

HAN'GŪLIZATION AND ROMANIZATION:
TWO MODELS OF SCRIPT CHANGE

by

TIMOTHY WAYLAND ALFORD

DOUGLAS LIGHTFOOT, COMMITTEE CHAIR
JOHN PETROVIC, COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR
ERIN O'ROURKE
MICHAEL PICONE
BEDRETTIN YAZAN

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Modern Languages and Classics
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2019

Copyright Timothy Wayland Alford 2019
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Script change is a branch of language planning and language policy. To assist language planners and policy makers with their endeavors, I have performed a Qualitative Research Synthesis to determine if the Han'gŭlization of Korean and the Romanization of Turkish are two distinct models of script change and if one model is more useful than the other. After describing language planning and policy making, I define script change, operationalize the terms used in the field, and discuss its history, its causes, and factors. Then, I explain the methodology and detail how I use it. Next, there are case studies of the language communities which exemplify the two models of script change: Korean representing the evolutionary one and Turkish the revolutionary. Following that, there are selected studies regarding the status of each script change. Current research on Korean asks who should receive credit for the revaluation of *Han'gŭl*; for Turkish the concern is national identity reconstruction along neo-Ottomanist lines. The data extracted from the selected studies are used to identify themes and sub-themes for producing a synthesis and a comparative analysis. My conclusion is that the answers to my questions are in the affirmative: the two models are distinct, and one is more useful than the other.

DEDICATION

I would like to preface my dedication with a statement of the stance which I bring to my research and to the writing of this dissertation. I am performing a Qualitative Research Synthesis (QRS) on the data which I gathered. An important aspect of being a qualitative research synthesist is to take a careful, deep, attentive, and interpretive stance toward my topic, and to be honest regarding that stance. QRS researchers are also encouraged to be frank regarding their own biases, methodologies, and research processes. Therefore, in accordance with my stance as a qualitative research synthesist, I am disclosing that I am an avowed member of the Bahá'í Faith, and that the teachings which I follow are attuned to the sociopolitical commitment to social equality and social justice which are evinced by practitioners of QRS.

Having made the above statement, I now dedicate this dissertation to the Universal House of Justice, the supreme administrative body of the Bahá'í Faith, because of the inspiration which I have derived from the Writings of Bahá'u'lláh, the founder of that Faith, the Báb, His Precursor, 'Abdu'l-Bahá, the Perfect Exemplar and Center of the Covenant, and Shoghi Effendi, its Guardian. It is my hope that this dissertation may prove to be of service to the Universal House of Justice in its future deliberations regarding a universal auxiliary language and its accompanying script.

In the Writings of Bahá'u'lláh we read,
the well-being of mankind, its peace and security, are unattainable unless and until its unity is firmly established. This unity can never be achieved so long as the counsels which the Pen of the Most High hath revealed are suffered to pass unheeded. (n.d.-a)

This selection inspired me to choose a counsel from among the many proffered in the Bahá'í writings, and to work towards its fulfillment as my contribution to the establishment of the well-being, peace, and security of humanity. I found that counsel in the following quotation, also from the Writings of Bahá'u'lláh.

The day is approaching when all the peoples of the world will have adopted one universal language and one common script. When this is achieved, to whatsoever city a man may journey, it shall be as if he were entering his own home. These things are obligatory and absolutely essential. It is incumbent upon every man of insight and understanding to strive to translate that which hath been written into reality and action. (n.d.-b.)

This dissertation is my attempt to translate the counsel of “one common script” into “reality and action”.

I also dedicate this work to my family who made it possible for me to pursue my goal of earning a doctoral degree: my wife, Aghdas, our daughters and sons-in-law, Ginous and Anis, Neda and Nathan, Ruha and James, and our grandchildren, Otis Wayland Long, Artemis Quinn Tacey, and Ramona Louise Long. Finally, I remember my parents, Eunice Lee Ray and H. Bennett Alford, Sr. My mother taught me to always begin with the most difficult task and see it to its conclusion. My father, I believe, planned for me to become a linguist and adopted the acquisition policy of providing me with educational opportunities for acquiring the love of world languages.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BCE	Before the Common Era
CE	Common Era
FAWL	Facts About the World's Languages
GGK	Government General of Korea
JDP	Justice and Development Party
MoNE	Ministry of National Education
MT	Modern Turkish
LPLP	Language Planning and Language Policy
OT	Ottoman Turkish
PA	Perso-Arabic
QRS	Qualitative Research Synthesis
RoT	Republic of Turkey
RPP	Republican Peoples Party
TDK	Turkish Language Society (<i>Türk Dil Kurumu</i>)
TLI	Turkish Language Institute
USA	United States of America
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I have completed my dissertation thanks to the assistance of the following people: my committee co-directors, Douglas Lightfoot and John Petrovic, for shepherding me through the pre-prospectus, prospectus, and dissertation process; the members of my committee, Erin O'Rourke, Michael Picone, and Bedrettin Yazan, for their guidance, suggestions, critiques, and the questions they contributed to my doctoral examination; William Worden, the Director of Spanish Graduate Students; Bryan Koronkiewicz, the Spanish Language Program Director; Isabelle Drewelow, the French Language Program Director; the Graduate School of the University of Alabama for its excellent seminars on writing and publishing a dissertation, for its financial support to attend conferences, and for the 2016 Dissertation Retreat; my professors at the University of Alabama for the inspirational courses they taught; my fellow Graduate Teaching Assistants who oriented me and coordinated my activities when I arrived at the University of Alabama, and who accepted my orientation and coordination when they arrived; my Spanish and French students who treated me with respect and confirmed me in my vocation; the staff of the Modern Languages and Classics Department for their logistical, clerical, and moral support; the administration, my colleagues, and my students at the Altamont School for supporting and encouraging me; the Tuscaloosa Bahá'í community and friends of the Faith for their fellowship, support, understanding, and prayers; my assistants who helped me in my capacity as member of the Auxiliary Board by performing my duties when my dissertation prevented me from doing so; my friends and neighbors for their understanding and encouragement; my language teachers from my elementary school, high school, college, and

graduate school years; my college advisor, D. Royce Boyer, for guiding me academically, musically, and personally through those four years, then becoming my friend for life; my youngest daughter, Ruha Tacey, for technical assistance with statistics and tables; my middle daughter, Neda Long, for editing assistance with citations and references; and my eldest daughter, Gigi Alford, for, among many other things, introducing me to the Library of Congress!

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
LANGUAGE PLANNING AND LANGUAGE POLICY.....	12
Language Planning.....	15
Language Policy.....	16
SCRIPT CHANGE.....	19
Script Technology.....	20
Causes and Factors of Script Change.....	26
METHODOLOGY.....	38
The Synthesis Design.....	39
Analysis, Synthesis, and Interpretation.....	46
QRS Applied.....	52
CASE STUDIES.....	65
Korean.....	65
Turkish.....	81

DATA	97
Selected Studies	97
Themes, Subthemes, and Analysis.....	102
Synthesis	152
Comparative Analysis.....	159
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	174
REFERENCES	182
APPENDICES	194
QRS Data for King, R. (2004)	194
QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008).....	208
QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015).....	222
QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüim, M. (2016).....	235
Initial List of Languages Considered.....	251
Sixty-Seven Languages with Script Changes	272
Korean Glossary.....	281
Turkish Glossary.....	283

LIST OF TABLES

1. Script Change Statistics	2
2. Instrument for Evaluating Studies Suitable for QRS	45
3. Faculty Perceptions of Innovative Experiences of Learning	48
4. Categories of Script Change Language Communities	53
5. Preliminary List of 22 Languages Considered.....	55
6. Different Models of Script Change.....	57
7. Criteria for Selection and Exclusion	58
8. List of 4 Studies and Criteria for Selection.....	60
9. Qualitative Research Synthesis Themes	61
10. Sample of Codes, Descriptors, and Counts.....	63
11. Description of Studies Selected	99
12. Description of Studies Excluded.....	101
13. Comparative Analysis of the Categories of Han'gūlization Sub-themes	171
14. Comparative Analysis of the Categories of Romanization Sub-themes.....	172

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Rebus Representation of the English Phrase “I can see you”21
2. Photograph of the Lawh Monuments in Behistun, Iran25

INTRODUCTION

The earliest script for which we have evidence, Sumerian cuneiform, is approximately 52 centuries old (DeFrancis, 1989). The next script, Egyptian hieroglyphics, arose some two centuries later (Coulmas, 1989). As time passed and other peoples (e.g., the Akkadians, the Persians) came into contact with this new technology, adaptations were created, and language communities began to consider their options for making their language visible (Coulmas, 1989; DeFrancis, 1989). When the ruler of a people improved an existing way of writing and replaced the initial script with it (e.g., Darius invented Old Persian cuneiform to replace Akkadian cuneiform) the field of script change was born (Coulmas, 1989).

Script change is an infrequent occurrence in the life of a language community as the following statistics will demonstrate: 113 of 180 widely written and historically important languages on the planet (Garry & Rubino, 2001) still use their initial script (category A); 38 of the remaining 67 have changed script only once at an average interval of 570 years (category B); 17 of the remaining 29 have changed script twice at an average of 489 years (category C); 11 of the remaining 12 have changed script three times at an average of 299 years (category D); and one language alone has experienced four script changes at an average interval of 235 years (category E). Although infrequent, script change can also occur with astonishing velocity and a quick pace. For example, the Turkish script change took place in only 25 months, and the first and second Uzbek script changes occurred within 10 years of each other.

Table 1. Script Change Statistics.					
	<i>Category A</i>	<i>Category B</i>	<i>Category C</i>	<i>Category D</i>	<i>Category E</i>
Number of languages in category	113	38	17	11	1
Average interval between changes, years	n/a	570	489	299	235
Standard deviation, years	n/a	±430	±238	±239	n/a

Script change is a branch of language planning and language policy, two closely related, complementary fields. Language planning refers to future-oriented, deliberate, conscious efforts to affect the three particularities of a language: status, corpus, and acquisition planning (Rubin & Jernudd, 1971). Status planning refers to raising or lowering the social prestige of a language through officialization (e.g., Swahili), reform (e.g., Malay), maintenance (e.g., Navajo), and revival (e.g., Irish). Corpus planning refers to actions intended to modify the linguistic structure of the language through standardization (e.g., Romani), vocabulary development (e.g., Tok Pisin), modernization (e.g., Kannada), script initiation (e.g., Quechua), and script change (e.g., Korean) (Chew, 2009, Cobarrubias & Fishman, 1983; Laforge, 1987; Marshall, 1991; Maurais, 1987; Tollefson, 2011; Weinstein, 1990a). Acquisition planning refers to organized efforts to promote the acquisition of a language, typically referring to second language acquisition of an indigenous, colonial, or non-indigenous language (e.g., monolingual vs. bilingual education). Cooper (1989) recognizes three types of acquisition planning: 1) second/world language teaching (e.g., French, Spanish); 2) maintenance of a threatened language (e.g., Navajo, Nahuatl); and 3)

revitalization (e.g., Hebrew, Maori). Corpus, status, and acquisition planning are considered to be inseparable (Daoust, 1991a, b, 1992, 1994), and are not usually employed in an either/or fashion, but rather, tend to produce hybrid plans (Tollefson, 2011).

The field of language policy refers to the implicit or explicit language policies established by the policy makers (i.e., government committees or officials, institutional administrators, and CEOs of corporations) (Tollefson, 2011). A liminal event of sociopolitical upheaval such as civil war, a surge of refugees, independence, a change of political party, or a foreign occupation can trigger the perceived need for a language policy (Daoust, 1997). The language policies of a nation-state can smooth the way for script change, or become its most insurmountable obstacle (Anderson, 2006).

The subject of my dissertation is whether the script change models of Han'gŭlization and Romanization are distinct models and, if so, is one more useful than the other? Answering these questions will provide language planners and policy makers with a rationale for pursuing the more useful model if one exists, and if it does not, my findings will give them a well-researched pair of models to choose from when considering script change. I will be looking specifically at the cases of the Turkish and Korean language communities by performing a Qualitative Research Synthesis using case studies of both language communities with a focus on the status of each. The Turkish case will represent the common, familiar model of script change (which I am calling revolutionary), and the Korean case will be representative of a potentially different model (which I am calling evolutionary). The Turkish case is often cited as the most successful example of script change in history. I intend to subject this claim to closer scrutiny, especially in light of the present-day movement in the Republic of Turkey towards the revival of Ottoman Turkish. The

case that proves to be more useful (if one does) will be offered as a potential model for language planners and policy makers to achieve successful, voluntary, and durable script change.

One of the many aspects of corpus planning is graphization (i.e., the selection or modification of a script or writing system for a given language). Sometimes the "modification" is to replace the current script with a completely different one. In 1928, for example, Mustafa Kemal *Atatürk* replaced the Perso-Arabic (PA) script used for writing the Ottoman Turkish spoken in the Ottoman Empire with a different script used for Modern Turkish (MT), the language developed for and spoken in the Republic of Turkey. He chose Roman, the script used for writing most of the languages in the Italic and Germanic branches of the Indo-European family of languages, as the replacement script. When the script used by a language community is replaced by a different one, this is known as script change. Script change occurs for many different reasons, but it is usually a stated objective of language planning and a result of the implementation of language policy. Script change can also cause sociocultural changes.

The script changes in Turkey and Korea are the primary cases for my analysis, and I return to them below. First, it is necessary to elaborate upon the definition of a script because script change is not just an aspect of corpus planning. It also affects other aspects of language planning. For example, script change affects the spoken language because the written language can assume aspects unfamiliar to the oral language, yet the written form can become the standard to which the spoken is then compared. This has direct implications for acquisition planning.

A script is a systematic, ordered set of graphemes that enables the literate members of a language community to record and share the expressive and communicative ability of their spoken language through the medium of writing. This criterion has dictated the historical development of scripts by forcing them to evolve from simple, rebus-like, mnemonic devices

into ever more complex systems until they achieved the relative ability of conveying most meanings of the spoken language. Yet, the script is not subservient to the spoken word. It surpasses the mere act of producing an analogue version of the language by enhancing the complex, intertwined relationships between language, the spoken word, and writing. It does this by producing a model which represents the spoken word, and which can be analyzed, thereby giving speech stability and endurance (Coulmas, 2009).

Goody and Watt (1968) refer to scripts as “the technology of the intellect” (as cited in Coulmas, 1989, p. 9). Using this technology, a language community expands its cognitive ability, stores and recalls information, educates its children, produces language arts, shares knowledge with other language communities, and increases its understanding of physical reality. Since its invention, the original script technologies have spread from the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and Mesoamerica to preliterate peoples throughout the world who in most cases, rather than inventing new script technology compatible with the internal logic of their own languages, borrowed the existing technology, and sometimes the language written in it as well, from their literate neighbors. Thus, a language community often becomes bilingual at almost the same moment that it becomes literate. The bilingual members of the language community are usually the first to realize that their own language can be written using the borrowed script in adapted form (Coulmas, 2009).

The symbols, or graphemes, of the script then become an alphabet, a syllabary, an alpha-syllabary, or a logo-syllabary. In general, alphabetic scripts are phonemic in nature, and are used in segmental writing systems. There are three varieties of alphabetic scripts: 1) an abjad (e.g., Arabic), in which the graphemes represent consonants, and the vowels are indicated by optional diacritics; 2) an abugida (e.g., Ge’ez), in which the graphemes that represent the sounds of the

consonants are combined with their obligatory vowel graphemes to form syllables; and 3) a vocalic alphabet (e.g., Cyrillic), in which the graphemes represent both consonants and vowels.

A syllabary (e.g. Cherokee) is a script composed of graphemes that represent the syllables of a given language and are used in syllabic writing systems. An alpha-syllabary (e.g., *Han'gǔl*) is a hybrid script in which the graphemes represent the spoken sounds of a language in a logical and systematic way, but with a syllabic orientation in its visual representation and interpretation (Pae, 2011). A logo-syllabary (e.g., Chinese) uses logographs that contain both phonetic and semantic information.

The oldest of the above-mentioned scripts, cuneiform ('wedge-shaped'), had its origin in Mesopotamia over five millennia ago. Approximately one millennium later, in nearby Egypt, hieroglyphics evolved along the same lines as cuneiform. In East Asia, the Han logo-syllabic script evolved, and remains in use today. Writing was also invented in Mesoamerica by the Maya, but its evolution was ended, or paused, with the age of discovery. Egyptian hieroglyphics, however, proved to be a very fertile variety of script, and a strong link in the evolution of scripts and writing systems.

The Semitic script evolved from an advancement in writing discovered by the Egyptians in which pictograms came to represent their initial sounds. It was then adopted by the Phoenicians who introduced it to the Greeks who found it necessary to adapt some of the letters in the Phoenician alphabet to represent the sounds in Greek that were not found in Phoenician. It is this Greek script that was then communicated to the Etruscans, and from them to the Romans some 2600 years ago, and which was eventually adopted by some European language families around 14 centuries ago. The Roman script continues to spread throughout the world today.

There are many sociolinguistic reasons for changing scripts. First, languages and scripts have always been used to decide who is considered a member of a group and who is considered an outsider. For example, the Hebrew word *shibboleth* ('the part of a plant containing grains') begins with the sound /ʃ/ and was used by the Gileadites to identify the Ephraimites whose phoneme inventory did not include /ʃ/. By using it as a password, the Gileadite sentries posted along the fords of the River Jordan could identify and punish Ephraimite survivors trying to escape to their home territory after their failed invasion of Gilead (Bible, King James Version). Today, language communities use their languages and their scripts as badges of identity, and many of the same sociolinguistic tools that are used to analyze spoken languages can be used to analyze the choice of a script (Unseth, 2005).

A second contributing sociolinguistic reason to change scripts is when a language community chooses the same script used for a more broadly spoken language to become more involved in movements beyond its borders. This is often the policy when the language community is planning for interaction within a new and wider sphere of influence. The Republic of Turkey, for example, which had previously used the Perso-Arabic script because of its political, economic, and religious ties to the Muslim world, changed to Roman to develop trade and political alliances with Europe. This became possible when the Republic of Turkey, founded on the Kemalist ideology of nationalization, modernization, secularization, and Westernization, formed a new nation-state by weakening its ties with Islam, and promoting a new Turkishness (Unseth, 2005).

A third sociolinguistic cause of script change is the realization by a language community that script and the medium of writing are an imperial technology. Writing serves imperial designs by managing time and space, creating a "spatial rationality of imperialism" (Liu, 2015, p.

376). Lacking a writing system, the conquerors would often despoil the conquered nation of theirs (e.g., the Akkadians appropriated cuneiform from the Sumerians). Without writing there is no imperial communications network (Liu, 2015).

Among the many factors to be considered by language planners and policy makers when choosing a script for a language community is the interplay among the writers, readers, and learners of the language, each of whom weights and values different aspects of the script according to their own interaction with it. Another factor is how deeply embedded the script is in the political, economic, educational, and social life of the language community. For instance, if the script is firmly established in academic institutions, administrative bodies, manufacturing interests, and religious organizations, then the economic and social costs of changing to a new script will be such that the arbiters of education, bureaucracy, business, and religion will put forth enormous effort to maintain the *status quo* and resist the proposed script change. This produces an inertia that is not easily overcome, and stifles innovation and progress (Walker, 2000). In this case, the speakers of language varieties (e.g., rural and urban dwellers, the economically disadvantaged, members of minority religions and ethnicities) other than the perceived standard variety are shut out of the script selection process, raising the questions of social justice and equality.

Script change is not based uniquely upon the linguistic merits of the script, and merit may not even be a factor, major or minor. Some language communities such as the Hausa, Kiswahili, and Somali once used the Arabic script. Now they use Roman. Malay changed from the Nagari script to Arabic, then to Roman. Vietnamese changed from *Hànzi* ‘Chinese characters’ to a modified form of Roman. Many republics of the Soviet Union (USSR) changed from the Arabic to the Roman to the Cyrillic script, then with the dissolution of the USSR, reversed the change

(e.g., Tajikistan adopted the Arabic script, Azerbaijan returned to the Roman). These examples of script change were based primarily on sociolinguistic factors (e.g., identity, nationalism, imperialism, privilege, and authority) as opposed to the sole factor of the merit of the script.

While not purely a sociolinguistic factor for the selection of a script, linguistic fit and adaptability can also be an influence (Coulmas, 2003). Once the graphemes of a script receive linguistic interpretation at a sufficiently sophisticated level, the script achieves the status of visible speech (DeFrancis, 1989) and becomes linguistically fit for adaptation to other languages. The linguistic fit of a script can be fine- or broad-grained, and very or generally accurate, but most scripts are dependent on, and derive their utility from a spoken language. The linguistic fit of a script can also be evaluated according to the variety of language types (e.g., analytic, synthetic) spoken by the language group which is considering a script change, but this comparison can only serve as a guiding principle, not a definitive one (Coulmas, 2009).

Because spoken languages contain complex layers of linguistic significance grouped into segments (e.g., phonologic, morphologic, tonal, semantic), different scripts reflect the different segmental units to varying degrees, enabling the writer, reader, speaker, and learner to analyze the visible representation of the language in different ways (Bassetti, 2006). The two-dimensional nature of writing gives the layers of overlapping elements of the spoken language a sequential appearance on the printed page when in actuality, they are simultaneous. Alphabetic scripts are composed of graphemes (normally representing phonemes) that combine to form units of meaning (morphemes), but they have the secondary effect of producing segmental phonology (Coulmas, 2009). I argue that the language planners and policy makers involved in choosing a script should consider how well its features adapt to those of the spoken language to create the best linguistic fit.

