドウスガヌ、ホスルマン・ヴァヴァ、林志興、パタイ、リムイ・アキ（女作家）、マサオ・アキ、ブクン、アタウ・バラフ、パイツ・ムクナナ（女作家）、拉黒子・達立夫、サキヌ、ネコツ・ソクルマン、啓明・拉瓦、達德拉凡・伊苞（女作家）、トマス、イティ・ダオス

BaLiwakes (Liók Sim-pó), Lîm Sûi-chhiong, Ko It-seng, Ng Kùì-tiâu, Tân Eng-hiông, Chan Goát-ngô (lú chok-ka), Ô Tek-hu, Icyang Parod, Koeh Kiàn-pêng, Ng Siu-êng, Iban Nokan, Yuhani Isqaqavut, Monaneng, Sasala Taban, Lyiking Yuma (lú chok-ka), Tuobasi Tamapima, Sun Tâi-chhoan, Walis Nokan, Syaman Rapongan, Syapen Jipehngaya, Liglave A-wa (lú chok-ka), Yupas, Auvini Kadresengan, Husluma.Vava, Lîm Chì-heng, Ba Dai, Rimui Aki (lú chok-ka), Masao Aki, Bukun. Ismahasan.Islituan, Adaw Palaf, Paiz Makgnana (lú chok-ka), Rahic. Talif, Sakinu, Neqou Sokluman, 啓明・拉瓦, Dadelavan Ibau (lú chok-ka), 多馬斯, itih a toaS.

第二冊目は、董恕明執筆にかかる『山海之内天地之外——原住民漢語文學』で、国立台湾文学館から2013年8月に出版された。全部で六章からなっており、附録には詳細な「文學年表1951-2013」が収録されている。頁数は198頁で、そのうちこの文學年表が42頁を占めている。構成は次のようになっている。

Tē jī pún sī Táng Sù-bêng siá--ê “Soa<sup>n</sup>-hái Chi-lāi Thi<sup>n</sup>-tē Chi-gōa: Goân-chū-bîn Hàn-gí Bûn-hák”, Kok-lip Tâi-oân Bûn-hák koán 2013 nî 8 goèh chhut-pán. Chit pún chheh lóng-chóng 6 chiu<sup>n</sup>, “Hù-liók” siông-sè siu-liók “Bûn-hák Nî-pió 1951-2013”. Chóng iáh-sò 198 iáh. Bûn-hák nî-pió tō chiám 42 iáh. Kui pún chheh ê bók-liók phiau-tê chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha án-ne:

第一章「序言—萌芽期の新緑」（原住民に文学はあるだろうか／台湾原住民文学の定義／わたしたちは同じ家族ではない——社会現実の批判／わたしたちは同じ家族——文化と歴史の反省／小結：有るべきと無かるべきのあいだ）、第二章「原初の創造力——街頭から書齋へ」（番刀とペンを揮う文筆工作者／街頭に出て



民族の傷を掘りだす／書齋に帰って民族の魂を注ぎ込む／小結：掘り出し注ぎ込むことのあいだ)、第三章「地元で声をあげる——山地から海洋」(山と海のなかの人々／自然の生活——文化実践の場としての地方／歴史の切れ端—エスニックグループの正義の試金石としての地方／小結：介入する創作)、第四章「美しいママ・姉妹Vu-lai-vu-lai-yan——家事仕事から家の外に」(番刀の外／勇氣と忍耐の鍛錬——民族と個人の文化叙事／外功と内功の修養——美感と個人の自伝／小結：天地の内)、第五章「あなたがいた——山と海の内・天地の外」(星の灯——陳英雄『域外夢痕』後の原住民作家文学／文章の獵場——文化・社会と歴史の刀と矢／田園にて——生活、感情、想像の耕作・草刈／小結：百年の出会い、百年……)、第六章「細かな雨や塵のようにキラキラと刻まれる」

Tē 1 chiu<sup>n</sup> “Sū-giân: 初萌的新綠” (Goân-chū-bîn kám ũ bûn-hák/Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák it-poa<sup>n</sup> ê tēng-gī/Lán kám sī chit-ke-lâng: siā-hōe hiân-sit ê phoe-phò<sup>n</sup>/Lán chit-ke lóng sī lêng: bûn-hòa kap lèk-sú ê hoán-su/siò-kiat: tī ũ àh hó bô mā hó chi-kan), tē 2 chiu<sup>n</sup> “Goân-chhòng-lék: Ûi Ke-thâu kàu toh-thâu” (hoan-to kap pit chò-hóe giáh ê bûn-jī kang-chok-chiá/kiá<sup>n</sup> tī ke-thâu put-cháu bîn-chòk ê chhòng-siong/tng khi toh-thâu put jip lái bîn-chòk ê lêng-hûn / siò-kiat: chhut jip chi-kan), tē 3 chiu<sup>n</sup> “Chhài-tē hoat-siá<sup>n</sup>: Ûi Soa<sup>n</sup>-nâ kah Hái-iû<sup>n</sup>” (soa<sup>n</sup>-hai nih ê lêng/chū-jiân ê seng-oáh: tē-hng chiá<sup>n</sup>-chò bûn-hòa sit-chiân ê tiû<sup>n</sup>-sò/lèk-sú ê chhiat-phì<sup>n</sup>: tē-hng chiá<sup>n</sup>-chò chòk-kûn cheng-gī ê chhi-giām chiòh/siò-kiat: kài-jip ê su-siá), tē 4 chiu<sup>n</sup> “Súi ê Ma-ma kò-niû Vu-lai-vu-lai-yan: Ûi Chhâ Bí Iú Iâm Loh-kàu Thang-chêng” (hoan-to chi-gōa/phek-lék kap tòng-thâu ê toan-liân: bîn-chòk kap kò-jîn ê bûn-hòa sū-sū/gōa-kong kap lāi-kong ê siu-ûi: bí-kám kap kò-jîn ê sè<sup>n</sup>-miā su-siá/siò-kiat: thi<sup>n</sup>-tē chi-lāi), tē 5 chiu<sup>n</sup> “Goân-lái Ū Lí: Soa<sup>n</sup>-hái Chi-lāi Thi<sup>n</sup>-tē Chi-gōa” (Hóe-sái: ùi Tân Eng-hiông “域外夢痕” liáu-āu ê Goân-chū-bîn chok-ka bûn-hák/bûn-hòa lāh-tiû<sup>n</sup>: bûn-hòa, siā-hōe kap lèk-sú to-chi<sup>n</sup>/雜作chhân-hng: seng-oáh, kám-chêng kap 思想的耕耨/siò-kiat: siong-hông pah-nî, pah-nî...), tē 6 chiu<sup>n</sup> “Hō-sap

Bî-tîn Ná Chhi<sup>n</sup> Khai-háp”.

本書は1950年代以後今日まで発展してきた台湾原住民文学について、テーマごとに論述したもので、文学史の観点からみれば、通史を重視した台湾原住民文学史とは言い難い。しかし、先述したように詳細な文学年表が付されており、一定の文学史の役割を備えているといえよう。

Chit pún chheh thó-lūn ùi 1950 nî-tāi kàu ta<sup>n</sup> ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê hoat-tián, nā ùi bûn-hák-sú ê koan-tám lâi khòa<sup>n</sup>, chiá<sup>n</sup> pháí<sup>n</sup> kā tòng-chò sī chù-tiōng thong-sú ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák-sú. M̄-koh in-ūi ū hù chin chiâu ê bûn-hák nî-pió, só-ti mā-ū i it-tēng ê bûn-hák-sú ê kong-iōng.

本書で名前のががっている文学関係者は、次の通りざっと51名を数える。

Chit pún chheh ū kóng-tiōh kap bûn-hák siong-koan ê chok-ka ê miá-sè<sup>n</sup>, liōng-kí-iok kā sng ū 51 ūi.

陳英雄、トパス・タナピマ、モーナノン、バリワクス(陸森宝)、林瑞昌、高一生、曾月娥、郭建平、黄修荣、イヴァン・ノカン、尤哈尼・伊斯卡卡夫特、タイパン・ササラ、ワリス・ノカン、ホスルマン・ヴァヴァ、アオヴィニ・カドウスガヌ、ブクン・イシマハサン・イシリトアン、亞榮隆・サキヌ、ネコツ・ソクルマン、ジャマン・ラポガン、シャプン・奇伯愛亞、リカラツ・アウー、リムイ・アキ、パイツ・ムクナナ、達德拉凡・伊苞、孫大川、パウスヤ・ポイツォヌ(浦忠成)、胡徳夫、イチャン・バルー、林志興、パタイ、アタウ・バラフ、イティ・ダオス、ヴァツク、温奇、麗依京・尤瑪、黄貴潮、拉黑子・達立夫、日羿・吉宏、サリラン、啟明・拉瓦、讓阿淥・達人拉雅之、甘焯文、尤霸斯・撓給赫、マサオ・アキ、トマス、阿綺骨、悠蘭・多又、董恕明、明夏、李永松

Tân Eng-hiōng, Tuobasi Tamapima, Monaneng, BaLiwakes (Liók Sim-pó), Lîm Sūi-chhiōng, Ko It-seng, Chan Goát-ngô, Koeh Kiàn-pêng, Nḡ Siu-êng, Iban Nokan, Yuhani Isqaqavut, Sasala Taban, Walis Nakan, Husluman Vava, Auvini Kadresengan, Bukun. Ismahasan. Islituan, Sakinu, Neqou-Sokluman, Syaman Rapongan, Syapen

Jipehngaya, Liglave A-wa, Rimui Aki, Paiz Mukunana, Dadelavan Ibau, Sun Tāi-chhoan, Pasuya Poiconu (Phó Tiong-sêng), Ô Tek-hu, Icyang Parod, Lâm Chì-heng, Badai, Adaw Palaf, itih a taoS, 伐楚古, 溫奇, Lyiking Yuma, Ng Kùì-tiâu, Rahic. Talif, Kaji Cihung, Salizan, 啟明・拉瓦, Rangalu Taruljayaz, Kam Chiau-bùn, Yubas Naogih, Masao Aki, 多馬斯, Ah Chi Gu, Yulan Toyuw, Táng Sù-bêng, 明夏, Lí Éng-siông.

台湾で書かれた台湾原住民文学史は以上の二冊だが、日本ではまだ書かれていない。ただし、中島利郎・河原功・下村作次郎編『台湾近現代文学史』（研文出版、2014年）のなかで、全13章の1章として、魚住悦子によって「台湾原住民族文学の誕生—ペンをとった台湾原住民族」が書かれている。本稿のタイトルは文学史とは銘打たれていないが、その書き方は文学史の方法を踏襲している。そのことは構成によくあらわれている。

Tī Tâi-oân í-keng ū 2 pún ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák-sú, m̄-koh tī Jit-pún iáu-bōe ū. Put-jī-kò Nakajima Toshio, Kawahara Isao, Shimomura Sakujiro pian ê “Tâi-oân Kīn-hiân-tâi Bûn-hák-sú” (Gián-bûn chhut-pán, 2014) chit pún lâi-té, 13 chiu<sup>n</sup> ū 1 chiu<sup>n</sup> sī Uozumi Etsuko siá-ê “Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê chhut-si: giáh-pit ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chòk”. Chit chiu<sup>n</sup> ê phiau-tê sui-bóng bô choan-kang kóng sī bûn-hák-sú, m̄-koh siá-hoat iáu sī thng bûn-hák-sú ê chhiú-lō, ùi i ê ki-kut-á chin kán-tan tō khòa<sup>n</sup> ē chai.