There appear to be at least two different models of script change. As I researched the examples of script change in the Persian, Uzbek, Turkish, and Javanese language communities, I became aware that their experiences all bear similar markings: a new dynasty, an autocratic or dictatorial government, or a conquering power effects (revolutionary) script change swiftly by fiat with little consideration for the entire language community. The language communities mentioned were predominately pre-literate and the script changes occurred at important, liminal moments in their histories. In general, the rapidity of the script change is also a common feature of these language communities. In some cases, imposed script change became a frequent occurrence as in the Uzbek language community which, under Soviet language planning, changed from its initial script (Arabic) to Roman in 1929, to Cyrillic in 1939, and back to Roman in 1989. The model which stands out as potentially different from the others, and which I am calling evolutionary, is that of the Korean language community.

The Korean language community was introduced to *Hànzi* ‘Chinese characters’ in the 2nd century Before the Common Era (BCE). Chinese writing was known in Korea as *Hanja*, or *Hanmun*. When the Korean scribes began recording dynastic chronicles in the second half of the 4th century of the Common Era (CE) they began to adapt *Hanja* as the initial script for writing Korean names and places. This marked the first use of *Hanja* for writing Korean. In the latter half of the 7th century, the *Ido* system of writing Korean using *Hanja* represented an improvement, but still left much to be desired. A variation of *Hanja* known as *Kukhanmun* or *Hangch'al* ‘Mixed Sino-Korean script’ was used for writing poetry, but prose continued to be written in *Hanja*. Then, in the middle of the 15th century an enlightened ruler came to the Korean throne (Haarmann, 1993).

King Sejong the Great sought benevolently to provide the Korean peoples with the means to become literate *en masse* and record their thoughts easily in the Korean language. He and his scribes created *Han'gŭl*, a unique event in the history of script change because it was not the result of adaptation, but rather, it was “logically, scientifically and systematically devised” (Pae, 2011, p. 106). It is unique because of its syllabic structure and visual representation. The graphemes representing consonants indicate their articulation, and the ones for the vowels allude to Korean philosophy involving “the harmonious relationship between heaven and human and between earth and human” (Pae, 2011, p. 106). That the adoption of *Han'gŭl* occurred without resorting to an edict from the rulers of the land, that it was finally achieved as part of a national identity movement at a time when illiteracy was not widespread, that it was linguistically and philosophically designed to fit Korean, and that it took place over centuries instead of being imposed during a brief span of time suggest that the Korean script change is potentially different.

I will be analyzing, synthesizing, and comparing these two models of script change (which I am calling evolutionary and revolutionary) based on their historical case studies, their status, and the themes revealed by the studies I choose for the QRS to produce an interpretation of the data to determine if they are indeed distinct models, and if one is more useful than the other.

LANGUAGE PLANNING AND LANGUAGE POLICY

Script change mainly occurs because of language planning and language policy (e.g., the Central Asian Republics of the former USSR). There are many sociolinguistic factors (e.g. privilege, authority, identity) that affect script choice in the fields of language planning and language policy (LPLP). When a language community is encompassed by a national or regional administration, script change becomes a question of LPLP. Because language is an agent for social interaction and for the transmission of cultural and societal values, the sociolinguistic forces that shape language choice (e.g., politics, society, religion, and culture) become important (Daoust, 1997).

In the 1950s, language planning was involved in the standardization process. Standardization here refers to the endgame, not the sometimes centuries-long process of natural language change that refines and reforms language usage producing a recognizable language distinct from those of its geographical neighbors (Romaine, 2007). In the middle of the 20th Century, standardization included script initiation and modernization, the revival, maintenance, and spread of languages, and inter-linguistic communication within and among nation-states (Ferguson, 1968; Nahir, 1984). Later, linguistic, sociolinguistic, economic, and political aspects of the integration of language in society were also involved (Daoust, 1997; Rubin & Jernudd, 1971; Weinstein, 1980; 1990a). Early language planning employed the sociolinguistic concepts of language maintenance, language shift, language dominance, linguistic minorities, diglossia, nationalism, and ethnicity (Fishman, 1972). Language planning was first viewed as being valuable for solving the “language problem of developing nations” (Fishman, Ferguson & Das

Gupta, 1968, as cited by Tollefson, 2011, p. 358), then for assisting older, multilingual nation-states (e.g., USSR, USA, Belgium) in addressing their linguistic challenges (Fishman, Ferguson, & Das Gupta, 1968).

Early LPLP used the framework of corpus planning and status planning (Haugen, 1959; Kloss, 1968) which was later expanded to include acquisition planning (Cooper, 1989). This early LPLP process had 3 stages: 1) formulation (i.e., deciding goals; specifying programs); 2) implementation (i.e., executing the plan); and 3) evaluation (i.e., assessment of the effectiveness of the plan), but the process was not always linear (Fishman et al., 1968; Lewis, 1972).

Formulation began with fact-finding to establish goals, during which time the language planners and policy-makers investigated the social, cultural, political, and economic parameters of the communities which were the target of the plan. The goals formulated would have borne in mind “the social direction of each of these parameters” (Rubin, 1971, p. 218) to make the plan feasible. This stage also included the study of previous cases of LPLP (e.g., the province of Québec; Norway). The implementation phase would have been considered educational and had to be explicitly detailed to reduce complaints, resistance, and rejection (Daoust, 1997).

Four language ideologies have been identified that entered into early LPLP: 1) linguistic pluralism based on “the coexistence of different language groups and their right to maintain and cultivate their language on an equitable basis” (Cobarrubias & Fishman, 1983, p. 65); 2) linguistic and script assimilation, and nationalism employed to “make sure that every member of a speech community is able to use the dominant language” (Cobarrubias & Fishman, 1983, pp. 63-4); 3) internationalism, “which consists in adopting a nonindigenous language of wider communication either as an official language or as language of instruction” (Cobarrubias & Fishman, 1983, p. 66); and 4) vernacularization (the alternative to internationalism) in which

“indigenous or national languages are restored or modernized and officially recognized in lieu of or alongside an international language of wider communication” (Cobarrubias & Fishman, 1983, p. 66).

The next phase of the early LPLP process was implementation. Because not all social, political, and linguistic factors could be controlled during language planning, an overall implementation plan helped avoid haphazardness (Cooper, 1989; Rubin, 1971). Among the problems faced by early LPLP was the need to explain ideologically based goals in such a way as to minimize mission drift, prevent backlash, and avoid social tumult during implementation (e.g., studying the implementation plan used in Québec was instructive as to how to avoid social upheaval and to achieve objectives). Finally, early LPLP used evaluation as an on-going component in which objectives and implementation procedures were reassessed, especially as planned language change interacted with natural language change (Daoust, 1997; Rubin, 1984; Vaillancourt, 1993).

During the 1980s, early LPLP underwent a period of criticism because, despite the initial optimism, the planning approach tended to sustain the privileges of the elites established during the colonial period. By focusing on modernization and free-market capitalism, dominant groups were using LPLP to maintain their dominance (e.g., in sub-Saharan Africa) (Mazrui, 2002; Moumoni, 1998). There was also a lack of full investigation regarding the minority linguistic communities affected by the policies. The evaluation of LPLP was focused on how the goals of the nation-states were attained and showed little regard for how the peoples who were the object of the plan were affected. Questions of power, identity, inequality, and the social interactions between peoples were ignored in cost-benefit analyses, to the benefit of the elites and their institutions (Jones & Martin-Jones, 2004). These perceived shortcomings of early LPLP led to

the development of a new conceptual framework, accompanied by new methods, and a ‘revitalization’ of LPLP (Tollefson, 2011).

Language Planning

Language planning refers to future-oriented, deliberate, conscious efforts to effect change in the status, corpus (i.e., internal structure), and/or acquisition of a language (Fishman, 1974; Rubin & Jernudd, 1971). Each type of language planning is important and will receive additional explanation below. Some examples of language planning are officialization, transformation, reform, and standardization. In one version of officialization, the language of the dominant group becomes *de jure*, allowing the elites to maintain the status quo of linguistic privilege. In another, officialization means that the languages of historically marginalized language groups are made official as in the case of post-apartheid South African languages and that of Catalan in the autonomous region of Catalonia in Spain (Petrovic, 2015).

Transformation is an example of language planning which includes changing identities, replacing one governing group by another, and altering patterns of access when one dominant class, or ethnicity replaces another (Weinstein, 1990b). Transformation is often seen when the plan attempts to eliminate a language from a bilingual or multilingual nation, for example Alsatian under French rule, Native American languages under U.S. rule, and Catalan under Spanish rule (Petrovic, 2015). Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) call transformation an example of “negative language planning” (as cited in Petrovic, 2015, p. 2), a form of linguistic repression of minority languages which decreases linguistic options, and includes punishment for their continued use (Petrovic, 2015). Petrovic and Kuntz, (2013) contrast negative language planning with reform, calling it an example of “positive language planning” (p. 2) in which linguistic options increase, and more languages become viable under more circumstances (e.g., the Voting

Rights Act of 1975 which allowed election materials in languages other than English, and the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 which funded transitional bilingual education) (Crawford, 2004).

Language Policy

Language policy refers to the ideas, principles, and regulations (implicit or explicit) formulated by government officials, institutional administrators, and CEOs of corporations intended to effect, or prevent change in a language community (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Petrovic, 2015; Tollefson, 2011). The language policy of a nation-state can be enacted through various means including legislation, executive action, and court decisions, and are based on laws, and bureaucratic rules and practices. Language policy can smooth the way for script change, or become its biggest obstacle (Anderson, 2006; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Petrovic, 2015).

Language policy proceeds from language planning. According to Daoust (1997), a perceived need for a language plan can be triggered by a period of sociopolitical upheaval (e.g., civil war, a surge of refugees, political independence, a change of political party, or occupation by a foreign power). Once planners have determined what goals a language community needs, or desires, they investigate which policies will best lead to them. These policies might include encouraging or discouraging bilingual education; promoting literacy skills; affirming group or individual rights to revive, learn, or invent a language; selecting a lingua franca; maintaining the *status quo*; and transforming or reforming the linguistic characteristics of a language community (Petrovic, 2015; Weinstein, 1990b). The policies that the planners establish sometimes have little to do with planning (e.g. the *ad hoc* language policy of the United States which has been cobbled together from court cases, public opinion, and legislation without the benefit of a coherent language ideology). Such language planning rarely progresses systematically since it

can be influenced by changing economic conditions, partisan political maneuvering, and social upheaval (Petrovic, 2015).

Corpus planning. Corpus planning refers to intentions to modify the linguistic, or internal structure of the language (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). Some of these intentions are addressed through standardization (e.g., Romani), vocabulary development (e.g., Tok Pisin), modernization (e.g., Kannada), revitalization (e.g., Irish), and script initiation (e.g., Quechua). Standardization is a primary task of corpus planning that deals with vocabulary, grammar, and orthography (i.e., the correct usage of the writing system). It is also concerned in some cases with eliminating or minimizing foreign words and phrases through institutions charged with maintaining the purity of the language such as the Académie Française or the Real Academia Española. Determining translations of words used for modern inventions and technologies (e.g., the internet, email, space shuttle, microprocessor) is the domain of modernization and revitalization. Corpus planning often overlaps with status planning.

Status planning. Status planning deals mainly with the external, social issues and concerns of the language and refers to raising or lowering its social prestige (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). Some of these issues are officialization (e.g., Swahili), reform (e.g., Malay), maintenance (e.g., Navajo), and revival (e.g., Irish) (Chew, 2009; Cobarrubias & Fishman, 1983; Laforge, 1987; Marshall, 1991; Maurais, 1987; Petrovic & Kuntz, 2013; Tollefson, 2011; Weinstein, 1990a). A telling example of officialization is the English Only movement in the USA. As mentioned above, this type of status planning intends to preserve the *status quo* of English as the *lingua franca* in the USA by making it *de jure*. On the other hand, officialization could also be used to elevate Native American languages or Spanish to official status. Another example of reform status planning is the constitutionally required mandate in India for children to study

three languages in an effort “to allocate status to particular languages, to encourage acquisition of a lingua franca and to promote multilingualism” (Petrovic, 2015, p. 3). As mentioned above, status planning such as this increases linguistic options for minority languages, and the circumstances where they are viable. There is an intimate relationship between status planning and acquisition planning.

Acquisition planning. Acquisition planning refers to organized efforts to promote the acquisition of a language by providing a language community with opportunities to acquire it. These efforts typically refer to second language acquisition of an indigenous, colonial, or non-indigenous language that might be established as a goal by the language planners. There are three types of acquisition planning: 1) second, or modern (foreign) language teaching (e.g., French, Spanish); 2) reacquisition of a threatened language (e.g., Navajo, Nahuatl); and 3) maintenance, and revitalization of a language which was once spoken (e.g., Hebrew, Maori) (Cooper, 1989). Acquisition planning is about more than just the methodologies, approaches, and techniques used for language instruction, but curricular considerations are crucial to it (Petrovic, 2015). Status, corpus, and acquisition planning are considered inseparable by most researchers (Daoust, 1991a, 1991b, 1992, 1994), and are not usually employed in an either/or fashion, but rather, tend to produce hybrid plans (Tollefson, 2011). Language planning and language policy are instrumental in the development of status, corpus, and acquisition planning, and will be brought to bear on any decision by a language community considering script change.

SCRIPT CHANGE

When a language community plans to strengthen its identity, increase literacy, standardize its language, or promote the acquisition of a world language of broad usage, it may adopt a policy of script change (e.g., the adoption of a modified Roman script by the Ottoman Turkish speaking community of the Republic of Turkey to replace its Perso-Arabic one). The following sections of my dissertation serve to further define script change.

Scripts, beginning with cuneiform and hieroglyphics, are a 5000-year-old intellectual technology. Script makes speech visible, but it is not subservient to it. Most of the existing scripts are historical artifacts developed through a process of sociolinguistic adaptation in which linguistic considerations are most often subordinate to the social, or symbolic ones. A case in point is the selection of the Tifinagh script by the language planners and policy makers for use by the Berber language community as a compromise between the proponents of the Arabic script and those of the Roman, both of whom, refusing to yield to the other, threw their support to the proponents of Tifinagh (Coulmas, 2009).

What begins as an already complex relationship between the written and spoken word becomes even more complicated as natural changes of pronunciation, morphology, and syntax occur in the spoken language. This change is most apparent when the unit of analysis is on the finely-grained end of the linguistic spectrum. Different types of scripts, writing systems, and orthographies are affected in different and unpredictable ways by these changes, mainly because the scripts themselves were not usually designed systematically, but rather developed over time, and were later adapted by different language communities (Coulmas, 2009).

Script Technology

Five millennia ago in Mesopotamia, the Sumerians used pictograms (i.e., icons which resemble objects pictorially) to symbolize concrete objects. While not considered true representations of language, these stylized icons (wedge-shaped because of the existing writing technology of the day: a reed stylus on clay tablets) evolved slowly into cuneiform characters. The characters then took on semantic representations of meanings and associated meanings that referred to different concrete objects, as well as to actions, activities, and abstract ideas. They had become what we refer to today as morphograms. Then, through the process of phonological extension, the morphograms became associated with the sounds of the names of objects and the concepts they represented. The morphograms became phonograms, and the phonographic writing system was born. The phonograms were then combined to form a phonetic representation of a word or phrase, spelling the name of a new object or idea using the rebus “by things” principle. For example, the English sentence “I can see you” is represented by the rebus formed by the pictograms for the following objects: *eye—canister—sea—ewe*.



" I CAN SEE YOU "

Figure 1. Rebus Representation of the English Phrase "I can see you".

As mentioned in the introduction, the next step in the evolution of script took place among the Semitic tribes which developed a script based on a development undergone by Egyptian hieroglyphics in which the phonograms became associated with their initial sounds, then were used in conjunction with other phonograms to refer to other objects, actions, activities, and abstractions by creating a visual, phonetic representation of the object. This advancement in script technology was embraced by the Phoenicians who then shared it with the Greeks. The designation 'alphabet' is an acronym ($\alpha + \beta$) derived from the expansion of the first two symbols of the Semitic script which represent the words *ʔalef* 'ox' and *bet* 'house' in the Canaanite language. The Ethiopian term 'abugida' (i.e., a syllabic alphabet) originated in a similar fashion by combining the sounds of the first four symbols ($\text{አ} + \text{ቡ} + \text{ጊ} + \text{ደ} = /a\text{-bu-gi-da}/$) of the Ge'ez script.

Next, the Greeks appropriated all the Phoenician symbols, or graphemes, along with their Phoenician names which were given pronunciations conforming to Greek phonology. The Greeks also altered some of the letters to represent the sounds in Greek not found in Phoenician. This was especially true of the vowel sounds because, being an abjad writing system like Hebrew and Arabic in which the vowels were optional and usually omitted, the Semitic script required only the representation of consonants. It is this script that was passed to the Etruscans, then from them to the Romans around 26 centuries ago, and which, through the vagaries and serendipity of history, was eventually adopted by the Germanic and Italic language communities around 1400 years ago. It continued to be spread through conquest and evangelization as the European powers colonized other lands and proselytized other peoples (see Script as imperial technology, below).

Script. The terms script, writing system, and orthography are often conflated, and there is much variation among researchers as to the way these terms are employed (Cook, Vaid & Bassetti, 2009). I define how I use these terms below. A script that records all the elements of spoken language (e.g., phonetic, morphologic, semantic, pragmatic, tonal, segmental, supra-segmental, etc.) would be complicated, difficult, cumbersome to learn, and next to impossible to employ. In contrast, the existing scripts in use today emphasize one, or a few selected linguistic levels. Any perceived opaqueness, degree of symbolic abstraction, or visual complexity in the existing scripts probably contributes to their flexibility, which is a compromise between the three users of the script: the writer, the reader and the learner (Coulmas, 2009).

Unlike most technologies which are adopted for utilitarian reasons, the adoption of script technology is determined by sociolinguistic factors such as identity, authority, power, imperialism, standards of language, and education. The sociolinguistic tools and concepts for

studying how spoken languages are chosen (e.g., bilingualism, domain-governed usage, code switching, areal influences, language shift, and ethnography of communication) are also applicable to the process of choosing scripts (Sjoberg, 1966). In addition to being a technology, scripts are a visual symbol (conscious or not) of both the language and identity of a language community (Unseth, 2008).

Script technology was invented independently in Mesopotamia, China, and Mesoamerica with the shared goal of conveying meaning and recording spoken language. Many variations were found, and continue to be sought (e.g., Na-Dené) for achieving that goal. Expanding here on the variations mentioned in the introduction, an abjad alphabetic script (e.g., Arabic, Hebrew) contains graphemes that represent consonants, and the vowels are indicated by optional diacritics. An abugida alphabetic script (e.g., Ge'ez, Devanagari, Burmese) contains graphemes that represent the sounds of the consonants with their accompanying, obligatory vowels, which together form syllables. In an abugida, if the syllables contain phonetic similarities, the graphemes also bear a visual resemblance. A vocalic alphabetic script (e.g., Greek, Roman, Cyrillic) contains graphemes for both consonants and vowels. A syllabary (e.g., Cherokee, Gujarati) is composed of graphemes representing the syllables of a language. These symbols are not visually harmonized or systematized like the graphemes of an abugida. An alphabetic syllabary (e.g., *Han'gǔl*) is a hybrid script based on the alphabetic principle (i.e., the association of sound(s) with a grapheme), but visually oriented, and interpreted syllabically (Pae, 2011). A logo-syllabary (e.g., *Hànzì* 'Chinese characters') places both phonetic and semantic information within a logograph. Once the language planners and policy makers have chosen a script from among the above-mentioned varieties, it becomes the medium for a writing system.

Writing system. The writing system of a language community conforms to the type of script it uses. An alphabetic script produces a writing system which associates its graphemes with the phonological correspondences of the spoken language. This is another example of the alphabetic principle. In the case of a logographic script, the correspondence is between the graphemes and a combination of phonemic and morphologic information. A script is generally adaptable to any language while a writing system is specific to the language it represents because the identical graphemes of an abugida, a syllabary, or an alphabetic script may become associated with different sounds in different writing systems (e.g., the <g> or the <j> in English, French, German and Spanish) (Coulmas, 1989).

An optimal writing system must be easily acquired by the learner, and efficient for the skilled reader and writer (Adams, 1990; Rogers, 1995). As mentioned above, the same script can be used as the basis for differing writing systems that vary according to the needs of the language community (Cottrell, 1971). For example, cuneiform was used for the three languages (i.e., Old Persian, Neo-Babylonian and Elamite) found in the Lawh monuments in Behistun, Iran which date from the time of Darius who ruled from 522 to 486 BCE.



Figure 2. Photograph of the Lawh Monuments in Behistun, Iran.

Some language communities use more than one script in their writing system (e.g., Japanese uses Kanji, Katakana and *Hànzi* scripts, and Egyptian used hieroglyphic, hieratic, demotic, and Coptic scripts). It is important not to conflate the writing system with the language, because “a language is not a writing system; a language typically has a writing system” (Cook et al., 2009, p. 2). Arguably, the same can be said about scripts. Therefore, conflating *Han’gŭl* (the script) with Korean (the language), should also be avoided.