該論は全八節からなる。第一節では、原住民族は元々文字をもたない民族であり、オランダ、清朝人、日本人は、他者としてどのように原住民族を描いたかについて書かれている。第二節は、新港文字や日本語といった文字を獲得しはじめた原住民族について述べている。第三節は、初めて文字で小説を書いたパイワン族の陳英雄について述べている。陳の『域外夢痕』は、原住民族文学の最初の小説集である。第四節は、一九八〇年代に起こった原住民族権利促進運動のなかで生まれた原住民族文学について論述している。八〇年代の作品のテーマは、権利促進運動のスローガンと密接な関係を有している。この時期の代表的な作品は、トパス・タナピマの小説集『最後の獵人』とモーナノンの詩

集『麗しの稲穂』等である。第五節は、一九九〇年代の部落回帰運動のなかで生まれた原住民文学について論述している。この時期には、ワリス・ノカン、リカラッ・アウー、シャマン・ラポガン、アオヴィニ・カドゥスガヌなど、多くの原住民族作家が輩出した。第六節は、二〇〇〇年代の原住民族文学について書かれている。この時期の最大の特徴は、長編小説の誕生である。例えば、シャマン・ラポガン『黒い胸びれ』、ホスルマン・ヴァヴァ『玉山魂』、ネコツ・ソクルマン『東谷沙飛傳奇』、パタイ『笛観』『斯卡羅人』『馬鐵路』等が生まれた。第七節は、特にパタイが書いた歴史小説を取りあげて論じている。第八節は、女性作家のリムイ・アキが書いた長編小説について論述している。

Chit phi<sup>n</sup> lūn-būn lóng-chóng ū 8 chat, thâu chit chat kóng Goân-chū-bîn pún-té sī bô bûn-jī ê bîn-chòk, mā kóng tiòh Hô-lan lāng, Chheng kok lāng, Jit-pún lāng téng chiaê tē 3 chia án-chóa<sup>n</sup> khòa<sup>n</sup> goân-chū-bîn-ckók. Tē 2 chat sī kóng tiòh tú chiap-chhiok Sin-káng bûn-jī kap Jit-bûn ê Goân-chū-bîn-chòk. Tē 3 chat siá thâu pái iōng Tiong-bûn siá siáu-soat ê Payuan chòk ê Tân Eng-hiông. I siá ê “域外夢痕” sī Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák thâu pún ê siáu-soat chip. Tē 4 chat sī siá 1980 nî-tāi khai-sí ùi Goân-chū-bîn-chòk koân-lī chhiok-chìn ūn-tōng lāi-té se<sup>n</sup>--chhut-lāi ê Goân-chū-bîn-chòk bûn-hák. 80 nî-tāi chok-phín ê tê-bòk kap koân-lī chhiok-chìn ūn-tōng ê kháu-hō ū chia<sup>n</sup> bā ê koan-hē. Hit tang-chūn tāi-piáu ê chok-phín sī Tuobasi Tamapima ê siáu-soat chip “Chòe-āu ê Láh-jîn” kap Monaneng ê si-chip “Bí-lē ê Tiū-sūi”. Tē 5 chat lūn-sút 1990 nî-tāi tng-khì pō-lòk ūn-tōng sí-kí sán-seng ê Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák. Chit tang-chūn ū chin chē chok-ka, chhiū<sup>n</sup> Walis Nokan, Liglave A-wu, Syman Rapongan, Auvini Kadresengan téng. Tē 6 chat kóng 2000 nî-tāi ê Goân-chū-bîn-chòk bûn-hák. Chit-ê nî-tāi siōng tōa ê tèk-sek tō-sī tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat sán-chhut ê tai-chì. Chhiū<sup>n</sup> Syman Rapongan “O ê Sít-á”, Husluman Vava “Giòk-san Hûn”, Neqou-Sokluman ê “Tongku Saveq Thoân-kí”, Ba Dai ê “Deiguwan”, “Seqalu lāng”, “Bé Thih-lō” chia--ê. Tē 7 chat tèk-piát kóng Ba Dai siá--ê chia ê lèk-sú siáu-soat koh kā lūn-sút. Tē 8 chat siá lú-sèng chok-ka Rimui Aki siá ê tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat.

以上、該稿の構成は、他者による原住民族像の変遷と創作（書写）文学として誕生した台湾原住民文学の発展を、一九七〇年代、一九八〇年代、一九九〇年代、二〇〇〇年代に時期区分して、その発展の過程と



時期的な特色について概括している。言い換えれば、該稿は台湾原住民文学について、無文字時代における描かれた原住民族像を視野に入れ、誕生から発展そして将来の展望までを史的に考察した論考であり、日本における最初の台湾原住民文学史を構想した論考と位置づけることができよう。<sup>8</sup>

Téng-koân kóng--ê chit phi<sup>n</sup> bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup> ê ki-kut sī kā tha-chiá kun-kù Goân-chū-bîn-chòk ê piàn-chhian kap chhòng-chok (su-siá) bûn-hák se<sup>n</sup>--chhut-lâi ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê hoat-tián pun-chò 1970 nî-tâi, 1980 nî-tâi, 1990 nî-tâi, 2000 nî-tâi, chiàu múi chit-ê sî-kî ê hoat-tián kòe-téng kap tèk-sek chòe tâi-khài ê siâu-kài. Ōa<sup>n</sup> òe kóng, chit phi<sup>n</sup> bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup> tùi tī Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ū kā chiau-tiám khng-tī bô bûn-jī sî-tâi ê Goân-chū-bîn chòk tô-siōng, mā ùi bûn-jī bûn-hák tàn-seng kah í-âu ê tián-bōng só hêng-sêng ê sú-koan lâi thàm-thó. Ê-tàng kā téng-ūi chò tī Jit-pún siōng chá siū<sup>n</sup>-tiòh Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák-sú ê lūn-bûn.<sup>8</sup>

該稿では、台湾原住民族を描いた他者および台湾原住民族作家として、次のような人々を取りあげている。

Ē-kha sī chit phi<sup>n</sup> bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup> ū kóng--tiòh siá Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chòk ê tha-chiá kap Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn ê chok-ka.

欧米人：コイエット（Coyet Fredrik）、キャンベル（William Campbell）、マッケイ（George Mackay）

清朝人：郁永河、黄叔璥、胡傳

日本人：益田太郎冠者、佐藤春夫、大鹿卓、中村地平、坂口子、真杉静枝、野上弥生子、山部歌津子、中村地平、西村望、津島佑子

漢民族：頼和、龍瑛宗、張深切、鍾理和、鍾肇政、胡台麗、吳錦発、鄧相揚、舞鶴、姚嘉元（日本統治時代以降、現在まで）

原住民：林瑞昌（ロシン・ワタン、日野三郎）、花岡一郎（ダックス・ノビン）、高一生（ウォグ・ヤタウユガナ、矢多一生）、陸森宝（バリワクス）、ピホ・ワリス（高山清、高永清）、リヴォ

8 筆者はかつて「台湾原住民族文学史の初歩的構想」、『天理台湾学会年報』第13号2004年7月を発売したことがあるが、この構想はいまだ実現には至っていない。

Pit-chiá bat hoat-piáu“台湾原住民族文学史の初歩的構想”，“天理台湾学会年報” tē 13 hō, 2004 nī 7 goèh, m̄-koh kàu ta<sup>n</sup> chit ê siū<sup>n</sup>-hoat iáu-bōe sít-hiān.



ク、カテ・ラタ（杜寅吉）、マヤウ・カテ（杜仁智）、陳英雄（コワン・タラル）、モーナノン、トパス・タナピマ、胡徳夫、孫大川、ワリス・ノカン、リカラッ・アウー、シャマン・ラポガン、アオヴィニ・カドウスガヌ、パスヤ・ポイツォヌ（浦忠成）、サキヌ、ホスルマン・ヴァヴァ、ネコッ・ソクルマン、リムイ・アキ、パタイ

Au Bí lǎng: Koieeto (Coyet Fredrik), Kyanberu (William Campbell), Makkei (George Mackay)

Chheng-tiâu lǎng: Hiok Éng-hô, Ng Siok-kèng, Ô Thoân

Jit-pún lǎng: Masuda Tarokajya, Sato Haruo, Ooshika Taku, Nakamura Chihei, Sakaguchi Shigeru, Masugi Shizue, Nogami Yaeko, Yamabe Katsuko, Nakamura Chihei, Nishimura Bo, Tsushima Yuko

Hàn bîn-chhòk: Lôa Hô, Liông Eng-chong, Tiu<sup>n</sup> Chhim-chhiat, Chiong Lí-hô, Chiong Tiâu-chèng, Ô Tâi-lē, Ngô Gím-hoat, Tēng Siong-iông, Bú-hóh, Iâu Ka-goân (Jit-pún thóng-tī liáu kàu chit-má ùi-chí)

Goân-chū-bîn: Lím Sūi-chhiong (Roshin Watan, Hino Saburo), Hanaoka Ichir (ダツキス・ノビン), Ko It-seng (Uyongu yatauyungana ウォグ・ヤタウユガナ, 矢多一生), Liòk Sim-pó (Bariwakusu), Piho Waeisu (Ko San-chheng, Ko Éng-chheng), リヴォク, カテ・ラタ (Tō Ín-kiat), Mayau Kate (Tō Jín-ti), Tân Eng-hiông (Kowan Tararu), Monaneng, Tuobasi Tamapima, Ô Tek-hu, Sun Tâi-chhoan, Walis Nokan, Liglav A-Wu, Syaman Rapongan, Auvini Kadresengan, パスヤ・ポイツォヌ (Phó Tiong-sêng), サキヌ, Husluman Vava, ネコッ・ソクルマン, Rimui Aki, Ba Dai.

以上、三点の文献により、台湾原住民文学には、過去30年のあいだにどのような作家が生まれてきたのか、その全体像を窺うことができる。

Chioh koân-téng 3 khoán bûn-hiàn, ē-tàng khòa<sup>n</sup>-tiòh kòe-khi 30 tang lâi-té Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák bat chhut-hiân kòe siá<sup>n</sup>-khoán ê chok-ka.

## 5. 『台湾原住民文学選』以降の翻訳と書評

### 5. “Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán” liáu-āu ê Hoan- èk kap Chheh-phêng

台湾原住民文学の長編小説は、シャマン・ラポガンが1999年4月に『黒色的翅膀』（晨星出版）を發表したのが最初で、続いてアオヴィニ・カドゥスガヌが2001年12月に『野百花之歌』（晨星出版）を上梓した。

Siōng chá ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat sī Syman Rapongan 1999 nî 4 goèh hoat-piáu ê “*O ê Sit-á*” (Sîn-chhi<sup>n</sup> chhut-pán), sòa--lòh sī Auvini Kadresengan 2001 nî 12 goèh chhut-pán ê “*Iá-pek-háp ê Koa*” (Sîn-chhi<sup>n</sup> chhut-pán).

その後、2000年代の後半に入ると、次々と長編小説が書かれていった。2006年12月にホルスマン・ヴァヴァが『玉山魂』（印刻出版）を出し、2007年8月にパタイが『笛鶴 大巴六九部落之大正年間』（麥田出版）を書いた。パタイは、これ以降次々と長編小説を量産するようになり、2009年8月に『斯卡羅人』（耶魯文化）、2010年6月に『走過 一個台籍原住民老兵的故事』（印刻出版）、2012年8月に『馬鐵路：大巴六九部落之大正年間（下）』（耶魯文化）、2014年6月に『巫旅』（印刻）、2012年7月に『白鹿之愛』（印刻）、2015年8月に『最後的女王』（印刻）と、最初の長編小説発表以来この8年間で、7冊の長編小説を世に問うており、いま最も注目される原住民族作家の一人である。

Kàu kah 2000 nî-tâi bôe-pò<sup>n</sup> kî, tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat liók-siòk chhut-pán. 2006 nî 12 goèh, Husluman Vava chhut-pán “*Giòk-san hùn*” (Ìn-khek chhut-pán), 2007 nî 8 goèh Ba Dai siá “*Deiguwan: Damalagaw Pō-lók ê Tâi-chèng Nî-kan*” (Bèh-tiân chhut-pán). Ba Dai chū-án-ne sòa-chiap it-tít chhòng-chok tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat, 2009 nî 8 goèh ê “*Seqalu lāng*” (Yale bûn-hòa), 2010 nî 6 goèh ê “*Kiā<sup>n</sup>-kòe: chit ê Tâi-chek Lāu-peng ê Kò-sū*” (Ìn-khek chhut-pán), 2012 nî 8 goèh ê “*Bé Thih Lō: Damalagaw Pō-lók ê Tâi-chèng Nî-*

*kan (hā)*” (Yale bûn-hòa), 2014 nî 6 goèh ê “巫旅” (Ìn-khek chhut-pán), 2012 nî 7 goèh ê “*Péh Lók chi Ài*” (Ìn-khek chhut-pán), 2015 nî 8 goèh ê “*Chòe-āu ê Lú-ông*” (Ìn-khek chhut-pán), ùi siōng chá ê tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat hoat-piáu liáu 8 tang ê si-kan, i lóng-chóng hoat-piáu 7 pún tng-phi<sup>n</sup> ê siáu-soat, sī chit-chūn siōng hông chù-bák ê Goân-chū-bîn chok-ka lâi-té ê chit-ê.