Most linguists place speech above writing in importance. For example, Bloomfield wrote, “in order to study writing, we must know something about language, but the reverse is not true” (1933, p. 21). Nevertheless, it is recognized that a writing system can exert an influence on speech, and on the phonology of a language (Haas, 1970; Levitt, 1978). The unit of analysis of alphabetic writing systems is the phoneme, but morphemes, words, parts of speech, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, and even entire speeches can be used as units of analysis. The Universal

Writing System Constraint Hypothesis argues that a writing system governs the writing-language relationship, and the Language Constraint of that hypothesis states that the writing system does not encode the meaning, but rather the sound of the spoken language (Perfetti, 2003). The modular theory of phonographic writing systems states that the writing system depends on the language system (Neef, 2012). This means that the writing system allows the reader to recode the sound of the spoken language, and the meaning is derived from the language. In all cases, the writing system derives from the chosen script.

Orthography. After the language planners and policy makers have agreed upon a script and a writing system for their language community, they then develop an orthography ‘correct writing’, which is a collection of writing conventions (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, diacritics, upper and lower cases, word spacing, etc.) governing how words are written properly in a given language (Perfetti, 2003). The orthography includes every writing resource that is used by a language community, so that we can refer to the English orthography, or the Japanese orthography (Cook et al., 2009). Academic writing style (e.g., APA, MLA) would also be considered an example of orthography in an academic context. The terms script, writing system, and orthography may be used interchangeably at the macro level, but not at the micro. An orthography does not produce the correct pronunciation of a word (that is what the writing system is for), but it does tell us if the word needs to be capitalized, indented, italicized, bolded, or have any other extra-linguistic effect added to it.

Causes and Factors of Script Change

Languages and scripts are frequently used to distinguish between who belongs to a group and who is an outsider. Kindly recall from the introduction the example of the Hebrew word *shibboleth* which was used as a password to establish identity. As stated above, language groups

use their languages and their scripts as badges of identity, and “the choice and use of a language and of a script can be analyzed by many of the same sociolinguistic tools as used with spoken languages” (Unseth, 2005, p. 20).

Sociolinguistic causes. Two somewhat overlapping sociolinguistic factors involved in script change are 1) identity and separation (e.g., personal, familial, ethnic, gender, age, religion, and class), and 2) participation in wider movements (e.g., economic, cultural, and religious) (Fasold, 1984). Identity expresses ethnicity, nationality, politics, prestige, and religion. It manifests itself in the following three ways: 1) when an outsider wishes to join a group, or an insider wishes to expand it; 2) when a group claims a tradition by identifying with their ancestors; and 3) when minority groups choose to join the dominant national culture (Unseth, 2005). Separation expresses national or ethnic pride, political autonomy, and religion. Its expression can be seen when similar languages (e.g., Serbian and Croatian, Urdu and Hindi) use different scripts (e.g., Cyrillic and Roman; Arabic and Devanagari), when language communities invent a script (e.g., Cherokee), and when cultural or religious exclusivism is asserted (e.g., the Deseret movement by the Mormons in the 19th century) (Bigler, 1998; Unseth, 2005).

Another contributing sociolinguistic factor to script change is the decision by a language community to involve itself in larger movements by changing to the script used for the broader world language in preparation for interaction with the language community of the larger movement. Recall the example from the introduction regarding the Republic of Turkey.

Two of the observable sociolinguistic processes and concepts which can be used for the analysis of script selection are script contact which produces digraphia (see below), and script death. Just as we could argue that some languages are not dead, but live on in their descendants (e.g., Indo-European in the Romance, Germanic, Slavic, and Indic language groups), scripts have

also survived in modified forms (e.g., Brahmi in the Devanagari script, Semitic in the Hebrew). The process of script death reflects the process of language death (i.e., contraction of the number of readers, writers, and domains until none remain) as once occurred with *Niushu* ‘women’s script’ (Chiang, 1995), and the script used by the *Hanunó’o* ‘true, pure, genuine’ in the sole remaining domain of love songs and courtship (Kuipers & McDermott, 1996). Script death is not final if it occurs in one community but is still used in another. Revival efforts are sometimes made for dying scripts just as they are for moribund languages, often with the same result: too little, too late (Unseth, 2005). One notable exception is the previously-mentioned *Niushu* which began to experience a rebirth in the 2000s when it was officially recognized by the Chinese government as a valuable cultural heritage (Liu, 2015). In addition to the factors already mentioned in the introduction such as linguistic fit and adaptability, there are others which are also important to the study of script change as a branch of language planning. The following sections will introduce some of them.

Script as imperial technology. When someone utters the commonplace expression ‘civilization is unthinkable without writing’, it must be subjected to closer reflection. Are the dichotomies that it suggests (between writing and orality, the primitive and the modern, the pre-technological and the intellectual) viable, or is it a mistaken, phono-centric representation which ignores the medium of script? This is the question that Liu (2015) poses as she argues that script and the medium of writing are an imperial technology, and thus a sociolinguistic cause of script change and script initiation, as previously stated in the introduction. Liu details how writing has served imperial designs in the past and present by managing both the time and the vast spaces of empires governed by a centralized bureaucracy. This need for centralized governance and long-distance communication of imperial orders created what she calls the “spatial rationality of

imperialism” (p. 376) which is then facilitated by a writing system. Conquering nations which lacked one often made the script and writing system of a conquered nation a spoil of war. Recall the example of the Akkadians who, after conquering the Sumerians, adapted Cuneiform to their language to solidify their conquest. Genghis Khan repeated this sequence of events when he captured a bilingual Uighur scribe and ordered him to adapt the Uighur script (which had come to Uighur from Syriac via Sogdian) to the Mongol language, thereby producing classical Mongolian which was later borrowed to produce the Manchu writing system (Liu, 2015).

The medium of script also facilitates imperial rule and social organization. Empires are built upon the standardization of scripts (including numbers), orthographies, legal codes, bureaucracies, weights, measures, coinage, and road widths. The dynastic histories which were maintained continuously in China for millennia would not have been possible without a tradition of writing that used and maintained one universal script regardless of the ruling dynasty. Borrowing an existing script is easier than inventing a new one which explains why only a few scripts have been used as the basis for many writing systems. According to Liu (2015), the fact that a multitude of historical languages never felt the need for script initiation suggests that the need to borrow a script arises from “the spatial rationality of imperial expansion” (p. 378).

Liu goes on to explain that the modern use of script as imperial technology deals with the imperial imposition of the Roman script throughout the world under the guise of language reform, but which is in fact a code switch at the level of script, and not true language reform. Examples of this include when the French replaced *Hànzi* by a modified Roman script (one foreign script for another) for writing Vietnamese which eliminated the digraphic writing system that had existed in Vietnam for centuries (i.e., the Vietnamese used *Hànzi* for official court documents and scholarly histories, and they used the Sino-Vietnamese adaptation of *Hànzi* for

informal, spoken Vietnamese). As previously mentioned, the Perso-Arabic script was replaced by a modified Roman (again, two foreign scripts, although Roman was purported to be less foreign) in the Republic of Turkey by Mustafa Kamal *Atatürk*, another code switch at the level of script. Both code switches accomplished political goals through catachresis (i.e., the deliberate misuse of words or concepts), in this case, script change labeled as language reform. Liu (2015) argues that this global push for Romanization is being undertaken by world leaders who consider “the Roman script as the universal medium of progress” (p. 379). This is accomplished by cleansing the cultural and historical vestiges of imperialism from Roman and anointing it the global universal medium, thereby allowing any reform minded person to use it anywhere in the world without political or social repercussions. For example, Romanization movements led by well-meaning reformists occurred in China and Japan producing *rōmaji* and *Gwoyueu Romatzyh* (Liu, 2015).

Liu (2015) traces the origins of how scripts became players on the global stage of universalism and imperialism back to the Enlightenment philologists and orientalist who grouped scripts into the following categories: alphabetical writing, ideographs, pictographs and hieroglyphs. The Jesuits are also credited with contributing to its origins through their grouping of societal development into the categories of enlightened/civilized, semi-civilized, barbarian, and savage. Putting the two sets of categories together, Jean-Jacques Rousseau was then able to write “the depicting of objects is appropriate to a savage people; signs of words and of propositions, to a barbaric people; and the alphabet to civilized people” (as cited in Liu, 2015, p. 380), and Samuel Johnson was able to refer to the Chinese as ‘barbarians’ (as cited in Porter, 2001, p. 76) because of their lack of an alphabet. The nations conquered by European armies, while resisting their conqueror’s political and military hegemony, embraced the Roman script as

a means of becoming members of the community of enlightened civilizations. They converted it into a system of transcription for their languages, a process that led to “the mystification of the phonetic alphabet” (Liu, 2015, p. 381). Thus, the evolutionary theory of script development was born (see below).

The Roman script as a phonetic alphabet is not as phonetic as it is purported to be. In the English writing system, for example, the seven vowel signs represent 54 different sounds, all 26 letters of the alphabet represent 107 sounds, and when digraphs and multigraphs are added, the total becomes 280 sounds (Ogden, 1935) creating a cognitive, “phonocentric fallacy” (Liu, 2015, p. 381) concerning how the writing system connects to the mental sound image (Liu, 2015). According to Derrida (1974), Saussure’s *signifié*, which connects the written letter to the ‘concept’ in the linguistic sign, converts the sound image into a conundrum.

Because spatial rationality has always been included in imperial designs, and because the alphabet’s phonetic element has overshadowed its numerical function, Liu (2015) argues for the inclusion of numbers and numerical thinking in a “generalized semiotic conception...of the sign” (p. 381), and that the evolutionary theory of script development could be replaced by the organic growth “out of a set of semiotic situations much more complex than the need to record human speech” (p. 381). Alphabetic writing is one of the oldest human inventions still in use, and it now forms the basis of the digital media revolution thanks to the American Empire, according to Liu (2015). The Roman script has become the “global, universal medium of communication systems”, and digital media have turned alphabetic writing “into a new imperial coding system” (Liu, 2015, p. 382).

Digraphia. The study of scripts, writing systems, and orthographies was thought of as secondary to language planning/language policy. Because this consideration was based mainly

on linguistic observations and did not consider the sociopolitical aspects, Grivelet (2001) introduced the sociolinguistic process of digraphia into the field. Modelled on Ferguson (1959), digraphia began as an attempt to draw parallels between diglossia (i.e., the use of two languages, each spoken in distinct domains, by one language community), and the observed use of two scripts by a language community (e.g., both the Gujarati and Devanagari scripts for Gujarati). Digraphia refers to the coexistence of two different scripts for the same language community (e.g., Roman and Cyrillic for Serbo-Croatian, Devanagari and Arabic for Hindi-Urdu, and Pinyin and *Hànzì* for Chinese), and to both synchronic and diachronic script change (DeFrancis, 1989). Synchronic digraphia occurs when a writing system survives for limited purposes after it has been replaced by another writing system, or when writing systems are mixed (DeFrancis, 1984). Dale (1980) further clarifies the difference between synchronic and diachronic digraphia and adds that the choice of a script by language planners and policy makers for their language community is affected by “prevailing cultural influences (often a religion)” and the “prevailing political influence” (p. 12) (e.g., conservatism, progressivism, despotism, etc.). He also elucidates the cause of synchronic digraphia as when the prevailing influences are not strong enough to unite all the members of the language group (e.g., Hindi-Urdu and Serbo-Croatian), and the cause of diachronic digraphia as when the prevailing influences change (e.g., Turkish and Korean) (Dale, 1980). Grivelet (2001) gives the following succinct synthesis of the preceding definitions: “Digraphia is a single sociolinguistic process with two types of outcome (concurrent or sequential digraphia) and with specific features related to the causes and types of development of the various cases” (p. 6).

Currently, the notion of digraphia appears most often in scholarly Chinese studies (e.g., Hannas, 1997; Mair, 1996a, 1996b; Unger, 1996; Wang, 1996; Yin, 1991; Zhou, 1986)

examining the implementation of *Hànyū Pīnyīn* (i.e., the rendering of Chinese languages in a Roman based script) in ever expanding domains with an eye towards the eventual replacement of *Hànzì*, the character based logographic system used currently for writing Cantonese, Mandarin, Shanghainese, Taiwanese, etc. *Hànyū Pīnyīn* is derived from the Chinese word meaning ‘the spoken language of the Han people’ plus the word meaning ‘spelled sounds’. These scholars are of the mind that *Hànyū Pīnyīn* will not progress unless and until important people “emerge who can tip the balance in favor of this simpler system of writing by stimulating its prestige and thereby extending its function and acquisition by all segments of the Chinese society” (DeFrancis, 1984, p. 65). This would be the same manner in which French, Italian, and Spanish prevailed over Latin thanks to Pascal and Corneille, Dante and Galileo, Alfonso X and Nebrija (Grivelet, 2001). I agree with these scholars and argue that the triumph of *Han’gŭl* over *Hanja* thanks to Sejong and Sŏ Chae p’il (see below) can be added to the previous list. While the analogy of Grivelet refers to languages, I argue that it can also be applied to script digraphia.

Along with DeFrancis, who actively promotes replacing *Hànzì* with *Hànyū Pīnyīn*, the previously mentioned scholars seek to define digraphia using three characteristics of diglossia: 1) the distinction of scripts into high and low; 2) the specialization of functions or domains for each script; and 3) the stability of each script. Regarding the first characteristic as it relates to Chinese, DeFrancis (1989) tries to make the case for *Hànzì*, or Chinese characters, as the high variety, and *Hànyū Pīnyīn* as the low. Regarding Korean, Haarmann (1993) refers to *Hanja* (based on Chinese characters) as the original high variety and *Han’gŭl* as the low, but points out how *Han’gŭl*, the script developed by King Sejong in the 15th century and referred to as *ŏnmun* ‘vernacular script’ from the time of its creation, came to be called *Han’gŭl* ‘high script’ in the early 20th century because of its increased prestige, the result of evolving Korean societal values

during the development of a national identity beginning in the middle of the 19th century. Also, high and low varieties do not appear to be a characteristic of digraphia since the two most cited examples, the Hindi/Urdu, and Serbian/Croatian language groups, do not base their script choice by making a distinction between high and low varieties of scripts. Nor do these examples represent the second characteristic regarding the specialization of functions or domains (Grivelet, 2001; Zima, 1974). The third characteristic of diglossia, the idea of stability, is disproven to apply to digraphia as well because most researchers in Chinese studies view digraphia as a dynamic process despite the insistence on its transitory nature (Zima, 1974). Therefore, the notion of diglossia distorts the definition of digraphia and its influence can be confined to the idea that two or more writing systems can exist for a language community (Grivelet, 2001). The study of digraphia adds an interesting dimension to this qualitative research synthesis because of the analytical tools it provides, as well as the explanation it offers for failed script changes such as the modifications proposed by Andrés Bello (Páez Urdaneta, 1982) in Chile, and the Romanization of Hebrew (Aytürk, 2010) in Israel.

The evolutionary theory of script development. The early study of script change was dominated by the evolutionary theory of script development, or the alphabetic hypothesis, which assumed that scripts evolve “through the stages of logography, syllabography and alphabetography in this, and no other, order” (Gelb, 1963, p. 201). This claim by Gelb was known as “the principle of unidirectional development” (Daniels, 1996, p. 7). Gelb (1963) defines this process as “the necessary conclusion of natural development that leads from logograms through syllabic signs to the decomposition of syllables into signs for consonants and vowels” (p. 201). According to the evolutionary theory of script development, the permanency of visible language produced by the interaction of the script, the writing system, and the

orthography makes the written language seem destined to continue along the traceable line of its development, and project into the future (Coulmas, 1989). Eventually, evolution had to be removed from the typology of writing systems even though it can be applied scientifically to human speech and metaphorically to natural language change (Daniels, 1996). The evolutionary theory of script development is not to be confused with the evolutionary model of script change.

The evolutionary theory of script development has been used by apologists such as Hegel and McLuhan to trumpet the supremacy of Western civilization. McLuhan (1962) wrote with absolute certainty that “it is by alphabet alone that men have detribalized or individualized themselves into ‘civilization’.... without the phonetic alphabet they [cultures] remain tribal, as do the Chinese and the Japanese” (p. 48). Coulmas (1989), debunking this statement says, “to describe one of the most advanced civilizations of the world as ‘tribal’ only because it makes use of a non-alphabetic writing system is capricious if not absurd” (p. 169).

The evolutionary theory of script development, refuted by Neef, Grivelet, Coulmas, and others, introduces assumptions into the field of writing systems that are created by the controversial and circular notion that visible language both reproduces a schema of the spoken language and structures it in the mind of the writer, like the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis which conjectures that language itself structures the thoughts of the speaker (Fishman, 1982). The evolutionary theory of script development glosses over the effect that writing system technology (e.g., scripts, writing systems, and orthographies) exerts on the social context of the language community. Linguistic analysis and functionality were outcomes of script technology, not the goal, as the evolutionary theory of script development would have us believe. The initial goal of script technology was to record inventories, then to convey meaning, and eventually to provide identity (Coulmas, 2009). The fact that Roman is the most widely propagated of all scripts can

be explained by many factors that influence the choice of the script used for the initial visible representation of a hitherto unwritten language. Two of these are colonization by a foreign power as practiced by the Romans, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, and English (each one a language community that employed the Roman script), and proselytization by Christian missionaries (who also used Roman) in the American, Asian, and African continents, and on the islands of Oceania (Coulmas, 2003).

Logically speaking, if the development of the Greek alphabet were the inevitable outcome of evolution, then it would not be unique because all writing systems should follow the path predicted by Gelb, or so the evolutionary theory of script development would have us believe (Coulmas, 2009). The Greek alphabet is the result of adaptation from the Semitic abjad alphabet via the Phoenician. A significant advance in writing system technology was produced by this adaptation because it bridged one language type (Phoenician had very few vowels) to another (Greek vowels had high morphemic value). Greek scribes needed vowel graphemes in addition to consonant graphemes, therefore signs resembling those for the consonants were invented to represent the vowels, then added to the Semitic script. Vowel signs were not needed in Hebrew or Arabic, two other languages that adapted the Semitic script, because vowels had limited morphemic value. Therefore, an abjad script (in which vowels are indicated using optional diacritics) was sufficient to develop their writing systems. The addition of vowel signs represents a major advancement from the ‘independent consonant’ type of alphabet to the ‘independent consonant’ + ‘independent vowel’ type (Voegelin & Voegelin, 1961).

The causes and factors of script change detailed above provided me with the necessary framework for evaluating the Korean and Turkish script changes and performing the comparative

analysis below. Now, I turn to a detailed description of Qualitative Research Synthesis and how I put it to use.

METHODOLOGY

For my methodology I will be performing a Qualitative Research Synthesis (QRS). The processes employed in a QRS are drawn from the qualitative research of the past two decades. A QRS is a means of extracting knowledge from the findings of existing qualitative studies. It is not an entirely new concept: literature reviews and summaries have always been a staple method for research. QRS is conceived of as a parallel to the quantitative research method of meta-analysis. Major and Savin-Baden (2010), in their search for such a parallel method, looked first at narrative reviews (also referred to as narrative explanatory syntheses), research syntheses, explanatory literature reviews, and narrative literature reviews. Their objective was to be able to view qualitative studies in relation to each other to reveal the implicit inner meanings found within the relationship. Then, they discovered some useful models in meta-analysis of quantitative studies, meta-summary, grounded meta-analysis (i.e., the extraction and reduction of data through aggregated topical/thematic summaries), quantitative content analysis, and case survey (i.e., the imposition of quantitative processes on qualitative data). They felt that the previously mentioned models were more narrative-based or aggregative, than interpretive, and that it was important to take an interpretive stance, an approach that they discovered in *Meta-ethnography: Synthesizing qualitative studies* (Noblit and Hare, 1988). This led to the creation of QRS which does in fact incorporate taking a critical, interpretive stance into its methodology. For example, the criteria that Savin-Baden and Fisher (2002) use for engaging with honesties in the research process include placing themselves in relation to both their participants and to the

data, admitting their mistakes, and approaching research from a careful, more attentive stance (Savin-Baden & Major, 2007).

QRS is also a method of dealing with the information explosion in the social sciences. It avoids reinventing the wheel, connects existing studies to each other, and complements primary empirical studies and quantitative meta-analysis or meta-syntheses by presenting a different perspective. QRS also advances theory, identifies gaps and omissions, enables dialogue and debate, and develops evidence-based practice and policy. It is a cost-efficient approach to qualitative research intended for social science researchers, for lecturers who wish to assign a QRS instead of a traditional research paper or review, and for practitioners, planners, and policy makers. QRS is being used by other doctoral candidates for their dissertations as well (Major & Savin-Baden, 2010).

The Synthesis Design

During the design process of a QRS, researchers ask themselves critical questions to become self-conscious and to proceed towards self-awareness. The research question that is constructed is meant to demonstrate the researchers' knowledge of the field and to determine what part of that knowledge will be accessed to produce the data for interpretation. To give an example of determining the knowledge to be accessed, Savin-Baden and Major (2007) felt it necessary to acquaint their readers with four essential areas of the literature on the topic of problem-based learning to equip them with the knowledge necessary to understand the results. The researchers' question is also constructed to determine what new knowledge will be produced, how future research will be undertaken, and which practices and policies might be affected by their findings. Major (2010), for example, makes recommendations to university administrators which might affect their policies regarding distance learning. Also, Major and

Savin-Baden (2010) make clear their intention to inform both methodological and disciplinary practices.

The research question states not only what the researchers want to know, but why they want to know it. It also determines at what point during the research they are performing their roles as critic, analyst, or advocate, three roles or perspectives that are used interchangeably during the analysis, interpretation, and presentation of the results, and reflect their stance as QRS synthesists (Major & Savin-Baden, 2010). In the formulation of their question the researchers consider the following: 1) the entities which are the subject of their synthesis; 2) the environment of the entities; 3) the intervention they undergo; 4) the comparison produced by their synthesis; and 5) the outcome of the intervention (Major & Savin-Baden, 2010). As the researchers reflect upon their question during the research and writing process, and consider the final product of the QRS, they consider its purpose (i.e., why this question and not another, what do they hope to accomplish), the source of the question (i.e., what experiences influenced them and led them to it, what do they think the answer is), and its components (i.e., which ones are the most important, how do they delimit the synthesis, can the delimitation be justified). In addition to these self-reflective questions, the synthesists also reflect on the practical ones concerning the level of interest which their topic holds for them and for others, its importance to the field, the likelihood of encountering sufficient data (i.e., accessible, original studies) that can be analyzed by a QRS, and whether it is reasonably limited in scope.

During the process of identifying their data (i.e., qualitative studies) the researchers make explicit mention of the parameters, search strings, criteria for inclusion and exclusion, and how the studies are appraised. The inclusion of such detailed description allows for the replication of the synthesis (Savin-Baden & Major, 2007). For example, Major and Savin-Baden (2010)

include a detailed description of their search process in acknowledgment of the importance of recognized best research practices. To yield the highest number of relevant articles in the initial search, synthesists consult databases such as the Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA), the Modern Language Association International Bibliography (MLA), Journal Storage (JSTOR), and the Online Computer Library Center (WorldCat) using Boolean logic (e.g., scripts AND, scripts OR, scripts NOT) including parentheses (e.g., scripts AND (change OR initiation)) which should elicit a manageable data set. In addition to consulting databases, researchers perform hand-searches of the tables of content and bibliographies of key journals and books, and the bibliographies of relevant articles as Major (2010) does for her study “Do virtual professors dream of electric students?” Hand-searches, as exemplified in Savin-Baden and Major (2007), are used to overcome the difficulty of identifying electronically all relative studies caused by the differences in terminology used by researchers in different countries.

To identify the studies that constitute the data for the QRS, researchers read the abstracts to determine if the studies contain qualitative data, then they peruse them to identify that qualitative data in the form of rich, thick quotations and descriptions that will withstand thinning during analysis. As an example of thick description, consider Ryle (1971) writing about,

a single golfer, with six golf balls in front of him, hitting each of them, one after another, towards one and the same green. He then goes and collects the balls, comes back to where he was before and does it again. (p. 474)

The synthesists also look for clearly described methods of collection and analysis, and some indication of the researcher’s stance, an important and necessary aspect of a QRS.

Otherwise, as Savin-Baden and Major (2007) point out, there is the tendency among researchers

without an interpretive stance to decontextualize the studies and use thin rather than thick descriptions. Such researchers also pay less attention to differences in methodology.

When the synthesists reflect on the selection of the studies, which they generally seek in peer-reviewed journals because of the quality implied by the rigor of the peer-review process, they reconsider the methods used, how the search is limited or extended by the use of connectors in the strings, and how this may permit omissions. They also review the search strings and how other potential terms may affect the nature of the synthesis by producing different results. Finally, they reconsider the criteria for inclusion and exclusion, how these influence the synthesis, and if they can be justified.

When appraising the quality of the studies, synthesists take into consideration that both strong and weak studies can add to their ability to interpret data, but they are wary of studies containing design flaws, and they consider excluding them unless they contain thick, rich descriptions or useful data that make them worthwhile. The synthesists' criteria include the presence of the researchers' stance and the congruity between that stance and the methodology, and between the methodology and the research goals. They also consider the congruity between the research questions and the following: 1) the data collection techniques; 2) the data analysis; and 3) the presentation of the findings. Finally, they look for congruity between the methodology and the interpretation of the findings (Major & Savin-Baden, 2010).

The final sample of studies from which the synthesists draw their data represents a balance between two important issues: 1) comprehensive representation versus saturation; and 2) maximum richness versus manageability. To resolve the first issue, they begin with a comprehensive list of potential studies, then run data strings until the repetition of themes (i.e., the findings from the original studies which are found to be unequivocal or credible) diminishes

(i.e., the point of saturation). As far as the second issue goes, it is true that the more comprehensive the sample, the richer the data. Hence, more studies allow for more development, and more data strings equal greater ease in finding strong examples of the themes. But the advantage of data richness becomes a disadvantage when the data set becomes unwieldy and cannot be analyzed, synthesized, or interpreted because of its richness. Savin-Baden and Major (2007), for example, achieve this balance using criteria for inclusion and exclusion based on the exacting needs of that study, and choose their criteria based on their knowledge of problem-based learning and their familiarity with qualitative approaches.

Because each qualitative study is by criteria already rich in thick description, the number of studies for a QRS varies from synthesist to synthesist, from a minimum of two to four studies all the way through a maximum of ten to twenty studies. Major and Savin-Baden (2010) recommend six to ten studies to obtain manageability with satisfactory richness as exemplified in Savin-Baden and Major (2007) which includes six articles that meet their criteria for inclusion and pass their evaluation. Synthesists determine that their sample is complete when new themes cease to appear, and the amount of data is deemed sufficient to enable their analysis.

As a matter of course, QRS incorporates a final reflection upon the design process which involves the synthesist in three phases: 1) critical appraisal to determine if the question identifies the commonality in the existing literature, and if it has all been examined; 2) evidential support to insure that any policy papers that identify critical questions, any recent publications that outline advances in electronic search technology, any collaborations that use similar appraisal criteria, or any new methods papers have been taken into consideration; and 3) the use of reflection to evaluate strengths and weaknesses for planning future research (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; Major & Savin-Baden, 2010). This final reflection, included in the methods

section, helps to provide the QRS with additional credibility. As an example, Savin-Baden and Major (2004) developed an instrument for evaluating credibility to identify studies that reflect the values the authors considered necessary for inclusion in interpretive meta-ethnography. Along a scale of 0-3 (i.e., 0 = No mention; 1 = Some mention; 2 = Good mention; and 3 = Extensive mention), they evaluated the following criteria: 1) Researcher(s) situated in relation to participants; 2) Mistakes voiced; 3) Researcher(s) situated in relation to data; 4) Researcher(s) take a critical stance towards research; 5) Participant involvement in data interpretation; 6) Study theoretically situated; and 7) Different versions of participants' identities acknowledged.

Table 2. Instrument for Evaluating Studies Suitable for QRS (modified from the evaluation instrument that was developed by Savin-Baden and Major (2004) to assess credibility of each study necessary for inclusion in interpretive meta-ethnography).

	0	1	2	3
	<i>No mention</i>	<i>Some mention</i>	<i>Good mention</i>	<i>Extensive mention</i>
Researcher(s) situated in relation to participants				
Mistakes voiced;				
Researcher(s) situated in relation to data;				
Researcher(s) take a critical stance towards research;				
Participant involvement in data interpretation				
Study theoretically situated				
Different versions of participants' identities acknowledged				

Analysis, Synthesis, and Interpretation

In a QRS, the analysis, synthesis, and interpretation of data is an “iterative process of thinking, interpreting, creation, theorizing and reflecting” (Paterson, Thorne, Canam & Jillings, 2001, p. 112). The process begins with situating the studies, then deciding what counts as data, followed by comparing the studies, and finally, by identifying the findings. Among the many forms of analysis to inform the situation of the original studies, Noblit and Hare (1988) proposed the following: 1) reciprocal translation in which studies are combined and situated in terms of one another by identifying common themes and concepts, then choosing the most adequate theme and concept for the synthesis; 2) refutational analysis which sets one study against another in order to refute and explain contradictions; and 3) line of argument analysis which shows how one study informs another. The line of argument analysis relates the studies to each other in four different ways: A) emic (based on internal structure and function); B) historical/chronological; C) comparative/analogical; and D) holistic understanding through interpretation and context. Situating the studies allows the researchers to construct a generalized interpretation which is grounded in the original studies and represents the themes of the dataset (Dixon-Woods *et al.*, 2006).

The location of what counts as data must be chosen along a continuum which starts with everything in the study on one end and extends to only the original data presented in the findings on the other. Major and Savin-Baden (2010) recommend the middle ground (i.e., using the context and the rich, thick description from the original data). To compare studies, it is necessary to summarize the details of each one by setting, participants, notions of validity, and positioning. It is also necessary to identify the main themes, the methodology, and the findings. This step is exemplified by Savin-Baden and Major (2007) where they summarize each of the six

studies included in their QRS, allowing the readers to familiarize themselves with the type of studies the researchers use and how each study meets the criteria for inclusion. Once this is completed the details are placed in a tabulated summary to facilitate the analysis and the identification of the findings. For example, the following table is used by Savin-Baden and Major (2007):

Table 3. Faculty Perceptions of Innovative Experiences of Learning (Savin-Baden & Major, 2007).

<i>Methods, perceptions, and concepts</i>	Savin-Baden (2000)	Major and Palmer (2002)	Major and Palmer (2006)	Savin-Baden (2003)	Wilkie (2004)	Foord-May (2006)
<i>Sample</i>	22 academic staff	31 faculty	31 faculty	20 academy staff	18 academic staff	7 faculty
<i>Setting</i>	Four departments in four UK Universities	Private University in the US	Private University in the US	Faculty in UK University	Faculty in UK University	Department in US University
<i>Methods</i>	New paradigm research and narrative inquiry	Narrative inquiry	Narrative inquiry	Narrative and collaborative inquiry	Constructivist interpretivist paradigm	Qualitative inquiry
<i>Data collection</i>	Semi-structured interviews	Semi-structured interview	Semi-structured interview	In-depth interviews, email discussions	Semi-structured interviews, audio taping of seminars	Semi-structured interviews; focus groups
<i>Notion of validity</i>	Trustworthiness and reflexivity	Trustworthiness and reflexivity	Trustworthiness and reflexivity	Trustworthiness and reflexivity	Trustworthiness and reflexivity	Participant validation
<i>Positioning of researcher</i>	Inquirer and reflexive learner	Inquirers and Insider/outsider	Inquirers and Insider/outsider	Co-inquirer	Co-inquirer	Inquirer and researcher
<i>Themes and concepts</i>	Disjunction causes faculty change in pedagogical stance	Faculty knowledge of students is fundamentally altered with adoption of PBL	Faculty knowledge of discipline and pedagogy is altered with PBL and ultimately expressed differently	Pedagogical stance affects positioning of faculty in PBL environments	Facilitator approaches are affected by conceptions of learning	Support for faculty is vital for effective change management

In a QRS, there is a four-step process by which the findings are identified: 1) locating (i.e., the findings related to the question are identified and any unrelated findings are discarded); 2) extracting (i.e., the study is deconstructed to identify the givens allowing the studies to be compared); 3) evaluating (i.e., finding and submitting the evidence to criteria); and 4) translating (i.e., convert the rich text to themes and sub-themes) (Major & Savin-Baden, 2010). The evidence found in step 3 can be evaluated using a rating scale, such as the following: Unequivocal = supported with clear and compelling evidence; Credible = plausible given the weight of the evidence; Unsupported = not supported by data (The Joanna Briggs Institute, 2007, as cited in Major & Savin-Baden, 2010, p. 58). When the four steps are completed it is time to move on to the analysis.

Analysis. Analysis moves beyond comparisons and contrasts by listing and organizing themes, and relating them to each other (Schofield, 1990). The themes (both converging and diverging) are drawn from the findings which are located across the different studies. The value of a QRS in interpreting the themes while acknowledging the stance of the researchers is that the social and theoretical context of the research can be recovered enabling new syntheses and interpretations. The themes form part of the analysis, and some become part of the final interpretation while others are discarded in favor of more relevant or salient ones. A good example of this is found in Savin-Baden and Major (2007) where they demonstrate the flexibility of a QRS by using original themes (which had been relabeled from the original articles) and new themes when the originals did not fully capture the synthesized ideas.

A QRS depends on a good coding scheme which helps with retrieval and comparison and contains enough coding symbols to encompass the number of themes and additional sub-themes

that are generated. When temporary saturation is reached (i.e., no new codes are generated) the coding process is finished, and the synthesis can begin.

Synthesis. During the synthesis, the common themes across studies are identified so that the data can be compared, and the concepts explored to understand how the studies were presented. Major and Savin-Baden (2010) suggest that a matrix be constructed to assist the tracking of codes and themes during the synthesis. Using an attentive and reflective stance, the researchers attempt to create with their synthesis a new perspective by combining primary order themes and categories to identify secondary order themes and categories, while maintaining realistic transitions between the levels. Potentially, this new perspective achieved through synthesis will lead to increased knowledge and understanding of the field. This process is exemplified by Savin-Baden and Major (2007) where both researchers read all the studies carefully, examine the relationship between them, extract common themes, and synthesize the data to develop secondary order themes, leading to third order interpretations that go beyond a simple comparison of the findings of each.

Interpretation. The next step in a QRS is the interpretation of findings. Interpretation is more than a comparison, or an aggregation. It takes the findings of the primary studies to the higher level of an interpretation. The interpretation itself occurs on three levels: 1) seeking revelation; 2) developing third order interpretations; and 3) allowing for differences (Major & Savin-Baden, 2010). Denzin (1989) compares interpretations to epiphanies, or revelations, that come in four types: A) Major (i.e., a Maslow-like peak experience caused by a singular event; a turning point); B) Cumulative (i.e., a revelation produced by a series of events); C) Illustrative (i.e., an insight revealed through reflection on a certain moment, a specific experience, or an event that raises questions); and D) Relived (i.e., understanding derived from reliving events).

Using these processes in an iterative fashion, the synthesists arrive at their interpretation by reviewing the patterns of and connections between the primary order themes and secondary order themes to develop the third, or tertiary order themes. As they search for common meanings and organizing principles they try to avoid oversimplification in the early stage to allow complexity to emerge, and if they describe the product (i.e., their interpretation) with enough transparency, the process will reveal itself through inference. As an example of how they support their interpretations, Savin-Baden and Major (2007) quote thick, rich descriptions from the original studies.

There are differences between the primary order analysis of the original studies and the secondary order themes and tertiary order interpretations which the researchers discover. In a QRS it is important to highlight those differences and explain them rather than force the data into artificial themes. This is because real synthesis admits the possibility of failure (Noblit & Hare, 1988) when the perceived similarity of the primary order analysis turns out to be fundamentally different from the final interpretation, when the comparison or metaphor breaks down, or the analogy falls apart during the iterative process detailed above (Major & Savin-Baden, 2010). As an example of the importance of the third level of interpretation, Savin-Baden & Major (2007) point out that, since it is a questionable research practice to force all data into the common themes, they retain issues that diverge and point out the differences when some primary themes do not fit into the final interpretation.

As mentioned previously, QRS incorporates self-reflection and self-awareness into the process of producing a synthesis. This is accomplished by asking questions throughout the process. For example, during the primary level analysis the researchers ask themselves about the clarity of the findings, the source of the themes, and how those themes converge or diverge.

During the secondary level synthesis, they consider how discrepancies in the themes affect their confidence in their synthesis, and during the tertiary level interpretation they reflect on how they manage, interpret, and explain the data, and whether they have explained any contradictions that have arisen. Although Major and Savin-Baden (2010) are aware that technology can help synthesisists perform a QRS through indexing, searching, coding, retrieval, data connection, data management, extraction, appraisal, synthesis, and reporting, they recommend working with the data in a “hands on” (p. 70) fashion to allow the themes to emerge and develop iteratively.

QRS Applied

Following the QRS methodology described above, I formulated my research questions by asking myself what I knew about script change as a branch of language planning and what more I wanted to know. For this reason, although my original questions evolved as my research progressed, my questions came to demonstrate my knowledge of the field, determined what part of that knowledge I accessed to produce the data for my interpretation, and reflected my stance as a synthesist. They also determined what new knowledge was produced, the practices and policies affected by my findings, and suggested what future research could be undertaken. My final questions ask if there are two different models of script change and if one model is more useful than the other. They demonstrate my desire to assist language planners and policy makers engaged in script change, and they remind me that during the research, analysis, interpretation, and presentation of the results, I play the interchangeable roles of critic, analyst, and advocate for my synthesis.

To arrive at my final language communities, I began by creating a spreadsheet of 180 important, widely spoken, visible languages, from the past or present (Garry & Rubino, 2001). The spreadsheet (see appendix 5, p. 251) contains columns for the name of the language, its

autonym (i.e., what the language community itself calls the language), the name of its initial script, the approximate date of its adoption, the name of its first script conversion, the approximate date of the first conversion, whether or not the language is digraphic, whether the language is living or extinct, miscellaneous information, references, and any subsequent script conversions along with approximate dates for those conversions. I then categorized them according to the number of script changes they had undergone, ending up with 5 categories of language communities: A) those still using their initial script; B) those having undergone one script change; C) those with two script changes; D) those with three changes; and E) the one language community with four identifiable script changes, Uyghur. Interestingly, but not surprisingly, the size of the categories diminishes with the number of conversions as do the time intervals between script changes.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Total</i>
A	Those still using their initial script.	113
B	Those having undergone one script change.	38
C	Those with two script changes.	17
D	Those with three changes.	11
E	The one language community with four identifiable script changes.	1

From the initial 180 languages, I chose 22 that, based on my previous studies, experience, background knowledge, and the research I had collected, merited inclusion in a preliminary investigation to determine if there might be a sufficient number of studies available to qualify them as good candidates for a QRS. These are the languages that were chosen: from category B

(i.e., one script change), Arabic, Bhojpuri, Korean, Romanian, Turkish, Urdu, and Wolaitta; from category C (i.e., two script changes), Javanese, Kazakh, Persian, Santali, and Vietnamese; from category D (i.e., three script changes), Azerbaijani, Kirghiz, Mongolian, Sindhi, Sundanese, Tajik, Tatar, Turkmen, and Uzbek; and Uyghur (the only language with four script changes) from category E. During this step I noticed that several languages from the former USSR (Azerbaijani, Kirghiz, Tajik, Tatar, Turkmen, and Uzbek) had all passed through the same conversions, and that Kazakh had followed a very similar path. This suggested to me that they could be treated as one group. I determined to use Uzbek as the representative of this group instead of the entire group since they all had undergone the same or similar conversions. This reduced the total number of languages to 16, a necessary step towards producing a reasonable limit to the scope of my QRS.

Table 5. Preliminary List of 22 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Category A</i>	<i>Category B</i>	<i>Category C</i>	<i>Category D</i>	<i>Category E</i>
Arabic		x			
Bhojpuri		x			
Korean		x			
Romanian		x			
Turkish		x			
Hindi/Urdu		x			
Wolaitta		x			
Javanese			x		
Kazakh			x		
Persian			x		
Santali			x		
Vietnamese			x		
Azerbaijani				x	
Kirghiz				x	
Mongolian				x	
Sindhi				x	
Sundanese				x	
Tajik				x	
Tatar				x	
Turkmen				x	
Uzbek				x	
Uyghur					x

Next, I compiled the information I had in my spreadsheet for the 16 languages I had chosen and researched them further in the *Concise Compendium of the World's Languages* (Campbell, 1995) to add to my knowledge of the chosen languages, and to refine my list. Then, I did a simple string search (Language AND Script) in the LLBA for each language on the list and repeated the search to verify my results. The number of references to articles and books revealed by these searches yielded evidence that some of the candidates on the list were more promising than others because of the number of studies available. My continued research revealed that the

script change models for Javanese and Persian are each of such a complexity (i.e., two script changes, models other than Han'gŭlization and Romanization) that they merit their own QRS. Likewise, other languages that I considered with multiple script changes in Categories C and D proved counterproductive to my initial research aims of understanding the nature of script change because each additional script change introduced more confounding variables (e.g., additional literary traditions, increased literacy). Furthermore, the Turkish and Uzbek languages proved to be so similar that they could be considered varieties of one model of script change. This additional process of elimination reduced the total number of languages to seven, all from Category B (i.e., one script change).

As I reviewed the remaining seven, a distinction emerged (i.e., the creation of an original script) between the script change of the Korean language community from *Hanzi* to *Han'gŭl* (a script created especially for the language) and the script changes of the other six languages from their initial scripts to modified or adapted versions of existing scripts. Concurrent with taking note of the unusual elements of the Han'gŭlization of Korean, I also noted the consensus within the LPLP research field that the script change of the Turkish language community from Arabic to Roman epitomizes the typical (and possibly necessary) conditions and patterns for script change to occur. Yet, given the resurgent movement within Turkey to revert to the Arabic script less than a century after the Turkish Language Reform and the growing appreciation of the success of Han'gŭlization, I considered whether it was time to reexamine our assumptions about these two models (despite the different conditions and processes that they exhibit), and whether this reexamination would contribute to our understanding of script change as a phenomenon. Therefore, I made a final choice of comparing the Turkish script change (representing the revolutionary model) to the Korean (representing the evolutionary one). This reduction of the

number of language communities was the result of the shift in my focus from examining many similar, individual models to comparing two distinct ones. Reducing the number facilitated their comparison and achieved a reasonable scope for my dissertation. Then, in pursuit of the answers to my research questions, I proceeded to consider the representative models in view of their historical, sociolinguistic environments and by comparing the status of each script change.