その他、2008年1月にネコツ・ソクルマンが『東谷沙飛傳奇』（印刻出版）を出し、2010年10月にリムイ・アキが『山桜花的故郷』（麥田出版）を出版している。

2008 nî chia<sup>n</sup>--goèh Neqou-Sokluman 台湾話文壇 “*Tongku Saveq Thoân-kī*” (Ìn-khek chhut-pán), 2010 nî 10--goèh Rimui chhut-pán “*Soa<sup>n</sup> Eng-hoe ê Kòr-hiong*” (Bèh-tiân chhut-pán).

もう一人パタイと競うようにして、次々と作品を発表しているのがシャマン・ラポガンである。シャマンは2012年8月に二冊目の長編小説『天空的眼睛』（聯経）を発表した。さらに2014年9月には大長編小説『大海浮夢』（聯経）を上梓、そして2015年8月には『安洛米恩之死』（印刻）を出版している。これらの長編小説の他、シャマン・ラポガンは小説・散文集では『冷海情深』（聯合文学、1997年5月）、『海浪的記憶』（聯合文学、2002年7月）、『航海家的臉』（印刻、2007年7月）、『老海人』（印刻出版、2009年8月）を出版している。

Koh ū chit-ê ká-ná sī teh kap Ba Dai sio piá<sup>n</sup> ê Syman Rapongan, chok-phín sio-liân-sòa hoat-piáu. I tī 2012 nî 8 goèh hoat-piáu tē 2 pún tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat “*Thi<sup>n</sup>-téng ê Bák-chiu*” (Liân-keng chhut-pán). Tī 2014 nî 9 goèh chhut-pán tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat “*Tōa-hái Phû-bāng*” (Liân-keng chhut-pán), koh tī 2015 nî 8 goèh chhut-pán “*Omalumirem ê Sī*” (Ìn-khek chhut-pán). Khioh-khí chia ê tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat liáh-gōa, Syman Rapongan mā bat chhut kòe siáu-soat, sà-n bûn chip “*Léng-hái Chêng chhim*” (Liân-háp bûn-hák, 1997 nî 5 goèh), “*Hái-lōng ê Kì-ek*” (Liân-háp bûn-hák, 2002 nî 7 goèh), “*Hāng-hái ka ê Bīn*” (Ìn-khek chhut-pán, 2007 nî 7 goèh), “*Lāu Thó-hái lāng*” (Ìn-khek chhut-pán, 2009 nî 8 goèh).

以上のように、台湾原住民文学は詩、散文、ルポルタージュ、短編小説、中編小説、そして長編小説と文学の各ジャンルにわたって多様な

作品を発表するようになった。まさに現代創作（書写）文学として、すでに30年の文学史を形成しているのである。

Tō chhiū<sup>n</sup> téng-koân kóng--ê, Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák sī pau-hâm tiòh si, sà-n-bûn, pò-tō bûn-hák, té-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat, tiong-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat, tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat téng kok chióng ê bûn-hák chhòng-chok. Chìn 1 pō hoat-tián kàu bók-chiân ê hiân-tâi chhòng-chok (su-siá) bûn-hák, thang kóng í-keng ū 1 ê oân-chéng ê 30 tang ê bûn-hák-sú.

次に『台湾原住民文学選』以降の翻訳について述べてみよう。小説は次の4冊が邦訳されている。

Sòa-chiap lâi kóng “Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán” chhut-pán í-āu ê hoan-ék chok-phín, ū ē-kha 4 pún hoan-ék chò Jit-bûn ê siáu-soat.

パタイ著、魚住悦子訳『タマラカウ物語（上）女巫ディーグワン』草風館、2012年12月

パタイ著、魚住悦子訳『タマラカウ物語（下）戦士マテル』草風館、2012年12月

シャマン・ラポガン著、魚住悦子訳『冷海深情』草風館、2014年12月

シャマン・ラポガン著、下村作次郎訳『空の目』草風館、2014年12月

Ba Dai tù, Uozumi Etsuko êk “Tamarakau ê Kò-sū (siōng) Lú-hoat-su Deiguwan”, Sofukan, 2012 nî 12--goèh.

Ba Dai tù, Uozumi Etsuko êk “Tamarakau ê Kò-sū (hā) Chiàn-sū Materu”, Sofukan, 2012 nî 12--goèh.

Syaman Rapongan tù, Uozumi Etsuko êk “Léng-hái Chhim-chêng”, Sofukan, 2014 nî 12 goèh.

Syaman Rapongan tù, Shimomura Sakujiro êk “Thi<sup>n</sup>-téng ê bák-chiu”, Sofukan, 2014 nî 12 goèh.

前述したようにパタイは、いま最も旺盛な創作活動を行うプユマ族の作家であるが、処女作は2000年11月号の『聯合文学』に発表した短編小説「サーチンのヤギの角」である。いま『台湾原住民文学選』の第6巻に松本さち子訳で収められている。その他、同じく松本訳で「ジンジャーロード」（第4巻）、「山地眷村」、「ビリンのキマメ畑」、「母の粟



畑」(第6巻)が訳されている。これらはいずれも短編小説であったが、今回はじめて本格的なパタイの長編小説が、上・下2巻本で邦訳されたのである。

Ba Dai sī hiān-chhú-sī chhòng-chok-lèk siōng ōng ê Pinuyumayan ê chok-ka, tē 1 phi<sup>n</sup> chhòng-chok sī 2000 nī 11 goèh hoat-piáu tī “*Liân-háp Bùn-hák*” ê siáu-soat “Sachin ê Iū<sup>n</sup>-á Kak”, chit-má siu tī Matsumoto Sachiko hoan-ék ê “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bùn-hák Soán*” tē 6 koàn. Kāng-khoán sī Matsumoto hoan-ék ê ū “ジンジャーロード” (Kiu<sup>n</sup> Lō) (tē 4 koàn), “Soa<sup>n</sup>-tē Koàn-chhoan, “Birin ê chhiū-tāu-í”, “A-bú ê Tai-á-bí Chhân” (tē 6 koàn). Chia lóng-sī té-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat. Che sī thâu pái cheng-sek kā Ba Dai ê siōng, hā 2 koàn pán-pún ê tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat hoan-ék chò Jit-bùn--ê.

『タマラカウ物語』の下巻には、訳者の解説「二一世紀の台湾原住民文学を切り開く歴史作家パタイ」が収録されている。それによると、上巻の原書はパタイの最初の長編小説で、2007年8月に上梓された『笛鶴』である。そして、下巻の原書は、2012年8月に刊行された『馬鐵路』で、いずれも「大巴六九部落之大正年間」という副題がついている。解説にあるように、「この物語は、プユマ族の小さな部落のタマラカウ（大巴六九）の大正（一九一六）年六月から、同八（一九一九）年八月までを描いている」。

“*Tamarakau ê Kò-sū*” hā koàn lâi-té ū siu êk-chiá ê kái-soeh “Phah-khui 21 sè-kí Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bùn-hák ê Lèk-sú Chok-ka Ba Dai”. Kun-kù lâi-té kóng--ê, téng koàn ê goân-tù sī Ba Dai siōng chá tī 2007 nī 8 goèh chhut-pán ê tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat “*Deiguwan*”, hā koàn ê goân-tù sī 2012 nī 8 goèh chhut-pán ê “*Bé Thih-lō*”, lóng ū phiau “Tâi-chèng nī-kan ê Tamalakau pō-lók” ê hù phiau-tê. Chhiū<sup>n</sup> kái-soeh kóng--ê, “Chit ê kò-sū sī biô-siá Pinuyumayan ê sió pō-lók Tamalakau, ùi Tâi-chèng (1916) nī 6 goèh kàu Tâi-chèng (1919) nī 8 goèh ùi-chí.”

魚住悦子によると、パタイが書いた長編小説はいずれも歴史小説だという。それゆえパタイは解説のテーマにみるように、「歴史作家」と位置づけられている。そして、パタイが歴史作家となった動機を、次のように述べている。「パタイは、部落の老人たちから話を聞くうちに、日本側が残した記録『理蕃誌稿』と部落に伝わる口述歴史が異なってい

ることに関心を覚え、部落の側から見た歴史、すなわち「野史」を書こうと思い立ったのだと述べている」<sup>9</sup>と。そして、「『タマラカウ物語』は、『理蕃誌稿』に記録された事件と部落に伝わる歴史を軸にして展開していく。プユマ族の社会や文化が詳細に描かれており、巫術と戦闘の描写が大きな特色である」という。

Kun-kù Uozumi Etsuko ê kóng-hoat, Ba Dai siá ê tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat lóng-sī lèk-sú siáu-soat, só-tì, Uozumi tī “Kái-soeh” ê phiau-tê tō kā Ba Dai tēng-ūi chò lèk-sú chok-ka. Ē kā Ba Dai tòng-chò lèk-sú chok-ka ê tōng-ki, chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha só kóng--ê: Ba Dai i ka-tī kóng tī leh chhái-hóng pō-lòk ê lâu-pòe ê sí, tui tī pō-lòk ê kháu-thoân ê lèk-sú kah Jit-pún chit-pêng lâu--lòh-lái ê kì-liòk “*Lí Hoan Chì-kó*” bô-kâng, chit tiám hō i ū chhū-bī, soah siu<sup>n</sup> beh ùi chéng-lí l pō pō-lòk chit-pêng ê koan-tiám ê “iá-sú”<sup>9</sup>. “*Tamarakau ê Kò-sū*” sī iōng “*Lí Hoan Chì-kó*” kì-liòk ê sū-kiá<sup>n</sup> kap pō-lòk thoân-kóng ê lèk-sú chò chú-iàu lái siá ê chok-phín, kā Pinuyumayan ê siā-hōe kap bûn-hòa siá kah chin chiâu-ûn, kī-tiong bû-sút kap sio-chiàn ê biô-siá sī i siōng tōa ê ték-sek.

『タマラカウ物語』への書評は、人類学者の笠原政治によって書かれ、『台湾原住民研究』第17号（2013年11月）に掲載されている。書評は、次のような文章ではじまる。

Tī “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Gián-kiù*” tē 17 hō (2013 nî 11 goèh) ū khan jîn-lūi hák-chiá Kasahara Masaharu siá--ê “*Tamarakau ê Kò-sū*” ê chheh-phêng. Chheh-phêng chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha chhím-thâu siá kóng:

「台湾原住民作家の詩や小説が日本で翻訳され紹介され始めた頃から、大きな期待を込めてずっと待ち続けてきたことがある。日本統治時代の原住民とその部落（村落）を描いた本格的な歴史小説がいつ現れ、その翻訳がいつ日本で出版されるのかである。評者は主として人類学的な関心からそのような小説の出現を待ち望んできたのであるが、予想したのはそれだけではない。台湾原住民文学が一段と成熟し、より広い読者層を獲得していく上で、作

<sup>9</sup> 『台湾近現代文学史』（本文前掲）、450頁参照。

Chham-khó “台湾近現代文学史” (*Tâi-oân Kīn-hiân-tâi Bûn-hák-sú*) (pún-bûn thâu-chêng siá ê) 450 iáh.