	Korean (Evolutionary)	Ottoman Turkish (Revolutionary)
<i>Name of Initial script</i>	<i>Hanja</i>	Arabic
<i>Name of subsequent script</i>	<i>Han'gŭl</i>	Modified Roman
<i>Date of (proposed) script change</i>	15th century CE	1928
<i>Origin of script</i>	Specifically designed	Imported from Europe
<i>Literacy rate at time of (proposed) change</i>	Low	Low
<i>Type of rule at the time of (proposed) change</i>	Benevolent monarchy	Authoritarian presidency

Inclusion and exclusion criteria. My next step was to identify the studies (which I had sought in peer-reviewed journals because of the quality implied by the rigor of the peer-review process) that would constitute the data for this QRS to determine whether they met my criteria for selection. The studies which I chose to include had to: 1) address the Han'gŭlization and Romanization models of script change (studies addressing other models such as Cyrillization, Hellenization, Hebraization, Devanagarization, were excluded); 2) be empirical, qualitative, and contain thick, rich descriptions which would withstand the thinning process during analysis; 3) be interpretive; and 4) reflect to some degree the stances of the researchers.

Table 7. Criteria for Selection and Exclusion.				
	0	1	2	3
	<i>No Mention</i>	<i>Some Mention</i>	<i>Good Mention</i>	<i>Extensive Mention</i>
<p>Researcher(s) addressed the models of script change: Han'gŭlization and Romanization</p> <p>Research was empirical, qualitative, and contained thick, rich descriptions which would withstand the thinning process during analysis</p> <p>Research was interpretive</p> <p>Researcher stance was reflected to some degree</p>				

After reviewing the studies which were in my initial selection (7 regarding Korean and 19 regarding Turkish), I realized that the most revealing of them were the empirical ones dealing with the status of my chosen language communities. This realization sharpened my focus even more. For Korean, the selected studies deal with a purported polemic between Korean linguists and linguists from the international community regarding the role played by Protestant missionaries in the reevaluation of *Han 'gŭl* in the 19th and 20th centuries. I will argue that the success of the Korean script change from *Hanja* to *Han 'gŭl* is so complete that the current research is no longer concerned with if or how *Han 'gŭl* will succeed, but in assigning the proper credit to those who are responsible for its success.

For Turkish, I selected the studies which address the resurgence of Ottoman Turkish, a trend which suggests a possible return to the Perso-Arabic script and a reversal of the Turkish Language Reform. I will argue that the characterization of the Turkish script change from Arabic to Roman as the foremost example of Romanization in history is currently being called into question because of the neo-Ottomanist ideology of the current government led by President Erdoğan.

Table 8. List of 4 Studies and Criteria for Selection.

	<i>Han'gŭlization and Romanization</i>	<i>Empirical & rich descriptions</i>	<i>Interpretive</i>	<i>Reflect researcher(s) stance</i>	<i>Overall Score</i>
<i>Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization, King (2004)</i>	3	2	3	2	36
<i>Missionary contributions toward the revaluation of Hangeul in late 19th century Korea, Silva (2008)</i>	3	2	3	2	36
<i>Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish campaigns on Facebook, Yazan (2015)</i>	3	2	3	2	36
<i>Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: current language planning and discussions in Turkey, Yazan and Üzümlü (2016)</i>	3	3	3	2	54

My analysis, synthesis, and interpretation. I began the iterative QRS process by choosing the studies that met the criteria for inclusion. Then I decided what part of each study would be considered as data, followed by the harvesting of that data from the studies, and finally, by identifying the themes and concepts. I analyzed the original studies by combining and situating them in terms of one another, by identifying common themes and concepts (e.g., politics, nationalism, identity), then choosing the most adequate ones for my synthesis. These are the themes that I identified: 1) assigning credit for the revaluation of *Han'gũl*; and 2) the shifting ideology in Turkey that threatens the Turkish script change. Situating the studies in terms of one another allowed me to construct a generalized interpretation grounded in the original studies and representing the themes of the dataset.

Table 9. Qualitative Research Synthesis Themes.
<i>Themes</i>
1) Assigning credit for the revaluation of <i>Han'gũl</i> .
2) The shifting ideology in Turkey that threatens the Turkish script change.

Per the above methodology, I located the data along a continuum starting with everything-in-the-study on one end and extending to only-original-data-presented-in-the-findings on the other. I used both the rich, thick descriptions from the original data and the findings from the studies for my data. I preserved all data that was found to be related to my question and discarded any that was unrelated. To compare the studies, I summarized each one by its topic, focus, participants, and stance. I also identified the main concepts, themes, and sub-themes for each study. I accomplished this by placing the data in a spreadsheet (see appendices 1-4, p. 194,

p. 208, p. 222, p. 235) to facilitate its analysis using Dedoose (<https://www.dedoose.com>), an online application for collecting and analyzing qualitative research.

Once the data were identified and the main concepts had been labeled, I converted the text to themes and concepts, and then coded them. A QRS depends on a good coding scheme which helps with the retrieval and comparison of the data. I developed my coding scheme by taking the first three letters of the principal word in the descriptor of the theme or concept and enclosing them within brackets. This provided enough coding symbols for the number of themes, additional sub-themes, and concepts that were generated and made the counting process simple using the 'find' feature of my documents. If the first three letters of the principal word were already taken, I used the next set of three letters. Then, script change model by script change model, I described and illustrated the themes, the sub-themes that were derived from them, and concepts using appropriate excerpts from the data. The themes were drawn from both the thick, rich descriptions and from the findings which were located across the different studies. The themes and sub-themes formed part of the analysis, and some became part of the final interpretation while others were discarded in favor of more relevant and salient ones. The sub-themes were created during this step by analyzing the data according to how they addressed the themes. My analysis moved beyond comparisons and contrasts by listing and organizing the themes and sub-themes by how they related to each other. When no new sub-themes were generated, I considered the analysis process finished, and began my synthesis.

Table 10. Sample of Codes, Descriptors, and Counts.

<i>Code</i>	<i>Descriptors</i>	<i>Count</i>
[LAN]	Language, language reform, linguistics	249
[SCR]	Script change/conversion/adoption	247
[IDE]	Identity, culture, symbols, heritage, ethnicity, tradition, history, literature	208
[EDU]	Education, instruction, teachers, pedagogy, training	175
[GOV]	Government, bureaucracy, control	166
[LIT]	Literacy/illiteracy (reading & writing), literature	165
[REL]	Religion	131
[POL]	Politics, political party	104
[NAT]	Nationalism/nation building/nationality, state	103
[ISM]	-isms, ideology, modernization, globalization, imperialism, colonialism	100
[LPL]	Language planning/policy, planners and policy makers	91
[ORT]	Orthographic reform/changes	88
[ELI]	Elite/intelligentsia/literati, writers	84
[POW]	Power, prestige/stigma, coercion, control	66
[KNO]	Knowledge, wisdom, learnedness, philosophy	50
[PEO]	People (commoners, masses)	46
[AUT]	Authority	45
[NCE]	Stance	31
[STA]	Status planning	23
[REV]	Revolutionary	16
[COR]	Corpus planning	13
[TIM]	Time	10
[EVO]	Evolutionary	1

During the synthesis, I identified the common themes across studies so that the data could be compared, and the concepts could be explored. Using a thoughtful and reflective stance, I attempted to create a new perspective with my synthesis of the themes and sub-themes. This process led me to the discovery of my overarching theme: identity. This new perspective achieved through this QRS provides the answers to my questions regarding the two models of script change. I arrived at this discovery by reviewing the patterns of, and connections between the themes and sub-themes. As I searched for common meanings and organizing principles, I knew that the process I had followed could be inferred because I had described with enough transparency how I analyzed the themes to arrive at the sub-themes and then synthesized those sub-themes to arrive at my conclusion. There are differences between the themes from the original studies, the sub-themes created by my analysis, and the synthesis which I produced. I have highlighted those differences and explained them in the following chapter.

As I reflected upon the process of this QRS in the light of the results of my synthesis (beginning with my initial questions and continuing through the research and writing stages) I realized that I had discovered a focus which exceeded the mere description of several different examples of script change, and which offered language planners and policy makers a clear choice between two distinct models to consider in their deliberations, one of which was discernibly more useful. I found that my own interest in script change was reinvigorated by my discovery and that my motivation to continue writing and investigating was also renewed. I felt confident that the narrative I was creating would interest my readers.

CASE STUDIES

As indicated in the introduction, my research has shown me that most script change follows the path of the Republic of Turkey when it was founded almost 100 years ago: an autocratic ruler quickly imposes an ideologically motivated script change on a mostly illiterate populace during a period of social upheaval without considering the needs of the entire language community or heeding the objections of the opposition. One language community that I have investigated, the Korean, appears to have followed a different path. A script change was proposed by a benevolent ruler, King Sejong, who encouraged, but did not force its adoption. This moment of inception was followed by a five-century long process during which the new script, *Han'gŭl*, gradually evolved from the stigmatized form of writing to become the prestigious, eventually replacing the previously preferred form.

To achieve my goal of offering either a more useful model of script change, or two models of equal viability to the language planners and policy makers for their consideration, I performed a case study for the revolutionary model represented by the Turkish language community, and one for the evolutionary model represented by the Korean. Here they are now, followed by the data from the QRS, a synthesis of that data, a comparative analysis of the two models, my conclusions, and a discussion of their implications.

Korean

I begin with a brief history of the origin and development of the Korean language, then proceed to detail the process by which it became a visible language (including the use of *Hanja* ‘Chinese writing’, the development of *Ido* ‘clerk reading’, and *Kukhanmun* ‘mixed Sino-Korean

script’) followed by the creation of *Han’gŭl* during the reign of King Sejong (1418-1450), then focus on the gradual, evolutionary script change from *Hanja* to *Han’gŭl* over the next five centuries, concluding with the status of the Korean language and the *Han’gŭl* script.

Origins. Korean is descended from the ancient language of the Silla Kingdom that dominated the Korean peninsula when the Chinese arrived. It is not related to Chinese structurally or genetically. It is classified as a member of the Korean language family and is considered a language isolate, like Finnish and Basque. During the first millennium CE, the Korean language was known as Old Korean, but few documents written in Old Korean exist. Korean has also been considered an Altaic language (Miller, 1971) and, although there are featural similarities (e.g., agglutinative, polysyllabic, with content and grammatical morphemes) between it and Japanese, no conclusive evidence exists that they are related. These same features and the lexical, monosyllabic character of Chinese (an isolating language) made *Hànzì* ‘Chinese writing’ a bad fit for writing Korean in the same way that Sumerian Cuneiform was ill-suited for writing Akkadian (Coulmas, 1989; Haarmann, 1993).

For possibly 2,500 years, *Hànzì* has been known to the inhabitants of the Korean Peninsula where it is called *Hanja*, a Korean word derived from *Hànzì*. It is also known as *Hanmun*, another Korean word derived from the word *hanwen* ‘Chinese characters’ (Lee, 1975). *Hanja*, along with Chinese bureaucracy, was introduced to the Koreans in 108 BCE when China became the controlling political power there (Haarmann, 1993; King, 1996) and continued to be used by the Han administrators until 313 CE. The earliest evidence of Koreans using *Hanja* is found on a stone inscription dating from 414 (King, 1996). Because the *yangban* (i.e., the ‘Korean elite’, males of noble pedigree) valued Chinese culture above their own, their education focused on maintaining Korea as a *Sohwa*, ‘Small China’ (Sampson, 1985).

Hanja. In the 4th century the Koreans began to write their historical narratives in Chinese using *Hanja*. Because proper and common names of Korean things figured prominently in the narratives, *Hanja* was adapted using two strategies: 1) disregard the meaning of the Chinese character and use its phonetic value to write the syllables of Korean words; 2) disregard the phonetic value of the Chinese character and use it for the same word in Korean. This second strategy was an original Korean solution which was later used more extensively by the Japanese. The Koreans also invented over 150 of their own Chinese characters for native Korean words, personal names, and place names (King, 1996). These strategies resulted in *Hanja* being used eventually to write Korean itself (Coulmas, 1989; Haarmann, 1993).

Ido. When *Hanja* was written in the order of Korean, a subject-object-verb language, it led to the creation of *Ido*, a cumbersome form of writing used as the official script of the chanceries, hence the meaning of its name ‘clerk reading’. *Ido* was systematized in the late 7th century by Solch’ong, a scholar serving King Sin-mun. It was a mix of pleremic (i.e., having a specific meaning, logographic) elements and cenemic (i.e., representing different sounds, phonographic) elements. Thus, *Ido* was a logo-phonographic writing system with one set of *Hanja* characters used for lexical items and another set used to represent Korean syllables. It can be further described as a hybrid of *Hanja* and the Korean language in which the *Hanja* characters followed Korean syntax and to which Korean inflections were added (Lee, 1975). The difficulty of having two sets of Chinese logographs which were visually indistinguishable from each other, but which had different uses, led to reforms in the 13th and 14th centuries. The grammatical characters were simplified which enabled them to be differentiated from the lexical ones and became known as *Kugyol*, ‘phrase parting’, a system for annotating Classical Chinese texts so that they could be read in Korean (Coulmas, 1989; Haarmann, 1993).

Kukhanmun. In the 9th and 10th centuries, a variety of *Ido* was developed known as *Kukhanmun* or *Hangch'al* ‘mixed Sino-Korean script’. *Kukhanmun* is considered another method of using *Hanja* for writing Korean. In this method, the lexical stems are written in *Hanja*, but read in Korean. The suffixes and grammatical morphemes are read in Sino-Korean. A satisfactory reading depended on familiarity with the text and the result was often as complex and artificial as the *Ido* system. Despite being the best suited method for rendering Korean using *Hanja*, *Kukhanmun* was used predominantly in the domain of poetry possibly because it preserved the rhyme and vocal harmony of the verses. *Wényán* ‘Classical Chinese writing’ was the exclusive writing system used with prose until the creation of *Han'gŭl* in 1446 and continued to be the preferred choice of the *yangban* for writing prose into the 19th century. *Hanja*, *Ido*, and *Kukhanmun* all required years of training and effort to acquire, and only the *yangban* and scribe class were fully literate. Since the Koreans never successfully developed a syllabic form of writing Korean using *Hanja*, some of them became dissatisfied with it and sought another way to write their language (Coulmas, 1989; Haarmann, 1993; King, 1996).

King Sejong. King Sejong the Great, the fourth sovereign of the Yi Dynasty (1392-1910), ruled Korea from 1418-1450. He is venerated in Korea where schoolchildren memorize passages from his writings such as the following from *Hunminchŏng'ŭm*:

The sounds of our country's language are different from those of the Middle Kingdom and are not confluent with the sounds of our characters. Therefore, among the ignorant people, there have been many who, having something they want to put into words, have in the end been unable to express their feelings. I have been distressed because of this, and have newly designed twenty-eight letters, which I wish to have everyone practice at their ease and make convenient for their daily use. (as cited in Ledyard, 1966, p. 124)

In South Korea, Sejong is featured on the 100 won banknote. He was a benevolent ruler who considered the needs of his nation, exhorting his educated subjects in an edict from 1434 to teach reading to everyone, noble born or commoner, including women and girls because he believed that illiteracy was a problem (Haarmann, 1993; Pae, 2011). This benevolence also motivated him to create a script that would allow all Koreans to become literate and express themselves in writing, easily and economically, in their own language. An extremely well-educated sovereign, King Sejong was familiar with the principles of alphabetic writing because of his interest in Buddhist literature and was himself capable of devising the new Korean writing system without the help of his school of translators and interpreters (Haarmann, 1993).

Being a wise ruler as well, King Sejong recognized that he would require the support of the *yangban* to bring about a script change from *Hanja* to this new script because the *yangban* were accustomed to Chinese culture and benefited from their knowledge of *Hanja* and the linguistic capital it gave them. To accomplish this, he created the Bureau of Standard Sounds and, in the autumn of 1443 through the spring of 1444, invited members of the *yangban* and his royal school of translators and interpreters (*Chiphyŏnjŏn* ‘official academic research institution’) to develop a standard Korean writing system. The presence of the *yangban* in the bureau helped King Sejong avoid the appearance of authoritarianism.

The great king guided the project from its inception with the help of the bureau members and produced an original, *Hanja* free, Korean script. A statement was issued at the end of the project indicating that the sovereign had personally created a 28-letter *ŏnmun* ‘common script’ (Ledyard, 1966) and on 9 October 1446 the official announcement of the new script was made in a document entitled *Hunminchŏng’ŭm* ‘The correct sounds for the instruction of the people’. During the ensuing centuries, this script would be called by many names, some with negative

and some with positive connotations, and would eventually be known as *Han'gŭl*. King Sejong had made it clear in *Hunminchŏng'ŭm* that he found Korean sounds to be very different from Chinese and that because *Hanja* was unable to express them, it was impossible for Korean peasants to become literate (Kim, 2005). This was his stated justification for creating *Han'gŭl* 573 years ago (Haarmann, 1993; Pieper, 2011).

Origin of Han'gŭl. Pae (2011) cites the traditional legend of the leaves as the origin of *Han'gŭl*. The legend goes as follows: King Sejong, contemplating the promulgation of *Hunminchŏng'ŭm* and how he would overcome the resistance of the *yangban*, devised a strategy for convincing them that the new script was sent by benevolent spirits. One morning, as he and his entourage entered the courtyard, they encountered 28 fallen leaves on the ground. Upon each was one of the new symbols that King Sejong had created. The courtiers marveled at this occurrence and recounted the story to the Korean people. They all agreed, courtiers and commoners alike, that *Hunminchŏng'ŭm* must be a sacred gift from the spirit world.

What they did not know is that the previous day, King Sejong had gathered the leaves from beneath the trees in the palace courtyard, then traced the shapes of his new letters on them with honey and returned them, under the cover of darkness, to the courtyard where the ants had eaten away the honey-coated part of each leaf. The leaves had been incised with the shape of a vowel or consonant symbol from *Hunminchŏng'ŭm*.

The development of the Korean script represents a departure from the typical, *ad hoc* process of script development in which an existing script would be borrowed and adapted. Such adaptations often included solutions to technical problems which failed to satisfy the users of the script. The creation of King Sejong was based on linguistic analysis which went far beyond the mere consciousness of linguistic necessity that other adapters of preexisting scripts had

manifested. Its creation is an example of proto-language planning that is linguistically informed and deliberate (Ledyard, 1966). Its linguistic sophistication is evidenced by the systemic relationship between the points of articulation of Korean phonology and the graphic, visual depiction of those points by the script's symbols. For example, the symbol for /k/ depicts the back of the tongue touching the soft palate of the mouth (Coulmas, 1989).

Opposition to Han'gŭl. The *yangban* and some members of the *Chiphyŏnjŏn* opposed the King's new script even before the publication of *Hunminchŏng'ŭm*. Their criticisms focused on faithfulness to Confucianism, Chinese writing, and Chosŏn culture, and rejection of barbaric non-Chinese scripts, mass literacy, popular culture, and the appearance of authoritarianism. The king countered their arguments by questioning their linguistic knowledge, reminding them of his altruistic motivation towards the commoners, and emphasizing that *Hunminchŏng'ŭm* was an important matter of royal governance. What he did not address was the epistemological issue of Confucianism and the connection between *Hanja* and Korea's civilization and culture, thus avoiding a confrontation with the sinocentric beliefs and social rank of the *yangban*. King Sejong's strategy of appealing to the Korean commoners as those who would most benefit from his new script enabled it to survive the long centuries until the intellectual and political climates were more conducive to its adoption (Pieper, 2011).

Description of Han'gŭl. Of all the scripts in the world, the Korean has been described as the most scientific, the most scientifically designed, the most efficient, and the most rational (King, 1996; Reischauer & Fairbank, 1960; Watanabe & Suzuki, 1981). A less hyperbolic description recognizes its syllabic nature, its block-like appearance conforming to the square frame of Chinese characters (Kôno, 1969), its popular appeal, and the ease with which it can be learned. The arbitrary appearance of the signs is belied by their philosophical (i.e., Chinese

cosmology) and linguistic (i.e., articulatory depictions) foundations. Continuing his effort to overcome the resistance of the *yangban*, King Sejong linked his creation with the Chinese cosmological principle of five: directions (East, South, Center, West, North); elements (clay, fire, metal, water, wood); vowels (*a, e, i, o, u*); points of articulation (alveolar, bilabial, dental, glottal, velar); etc. The modern Korean script includes 24 basic signs and 16 combinations of the basics for a total of 40 phonetic symbols which are used to build syllables with distinct visual boundaries and to form words. This combination of the alphabetic and syllabic principles makes the Korean writing system a script isolate, possibly the world's only alpha-syllabary (Haarmann, 1993; King, 1996; Pae, 2011; Taylor, 1979).

After the initial promulgation of *Hunminchŏng'ŭm* in 1446, and despite the evident advantage of the Korean script for fostering literacy, Koreans continued to use *Hanja* and *Kukhanmun* 'mixed Sino-Korean' creating a state of digraphia with a prestigious variety (i.e., *Hanja*) and a stigmatized one (i.e., *Hunminchŏng'ŭm*). The stigmatized variety eventually became the prestigious as is shown by the evolution of its titles. Initially, *Hunminchŏng'ŭm* was referred to as *ŏnmun* 'vernacular', 'common', or 'vulgar script'; today it is known as *Han'gŭl* 'high script' or 'Great letters'. This reversal of fortune happened because of a reevaluation of societal beliefs during the development of a national identity beginning in the middle of the 19th century. *Han'gŭl* is an unequivocally authentic Korean invention which symbolizes and defines a national cultural identity (Coulmas, 1989; Grivelet, 2001; Haarmann, 1993; King, 1996).