家自身の直接的経験とは隔たった時代に作品の舞台を求めるのは欠かせない方向性の一つであり、とりわけ現代作家たちの父母、祖父母、さらには曾祖父母の世代が生きた日本統治時代をどのように描くのかという問題は必ずや文学上の重要なテーマとして浮上してくるにちがいない、と考えたのである。」

Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn chok-ka ê si kap siáu-soat chū khai-sí hông hoan-èk chòe Jit-gí tō siū-tiòh chiá<sup>n</sup> tōa ê kî-thāi. Kî-thāi ē-tàng khòa<sup>n</sup>-tiòh chin-sit biô-siá Jit-pún thóng-tī sî-tāi ê Goân-chū-bîn kap in ê pō-lók ê lèk-sú siáu-soat, mā koan-sim tang-sî chit ê êk-pún tī Jit-pún chhut-pán? Phêng-chiá chú-iàu sī ùi jîn-lūi-hák ê chiau-tiám, kî-thāi án-ne ê lèk-sú siáu-soat chhut-hiân. M̄-koh tng Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák koh khah sêng-sèk, ū khah chē ê thòk-chiá ê sî, kah chok-ka ka-kī tit-chiap ê thé-giām ū keh-hek ê sî-tāi iā-tō-sī chok-ka in ê pē-bó, a-kong a-má, sīm-chì sī a-chó sè-tāi seng-oáh ê Jit-pún thóng-tī sî-tāi, beh án-chóa<sup>n</sup> biô-siá it-tēng ê chiá<sup>n</sup>-chò bûn-hák-ték tiōng-iàu ê bûn-tê.

魚住も指摘しているように、台湾原住民文学の歴史小説は『タマラカウ物語』にはじまる。かつてアオヴィニ・カドゥスガヌが、長編小説『野のユリの歌』で、1918年に生れ1968年に亡くなった、父親ツムルサイ・カドゥスガヌをモデルにルカイ族の獵人の一生を描いた。しかし、本編は「ルカイ族の生命礼賛小説」と銘打たれた小説で、時代背景を忠実に描く歴史小説ではなかった。その後、アオヴィニは大正年間を時代背景とした歴史小説に取り組んでいると聞いているがいまだ実現していない。その意味でも、ここに笠原が指摘したことは、台湾原住民文学史研究のうえでも貴重な見解だ。さらに、本編が大正年間を時代背景としていることについて、次のように述べる。

Uozumi mā kóng tiòh, Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê lèk-sú siáu-soat sī ùi “Marakau ê Kò-sū” chò thâu, Auvini Kadresengan tī tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat “Iá-pek-háp ê Koa” lâi-té bat iōng 1918 nî chhut-si 1968 nî kòe-sin ê lāu-pē chò phoe-bô, siá Drekey thó-liáh lāng ê it-seng. M̄-koh chit phi<sup>n</sup> chok-phín sī thèh “O-ló Drekey sè<sup>n</sup>-miā ê siáu-soat” chò hō-thâu, m̄-sī chiàu sî-tāi pōe-kéng siá ê lèk-sú siáu-soat. Liáu, sui-bóng ū thia<sup>n</sup> kóng Auvini kè-ōe beh iōng Tâi-chèng sî-kî chò sî-tāi pōe-kéng siá lèk-sú siáu-soat,

m̄-koh kàu ta<sup>n</sup> iáu-bōe sit-hiān. Chiū chit-ê ì-gī lâi khòa<sup>n</sup>, Kasahara tī chia kí chhut-lâi ê, khiā tī Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák-sú ê gián-kiù mā-sī tiōng-iàu ê kiàn-kái. Koh lâi, koan-hē Tâi-chèng sí-kî ê sí-tâi pōe-kéng chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha kóng--ê:

「以前から評者も、プユマの他部落に関して文献記録と高齢者たちの記憶を織り合わせながら日本統治下の時代に思いを巡らせてきたが、いま残されている記録はすべて断片的なものであり、日本の統治を体験した世代の語りもほとんど昭和期より前の時期まで遡ることがなかった。本書が創作された文学作品であることは十分に承知しながらも、読み進めるうちにあらためて蒙をひらかれたという事柄が非常に多い。歴史小説としての完成度がいたって高いのである。」

Í-chá ê phêng-lūn-chiá mā it-tit kun-kù Pinuyumayan kí-tha pō-lók ê bûn-hián ki-liók kap lāu-pòe ê ki-tí, lâi kap Jit-pún thóng-tī ê sí-kí chò tui chiàu, m̄-koh lāu--lòh-lâi ê ki-liók lóng sí chit-chat-á chit-chat-á ê mih-kiá<sup>n</sup>, koh siū-kòe Jit-pún tóng-tī ê sè-tâi só kóng--ê chha-put-to lóng bô kóng tiòh Chiau-hô í-chêng ê sí-kí. Sui-bóng chai-ia<sup>n</sup> chit pún chheh sí bûn-hák chhòng-chok, m̄-koh teh thak ê kòe-thêng koh têng siū tiòh khé-hoat ê tãi-chi chin chē, thang kóng chin chiap-kūn lèk-sú siáu-soat.

笠原は、人類学者として、小説の舞台であるタマラカウ（現、台東県卑南郷泰安村）でもフィールド調査を行った経験があり、このような指摘は本編の正当な評価として、台湾原住民文学の意義を伝えるものとなっている。

Jîn-lūi hák-ka Kasahara bat khi siáu-soat ê bú-tâi Tamalakau (chit-má ê Tâi-tang koân Pi-lâm hiong Thài-an chhoan) chò tiân-ia<sup>n</sup> tiâu-cha ê keng-giām, i ê kiàn-kái hō chit phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat ū chit-khoán háp-lí ê phêng-kè, koh thoân-tát Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê ì-gī.

笠原はタマラカウの調査を行った数少ない学者であるが、他には『台湾高砂族系統所属の研究』（刀江書院、1935年）の馬淵東一と1977年の夏に調査をした土田滋をあげている。

Kasahara sí chio-sò bat khi kòe Tamalakau chò tiân-ia<sup>n</sup> tiâu-cha ê hák-chiá, chhun--ê



koh ũ “*Tâi-oân Ko-soa-chók hē-thóng ê Gián-kiù*” (Toko Shoin, 1935 nî) ê chok-chiá Mabuchi Toichi kap 1977 nî joáh--lâng khi hia chò tiân-ia tiâu-cha ê Tsuchida Shigeru.

土田滋は『台湾原住民文学選』の編者の一人であり、主として民族の言葉のカタカナ表記について教わった。ただ全巻にわたって徹底して行われたわけではなく、土田の見解と違うカタカナ表記も多い。魚住によると、「タマラカウ」のカタカナ表記は、原書の『笛鶴』にみるローマ字表記は「Damalagaw」と作者から直接聞いた発音からこう表記したという。ただ、笠原があげている土田の論文では、「プユマ語（タマラカオ方言）語彙」（『黒潮の民族・文化・言語』角川書店、1980年）のように、地名は「タマラカオ」となっている。ついでにいうと、「達吾族」（Ta-u）の表記は、土田の教示に従い、「タオ族」としたが、時々「タウ」の表記を見ることがある。他にも、作者のペンネーム「巴代」は、『台湾原住民文学選』では「バタイ」となっていたが、今回は「パタイ」と表記が変わっている。記者によると、作家自身の発音から「パタイ」にしたということである。土田もその表記を肯定しているという。中国語の発音から考えると、「バタイ」の方が適切だと思われるが、原語の発音を重視すると、「パタイ」の方がより適切だということになるようだ。台湾原住民文学の翻訳は、このように基本的なところで大きな難問が横たわっている。

Tsuchida Shigeru sī “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” pian-chiá chi chít, chú-iaù sī chí-tō beh án-chóa<sup>n</sup> kā bîn-chók ê sū-lūi iōng katakana lâi kì-liók. Chóng-sī kui koàn bô chò kàu té, kap Tsuchida ê kiàn-kái bô-kâng ê katakana lâi kì--ê chin chē. Uozumi “Tamarakau” ê katakana ê piáu-kì, sī kun-kù goân-tù “*Deiguwan*” ê lô-má-jī piáu-kì “Damalagaw”, tit-chiap ùi chok-chiá thia<sup>n</sup>--tiòh ê im lâi kì. Chí-put-kò Kasahara kí Tsuchida ê lūn-bûn “Pinuyumayan jí (Tamalakau hong-giân) Gí-lūi” (卑南語（大巴九六方言）語彙）（『黒潮の民族・文化・言語』Kadokawa chheh-tiám, 1980 nî) chít-khoán, chò tē-miá “Tamarakao”. Sūn-sòa kóng chít-ē, “Ta-u” ê piáu-kì sī chiàu Tsuchida kà--ê kì chò “Tao chók”, m̄-koh mā tiā<sup>n</sup> ē khòa<sup>n</sup>-tiòh kì chò “Tau”. Chhun--ê mā ũ chok-chiá ê pit-miá “Ba Dai” tī “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” kì chò “Batai”, m̄-koh chít-hôe pi<sup>n</sup> kì chò “Patai”. Êk-chiá kun-kù chok-ka ka-kī ê

hoat-im siá chò “Patai”, Tsuchida mā jīn-tông án-ne ê ki-hoat. Nā khó-lū Hàn-gí ê hoat-im, kì chò “Batai” khah háh, m̄-koh nā tiōng-sī goân-té jí-giân ê hoat-im, kì chò “Patai” koh khah sù-sī. Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ê hoan-ék tī chit-khoán ki-pún ê só-chhài ū kai tōa ê khùn-lân.

次に、シャマン・ラポガンの魚住悦子訳『冷海深情』と筆者訳『空の目』についてみてみよう。

Koh lâi khòa<sup>n</sup> koan-hē Syman Rapongan ê “*Léng-hái Chhim-chêng*” (Uozumi Etsuko êk) kap “*Thi<sup>n</sup>-téng ê Bák-chiu*” (Shimomura Sakujiro êk).

『冷海深情』は、『冷海情深』(1997年)に収録された13編の散文と、『老海人』(2009年)に収録された2編の短編小説「ンガルミレンの視界」、「波の子タガアン」の翻訳である。なお、短編小説集『老海人』に収められた5編の小説は、これですべて翻訳されたことになる。すなわち、この2編以外の「海人」と「漁夫の誕生」は、魚住悦子訳で『台湾原住民文学選』第7巻に収録されており、残る1編の「老海人ロマビツ」は、筆者訳で『空の目』に収められている。こうしてみると、シャマン・ラポガンの作品は、『黒色的翅膀』、『冷海情深』、『海浪的記憶』、『天空的眼睛』の4冊が邦訳されたことになる。

“*Léng-hái Chhim-chêng*” ū siu “*Léng-hái Chêng-chhim*” (1997 nī) 13 phi<sup>n</sup> ê sán-bûn kap “*Lâu Thó Hái-lâng*” (2009 nī) lâi-té siu ê 2 phi<sup>n</sup> té-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat “*Omalumirem ê Sī-ia*”, “*Lâu Thó Hái-lâng*” (lōng chú 達卡安) ê hoan-ék chok-phín. Té-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat chip “*Lâu Thó Hái-lâng*” siu ê 5 phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat lóng hoan-ék chhut-lâi ah. Tū-khì chit 2 phi<sup>n</sup> liáh-gōa, “*Lâu Thó Hái-lâng*” kap “*Thó-hái-lâng ê Tàn-seng*” sī siu tiàm Uozumi Etsuko hoan-ék ê “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” tē 7 koán lâi-té, chhun ê 1 phi<sup>n</sup> “*老海人ロマビツ*” (老海人洛馬比克) siu tī pit-chiá hoan-ék ê “*Thi<sup>n</sup>-téng ê Bák-chiu*” lâi-té. Chiàu án-ne khòa<sup>n</sup>, Syman Rapongan ê chok-phín “*O ê Sī-á*”, “*Léng-hái Chêng-chhim*”, “*Hái-éng ê Kì-tí*”, “*Thi<sup>n</sup>-téng ê Bák-chiu*” chit 4 pún lóng hoan-ék chò Jit-bûn ah.

さて、『冷海深情』に収められた「【解説】蘭嶼に生きる人々」によると、本書はシャマン・ラポガンのロングセラーであり、彼自身が「いちばん好きな」作品で、台湾では「高い評価を受け」、「中学、高

校、大学の教材として扱われることも多く、それを読んだ読者が蘭嶼を訪ねることも多いという」。『空の目』は二作目の長編小説である。なお、『空の目』とはタオ語で星をあらわす。

Kun-kù siu--jip-khì “*Léng-hái Chhim-chêng*” ê “kái-soeh: Seng-oáh tī Lân-sū ê Lâng”, chit pún sī Syman Rapongan tng-kî hó-siau ê chheh, sī i siōng kah-ì ê chok-phín, tī Tâi-oân “ū chiá” koân ê hong-phêng”, “tjong-hák, ko-tiong, tãi-hák chin chē kā thèh lâi chò kàu-chài, thòk-chiá thak liáu mā ū chin chē lêng khi Lân-sū.” “*Thi<sup>n</sup>-téng ê Bák-chiu*” sī i tē 2 pún tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat. Koh “*Thi<sup>n</sup>-téng ê Bák-chiu*” sī Tao gí thi<sup>n</sup>-chhi<sup>n</sup> ê i-sù.

この2冊は、シャマン・ラボガンの海洋文学1、2として上梓されている。書評は次の三編が出ている。いずれも新聞の書評欄に発表された。

Chit 2 pún iōng Syman Rapongan ê hái-iū<sup>n</sup> bûn-hák it kap jī chhut-pán. Chheh-phêng ū ē-kha 3 phi<sup>n</sup>, lóng tī pò-chóa ê “chheh-phêng nōa” hoat-piáu ê bûn-chiu<sup>n</sup>.

野田正彰「潮の香りたつ海洋文学」、『熊本日日新聞』、2015年1月18日

高樹のぶ子「日本の心性呼び覚ます台湾の小島の知性」、『毎日新聞』、2015年3月15日

後藤明「タオ族の生活や蘭嶼島、そして人々の繊細な心理を描く台湾の東南海上、フィリピンとの間、バシー海峡に浮かぶ蘭嶼島」、『図書新聞』、2015年7月11日

Noda Masaaki “潮汐馥郁的海洋文學”, “*Kumamoto Hikaru Shinbun*”, 2015 nî 1 goèh 18.

Takagi Nobuko “Kiò chhi<sup>n</sup> Jit-pún ê Sim-sèng Tâi-oân Sió-tó ê Ti-sèng”, “*Mainichi Shinbun*”, 2015 nî 3 goèh 15.

Goto Akira “Biâu-siá Tao ê seng-oáh kap Lân-sū-tó in ê chók-jîn iù-jī ê sim-lí Tâi-oân tang-lâm hái kap Philippines chi-kan, phû tī Pa-sū hái-kiap ê Lân-sū-tó”, “*Tosho Shinbun*”, 2015 nî 7 goèh 11.

では、評者はどのようにシャマン・ラボガンの作品を読んだのであろうか。

Phêng-lūn chiá koh sī án-chóa<sup>n</sup> thak Syman Rapongan ê chok-phín leh?

野田正彰は精神医学者であり、ノンフィクション作家でもあるが、先述したように、台湾原住民文学には早期から関心を寄せている。野田は、書評のタイトルにみるように、海洋文学という些か聞き慣れない用語をすんなりと受け入れている。果たして、シャマンのいう海洋文学とはいかなる文学なのか。シャマンは日本語版序「海洋文学——父の物語」で次のように述べている。

Noda Masaaki sī cheng-sîn i-hák choan-ka, mā-sī hui siáu-soat ê sán-bûn bûn-hák chok-ka, m̄-koh tō chhiū<sup>n</sup> téng-koân kóng-ê i lâu-chá tō tui Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák ū chhù-bī. Chhiū<sup>n</sup> chheh-phêng ê tê-bók khòa<sup>n</sup> tiòh-ê, Noda chin kín tō chiap-siū hái-iū<sup>n</sup> bûn-hák chit-ê hong thia<sup>n</sup> khi-lâi ū kóa bē koân-si ê iōng-gí. Syman kóng ê hái-iū<sup>n</sup> bûn-hák sī siá<sup>n</sup>-khoân ê bûn-hák leh? Syman tī Jit-gí pán ê sū-bûn “Hái-iū<sup>n</sup> Bûn-hák: Lâu-pē ê Kò-sū” lâi-té án-ne kóng:

親愛なる日本の読者のみなさま、こんにちは。私は中国語で文学を創作する、台湾原住民族でただひとりの海洋文学作家です。台湾にも日本にも、漁夫の美しい物語がたくさんあり、海を敬愛する漁師たちの美学があります。しかし文学作家たちはそれに目を向けてこなかったようです。これは海洋島嶼文学にとって、最も残念な点です。」

Kok-ūi chhin-ài ê Jit-pún thok-chiá lín hó. Góa sī iōng Tiong-bûn chhòng-chok bûn-hák, tī Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chok lâi-té ūi-it ê hái-iū<sup>n</sup> bûn-hák chok-ka.

Tī Tâi-oân iáh-sī tī Jit-pún lóng ū chin chē thó-hái-lâng ê bí-lē kò-sū, ū thià<sup>n</sup> hái ê thó-hái-lâng in ê bí-hák. M̄-koh bûn-hák-ka in bô chù-ì-tiòh, che tui hái-iū<sup>n</sup> tó-sū bûn-hák lâi kóng, sī siōng ūi-hām--ê.

シャマン・ラポガンはここで何を言っているのだろうか。「私は中国語で文学を創作する、台湾原住民族でただひとりの海洋文学作家です」とはまた、傲岸不遜ではないか。孤高の作家といえば聞こえはいいが、一体どういう意味なのだろう。これに対して、野田は書評の最後に、次のように述べている。

Syman Rapongan tī chia sī teh kóng siá<sup>n</sup>? I Kóng “Góa sī iōng Tiong-bûn chhòng-



chok bûn-hák, tī Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn-chòk lâi-té ùi-it ê hái-iû<sup>n</sup> bûn-hák chok-ka.” che thia<sup>n</sup>-khi-lâi sī-m̄-sī chin hiau-pai, hō lāng kám-kak i sī kiau-ngō ê chok-ka, m̄-koh sī sím-mih ì-sù? Nota tui che tī chheh-phêng siōng bóe ū kóng--tiòh:

「日本は海の上に浮かぶ島国である。漁業は盛んであるが、遠洋漁業、大都市への商業漁業、そして近年は近海での養殖漁業に熱中し、海と共に生きてきた文化の全体を理解できなくなっている。ヘミングウェイの『老人と海』、メルビルの『白鯨』のごときうわずつた大魚との闘いの小説ではなく、満ち干きする潮の香りたつ海洋文学はシャマン・ラポガンによって開かれた」と。つまり、野田はシャマン・ラポガンは、『老人と海』や『白鯨』とは異質の、まったく新しい海洋文学を創造したことを述べているのである。ちなみに、シャマンはピエール・ロチの『氷島の漁夫』（1886年）に親しみを感じている。」

Jit-pún sī hái-siōng ê tó-kok, hī-giáp heng-ōng, m̄-koh in soah khah hêng oân-iû<sup>n</sup> hī-giáp kap siong-giáp hī-giáp, kap kīn-hái ê íong-sít hī-giáp, bô hoat-tō lí-kái kap hái kiōng-seng ê chéng-thé bûn-hòa. Syman Rapongan ê chok-phín bô chhiū<sup>n</sup> Hemingway ê “*Lāu-lāng kap Hái.*” Iáh-sī Melville ê “*Péh Hái-ang.*” hit-khoán kap tōa bóe hī leh chhia-pià<sup>n</sup> hông thák tiòh ē chin kék-tōng ê siáu-soat, Syman Rapongan khai-tián--chhut hit-khoán chúí tiòng chúí khó, chhiong-boán hái-tiâu khi-hun ê phang-khùi ê hái-iû<sup>n</sup> bûn-hák. Chóng-kóng chit-kù, Noda jīn-úi Syman Rapongan kap “*Lāu-lāng kap Hái*” iáh-sī “*Péh-hái-ang*” oân-choân bô-kāng, chhòng-chō choân-sin ê hái-iû<sup>n</sup> bûn-hák. Só-ti, Syman chiah ē tui Pierre Loti ê “*Island ê Thó-hái-lāng*” (1886 nî) kám-kak chhin-chhiat.

次に、高樹のぶ子は小説家で、シャマン・ラポガンとの文学上の交流も深く、良き理解者である。書評ではシャマンの「作品は直接タオ族の主張を提示するのではなく、彼らの喜怒哀楽を淡々と記述することで、結果として文明社会に新鮮な発見をもたらす。ここにこうして生きている人間が居る、ただそれだけの実感が、読む人間を謙虚に覚醒させる。小説の本来の力がここにある。……こうした効果は、文明の中にい

て文明批判する立場からは生まれない。世界の構造で考えれば外れの外れである蘭嶼島に戻り、その場所でラポガンが書くことは大きい。マイノリティが棲む蘭嶼島の向こうには、政治的にも文化的にも圧倒的な台湾が存在し、その台湾はさらに巨大な中国大陆と対峙している」。

Koh lâi, Takagi Nobuko sī siáu-soat ka, tī bûn-hák--nih kap Syman Rapongan kau-pôe kài chhim, sī ti-kí. Chheh-phêng lâi-té ū kóng-tiòh: Syman ê chok-phín pêng m̄-sī tī t-chiap kóng in Tao chòk ê chú-tiu<sup>n</sup>, lóng-sī pèh-chiá<sup>n</sup> pèh-chiá<sup>n</sup> leh kóng in ê hí nō ai lók, án-ne soah hō chit ê bûn-bêng ê siā-hōe khò<sup>n</sup>-chò chiá<sup>n</sup> sin-sian ê hoat-hiān. Tī Lân-sū hia iōng in ê hong-sek leh seng-oah ê lāng, kan-ta ē-tàng ēng hit-khoán chin-sit ê kám-siū hō hia thòk-chiá khiam-pi kak-chhi<sup>n</sup>. Á siáu-soat ê lát-chháu tō tī chia. Chit-khoán hâu-kó m̄-sī lán khiā tī bûn-bêng ê siā-hōe nih khi phoe-phò<sup>n</sup> bûn-bêng thang ū ê. Nā-sī tī sè-kài ê ki-kut-á nih khi su-khó, tng-khi kàu bóe-liu-bóe-liu ê Lân-sū, án-ne Rapongan tī hit-ê só-chāi ê su-siá sī chin tōa-bô ê. Tī bô gōa-chē lāng leh khiā ê Lân-sū ê tui-bīn, ū cheng-tī kap bûn-hòa téng-koán ū choát-tui-ték ê Tâi-oân, ah hit-ê Tâi-oân koh kap chiok tōa-bô ê Tiong-kok tiâu-tui.

そして、次のようにシャマン・ラポガンの文学について述べるのである。

Sòa--lòh i koh chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha án-ne kóng Syman Rapongan ê bûn-hák:

「しかし世界の果てからの遠望と俯瞰を文学にするには、その視点獲得と同時に、世界へ発信可能な北京語を会得しなくてはならなかったし、出版という流通システムも知らなくてはならなかった。蘭嶼島から出て学び、タオ族の民として戻ってくることで、ようやく彼の文学は成立したのである。」

M̄-koh, ùi sè-kài ê bóe-liu khò<sup>n</sup> Tâi-oân ê bûn-hák, nā beh tit-tiòh chit-khoán koan-chhat hē lát-thâu ê só-chāi, tiā<sup>n</sup>-tiòh ài òh ē-hiáu ñg sè-kài chhut-sia<sup>n</sup> ê Pak-kia<sup>n</sup> òe, chai-ia<sup>n</sup> chhut-pán chit-ê thong-thàu ê hē-thóng chia<sup>n</sup> ū hoat-tō. Lî-khui Lân-sū chhut-lâi hák-sip, koh tng khi cháu-chhōe ka-tī Tao chòk ê sin-hūn, i ê bûn-hák chia<sup>n</sup> ē-tàng chiá<sup>n</sup>-keh.