The Process of Han'gŭlization. The adoption of *Hunminchŏng'ŭm* was a slow, evolutionary process because script change represents a dramatic departure from tradition which could entail major societal repercussions. The literary tradition of Korea was based on *Hanja*, and a new script would cut off access to it for future generations of readers and writers. Thus,

the process of Han'gŭlization was driven by cultural, not linguistic considerations. Throughout the process, Koreans from all walks of life indicated their national identity by their stance regarding the continued use of *Hanja* or the adoption of *Han'gŭl* because there is an essential connection between writing and identity in the Korean cultural tradition dating to the Middle Ages. The idea that national language reform, so prevalent throughout Europe in the 19th century (e.g., Germany, Italy), promotes national unity had already begun in Korea four centuries earlier (Coulmas, 1989; Haarmann, 1993).

Despite its royal endorsement, benevolent motivation, potential for democratization and universal literacy, the initial barrier to the adoption of *Han'gŭl* was the *yangban*, who perceived it as a threat to their aristocratic and academic standing within their sinophile society. It was they who denigrated *Han'gŭl* by dubbing it *ŏnmun* which became synonymous with 'crude' and stigmatized it as *amkŭl* 'female script' (King, 1996; Pieper, 2011). It was they who considered *ŏnmun* as the trivialization of a long, noble, and arduous education in *Hanja* (Sampson, 1985). Thus, the *yangban* argued irrationally and insubstantially against a rare achievement among the nations: the creation of an indigenous script. They strove to banish *Han'gŭl* from public life through their opposition, relegating it to the private domain, because they feared sharing literacy with the common people. Nevertheless, the seed of *Han'gŭl* had been planted in the hearts of the Korean people by their beloved sovereign, King Sejong, where it survived, existing in a state of digraphia with *Hanja*, until conditions became favorable for its growth, even though its mastery paid no social dividends to the common people who learned it (Coulmas, 1989; Haarmann, 1993).

Within four years of the promulgation of *Hunminchŏng'ŭm*, King Sejong was dead. From that time until the middle of the 19th century *Han'gŭl* survived as an alternate form of

literacy thanks to its adequacy for recording the Korean language, its simple graphemes which increased the efficiency of the learning process, the popularity of Korean lyric poetry, and the availability of private education. There is some non-specific evidence that *Han'gŭl* was widely used by Buddhists who found it useful for proselytizing, but the commonly accepted narrative that women were responsible for its continuation is mostly unsupported. Other evidence puts the number of men using *Han'gŭl* as equal to or surpassing the number of women. During the reigns of King Sejong and his successors there were translations of Buddhist literature (originally written in the *Sanskrit* or *Pali* languages using the Brahmi or Nāgarī scripts) from Chinese into Korean and written in *Han'gŭl* (Haarmann, 1993).

From the end of the 15th century through the end of the 16th, Classical Chinese *ŏnhae* ‘annotation’ (i.e., literal translations leaving word order and grammar intact) used *Han'gŭl* as a way of annotating the pronunciation, and eventually led to direct translations into Korean by adding Korean connectors, particles, and affixes. Starting in the 17th century and continuing into the 18th, many genres including verse, fictional narratives, and diaries were written using *Han'gŭl*. *Hanja* continued to be the prestigious, public medium for social advancement, but *Han'gŭl* became the private medium for expressing Korean patriotism, sentimentality, and a symbol of national culture and community building (Haarmann, 1993; Pieper, 2011).

The 19th Century Kabo Reforms. Summarizing Pieper’s explanation, the last decade of the 19th century began with much doubt regarding the status and role of *Han'gŭl* which would not be resolved until the liberation of Korea from Japan at the end of World War II. The *Kabo* reforms (i.e., the reorganization of government, finances, civil service recruitment, and social expectations) were forced upon the Koreans by imperial Japan. In the end, these reforms foreshadowed the demise of Chosŏn society and the beginning of major changes in Korea

including the advancement of the much-delayed script change from *Hanja* to *Han'gŭl*. As an example of this shift in attitudes, if a reformer previously dared to suggest the elimination of *Hanja* and the exclusive use of *Han'gŭl*, the *yangban* would rally their supporters to mock and ridicule the suggestion, but within two decades public sentiment had reversed itself and the most ardent supporters of *Hanja* were reduced to supporting the use of *Kukhanmun* 'mixed Sino-Korean script' while the reformers were persuasively arguing for *Han'gŭl* using the Korean language press, the education system, and a nascent national consciousness. One reason for this is that the *Kabo* reforms also established Korean as *kugŏ* 'national language' and, in an 1894 royal decree, *Han'gŭl* was first referred to prestigiously as *kukmun* 'national script', elevating it from the stigmatized *amgŭl* 'female script' and *ŏnmun* 'common script', and making official decrees accessible to more classes of Koreans (Pieper, 2011, pp. 44-46).

Because the *Kabo* reforms eliminated the Confucian-based government examinations, students of the new skills being taught in schools emphasizing Western knowledge (e.g., world languages, history, politics, business, and the sciences) excelled in the new system of civil recruitment based on recommendation. This created more interest in Western education among the Korean elite and hastened the break with Confucianism (Pieper, 2011, pp. 44-46).

These modern defenders of *Han'gŭl* were Koreans who enjoyed elite status and, like the *yangban*, were competent in *Wényán* and *Hanja*. As we shall see below, among the reformers whose efforts contributed to the revaluation of *Han'gŭl* were Protestant missionaries and Korean Christians who chose it for promoting education and printing literature, including Korean translations of the Bible. These groups acknowledged that using a cultural symbol would help them differentiate and spread their message (MacCulloch, 2009; Pieper, 2011). Despite the strides that *Han'gŭl* was beginning to make, it continued to serve as a supplement to *Hanja* and

only slowly, including an interim period of preference on the part of the reformers for *Kukhanmun* ‘mixed Sino-Korean script’, did it assume the prominent, prestigious position that it now enjoys (Pieper, 2011, pp. 44-46).

The Independent. The founding in 1896 of *The Independent*, the first *Han’gŭl*-only newspaper in Korea, whose editors and writers had been the recipients of a Western education, was another signal that cultural, social, and political attitudes were shifting. It was the medium of communication for The Independence Club, founded by Sŏ Chae p’il, known as Philip Jaesohn (1864-1951), the first naturalized Korean-American. The Independence Club espoused modernization, public education, and language reform. In the inaugural issue of *The Independent*, Sŏ Chae p’il wrote about the importance of *kukmun* ‘national script’. It was the first time in 450 years that a member of the educated elite had supported *Han’gŭl* and called for a break from *Hanja*. In his editorial, Sŏ praises the ease with which *Han’gŭl* can be learned, the accessibility to information and knowledge that it facilitates for all classes of Koreans and links the adoption of the script to the creation of the Korean nation (Pieper, 2011, pp. 47-50).

The 20th Century. At the beginning of the 20th century, the script which had been stigmatized as *ŏnmun* was relabeled prestigiously as *Han’gŭl* ‘Great Script’, a term coined in the 1910’s by Chu Si-kyŏng (1876-1914), the founder of Korean linguistics who promoted the use of *Han’gŭl* (Coulmas, 1989; Haarmann, 1993; King, 1996; Pieper, 2011). Chu realized that *Han’gŭl* could only succeed if it were codified, standardized, and brought into conformity with colloquial Korean. In that way it could be implemented throughout the educational system and lead successive generations of Koreans into modernity. Chu also argued that the alpha-syllabic nature of *Han’gŭl* would advance Korean civilization more quickly than the pictographic nature of *Hanja*. This was an inversion of the argument used in the time of King Sejong by the

yangban and disaffected members of his *Chiphyŏnjŏn* ‘official academic research institution’ in opposition to *Hunminchŏng’ŭm* who, as mentioned previously, claimed that non-Chinese writing systems were barbaric (Pieper, 2011, pp. 52-53).

Chu, like the supporters of *Hunminchŏng’ŭm* 450 years earlier, summoned Koreans to show their gratitude to King Sejong for creating the “twenty-eight letters...for any and all to learn them with ease and use them at their convenience in daily life” (King Sejong as cited in Pieper, 2011, p. 32). Other reformers agreed with Chu’s arguments and made contributions of their own to the Han’gŭlization of Korean. These arguments and contributions include the following: the importance of modern education; attaining mass literacy through *kugŏ* and *kukmun*; joining the international community; using *Kukhanmun* as an intermediate step leading to the exclusive use of *Han’gŭl*; using *Han’gŭl* in newspapers and periodicals; writing academic articles in *Han’gŭl*; standardizing *Han’gŭl*; and calling for long-term language planning. Korea’s first language plan was published in 1905 and led to the creation of the *Kukmun yŏn’guso* ‘National Script Research Institute’ (Pieper, 2011, pp. 53-57).

Drawing heavily on Pieper, the debate regarding script at this time focused on whether to use *Hanja*, *Kukhanmun*, or *Han’gŭl*. The supporters of *Hanja* (i.e., the *yangban*) were mostly silent and did not participate in the public debate possibly because of their satisfaction with the status quo which preserved the use of *Hanja*, maintained their privileged social status, and conserved the Sino-Korean culture. Those reformers in favor of *Kukhanmun* had no objection to *Han’gŭl* because they were already using it in the mixed Sino-Korean script and saw *Kukhanmun* as a transitional step between traditional *Hanja* and *Han’gŭl* which would allow the national script needed time for reform. Indeed, they agreed with the proponents of *Han’gŭl* that it was

easy to learn, would facilitate mass literacy, increase Korean nationalism, and show respect and loyalty to King Sejong (Pieper, 2011, pp. 57-59).

Labeling *Hunminchōng'ŭm* by the prestigious, new label did not end the debate between the opponents (i.e., the *yangban*) and proponents (i.e., the educated nationalists) of *Han'gŭl* who found themselves struggling over different visions for the future of the Korean nation. Each side claimed that its preferred script provided access to true knowledge which to the *yangban* meant traditional, Confucian philosophy and to the reformers, the philosophy of Western modernization embodied in the concept of *munmyōng kaehwa* 'civilization and enlightenment' (Pieper, 2011).

Munmyōng kaehwa. An important aspect of *munmyōng kaehwa* was the epistemological discourse between Confucianism and modernism. As Korea sought its place in the international economic realignment of nations, educated Koreans found a compelling argument for breaking with their centuries-long dependency on Chinese philosophy as the source of knowledge and looking to the promise of *munmyōng kaehwa* with its emphasis on nationhood, identity, and language. These reformers argued that the common citizens of Korea were too important to be consigned to a lifetime of illiteracy. They also argued that the *yangban* were too important to be condemned to a painstaking, protracted education in the *Wényán* and the *Hanja* scripts, thus postponing the productive years of their lives. Modern education, achieved in the schools through instruction in Korean written in *Han'gŭl*, would place Korea on the path to universal literacy and prepare the Korean people for the future. This epistemological shift helped transform *Han'gŭl* from the long-stigmatized Korean script into the national treasure of a proud people (Pieper, 2011, pp. 27-31).

Japanese occupation. To summarize Pieper again, the process of *Han'gŭl*ization was interrupted in 1910 by the Japanese annexation of Korea who brought with them their language

and their trigraphic writing system. The introduction of *hiragana* and *katakana* and the suppression of *Han'gŭl* created resentment among the Koreans toward the Japanese. Japanese became the official language of instruction in the schools. This action dethroned *Hanja* as the rising, prestigious script in Korea and the importance of Japanese was underlined by the educational requirements in the labor market for certifications in Japanese. Korean language reformers exploited the circumstances to promote the usage of *Han'gŭl* as they struggled against the popularization of Japanese (Pieper, 2011, pp. 65-66).

Even Korea's national language was an unsettled question during Japanese occupation with *Wényán*, Japanese, and Korean competing to be the answer. The popular press contributed to the promotion of Korean and *Han'gŭl* by publishing articles and opinion pieces written by Korean nationalists and reformers of *Han'gŭl*. The outcome seems to have been determined by the interaction between the forces of Korean nationalism and Japanese imperialism which took place in the popular press and in the educational system during the colonial period (Pieper, 2011, pp. 65-66).

Because of the suppression of *Han'gŭl* in Korea by the Japanese, only the Koreans living outside of occupied Korea near Vladivostok continued to have access to it. They were later deported to the Soviet Central Asian republics where they continued to print a small amount of Soviet Korean literature using *Han'gŭl* (Kho, 1987). Once the Japanese occupation ended in 1945, *Han'gŭl*ization would resume, but with the added difficulty of dealing with a divided nation (Haarmann, 1993).

Han'gŭl Society. Founded in 1921, the *Han'gŭl hakhoe* 'Han'gŭl Society' promoted the Korean language by compiling a dictionary, working for spelling reform, and advocating the use of *Han'gŭl* in the schools. The Society also trained Korean instructors, provided materials to the

schools, and promoted literacy through many traveling lecture series. In 1929, the Society equated the advancement of the Korean culture with *ŏnmun ilch'i* 'the unification of written and spoken language' and called for its rapid reorganization to achieve human happiness. In 1936, the Society published the *Classified Compendium of Standard Korean* which encouraged *ŏnmun ilch'i* in Korean language classes throughout the country (Pieper, 2011, pp. 72-74, pp. 78-79).

The Government General of Korea. Along with the *Han'gŭl* Society, the *Ilbon ch'ongdokbu* 'Government General of Korea' (GGK) contributed to the reform of Korean and *Han'gŭl*. As the colonial authority, the GGK was a critical source of support for language reform because, through its political authority, it was able to approve the reforms begun by the Korean nationalists. The GGK published the first Korean orthographies and the first standardized Korean dictionary which, because of their use in the Japanese school system, influenced the formation of linguistic attitudes among Korean students. However, the GGK was not entirely supportive of the Korean language as demonstrated by the facts that in 1937 the use of Korean was eliminated from the bureaucracy, in 1938 it was completely phased out of the schools, and in 1939 it was banned from the press. Despite the cooperation that existed between the GGK and the *Han'gŭl* Society, there always existed the possibility of language and political oppression as exemplified by the *Han'gŭl* Society Incident in 1942 in which the GGK arrested members of the Society and put them on trial for encouraging Korean independence by promoting Korean cultural symbols (Pieper, 2011, pp. 83-87).

Status. Five full centuries after its creation, at the end of World War II, successful implementation of *Han'gŭl* was finally assured during the post-liberation period when Korean was restored to its status as the universal language of instruction in the schools. Literacy in *Han'gŭl* was then achieved rapidly across North Korea, and soon after in South Korea. In North

Korea, the language plan of 1949 designated *Han'gŭl* as *Urikul* 'our script' and established it as the official script, eliminating *Hanja* completely from official publications and education, although some ideograms continued to be taught in school (King, 1996; Pieper, 2011). In South Korea, although most words and all inflections were written in *Han'gŭl*, approximately 1,800 lexical items, which were taught in the schools and used in the newspapers, continued to be written in *Hanja* (King, 1996). An attempt to remove *Hanja* was made in 1970, but several years later it was reintroduced. The use of *Hanja* continued to be controversial in South Korea during the 1990s. Currently, South Koreans consider *Hanja* to be optional and tend to use *Han'gŭl* exclusively. The differences in language policies in South and North Korea might create linguistic division between the two nations complicating the issue of reunification. Today, whether they live in the North or the South, in Japan, China, Central Asia, or the United States of America, Koreans are united by the Great Script (Haarmann, 1993; King, 1996).

Turkish

Continuing with my case studies, I now turn to Turkish. I will begin with a brief history of its origin and development, followed by the Ottoman Turkish period, then the Turkish Language Reform which produced Modern Turkish as it is spoken today, then focus on the script change from Arabic to Roman, and finish with a brief description of the current movement calling for a return to Ottoman Turkish.

Origins. Modern Turkish belongs to the South-Western group of Turkish languages. The ancient Turks received the Aramaic script from medieval Northern Iranians around the 7th century CE. They later used the Orkhon runiform alphabet (named after a river valley in Mongolia) which was comprised of characters resembling Germanic runes with curved features. Orkhon came from the non-cursive Sogdian script which was used for the first Turkish

documents, the Orkhon Inscriptions, but it was abandoned after a few centuries. During this time most Turkic-speaking peoples adapted the scripts and writing systems of the different peoples whose lands they shared. For example, the Uyghurs and other Turks, who were Manichean or Nestorian Christian, used Manichean Estrangelo and Sogdian scripts to write Turkish. These communities were spread from Central Asia to the Balkans and the various scripts used in their writing systems were more in tune with Turkish phonemes than was the Perso-Arabic (PA) script which they adopted around the turn of the millennium when they became Muslim. The PA script restricted the phonetic range of Turkish because there are only three PA vocalic graphemes available to record eight Turkish vowels. This makes texts difficult to read. The inadequacy of the PA script for writing Turkish was compounded by the existence of several superfluous consonant graphemes that were only used for writing foreign, borrowed words (Aytürk, 2010; Heyd, 1954; Kara, 1996).

From the early part of the 11th century, and during the time of the Seljuk Turks (1040-1157), Turkish borrowed many vocabulary words from Persian and Arabic which were considered more refined and elegant. Arabic assumed the larger role because it was the language of the Qur'án and because Persian had already borrowed many Arabic words. Each new Arabic word brought with it an entire family of words (e.g., *K—T—B—* 'writing': *KiTaB* 'book', *KaTaBa* 'he wrote', *KaTiB* 'writer', *maKTuB* 'written'). After becoming Muslim, the forebears of the modern Turkish people began the process of adopting Persian religious terminology (e.g., *namaz* 'prayer', *oruç* 'fasting', *peygamber* 'prophet', *hac* or *ziyaret* 'pilgrimage'). As members of the *Ümmet-i Muhammed* 'Community of Believers', the Turkish elders borrowed words from other domains as well. In addition to the vocabulary, there were also syntactical and grammatical borrowings such as grammatical gender and the Persian *izafet* 'attachment' which

means to join a noun and its qualifier. Turkish became a literary language during the 13th century (Heyd, 1954; Lewis, 1999).

There was always resistance to the surrender of the Turkish language to Arabic and Persian. For example, in the 13th century an important minister outlawed the use of all languages other than Turkish at court, in public, or in government offices. At the same time, dichotomously, a Sufi poet praised the Arabic and Persian languages as necessary for the advancement of civilization. The Chagatai dialect of Turkish became the literary standard in Central Asia during the 15th century. An Afghani argued in his book of that time that Turkish was equal to Persian as a literary language because aspiring Turkish writers found it easier to express themselves eloquently in their own tongue without struggling with Persian vocabulary. Ottoman Sultan Selim I (1470-1520) wrote poetry in Persian while his contemporary Persian counterpart, Shah Ismail (1487-1524) who was Turkish by birth, wrote in Turkish (Lewis, 1999).

This Perso-Arabization of Turkish continued under the Ottomans, the successors of the Seljuks, in the 15th century. Despite a reaction against the new words and expressions, it was impossible to halt their flow into Turkish. Writers of Turkish poetry and prose considered Turkish inferior to both Persian and Arabic and claimed to write in Turkish only because most Turks were ignorant of the prestigious languages. In the 16th century, when Istanbul and the Ottomans were at the height of their political and cultural power, the Turkish element was minimally represented in literature (Heyd, 1954; Lewis, 1999).

As previously stated, Persian and Arabic were considered the prestigious, classical literary languages of the time and Ottoman writers from the 14th to the 19th century borrowed freely from them creating borrowed words by adding Turkish suffixes. The resulting mixture of Turkish, Persian, and Arabic became the language of administration and literature that the Turks

called *Osmanlica* ‘Ottoman’. Academics have divided Ottoman Turkish into three periods: Old Ottoman (13th through 15th centuries); Middle Ottoman (16th through 19th centuries); and New Ottoman (19th century to 1928). The majority view of Ottoman Turkish in Turkey today is that it was a written *lingua franca* used to govern a vast empire composed of many peoples speaking many languages (a circumstance analogous to the 17th century mix of English and Latin in England). Because of the incorporation of PA lexicon, grammar, and syntax, and because it functioned as a *lingua franca*, I consider Ottoman Turkish to be a new language with one script change (Category B). Peasants could not understand Ottoman Turkish and, although they preserved genuine Turkish in their speech, they found both it and themselves stigmatized. The common people were often at a loss when dealing with bureaucrats, but they showed their sense of humor by subverting the pronunciation and meaning of foreign words, not out of ignorance, but playfulness (e.g., *chargeur* ‘charger’ > *carcur* ‘chatter’) (Aytürk, 2010; Heyd, 1954; Lewis, 1999; Yazan & Üzümlü, 2016).

Ottoman Turkish. The westernization and nationalization of the mid-19th century brought calls for the reform of Ottoman Turkish. The first phase of language reform was ushered in during the Tanzimat period (1839-1876), a reform movement which led to a surge of Turkish nationalism accompanied by an increase in journalism and a serious language reform movement. This movement was expressly guided by the declaration of the Turkish writer and poet, Ibrahim Şinasi, in the debut editorial of his newspaper. He gave notice that it was the duty of the newspaper to write in a manner which could be understood by the public. Ziya Paşa and Namık Kemal both condemned the excessive borrowing of foreign words for which legitimate Turkish equivalents already existed. Reference books began to include Ottoman Turkish words for the first time. In them, Persian and Arabic words were defined by their accepted meanings

(not their original ones), archaic meanings were omitted, and borrowed words were modified orthographically and syntactically according to Turkish rules (e.g., dropping the Persian *izafet* and the Arabic feminine ending, using the Turkish plural instead of the Arabic, and placing the adjective before the noun). Ottoman Turkish was no longer judged by how much it conformed to other languages. Poetry began to conform to Ottoman Turkish spoken rhymes, regardless of the spelling (Aytürk, 2010; Lewis, 1999; Yazan & Üzüm, 2016).