と。シャマン・ラポガンは、シャマン・ラポガン文学の良き理解者を得たといえよう。

Syman Rapongan thang kóng sī tī Syman Rapongan bûn-hák--nih ê ti-kí.

次の後藤明は、人類学を専門とする大学教授である。特に海洋人類学が専門で、「環フィリピン海サミット」で「カヌー復興プロジェクト」を行ったときには、シャマン・ラポガンを生泊に招いている。従って、作品世界への理解は、上述の二人とは些か趣を異にしている。殊に後藤は長編小説『空の目』に描かれたロウニンアジや海洋描写に心を惹かれて読んでいる。シャマン・ラポガンの海洋はどこにつながっているのだろうか。後藤は冒頭で、蘭嶼島の地理的環境について「蘭嶼島は台湾の東南海上、フィリピンとの間、バシー海峡に浮かぶ、黒潮が洗う島である。この南方にはフィリピン群島まで続く、バタム群島が連なっている」と説明する。そしてタオ族の言語は南島（オーストロネシア）語族に属し、「南島語族の北端が台湾、南端がニュージーランドのマオリ族、東端がラパヌイ（イースター島）なのである」と述べている。

Goto Akira sī jîn-lūi hák choan-giap ê tãi-hák kàu-siū, tèk-piát sī hái-iū<sup>n</sup> jîn-lūi hák sī i ê choan-giap léng-hèk, tī “Khoân Philip hái Ko-hong-hōe” lã-té ê “Ko-chûn (Bàng-kah) hòk-heng kè-ōe”, Goto ū iau-chhiá<sup>n</sup> Syman Rapongan khi Sin-ka-pho chham-ka. Só-ti, i tùi chok-phín sè-kài ê lí-kái kah téng-koân kóng ê 2 ê lãng bô-kâng. Goto tèk-piát hō tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat “*Thi<sup>n</sup>-téng ê bák-chiu*” lã-té siá ê ciat kap hái-iū<sup>n</sup> ê biô-siá siá<sup>n</sup>--khi. Syman Rapongan ê hái-iū<sup>n</sup> kap toh sio-liân leh? Goto tī chhím-thâu tō soat-bêng Lân-sū-tó ê tē-lí khoân-kéng, “Lân-sū-tó tī Tãi-oân tang-lâm hái kap Philip chi-kan, phû tī Pa-sū hái-kiap, sī hō 黒潮 chhiâng ê tó. Lâm-pêng it-tit kàu Philip kûn-tó, kap Batan kûn-tó sio-liân. Koh Tao ê gí-giân siók-tī Lâm-tó (Austronesian) gí-chòk, Lâm-tó gí-chòk ê pak-pêng sī Tãi-oân, Lâm-pêng sī New Zealand ê Maori, tang-pêng sī Rapa Nui (Koh-oáh-tó).”

後藤の書評は、シャマン・ラポガンの海洋世界がどこにつながり、どのように広がっているかを改めて教えてくれている。先に見た高樹のぶ子の視角と併せて読むと、その想像力は、「外れの外れである蘭嶼島」を他ならぬ真ん中に位置する島として大きく浮かびあがらせてくるのである。

Goto ê chheh-phêng têng kā lán kà kóng Syman Rapongan ê hái-iū<sup>n</sup> sè-kài kap toh-ūi sio-liân, koh gōa khòng-khoah. Nā-chún kap thâu-chêng kóng--ê Takagi Nobuko ê kak-tō chò-hóe thák, hit-khoán “Lím-kî<sup>n</sup> ê lím-kî<sup>n</sup> ê Lân-sū tó” ê sióng-siōng-lát, chià<sup>n</sup>-chià<sup>n</sup> tō-sī tī chià<sup>n</sup> tiong-ng bó chài-tiâu thè-ōa<sup>n</sup> ê tó-sū, hiah-nī-á tōa phû--chhut-lái.

以上、三者の書評をみると、シャマン・ラポガンの海洋文学には高い評価が与えられているといえよう。

Nā ùi téng-koán 3 ê lāng ê chheh-phêng kā khòa<sup>n</sup>, Syman Rapongan ê hái-iū<sup>n</sup> bûn-hák hong siōng khéng-tēng.

## 6. 翻譯上の問題

### 6. Hoan-ék tú--tiòh ê Bûn-tê

最後に、翻譯上の問題について簡単に述べてみよう。

Siōng bóe kán-tan lái kóng hoan-ék tú--tiòh ê bûn-tê.

『タマラカウ物語』の原書は、プユマ族の会話の部分は、「すべて、プユマ語がローマ字表記で併記されている」。魚住悦子は、プユマ語の扱いについて次のように述べている。

“*Tamarakau ê Kò-sū*” goân-tù lái-té Pinuyumayan tui-ōe pō-hūn, “Choân-pō ê Pinuyumayan gí lóng iōng lô-má-jī lái siá”. Uozumi Etsuko chhú-lí Pinuyumayan gí ê hong-sek, soat-bêng chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha án-ne.

「この作品を書こうとした動機の一つとして自分の娘たちにプユマの文化や言語を残したいと思ったと、パタイが語っており、そのような思いがここにはこめられている。

翻譯に際して、プユマ語の部分は割愛したが、会話の一部にプユマ語の語彙を残した。ジップン（日本、日本人）や、ナブルク（内本鹿）、マンヌワン（ブヌン族）などである。」

Ba Dai kóng siū<sup>n</sup> beh siá chit pún chheh ê tōng-ki chi it sī, siū<sup>n</sup> beh kā Pinuyumayan ê bûn-hòa kap gí-giân lâu hō i ka-kī ê cha-bó-kiá<sup>n</sup>, kā hit-khoán ê siū<sup>n</sup>-hoat lām--jip-khì. Hoan-ék ê sī-chūn, Pinuyumayan gí ê pō-hūn koah-



sià, m̄-koh chit-pō-hūn ê tui-ōe iū-goân lâu Pinuyumayan gí ê gí-lūi, chhiū<sup>n</sup>  
Jippun (Jit-pun, Jit-pún-lâng), Nabiruku (pasnanavan), Mannuwan (Bunun)  
chia--ê.

つまり、原文では、中国語とプユマ語が次のように併記されているが、訳文では、「kendo」だけ残してカタカナ書きし、次のように訳しているのである。

Chóng kóng tō sī, goân-bùn lâi-té Hàn-gí kap Pinuyumayan gí chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha án-ne  
chò-hóe ki, m̄-koh êk-bùn lâi-té, kan-ta chhun “kendo” iōng katakana siá, chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha  
hoan-ék--ê:

(原文) “kendo? Aeman yiru? Banahu zaman gada?”

(訳文) 「ケンドウだって？ じゃあ、なんであんな時に、おれたちにやってみせたんだ？」

“Kendo? He sī án-chóa<sup>n</sup> beh tī hit ê sí-kan piáu-ián hō goán khòa<sup>n</sup> ah?”

もう一例は、次の通りである。

Koh chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha ê lē:

(原文) “Tsuy! Maw a Zibung Ruwa maguza ya yi gami demar gawgawz ? “

(訳文) 「フッ、ジップンだ！ どういうわけでこんなところへ来て、おばけの真似なんかしてるんだ？」

Goân-bùn: Chhé! Sī chit ê Jit-pún-lâng! Bô tã-chì lâi chia pi<sup>n</sup> sîn pi<sup>n</sup> kúi beh chhòng  
sá<sup>n</sup>?

このような扱いについて、孫大川は「生番から熟漢へ——番語漢化と漢語番化の文学的考察」（孫大川〈パラバン・ダナパン〉著、下村作次郎訳『台湾エスニックマイノリティ文学論 山と海の文学世界』草風館、2012年12月）のなかで、次のような興味深いことを述べている。

Koan-hē chit-khoán ê chhú-lí hong-sek, Sun Tãi-chhoan ê “Ūi chhe<sup>n</sup>-hoan kàu sèk-  
hoan: Hoan-gí Hàn-hòa kap Hàn-gí Hoan-ōe ê Bùn-hák Khó-chhat” (Sun Tãi-chhoan  
tù, Shimomura Sakujiro êk, Tãi-oân エスニックマイノリティ Bùn-hák Lūn Soa<sup>n</sup>  
kap Hái ê Bùn-hák Sè-kài”, Sofukan, 2012 nî 12 goéh) lâi-té, ū chiâ<sup>n</sup> chhù-bī kóng--tiòh:

「漢字ローマ字読み」方式は、おそらく各民族の音を正確にあらわすことはできない。但し、この方式によって台湾原住民の語彙が漢語の最も潜在的な部分に介入することができるだろう。(略)この三年間(注:2003年~2005年)、この仕事(注:『台湾原住民族歴史語言文化大辞典』の編纂)を通じ私は繰り返して「番語漢化」の問題を考え、また原稿作成に関わった各民族の老人たちと何度も議論してきた。私たちはますますこれは民族の言葉を保存し、その影響の範囲を拡大する効果的で歩むべき道であると感じた。私たちは子細に原住民各族の最も核心的な文化的語彙を選び、厳格に適切な漢字を探し、逐次漢字を音訳して対訳とした。例えば、ツォウ族の男子会所kubaの音訳を「庫巴(クパ)」とし、ブユマ族の会所paLakuwanの音訳を「巴拉冠(パラクワン)」とし、アミ族の豊年祭iLisinの音訳を「伊礼信(イリシン)」とするなど。このような慎重な音訳の規範作りを通じて、多くの台湾原住民の重要な文化や歴史的な語彙が漢語世界に介入してはじめて漢語の有機的な一部分になることができるであろう。同時に、それはまた台湾漢語独特の意味と美意識を発展させることになるであろう。」

Sui-bóng iōng Hàn-jī thak ták chòk ê im, ū chiâ<sup>n</sup> chē hoân-sè bô chài-tiâu chin chún-khak thak tiòh, m̄-koh góa jīn-ûi che sī Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn gí-lūi kài-jip Hàn-gí siōng ū āu-khui ê só-chhài (séng-liòk). Leh chhui-sak chit hāng khang-khòe (chù: pian-siá “Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn lék-sū Gí-giân Bûn-hóa Tōa Sū-tián”) chit 3 tang (chù: ùi 2003 nî kàu 2005 nî), góa í-tit leh su-khó “Hoan-gí Hàn hòe” ê bûn-tê, mā kap chham-ú siá--ê ták chòk ê lâu-pòe piān-lūn, thó-lūn kú-nā pái. Goán ná-lai-ná kám-kak che sī pó-chûn chòk-gí, kā i ê éng-hióng hoân-ûi khok-tōa ū-hāu koh ē-tàng chò ê hong-sek. Goán chim-chiok keng Goân-chū-bîn ták chòk siōng hék-sim ê bûn-hóa gí-lūi, chiok téng-chin khi keng háh-su ê Hàn-jī, ták jī khi chò im-thók tui-ék. Khó-pí kóng goán keng Cou lâm-sèng hōe-só kuba ê thók-im sī “庫巴 (kupa)”, Pinuyumayan hōe-só paLakuwan ê thók-im sī “巴拉冠 (parakuwan)”, Amis hong-nî-chè iLisin sī “伊禮信 (irishin)” chia--ê.