Previously Ottoman Turkish was an amalgamation of Persian, Arabic, and Turkish with Persian and Arabic being the prestigious languages, and Turkish the stigmatized one. Later, Süleyman Paşa, the author of *Sarf-ı Türkî* (the first Turkish grammar book written by a Turk, published in 1874), suggested that the language be designated not as Ottoman, but as Turkish, a term once considered a derogatory reference to illiterate peasant speech. The official language of the Ottoman Empire was listed as Turkish, not Ottoman in article 18 of the Ottoman Constitution of 1876 (Aytürk, 2010; Heyd, 1954).

In 1881, Şemseddin Sami suggested that Turkish should be enriched using vocabulary from Eastern Turkish which had maintained much of its original vocabulary and pronunciation. Such a radical idea did not attract much attention from the Ottoman intelligentsia during the Tanzimat period. The simplification of Ottoman Turkish occurred thanks to its use in newspapers, novels, and plays, and more closely resembled middle class speech. Simultaneously, the spread of education pushed Ottoman Turkish in the opposite direction causing Turkish words to be replaced by Arabic, Persian, and European words, especially for newly minted technical terms (Aytürk, 2010; Heyd, 1954).

The end of the 19th century saw a last gasp effort to defend Ottoman Turkish and coincided with the renewed repression of progressive and nationalistic ideas by Sultan

Abdülhamid II. Form became more important than intelligibility creating a rift between practical and literary language. The Turco-Greek war (1897) produced renewed nationalistic feelings which found echo in the poetry of Mehmet Emin. Written in simple Turkish using the syllabic, native meters found in popular verse, the poems of Emin avoided PA vocabulary and constructions which had caused the divide between the Ottoman Turkish as written by the elites and the vernacular Turkish as spoken by the common people (Yazan & Üzüm, 2016). Addressed to Turks of all classes, his poetry had great success, especially in the provinces where the central government and its censors held less sway. Emin was awarded the title “the Turk poet” (Heyd, 1954, p. 18).

The second phase of language reform was ushered in by the Young Turk revolution (1908-1909). The Young Turks in 1908 declared, “the official language of the State will remain Turkish” (Lewis, 1999, p. 21). In January 1908, the *Türk Derneği* ‘Turkish Association’ was founded as a nationalist, cultural organization. Its official journal, by the same name, pledged to maintain PA words that had earned a place in the Turkish language and to use “the simplest Ottoman Turkish” (Lewis, 1999, p. 20) in its publications. Disagreements among the members of the association over the reform of Ottoman Turkish led to its demise in 1913.

The division between Turks and Ottomans can also be understood as a class distinction as seen in the reaction of an illiterate shepherd to the use by an educated Turk of the expression “We Turks.” The shepherd immediately exclaimed, “Lord have mercy! I’m a Turk; Your Excellency is an Ottoman” (Lewis, 1999, p. 22). To gain wider appeal among the masses of Turks, including the uneducated, the soldiers, the non-Turkish minorities, Turks as far away as Manchuria, and Muslims everywhere, the language had to be intelligible, an emphasis reflected

in the newspapers by their simplified language. Turkish nationalism had won the day. *Harf devrimi* ‘letter reform’ had begun (Heyd, 1954; Lewis, 1999).

The new-found interest in Turkish history, civilization, pre-Islamic culture, and folklore all found expression in linguistic development. In 1911, Ömer Seyfeddin, a short-story writer, and Ziya Gökalp, a sociologist, united a group called *Genç Kalemler* ‘Young Pens’ who called for the suppression of PA grammatical rules and the elimination of redundant PA words with Turkish equivalents. In addition, they also opposed the elimination of all PA words, the revival of archaic Turkish words, borrowing words and grammatical constructions from other Turkic languages, and artificially coining new Turkish words. They favored using the classical languages of Persian and Arabic for the formation of new words the way Europe created new ones from Latin and Greek. They also called for *yeni lisan* ‘a new language’ based on the speech of the women of Istanbul who used fewer foreign elements (Heyd, 1954; Lewis, 1999).

Although these reforms had previously been proposed, the time was now propitious for enacting them. Simple Turkish became the rule of the day for the Sultanate, the Parliament, and the War Ministry. Poetry moved away from PA quantitative meters into the syllable-counting meters of ancient and popular Turkish poetry. The new language ruled the day despite the opposition of conservative writers, and by the end of World War I, it was victorious. The multi-national, multi-cultural, multi-lingual Ottoman Empire had disappeared, soon to be followed by Ottoman Turkish (Heyd, 1954, Lewis, 1999).

Modern Turkish and script change. The beginning of the third phase of Turkish Language Reform coincides with the fall of the Ottoman Empire, the end of World War I, the Turkish Civil War, and the creation of the Republic of Turkey. It was part of a secular, cultural, and political movement led by Mustafa Kemal *Atatürk* as part of his scheme to modernize and

westernize Turkey, preserve the last independent Turkish nation, and create a new Turkish identity based on the movement now known as Kemalism (Yazan & Üzümlü, 2016). It began as a bid to rid Turkish of Perso-Arabic words, to bring the written language into line with the spoken, and to sever the association of Turkish, written in the PA script, from the Islamic faith. As mentioned in the introduction, when the Turkish language community chose the same script (Roman) used by many European languages in preparation for interaction between the Republic of Turkey and Europe, it was participating in a sociolinguistic act which enabled participation in movements beyond the Turkish borders (Unseth, 2005). Romanization in the Republic of Turkey was a pragmatic choice made by *Atatürk* based on ideological grounds. It was facilitated by a low rate of literacy and the exaltation of nationalism over the affective connection of the Turkish people for the script of the Qur'án.

Because the early economy of the Ottoman Empire had been preindustrial and agricultural, the government had felt no compulsion to teach the masses how to read and write. Nevertheless, Sultan Abdul-Hamid II (1876–1909) founded many Westernized schools during his reign to educate the children of the elites. Although this action increased the Ottoman literacy rate, the first republican census in 1927 revealed that only 3-8 percent of the population could read and write, a percentage that included very few women. Therefore, script change was not going to adversely affect over 90 percent of Turkish citizens (Aytürk, 2010). According to the Turkish Language Society (*Türk Dil Kurumu* or TDK), the overtly-stated goal of Romanization, was “to bring out the genuine beauty and richness of the Turkish language and to elevate it to the high rank it deserves among world languages” (as cited in Heyd, 1954, p. 140) (Anderson, 2006; Aytürk, 2010; Coulmas, 1989). Unseth (2005) also contrasts the very brief

time (one year) that it took Turkish to change from PA to Roman with the “very gradual” (p. 36) evolution (almost five centuries) of Korean from *Hanja* to *Han’gŭl*.

Summarizing from *Aytürk*, the debate on script change (whether to reform the PA script or to Romanize the language) began in the middle of the 19th century. It was not just a short-term issue for a small group of people, but rather a generational concern for first Ottoman, then Republican Turkish elites lasting through the fall of the empire, the rule of Mustafa Kemal *Atatürk* (1923-1938) even until today. Most Ottoman Turks during the Tanzimat period preferred reforming the PA script to make it more user friendly for writing Turkish. There was however a small minority that called loudly for the script to be changed to Roman. They claimed that the PA script was unsuitable because it was unable to express the importance of vowels in Turkish, that it limited the potential of the language, and that it would be difficult to implement substantial reforms to the script because of the presence of a strong religious tradition based on the Qur’án. These reformers also argued that, even though adjustments to the Roman would be necessary, changing to a new script might be easier since there would be no opposition based on an established, national literary tradition and because the level of literacy was low. These were the *Garbcılar* ‘Westernizers’ who desired to redirect the Turkish identity away from the Muslim world toward Europe economically, philosophically, and politically (*Aytürk*, 2010, pp. 106-107).

Language and script as symbols. As was mentioned in the introduction, a language and the script used to write it are symbols of identity. Because of the role they play in the transmission of history (e.g., evolutionary origins, natural and cultural treasures, and civilizational advancements) they indicate national identity and group membership (*Shohamy*, 2006). Adopting the Roman script for writing Turkish would be a visual signal of the identity shift sought by the *Garbcılar*. Turkish identity following World War I was an unstable mixture

of imperial and religious symbols, and an ambiguous linguistic heritage. Ottoman Turkish was an amalgam of Turkish and PA vocabulary and syntax. It had been the object of reform for almost a century and was actively being replaced. This idea of linguistic identity and other reforms that the *Garbcılar* advocated influenced the Kemalist reforms (e.g., Western numerals and clothing, the metric system, the Gregorian calendar) of the post-Ottoman Empire Republic of Turkey. But the path of Turkish modernization, according to Aytürk (2010), was not an original discovery of the nationalists. Instead, it was the unspoken, extreme replication of the Ottoman ideal of Westernization projected onto the policies of the new republic with the intention of portraying it as severed from its eastern, Islamic milieu of the past, the most visible symbol of which was the PA script. Contemporary thinkers who supported Romanization expressed that the need was not for a new script, but rather for a new identity that would reflect the new Turkish mentality (Aytürk, 2010, pp. 106-107).

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. Mustafa Kemal (the first president of the Turkish Republic, and the recipient in 1934 of the title *Atatürk*, ‘father of the Turks’) never made it a secret that he intended to Romanize the Turkish script. His party, the Republican People’s Party (RPP), and his ministers (former bureaucrats and members of the military) established the Republic of Turkey upon the institutions and attitudes inherited from the Ottoman Empire including a centralized administration, marginalization of competing factions, and a propensity for standardization. These characteristics of the Kemalist political system and the revolutionary sentiment of its supporters negated the existing opposition and cleared the path to Romanization (Aytürk, 2010).

From 1924 through 1927 there were public debates regarding this path. The conservatives, as we shall see below, opposed it because they believed that abandoning the PA

script would lead to the loss of their religious and literary traditions and that this abandonment was intentional and strategic on the part of the Kemalists (Yazan & Üzümlü, 2016). A sub-group of conservatives (i.e., the pan-Turkists who supported the reform of PA for writing Turkish) viewed the ambiguity of the script as a means of uniting the different dialects of Turkish throughout the Turkic world by concealing the differences in pronunciation in much the same way that the Hebrew script hides differences between the Ashkenazi and Sephardic dialects. The pan-Turkists posited that a journal published in Istanbul would be comprehensible in Bukhara or Samarkand if the PA script were moderately reformed. The Kemalist policy makers of the Republic of Turkey were not interested in the pan-Turkist movement. The pragmatism of maintaining good relations with the U.S.S.R. (1922-1991) dictated that their vision of the Turkish nation should remain within the borders of the republic rather than embrace the pan-Turkic ideology of the communities of Central Asia. Many newspaper articles were published by the supporters of the Roman script urging the abandonment of the PA script, blaming it for Turkey's low literacy rate, and declaring it incapable of recording faithfully the sounds of spoken Turkish. Even the Turkish Minister of Education came out in favor of Romanization (Aytürk, 2010; Fierman, 1991; Yazan & Üzümlü, 2016).

The Kemalist regime was at its most powerful point when the Language Council was founded in May 1928 despite the opposition of some Turkish elites. The creation of a Roman-based alphabet was the first task of the council, a task which it accomplished rapidly, which President Kemal endorsed immediately in August, and which the Turkish parliament debated and ratified as law in November that same year. The adoption of the Roman script demonstrated the clear desire of the Turkish government to separate from its Islamic heritage and adhere to European modernization (Aytürk, 2010).

In conformity with official Turkish language planning and policy, the new law (which included government support for newspapers, journals, and publishing houses to help them during the transition, a literacy campaign to produce readers capable of using the new script, the phasing out of Arabic and Persian as languages of instruction at the high school level, and the complete prohibition of PA letters after June 1930) prescribed swift implementation of the new script. Such speed of action and implementation by the government is considered a major determinant of success in cases of Romanization (Fierman, 1991). These measures insured that script change evolved from one of the most controversial of the Kemalist reforms to the one that is lauded above all other examples as the most successful script change in history, one which no reformer in contemporary Turkish society would ever dare challenge even though details still remained to be worked out (e.g., the spelling of foreign words, etymology versus pronunciation). Another contributing factor that benefitted Turkish language planners was the fact that modernization was a stated national goal of the Kemalist reforms. Therefore, the efficiency of the new script offset any concerns about symbolism (Fierman, 1991).

Atatürk's policy from the outset was to use the Modern Turkish language and its accompanying script as symbols of the new Turkish identity. When he became aware that the ideological manipulation of those symbols could distort the history of the Turks and their language he began to modify his approach. One modification was to restore some of the PA words that had previously been removed. But rather than making this move with transparency, *Atatürk* invoked the "Sun-Language Theory" (Perry, 1985, pp. 302-303) which declared that all words previously thought to be foreign were actually of Turkish origin because Turkish was, in fact, the mother of all languages (Coulmas, 1989; Fierman, 1991). Nevertheless, the Turkish

script change is universally acclaimed as a complete success and “the textbook example of a successful and lasting case of romanization” (Aytürk, 2010, p. 97). I examine this claim below.

Neo-Ottomanism. The opposition to the Kemalist agenda of Turkish Language Reform was never eradicated from the Republic of Turkey. It continued to smolder in the ashes of the disenfranchised minority political parties until the 1980s when the neo-Ottomanist movement began, and from that point gathered momentum, leading to the rise of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan who served as the mayor of Istanbul from 1994 to 1998, then founded the *Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi* ‘Justice and Development Party’ (JDP) in 2001. He served as Prime Minister from 2003 to 2014, then was elected President. On 24 June 2018 Erdoğan was re-elected to the presidency with additional powers granted by a nationwide referendum. When the JDP first gained power in 2003, neo-Ottomanism found expression in the foreign policy of the new administration. As the JDP consolidated its power, neo-Ottomanism moved into other areas of Turkish civic and cultural life. The JDP has now assumed the role of reconstructing the Turkish national identity upon neo-Ottoman ideals (Yazan & Üzüm, 2016). I will discuss the national identity reconstruction project below.

Turkish Language Institute. The Turkish Language Institute (TLI) was founded in 1932 with the goal of replacing PA loanwords with Turkish words from pre-Islamic texts, other Turkic languages, or Turkish derived neologisms. In 1934, the TLI collected and published some 30,000 Turkish replacements for approximately 7000 PA loanwords (Heyd, 1954) and in 1935, it published a pocket lexicon as an aid for reading texts written using the newly purified Turkish vocabulary. After the death of *Atatürk* in 1938, the TLI became the target of criticism from both religious conservatives and secular republicans because of its contentious obsession with purifying the language.

National identity reconstruction. In December 2014 the National Education Council of Turkey recommended that Ottoman Turkish be included in all high school curricula and soon after, with the public support of President Erdoğan, this recommendation became policy to the acclamation of its supporters and the condemnation of the opposition. This new policy is a major step towards Turkish national identity reconstruction made possible by the power of the JDP, but which ignores the voices of the experts responsible for its implementation (e.g., university teacher education faculty, high school principals, and teachers) (Yazan & Üzümlü, 2016). More will be said about the support of the JDP for Ottoman Turkish and its opposition to the Turkish Language Reform in the next chapter.

The Status of Turkish. As we shall see below, the current discourse regarding Turkish is between the opposing ideologies of the secular republicans and the religious conservatives. When a language policy is debated, it becomes subject to the political process and to the many ideologies that motivate the participants, generating a top-down, or macro to micro-level approach as occurred in Central Asia, Eastern Europe, Malaysia, Singapore, and Tanzania. Such a political process results in decisions made predominately by the more powerful factions who have the authority to reward the cooperative citizens or punish the recalcitrant ones (Yazan & Üzümlü, 2016).

Much in the same way that Süleyman Paşa suggested in the 19th century that Ottoman Turkish should be referred to by the previously stigmatized name ‘Turkish’, now Erdoğan is rehabilitating it by calling it “ageless Turkish” (as cited in Yazan and Üzümlü, 2016, p. 12) thereby placing it ideologically as the next step along the path of natural language change for the Modern Turkish created by the Turkish Language Reform (Yazan & Üzümlü, 2016).

Implementation of the language policy. Just as language policy is made according to the ideologies of the policy makers, the implementation of the policy will be subject to the ideology of those ultimately affected by the policy (e.g., principals, teachers, students, and their parents). Articulation between the national and local levels is rarely seamless (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008). The macro-level policy is usually the statement of a goal (i.e., by learning Ottoman Turkish high school students will reconnect to Ottoman culture), but it might also touch upon how it is to be implemented at the micro-level. Most often its implementation is left to the pedagogical expertise and knowledge of the subject matter of the teachers (Liddicoat, 2014; Zhao, 2011). Another variable affecting the implementation of language policy at the micro-level is the variety of interpretations and the amount of ownership the participants have, based on their individual beliefs and ideologies. In addition, these agents at the micro-level have influence over the rest of the community (e.g., the attitude of students towards mandatory Ottoman Turkish courses, or speaking Ottoman Turkish outside the classroom). This divergence of the macro and micro-level goals emphasizes the need for consultation between the two levels in the development of language policy (Baldauf, 2006; Çalışkan, 2013; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Yazan & Üzüm, 2016).

The new policy of including Ottoman Turkish instruction in all the high schools has made the selection of teachers and how they will be trained important questions for the implementation of the policy at the micro-level. In February 2014, guidelines were issued by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE), a macro-level decision maker, addressing the concerns of the micro-level implementers, in which the linguistic mastery of Ottoman Turkish by the teachers is emphasized to the neglect of their pedagogical expertise and their fields of study. This is a manifestation of the misunderstanding held by nonprofessionals that, for example, because a

science teacher, or a teacher of any subject, can speak a language, that teacher can also teach it without any preparation, training, or experience (Yazan & Üzüm, 2016).

DATA

This chapter begins with the details of how I made the final selection of studies included in the QRS and the criteria used for that selection. I also mention reasons why other studies were excluded. Then, I present the chosen studies and describe their contents. Next, I reveal the themes that I encountered in my data while clarifying their importance and creating subthemes using excerpts from the studies. After that, I present a synthesis of the themes and subthemes. Finally, I analyze how the synthesis addresses my research questions regarding the two models of script change by completing the comparative analysis of the status of Korean and Turkish.

Selected Studies

Each study chosen for this QRS addresses the status of the script change and meets the criteria for inclusion. There are two studies for Korean and two for Turkish. Although the number of studies chosen is small, it meets the minimum number suggested for a QRS. These are the four studies that I chose: King (2004); Silva (2008); Yazan (2015); and Yazan & Üzümlü (2016).

The first two studies are considerations of the role played by Christian missionaries in the reevaluation of *Han'gŭl*. In his study “Western Protestant Missionaries and the Origins of Korean Language Modernization”, King (2004) disputes the purported conclusion of Korean scholars that Christian missionaries had little effect on the reevaluation of *Han'gŭl* from the middle of the 19th century until the end of Japanese occupation in 1945. His focus is on the standardization of Korean orthography. He argues that Korean scholars acknowledge the role of missionaries but underestimate it and avoid mentioning the influence of non-Koreans. King quotes 35 scholars,

both Korean and non-Korean and a total of 50 studies, newspaper articles, and letters dating from 1879 to 1998. His stance and the stances of the scholars and authors are clearly indicated.

In “Missionary Contributions toward the Revaluation of Hangeul in late Nineteenth-Century Korea”, Silva (2008) also addresses the contributions of Christian missionaries toward the eventual triumph of the native Korean alpha-syllabary over the Korean adaptation of the Chinese script (*Hanja*). His focus is on the decision by the missionaries to use *Han’gŭl*, the stigmatized form of writing, instead of the prestigious *Hanja* to print and disseminate their literature including the Korean translation of the Bible. Silva cites 24 scholars and missionaries taken from a total of 30 studies and letters written between the years 1885 and 1919. His stance is also clearly discernable as are the stances of the authors of the various studies and letters cited.

The next two studies address the current movement in the Republic of Turkey to restore Ottoman Turkish along with its original script, culture, and traditions to the people of Turkey. In “Adhering to the Language Roots: Ottoman Turkish Campaigns on Facebook”, Yazan (2015) examines the attitudes expressed by members of seven Facebook groups which were created to support the acquisition and maintenance of Ottoman Turkish. His focus is on the language policing practices introduced by the Kemalists and the counter-language policing practices of the individuals connected to each other via the social networking site Facebook. While the focus on language policing falls outside the scope of my synthesis, Yazan includes conversations, artifacts, and comments from many members of the different Facebook groups, and cites the studies of eight scholars and the writings of *Atatürk* himself which do fall within its scope. His stance and the stances of the Facebook users and the scholars are discernable to various degrees.

In the second study, “Ottoman Turkish in the High School Curriculum: Current Language Planning Discussions in Turkey”, Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) explore the 2014 policy decision of

the Turkish Ministry of National Education to teach Ottoman Turkish at the high school level in the Republic of Turkey. The researchers highlight the divide between the Kemalist ideology that led to the Turkish Language Reform and the neo-Ottomanist ideals that are leading to a revival of Ottoman Turkish by citing the studies of 25 scholars, as well as the speeches of Mustafa Kemal *Atatürk* (the first president of the republic and founder of Kemalism) and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan (the current president and pro-Ottoman Turkish supporter). Yazan and Üzümlü, the scholars, and the Turkish presidents all display their stance to varying degrees.