「番語漢化」とは造語だが、「番語」すなわち民族語を漢語表記化することをいう。この問題は、危機言語の状況下にある原住民族諸語に

あつては深刻な問題である。これについて、カタカナ表記にする場合、民族語のローマ字表記のある場合はできるだけその音に近いカタカナ表記にするのが理想的である。日本語に訳する場合は、さらに次のような問題も存在する。魚住は次のように述べている。

“Hoan-gí Hàn hòà” sī jîn-chō-gí, m̄-koh “Hoan-gí” tō sī iōng Hàn-gí piáu-kì-hòa ê bîn-chòk gí-giân. Chit-ê bûn-tê tui ū gí-giân gûi-kì ê Goân-chū-bîn-chòk tàk khoán gí-giân lâi kóng sī giâm-tiōng ê bûn-tê. Siōng hó--ê sī, put-koán iōng katakana lâi kì, á-sī bîn-chòk-gí ê lô-má-jī lâi kì, lóng chīn-liōng óa hit-ê im ê katakana kì. Jit-gí hoan-ék, koh ū chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha kóng ê bûn-tê, chhiū<sup>n</sup> Uozumi kóng--ê;

「プユマ族の人名は、プユマ語の音に近いカタカナ表記にしたが、マテルやマオネプなど、『理蕃誌稿』に記録があるものは『理蕃誌稿』の表記を用い、史料との整合性をはかった。一方、日本人同士の会話では、内本鹿(ないほんろく)、大南などは漢字音で発音されるので、タマラカウ以外は、漢字音にした。」

翻訳におけるこのような処置は、きわめて適切だといえよう。

Bunun ê lāng-miâ iōng katakana piáu-kì óa Pinuyumayan gí ê im, m̄-koh materu kap maonepu chia--ê tī “*Lí-hoan Chì-kó*” ū kì-liók--ê, tō iōng “*Lí-hoan Chì-kó*” ê piáu-kì, chīn-liōng ē-sái kap sú-liâu chéng-háp. Lēng-gōa tī Jit-pún-lāng pēng-iú ê tui-ōe tiong, in-ūi naihonroku, 大南 chia--ê iōng Hàn-jī-im hoat-im, khioh-khí Damalagaw liáh-gōa, tō iōng Hàn-jī-im piáu-kì.

Hoan-ék bīn-téng án-ne chhú-lí sī siōng thò-tòng--ê.

シャマン・ラポガンの作品も、パタイの作品ほど徹底されていないが、タオ語で会話している箇所は、同様にタオ語と中国語が併記されている。一例をあげると次の通りである。同時に筆者の訳文を並べてみる。

Syman Rapongan ê chok-phín tī iōng-jī téng-bīn bô chhiū<sup>n</sup> Ba Dai ê hiah tah-té, iōng Tao gí tui-ōe ê só-chāi, ē iōng Tao gí kap Hàn-gí lām chò-hóe kì.

Yakai,abo cilat.Kwana ni Omalam.

「祖父，沒有浪人鱈可以吃嗎？」他的長孫巫瑪藍姆常常問他這句話。

「アカイ、アブ チラット（おじいちゃん、食べられるロウニンアジはないの？）」孫のウマラムはいつもそう聞いてきた。

「亞格斯，我會maciglang(剛強)的」

「アカス、僕はマチグラン（強く）になるよ」

ついでに述べると、ここに見るアカスは、タオ語で祖母を指す。このような親族呼称は、祖父はアカイ、父親はアマ、母親はイナ、姉はカカのように、みなカタカナ書きであらわしている。

Sūn-sòa kóng--chit-ē, chia khòa<sup>n</sup> ê akasu sī Tao gí a-má ê ì-sù. Chhiū<sup>n</sup> chit-khoán chhin-chòk-á ê kiò-hoat, a-kong sī akai, lāu-pē sī ama, lāu-bú sī ina, a-chí sī kaka, lóng sī iōng katakana lái siá.

他に、シャマン・ラポガンの作品には魚類や鳥類、樹木、さらに食物の名前などがたくさん出てくる。これは台湾原住民文学に共通した特色かもしれないが、これらの名前を日本語にすることがなかなか難しい。例えば、短編小説「冷海深情」には、次のような色とりどりの魚が出てくる。

Syman Rapongan ê chok-phín ū chhut-hiān chin chē khoán hî, chiáu-á, chhiū-á, koh ū chiah-mih ê miá. Hoān-sè che sī Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bin bûn-hák lóng ū ê tèk-sek, beh kā chiah-ê choan-iú miá-sû hoan-ék chò Jit-gí kai chiah-lát. Chhiū<sup>n</sup> kóng té-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat “*Léng-hái Chêng-chhim*” lái-té tō ū chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha kóng--ê kai chē bô káng-khoán ê hî:

ハナタカサゴ（花尾）、オウムブダイ（鸚哥魚）、アカヒメジ（金帯擬羊魚）、オオスジヒメジ（單帶海鯆鯉）、テングハギモドキ（六棘鼻魚）、コシヨウダイ（多紋胡椒鯛）、イシガキダイ（黒點石鯛）、ニザダイ（鋸尾鯛）、フエダイ（琉球黒毛）、イスズミ（白毛）

Hanatakasago (kim-hoe), oomubudai (eng-ko), akahimeji (金帯擬羊魚), oosujihimeji (chhiu-ko), tenguhomodoki (ak-phôe-á), koshodai (pah-thih-pô), ishigakidai (σ-tiám chiòh-chit), nizadai (σ-ti-ko), fuedai (Liu-khiū σ-mo), isuzumi (péh-mo)



訳者はネットで検索し、図鑑をめくりつてめぼしい魚を見つけ、さらには水族館に出かけ、水の中で泳ぐ魚を確認するのである。

Ēk-chiá tī bāng-lō téng chhōe, chhâ tô-kàm chhōe-tiòh khah sêng ê hî, sīm-chì khi chúi-chòk koán khak-jīn tī chúi-té teh siū--ê.

『空の目』は、全6章からなる長編小説である。第一章では、トビウオなどを捕食するロウニンアジと、かつては「漁労の盟主」と称えられた魚捕りの名人、シャブン・ウマラムとの格闘を描く。描かれたロウニンアジは、160センチ強、70キロもある巨大魚で、もう30年以上は生きており、口元には壮絶な海の戦いの跡でもある七つの錆びた大きな釣り針が付いたままで、そのなかの一つは、シャブン・ウマラムに釣られ、釣り糸を切ったときに残ったものである。この章にも、このロウニンアジやシイラなどの大型魚をはじめたくさんの魚類が出て、色鮮やかな海の世界を演出している。本編に登場する魚類は、漢語と併せてタオ語でも表記されている。例えば、次の通りであるが、訳者泣かせなのは、魚類の日本語名を見つけることの他に、このタオ語もカタカナ表記に直さねばならないことである。そこで筆者が取った方法は、作者に本編に出てくるタオ語の語彙をすべて録音してもらったことである。

“Thi<sup>n</sup>-téng ê Bák-chiu” sī 6 chiu<sup>n</sup> kò-sêng ê tng-phi<sup>n</sup> siáu-soat. Thâu chiu<sup>n</sup> siá 5 chiah poe-ō chia ê hî-á ê cilat kap bat hông kiò-chò “Liáh-hí ê thâu-láng” (捕漁盟主) ê 夏本・巫瑪蘭姆in ê koat-tàu. Biò-siá ê cilat tng 160 gōa kong-hun, 70 kong-kin tng ê tōa bóa hî, í-keng oáh 30 tang khah ke ah, í ê chhùi-kak ū tī hái-nih cheng-tàu ê hún-jiah, iáu ū 7 ki se<sup>n</sup>-sian ê tōa ki hî-kau-á tiâu--leh, lái-té 1 ki sī 夏本・巫瑪蘭姆ê tiò-kau, tiò-hî-sòa<sup>n</sup> tng--khi liáu lâu-tiâu--ê. Chit chiu<sup>n</sup> mā-sī iōng cilat kap kúi-thâu-to / poe-ō-hó chiah-ê tōa bóa hî chò thâu, chhut-hiān chin chē khoán hî, tī chhi<sup>n</sup>-chhioh ê hái-iú<sup>n</sup> sè-kài lái-té teh poa<sup>n</sup>-ián. Chit phi<sup>n</sup> kóng--tiòh ê hî iōng Hàn-gí kap Tao gí lām chò-hóe ki. Chhiū<sup>n</sup> ē-kha siá--ê, m̄-koh hō pit-chiá beh khàu bô bák-sái--ê sī, chhōe-tiòh hî-á ê Jit-gí miá, m̄-koh Tao gí mā it-tēng ài iōng katakana ki chiah ē-sái. Chia pit-chiá iōng ê hong-hoat sī, kā chok-chiá tī chit-phi<sup>n</sup> lái-té chhut-hiān ê Tao gí gí-sù lóng kā liók-im, thia<sup>n</sup> liáu chiah koh kā kái-chò katakana ê ki-hoat.

それを聞いてカタカナ表記に直すわけだが、言語学者でない筆者に

は、到底正確な写し取りは不可能である。しかしそうするより他にな  
い。一例をあげてみよう。

Tùi m̄-sī gí-giân hák-ka ê pit-chiá lâi kóng, lóng beh chiâu chún-khak kâ siá lòh-lâi  
sī bô hoat-tō--ê, chóng-sī mā kan-ta ē-sái án-ne niá. Kí chit-ê lē chò soat-bêng:

原文：タオ語（漢語）	訳文：タオ語（日本語）
Cilat（浪人鯨）	チラット（ロウニンアジ）
Fuzong（藍鰭鯨）	フロン（カスミアジ）
Vawuyu（鮪魚）	ヴァウユ（マグロ）
Kavavawuyu（黃鰭鮪魚）	カバアバアウス（マルタウグイ）
Arayu（鬼頭刀魚）	アラユ（シイラ）
Agegei（海雞母）	アガギイ（ナミフエダイ）
Varenten（斑點紅石斑）	ファレンテン（アカハタ）
Mazavnut（梭魚）	マラヴニュト（カマス）
Awu（金梭魚）	アウ（オニカマス）
Goân-bûn : Tao gí（Hàn-gí）	Èk-bûn : Tao gí（Jit-gí）
Cilat（浪人鯨）pa-lang-hî	チラットchiratto（ロウニンアジ） （roninaji）
Fuzong（藍鰭鯨）kam-á-hî	フロンfuron（カスミアジ） （kasumiaji）
Vawuyu（鮪魚）kim-chhiu <sup>a</sup> -hî	ヴァウユ（マグロ）（maguro）
Kavavawuyu（黃鰭鮪魚）chhng-á	カバアバアウス（マルタウグイ） （marutaugui）
Arayu（鬼頭刀魚）kúi-thâu-tō-hî	アラユarayu（シイラ）（shiira）
Agegei（海雞母）hái-ke-bó	アガギイagagii（ナミフエダイ） （namifuyudai）
Varenten（斑點紅石斑） âng-chiòh-pan	ファレンテンfarenten（アカハタ） （akahata）
Mazavnut（梭魚）chiam-so-hî	マラヴニュト（カマス）（kamasu）
Awu（金梭魚）kim-so-hî	アウ au（オニカマス）（onikamasu）

以上、『悲情の山地』と『台湾原住民文学選』の翻訳を通して、台湾原住民文学が日本でどのように受容されてきたか、さらに近年におけるパタイやシャマン・ラポガンの作品がどのように読まれているかについて述べてみた。こうしてこの機会に改めて振りかえってみると、大きく成長した台湾原住民文学は次第に日本の文学界でも知られるようになり、新たな交流が生まれる兆しがみえてきた。台湾原住民文学が日台交流に果たすその役割の重要性は、ますます増しているのである。

Téng-koân sī thàu-kòe hoan-ék “*Pi-chêng ê Soa<sup>n</sup>-tē*” kap “*Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn Bûn-hák Soán*” ê chêng-hêng, thó-lūn Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák tī Jit-pún án-chóa<sup>n</sup> hông chiap-siū, sòa--lòh soat-bêng chit kúi-nî lâi Ba Dai kap Syman Rapongan ê chok-phín án-chóa<sup>n</sup> hō lǎng oát-thók. Chioh chit-ê ki-hōe koh tēng khòa<sup>n</sup>, ē-tàng khòa<sup>n</sup> kóng sêng-tióng kài chē ê Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák tǎuh-tǎuh-á tī Jit-pún bûn-hák-kài hông jīn-bat, koh sán-seng sin kau-liú ê pò-thâu, tī Jit-Tâi kau-liú bīn-téng, Tâi-oân Goân-chū-bîn bûn-hák pān-ián ê kak-sek ná-lâi-ná tiōng-iàu.

【Pún-bûn sī 2015 nî 11 goe'h chhe 7, chhe 8 “Tâi-oân Bûn-hák Gōa-ék Gián-thó-hōe” ê choan-tê ián-káng. Gián-thó-hōe bāng-chí: <http://cvs.twl.ncku.edu.tw/conf/2015/>】







## 台語研究

發行公司：華藝數位股份有限公司  
 連絡電話：+886-2-29266006 轉 8695  
 服務信箱：press@airiti.com

郵寄地址：23452 新北市永和區成功路一段 80 號 18 樓  
 傳真專線：+886-2-2923-5151  
 Airiti Press 網站：http://www.airitipress.com/

個人					圖書館／機關團體				
	新台幣	歐洲	美洲	亞太		新台幣	歐洲	美洲	亞太
一期	\$ 500	€ 38	US\$ 45	US\$ 42	一期	\$ 1000	€ 63	US\$ 73	US\$ 70
一年	\$ 1000	€ 76	US\$ 90	US\$ 84	一年	\$ 2000	€ 126	US\$ 146	US\$ 140
卷	期	~	卷	期	數量	金額	總金額		
* 台灣單冊郵寄處理費 55 元				郵寄費用	數量	金額			

## 注意事項

- 期刊將在付款後兩個營業天內寄出。
- 價格及建議出版日期恕不另行通知可能變更。
- 機構團體是指圖書館、政府機構、公司使用者及公司以個人名義訂購。
- 個人訂戶是指單一個人使用而非以營利為目的者。
- 對於有意或無意扭曲「個人訂戶」一詞者，Airiti Press 保留法律追訴權，並得求償損失。

## 訂閱者資料

個人姓名	
機關名稱	
發票抬頭及統一編號	
聯絡電話	傳真號碼
電子信箱	
收件地址	

## 付款方式

<input type="checkbox"/> 郵局劃撥	帳號：50027465 戶名：華藝數位股份有限公司
-------------------------------	---------------------------

<input type="checkbox"/> 支票付款	公司：華藝數位股份有限公司 地址：23452 新北市永和區成功路一段 80 號 18 樓
-------------------------------	--

<input type="checkbox"/> 信用卡	
發卡銀行	<input type="checkbox"/> MasterCard <input type="checkbox"/> Visa
信用卡號	
信用卡有效期限	西元 _____ 年 _____ 月 卡片背面末三碼 _____
持卡人簽名	須與信用卡背面簽名相同

<input type="checkbox"/> 銀行匯款	
戶名	華藝數位股份有限公司
銀行	國泰世華銀行 - 中和分行
帳號	045039022102 (總行代碼:013; 分行代碼:045)

付款後請傳真或回函本訂閱單，即完成訂閱。

airiti press  **Subscription Form**

**Journal of Taiwanese Vernacular**

You may subscribe to the journals by completing this form and sending it by fax or e-mail to  
 Address: 18F., No. 80, Sec. 1, Chenggong Rd., Yonghe Dity., New Taipei City 23452, Taiwan  
 Tel: +886-2-29266006 ext. 8695 Fax: +886-2- 2923-5151 E-mail: press@airiti.com Website: http://www.airitipress.com

PERSONAL				LIBRARIES / INSTITUTIONS			
	Europe	US/CA	Asia/Pacific		Europe	US/CA	Asia/Pacific
<b>1 Issue</b>	€ 38	US\$ 45	US\$ 42	<b>1 Issue</b>	€ 63	US\$ 73	US\$ 70
<b>1 Year</b>	€ 76	US\$ 90	US\$ 84	<b>1 Year</b>	€ 126	US\$ 146	US\$ 140
Vol.	No.	~	Vol.	No.	Copies	USD \$	Total USD \$

\*All Price include postage

**PLEASE NOTE**

- Issues will be sent in two business days after receiving your payment.
- Please note that all orders must be confirmed by fax or email.
- Prices and proposed publication dates are subject to change without notice.
- Institutions include libraries, government offices, businesses, and for individuals where the company pays for the subscription.
- Personal rates are available only to single-user personal subscribers for personal and non-commercial purposes.
- Airiti Press reserves its right to take appropriate action to recover any losses arising from any intended or unintended misrepresentation of the term "Personal Subscriber".

**BILLING INFORMATION**

Name	
Company	
Tel	Fax
E-mail	
Shipping Address	

**INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS**


<b>Pay by Credit Card</b>	
Card Type	<input type="checkbox"/> JCB <input type="checkbox"/> MasterCard <input type="checkbox"/> Visa
Card Name	
Card Number	
Expiry Date	_____ / _____
CVV number	
Signature	

**Direct Bank Transfer**

Beneficiary	AIRITI INC.
Address	18F., No. 80, Sec. 1, Chenggong Rd., Yonghe Dist., New Taipei City 23452, Taiwan
Bank Name	E.Sun Commercial Bank, Ltd.Yong He Branch
Account No	0107441863017
Swift Code	ESUNTWTP
Bank Address	No.145, Zhongzheng Rd., Yonghe Dist., New Taipei City 23454, Taiwan



## NOTES ON THE SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPTS

1. Journal of Taiwanese Vernacular is a professional journal dedicated to the study of Taigi or the Taiwanese language. The journal encourages two types of submissions: first, research related to Taigi on any aspects, such as linguistics, literature, or culture. Second, comparative works between Taigi and other languages. Works on multilingualism, language revival and vernacular education are also welcome.
  2. The journal accepts research articles, field/work reports and book reviews. Articles and reports are normally limited to 10,000 words or less in English or 20,000 syllables in Taiwanese. Reviews are limited to less than 3,000 words.
  3. Manuscript style:
    - A) Manuscripts written in Taiwanese or English are preferred. Please have your manuscript checked by native speakers prior to submission. The author may provide an extra abstract in his/her mother tongue for publication. The author must be responsible for equivalent translation of the abstract.
    - B) Manuscripts written in Taiwanese must be either in Han-Roman hybrid or Roman-only styles. Roman scripts must be either Peh-oe-ji, the traditional Romanized Taiwanese or Tai-lo scheme promulgated by Taiwan's Ministry of Education. Please use Taigi Unicode fonts for the Taiwanese Roman scripts.
    - C) Footnotes are regarded as notes for extra information, and must be arranged in the bottom of each relevant page. References therefore should be arranged at the end of the full text.
    - D) The potential authors should refer to the journal's sample style for references. For those details not provided in the sample, please follow the journal LANGUAGE.
    - E) Manuscripts normally include a) paper title, b) abstract in Taiwanese, c) abstract in English, d) full text, e) references, and f) appendix (if applicable). Abstract should list up to five keywords.
  4. Submission and review procedures:
    - A) Manuscripts are normally submitted by email. Please provide both the Word and the PDF files with appropriate fonts. An extra hardcopy is requested if the manuscript contains special fonts.
    - B) All manuscripts submitted will be subject to double-blind peer review. For this purpose, please do not identify yourself in the manuscript. On a separate sheet, please provide the following information: a) Paper title, b) full name of the author(s), c) affiliation and position, d) contact methods. The submitted copy of manuscripts will not be returned in any circumstances, so please keep a copy of your own.
    - C) Only unpublished manuscripts will be considered for publication. Please submit your manuscripts at least four months prior to the proposed issue for publication.
  5. Copyright and honorarium:
    - A) After a manuscript has been published, its author will receive 5 copies of the journal volume in which the article appears without charge.
    - B) It is the responsibility of the author to obtain written permission for quotations from other publications or materials for which they do not own the copyright.
    - C) Upon receipt of manuscript, the author(s) agrees to authorize its copyright to the journal publishers free of charge for publication and reproduction in both print and digital forms for an unlimited period. Authors themselves retain the right to reproduce their own paper in any volume of which the author acts as editor or author, subject to appropriate acknowledgment and citation.
  6. The journal is published semiannually in March and September. Manuscripts and books for review should be sent to the editor-in-chief:  
Wi-vun Taiffalo Chiung, Center for Taiwanese Languages Testing, National Cheng Kung University, 1 University Rd., Tainan 701, TAIWAN  
E-mail: uibunoffice@gmail.com Tel: 06-2757575 ext 52627 Fax: 06-2755190  
Website: <http://ctl.twl.ncku.edu.tw/jotv.html>
- 



## 《台語研究》徵稿啟事

1. 《台語研究》是研究台語的學術期刊，專門刊載二類文章：第一類是以台語為研究對象的語言學、文學、文化等相關領域的論文。第二類是以其他語言為研究對象，m̄-koh伊的研究成果會使提供台語文發展參考的論文。
2. 文稿類型：通常分做「研究論文」kap「冊評」二類，有時有「田野/工作報告」。研究論文kap報告的台文稿以2萬字、英文稿1萬詞，冊評以3千字以內為原則。
3. 論文格式：
  - A) 本刊物kan-nā接受用台文iah是英文寫的文章。母語m̄是台語iah英語的投稿者請tāi-seng自費chhià<sup>n</sup>母語人士校稿。作者的民族母語若m̄是台語或者英語，ē-sái ka-tī提供用伊的母語書寫的摘要thang做伙刊。作者ài自行負責母語摘要內容翻譯的妥當性。
  - B) 台文稿接受漢羅kap全羅。羅馬字接受傳統白話字kap教育部公布的「台羅拼音」。漢字的部分建議使用本刊kap台語信望愛的推薦用字。漢羅濫用用法，以文意清楚為原則。羅馬字的字型請用Taigi Unicode。
  - C) 「註腳」採用當頁註，而且限定tī對內文的補充解說，文獻請列tī參考冊目。
  - D) 書寫格式請參考本刊提供的參考樣本，其他無特別規範的部分，請參照美國期刊LANGUAGE的格式。
  - E) 文稿內容順序分別是a)篇名 b)台文摘要 c)英文摘要 d)本文 e)參考冊目 f)附錄。摘要含關鍵詞（siōng ke 5個）。
4. 投稿kap審稿程序：
  - A) 請透過email投稿。稿件請提供Word kap PDF二種檔案。若有特別字型者，請提供紙本thang確保內容的正確性。
  - B) 匿名審稿包含2-3位外審委員，過半數通過才接受。投稿請分作者資訊kap文稿thang方便匿名審稿。作者資訊包含a)篇名 b)作者名姓 c)服務單位kap職稱 d)連絡方式。來稿無退還，請ka-tī留底。
  - C) 本刊無接受一份稿投kuí-ā位，mā無接受已經tī別位的學術期刊、專冊發表的論文。本刊採用隨到隨審的方式，請至少tī預定出刊前4個月投稿。
5. 著作權kap稿費：
  - A) 論文出版liáu，本刊會送作者當期出版品5份，無另外算稿費。
  - B) 作者ài保證kap負責文稿確實是伊的原作而且無侵犯別人的著作權。若違反者，作者ài ka-tī擔法律責任。
  - C) 作者投稿liáu視同同意kā著作財產權永久、非專屬授權本刊以紙本kap數位的任何型式出版kap重製。作者有保留日後tī別giah koh刊iah是集做冊出版的權利；若這情形，作者ài註明原底發表tī本刊。
6. 這份刊物是半年刊，預定每年3月、9月出刊。來稿iah是有冊beh review請寄：

701台南市大學路1號 國立成功大學 台灣語文測驗中心 蔣為文收  
(請註明投稿「台語研究」)

E-mail: uibunoffice@gmail.com Tel: 06-2757575 ext 52627 Fax: 06-2755190

Website: <http://ctlt.twl.ncku.edu.tw/jotv.html>