Table 11. Description of Selected Studies.	
<i>Study</i>	<i>Description</i>
King (2004). “Western Protestant Missionaries and the Origins of Korean Language Modernization”.	Disputes the purported conclusion of Korean scholars that Christian missionaries had little effect on the reevaluation of <i>Han’gŭl</i> from the middle of the 19th century until the end of Japanese occupation in 1945.
Silva (2008). “Missionary Contributions toward the Reevaluation of Hangeul in late Nineteenth-Century Korea”.	Addresses the contributions of Christian missionaries toward the eventual triumph of the native Korean alpha-syllabary over the Korean adaptation of the Chinese script (<i>Hanja</i>).
Yazan (2015). “Adhering to the Language Roots: Ottoman Turkish Campaigns on Facebook”.	Examines the attitudes expressed by members of seven Facebook groups which were created to support the acquisition and maintenance of Ottoman Turkish.
Yazan and Üzümlü (2016). “Ottoman Turkish in the High School Curriculum: Current Language Planning Discussions in Turkey”.	Explores the 2014 policy decision of the Turkish Ministry of National Education to teach Ottoman Turkish at the high school level in the Republic of Turkey.

Many studies were excluded from this QRS because they failed to meet one or more criteria. Consider the following examples of studies which address the Korean script change to *Han’gŭl*: Bai, Shi, Jiang, He, & Weng (2011) is a quantitative study of the ability of Chinese and

Korean characters to engage the same visual area; Wi-vun (2007) addresses orthographic transition within the Han (Chinese) sphere of influence, but focuses more on Japan, Taiwan, and Vietnam than on Korea; Lee (2000) is a quantitative study on language attitudes toward Korean writing systems; Vovin (1999) considers how Old Korean was read at a time before the invention of *Han'gŭl*; Kim, I.S. (1993), while pointing out the contribution that Christian missionaries had on the adoption of *Han'gŭl* for their printing needs, does not refer to the polemic between the Korean and non-Korean linguists; and King (1987) looks at the Manchu script reform of 1632 and considers potential Korean linguistic influences, but not that of *Han'gŭl*.

Among the studies excluded which refer to the Turkish script change to Roman are the following: Ongur (2014) focuses on the identification of Ottomanisms, not script change; Daldeniz (2014) studies the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey without addressing script change; Aytürk (2013) is a brief encyclopedia entry detailing Kemal *Atatürk's* contribution to language planning and policy; Darling (2012) and Kerslake (1998) are about Ottoman Turkish; and Aslan (2003), Aytürk (2004, 2008a, 2008b), Brendemoen (1998), and Doğançay-Aktuna (1995) study the Turkish Language Reform with an emphasis on the elimination of the Perso-Arabic lexicon and related grammatical structures.

Table 12. Description of Studies Excluded.

<i>Study</i>	<i>Description</i>
Bai, Shi, Jiang, He, & Weng (2011)	A quantitative study of the ability of Chinese and Korean characters to engage the same visual area.
Wi-vun (2007)	Addresses orthographic transition within the Han (Chinese) sphere of influence, but focuses more on Japan, Taiwan, and Vietnam than on Korea.
Lee (2000)	A quantitative study on language attitudes toward Korean writing systems.
Vovin (1999)	Considers how Old Korean was read at a time before the invention of Han'gŭl.
Kim (1993)	While pointing out the contribution that Christian missionaries had on the adoption of Han'gŭl for their printing needs, does not refer to the polemic between the Korean and non-Korean linguists.
King (1987)	Looks at the Manchu script reform of 1632 and considers potential Korean linguistic influences but not that of Han'gŭl.
Ongur (2014)	Focuses on the identification of Ottomanisms, not the script change from Arabic to Roman.
Daldeniz (2014)	Studies the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey without addressing script change.
Aytürk (2013)	This is a brief encyclopedia entry detailing Kemal <i>Atatürk's</i> contribution to language policy and planning.
Darling (2012) and Kerslake (1998)	Studies about Ottoman Turkish.
Aslan (2003), Aytürk (2004, 2008a, 2008b), Brendemoen (1998), and Doğançay-Aktuna (1995)	Study the Turkish Language Reform with an emphasis on the elimination of the Perso-Arabic lexicon and related grammatical structures.

Themes, Subthemes, and Analysis

In reviewing the studies (King, 2004; Silva, 2008) for this QRS regarding the theme for Han'gŭlization (i.e., assigning credit for the revaluation of Han'gŭl) I encountered the following sub-themes: 1) the linguistic research of Christian missionaries had no tangible or lasting effect on the work of Korean scholars and language reform of the time; 2) the role of missionaries in the revaluation of *Han'gŭl* has been acknowledged but underestimated by Korean linguists and historians; 3) the missionaries initiated the discussion of the standardization and modernization of Korean writing, instigating similar discussions among the Koreans; 4) the missionaries contributed to the revaluation of *Han'gŭl* by choosing it as the medium for their written materials despite the risk of stigmatization; 5) *Han'gŭl*, the stigmatized script, was more accessible, more widespread, and easier to learn than the prestigious, yet cumbersome *Hanja*; and 6) the reform of *Han'gŭl* proposed by the missionaries was stymied by an emotional attachment to the 'Great letters' among the Koreans.

The studies (Yazan 2015; Yazan and Üzümlü 2016) regarding the theme for Romanization (i.e., the shifting ideology in Turkey that threatens the Turkish script change) yielded these sub-themes: 1) The policy decision to incorporate Ottoman Turkish into the high school curriculum emerged as part of the national identity reconstruction promoted by the neo-Ottomanist government led by the Justice and Development Party (JDP) of President Erdoğan; 2) teaching Ottoman Turkish is essential to reconnect Turks with the Ottoman cultural heritage; 3) national identity reconstruction is a reversal of the Turkish Language Reform under *Atatürk* and Kemalism; 4) the Kemalists gave overt linguistic reasons for the Turkish Language Reform while guarding their covert ideological ones; 5) the Turkish Language Reform was intended to break the Ottoman cultural connection; and 6) conservative and religious ideologies opposed the

Turkish Language Reform. This section is a presentation of the theme, sub-themes and analyses for each of the representative languages beginning with Korean and followed by Turkish.

Theme regarding Han'gŭlization: Assigning credit for the revaluation of Han'gŭl.

The following are the sub-themes regarding *Han'gŭlization* which are derived from the above theme. They have been described and illustrated using excerpts from the data.

Han'gŭlization sub-theme 1: The linguistic research of Christian missionaries had no tangible or lasting effect on the work of Korean scholars and language reform of the time.

Regarding sub-theme 1, King (2004) describes the attitudes and opinions of Korean linguists and historians of Christianity who, to varying degrees, disregard the contributions of Christian missionaries to the eventual adoption of *Han'gŭl*. He gives the following examples:

Kim Söktük ([1983]1986) is exceptional in this regard, as he includes absolutely nothing on Western missionaries (or non-Korean research of any kind), giving the impression (reinforced in any case by other works in this genre), that early modern Korean linguistic scholarship developed in a kind of intellectual vacuum. (p. 11)

Clearly, this is the extreme case of absolutely no credit being given to the Christian missionaries (nor to any other non-Korean scholar) for the success of *Han'gŭl* in modern Korea. King (2004) continues,

Kang Sinhang (1986: 143-6, 165-8) devotes some remarks to the works of Western missionaries (especially the French Catholic missionaries), but includes nothing on the influence of these works on the Korean grammatical tradition of Korean language policy. (p. 11)

We do not learn much about these works because King (2004) is focused on the contributions of the Protestant missionaries and plans to devote another study to the contributions of the French Catholic missionaries.

King (2004) also tells us the following:

Pak Chongguk (1994: 175) devotes two short paragraphs to "Protestantism" in his chapter on "Korean language studies in the early modern period," but confines his remarks to an enumeration of some Bible translation titles and publication statistics, concluding that, "Protestant missionary activity rendered a huge contribution to the revival, regularization (*chongni*) and propagation of han'gŭl." (King, 2004, p. 12)

Pak gives some general credit to the missionaries for their work in legitimizing *Han 'gŭl* but fails to mention any specific actions they took beyond their translation and publication activities.

Next, King (2004) shares the following quotes from Yu:

Yu Ch'anggyun (1995: 329-32) also includes a brief section on "Korean language research by foreigners" in which he is rather generous with his praise for the 'amazing research' of the first Western dictionary compilers, whom he credits with the first scientific analyses of the Korean language. Some pages earlier (322-3), in his chapter on the "Importation and development of modern linguistics," Yu writes: "It is impossible to ignore the contribution of Protestantism to modernization . . . the exclusive-han'gŭl usage movement used in proselytizing contributed greatly to creating a new awareness of the national language." (King, 2004, p. 12)

In these quotes, Yu heaps generous praise upon Western linguists and recognizes Protestantism for raising awareness of *Han 'gŭl* by using it for proselytizing.

The Korean linguist Kim Minsu, commenting on this sub-theme, writes,

strictly speaking, and with the exception of the case of Kim Kyusik, there is scarcely any reason to speak about whether or not [these works] had any influence on the Korean language research of Koreans. ...But their dictionary compilations and grammatical descriptions were carried out for the sake of their own goals and convenience. Because they were not purely scholarly works, they were unable to work any great effect on Koreans. (as cited in King, 2004, p 29)

Here, Kim discredits the reference materials created by non-Koreans as powerless to influence Koreans because of the missionaries' extra-scholastic, ulterior motives of evangelization and conversion.

King (2004) also mentions the following:

And with respect specifically to orthographic reform and the National Script Research Institute, Chi (1971: 20) is wide of the mark when he complains that the Korean scholars who participated in the Kungmun Yŏn'guso "...seem to have been completely oblivious that the spelling in the Bible was a fixed orthography. Thus, the basic theory of Bible orthography was of no assistance to the committee members in determining their research direction." (King, 2004, pp. 29-30)

Chi argues that the ignorance of the Korean scholars is proof that the work of the governmental language planning body could not have been influenced by the linguistic efforts of the missionaries which King (2004) obviously disputes.

King (2004), in support of his argument against the accepted one-sidedness of the influence of *Han 'gŭl* on the Christian missionaries, refers in this next excerpt to Ko:

I wholeheartedly concur with Ko Yŏnggŭn's calls for re-evaluation of James Scarth Gale's research on and contribution to Korean language studies, and submit that the data

presented in this paper call into question the apparently widespread notion that the direction of influence was one-sided, and in the direction from Chu to Gale. Tracing "influence" in situations like these is a sticky business under the best of circumstances, but at the very minimum, it seems clear there must have been a mutually enriching and stimulating give-and-take of ideas about Korean writing and orthography between Gale and Chu over a period of many years. (King, 2004, p. 31)

Han'gŭlization sub-theme 2: The role of missionaries in the revaluation of Han'gŭl has been acknowledged but underestimated by Korean linguists and historians. In sub-theme 2, we see that the contributions of Christian missionaries specifically related to the establishment of *Han'gŭl* are recognized but diminished by the Koreans. Silva (2008) tells us that,

several authors have remarked upon the role of Hangeul as symbolizing Korea's nascent cultural and political independence near the turn of the twentieth century. Still others have noted the role played by missionaries in recognizing the untapped potential of Hangeul as a vehicle for promoting universal communication and education in Korea. (p. 58)

Here we notice that *Han'gŭl* itself is referred to as a symbol of modern Korea and as a means for achieving literacy.

Regarding this sub-theme, King (2004) writes,

in this paper, I look not so much at Western missionary attitudes toward Korean language and writing, as to the concrete effects of their research and translation activities on the standardization and modernization of Korean language and writing — in particular, on orthography. It is orthography, especially, that lends a standard language its 'look' and 'feel', and that, as much as any script or writing system itself, can assume tremendous

importance for different forms of identity, be they regional, national or denominational. Thus, I will be arguing that while the role of Western Protestants [sic] missionaries has been generally acknowledged by (South Koreans), it has nonetheless been underestimated. (p. 8)

Here, King (2004) speaks of *Han'gŭl* as a symbol whose 'look' helps to form Korean identity by giving it a certain 'feel'. He also restates the sub-theme that the acknowledged role of the missionaries in the conversion of *Han'gŭl* into a symbol has been under appreciated.

In King (2004) we also learn that Kim Yun'gyŏng mentions the specific contributions of the missionaries and has kind words for them.

Kim praises the missionaries for introducing Korean language and han'gŭl to Western academia, and enumerates other contributions: assistance in promoting widespread literacy in han'gŭl (for instance, he notes on p. 182 that the British Bible Society, between 1895 and 1936, distributed 18,079,466 Bibles translated into Korean in Korea); promotion of Korean language and script through church services and Bible study groups; development, through pure-*kungmun/ŏnmun* 'style', of a widely-recognized and regularized spelling system - so much so, that he speaks of three different *munch'e* or orthographic styles prior to Liberation - the *kŭrisŭdo p'yogich'e* or 'Christian spelling', the 'Japanese Colonial *ch'ongdokpu* spelling', and the Chosŏnŏ Hakhoe (Korean Language Society) spelling; inspiration and training of many prominent Korean linguists and grammarians. (p. 9)

Kim, Y. recognized that bringing *Han'gŭl* to the attention of non-Korean researchers was an important step forward in the revaluation of the Korean script as was its use in the written materials of the missionaries. Kim also notes that their work inspired many Koreans.

The Korean scholar, Ch'oe Hyŏnbae, is very straight forward in his praise of the role that the missionaries played. Ch'oe writes,

we must not forget to mention the Protestant missionaries for their enormous contribution to the revival, reform and propagation of han'gŭl, both before and after the revival period . . . As Koreans, there is probably nobody who does not feel gratitude for the great contribution of Protestantism to han'gŭl propagation. (as cited in Yi, 1987, p. 428)

However, as King (2004) tells us, Ch'oe tempers this praise by pointing out the reciprocal benefits that the missionaries received from *Han'gŭl*.

According to Ch'oe (1962: 73), what han'gŭl did for Protestantism was to 1) facilitate propagation of Protestantism, and 2) render propagation even easier because of 'indigenous monotheistic beliefs and the word *hanŭnim*'. By contrast, Ch'oe's list of things that Protestantism did for han'gŭl is somewhat longer: 1) it propagated han'gŭl among the masses; 2) it helped Koreans learn to read and write han'gŭl; 3) it promoted respect for han'gŭl and fostered a spirit of protecting han'gŭl; 4) it recognized the scientific value of han'gŭl; 5) it propagated the "Paedal" language and writing to the world; and 6) it fostered an atmosphere conducive to han'gŭl-only orthography. But Ch'oe shies away from delving into the specific research or policy-related contributions of individual missionaries, and his section on "Research on han'gŭl" covers only the question of Romanization. (p. 9)

Despite his awareness that *Han'gŭl* received greater benefits from the missionaries than the missionaries received from *Han'gŭl*, Ch'oe neglected to mention their proposed orthographic reforms and their contributions to language policy.

Another Korean linguist, Cho Yunje, seems to be telling us that the relationship between *Han'gŭl* (or *kungmun* 'national script') and the missionaries was mutually beneficial.

Generally speaking, in examining the development process of *kungmun* in early modern times, it is impossible to forget the weighty influence of developments in 'Western learning'; as soon as this Western learning arrived in Korea, translation of the Bible into Korean was begun in order to propagate its tenets widely to the general masses. ... As a result, it goes without saying that the propagation of Protestantism was an easy matter, and as a consequence, not only was a new culture propagated to the common masses, but this also had a huge relevance to the development of our *kungmun*. That is to say, we believe that *kungmun's* debt to Protestantism in early modern times looms extremely large; whereas people in the past had assumed that public and private documents needed to be written in *hanmun*, they now came to realize that using just *kungmun* was entirely sufficient. (as cited by King, 2004, p. 10)

Cho states that *Han'gŭl* made the propagation of Christianity easy and Protestantism made *Han'gŭl* sufficient for all documents written in Korean.

In the following excerpt, the Korean literary historian Cho Yŏn-hyŏn explains that the use of *Han'gŭl* in place of the mixed script was revelatory for the Koreans who were not accustomed to the exclusive use of *Han'gŭl*:

This assistance on the part of Protestantism to Korea's modern development was especially evident in Korea's modernization process, and the most concrete contribution that it left was the encouragement of *kungmun* and the movement for direct intercourse with the West. The *ŏnmun ilch'i* movement represented by *kukhanmun* [mixed script] was a very important element in the modernization movement, but outside of the confines of

fiction and the translated Bible, it was not easy to find use of exclusive *kungmun*. Even when Japanese imperialism crushed the use of Korean language and writing from the public sphere, our language continued to be pronounced in the churches. The merits bequeathed on Korean linguistic and literary life by the translation of the Bible into Korean can by no means be rated any less than its theological salvation work. (as cited by King, 2004, p. 11)

Cho equates the linguistic and literary contributions of the missionaries as they relate to the exclusive use of *Han'gŭl* in the printing of the Bible with the theological value of the message that the Bible contains.

King (2004) cites another article by a Korean linguist which reflects on the status of *Han'gŭl* at the beginning of the modern era.

The only other significant work that I am aware of is Yu Ch'anggyun's (1967) article on the Korean Bible and its influence on Korean language development, in which he details the lamentable digraphia of premodern Korea, and admits that "...when it came to writing, we had fallen into the evil practice of abandoning our national tongue and taking pleasure in using *hanmun*. There is no hiding the fact that the translation of the Bible was a stimulus freeing us from this mistaken notion." (King, 2004, p. 11)

Yu qualifies the digraphic state of the Korean writing system as "evil" because *Hanja* was preferred over *Han'gŭl* and credits the Korean version of the Bible for freeing Koreans from their mistake of using *Hanja* instead of *Han'gŭl*. Regarding the Korean version of the Bible, Chŏn T'aekpu states unequivocally that "the han'gŭl Bible was the greatest event in the history of the Korean language" (as cited in King, 2004, p. 11).

King (2004), in an unequivocal statement of his stance regarding sub-theme 2, writes, “in my view, it is astonishing that the missionary spelling reform debate of 1902-1906 has been passed over in silence by Korean historians of Korean linguistics and language reform” (p. 30).

His final contribution to this sub-theme, also a clear statement of stance, is the following:

In this paper, we have tried to marshal further evidence in support of Yi Manyŏl's (1987: 461) insightful comment that, whereas it is usual to distinguish two traditions in modern Korean grammar, one descending from Chu Sigyŏng, and the other from Western missionaries, ultimately, both go back to a Protestant missionary source. (p. 33)

Here, King not only reiterates the two purported Korean traditions of acknowledging and underestimating the contributions made by the missionaries but, in a move eerily reminiscent of the previously mentioned Turkish Sun Theory which claimed that all languages originated from Turkish, supports Yi's contention that both traditions come from the work of the Protestant missionaries.

Han'gŭlization sub-theme 3: The missionaries initiated the discussion of the standardization and modernization of Korean writing, instigating similar discussions among the Koreans. King (2004) clarifies that sub-theme 3 refers to the corpus planning that missionaries were involved in as they sought to perfect *Han'gŭl* for use with their printed materials. He writes, “in the context of turn-of-the-twentieth century Korean language, 'modernization' meant, first and foremost, orthographic reform — the establishment of the Korean script as an (if not the) official writing system, and reform and standardization of Korean spelling” (p. 8). The reforms mentioned by King are the same ones for which the Koreans acknowledged the missionaries and for which they themselves were working.

The Korean researcher Kim Hyongju makes it clear that in his opinion, the "genuine [grammatical] research was begun by the missionaries...." (as cited in King, 2004, p. 12), and not by the Korean linguists. King (2004) identifies the Korean linguist Chi Ch'unsu as the first to analyze the corpus planning of the missionaries for the Korean language. He writes,

with specific regard to orthography, Chi Ch'unsu (1971) is an excellent (and apparently the first) analysis of the orthography in the earliest Bible translations, and begins by lamenting the lack of attention to orthography in research to date. According to Chi, the "Bible orthography" had a number of distinguishing features, among which were its conservatism, its strict adherence to just ten *patch'im* or syllable-final consonants..., its efforts to maintain a consistent and strict division between verb roots and endings, and between nouns and particles (in other words, its attempts to write root morphemes consistently in the same shape, within the limits of the *patch'im* system), its consistency, its regularized system for rendering Western personal and place names in han'gŭl, its widespread but unspoken acceptance throughout Korea, and above all, word-spacing. (p. 12)

Chi himself recognizes the sparsity of research into this sub-theme and praises many of the features of the orthographic reforms proposed by the missionaries.

One of the earliest critiques of the Korean writing system was made by a linguist from Germany named von der Gabelentz (1892), an admirer of *Han'gŭl* who wrote that the Korean script was "...to my knowledge, the simplest writing system possessed by any people" (p. 587).

Von der Gabelentz continues his critique in the following manner:

On top of this we find an anarchy in the orthography and even in certain parts of the declension system which is well understandable if one recalls the contempt in which the

Korean language is held in its own country. ... The Japanese, at least, have an old, indigenous literature which they hold in high regard and study with philological methods. ... In Korea, there is nothing of the sort. So far as I can tell, there has never even been an attempt to standardize the indigenous language. ... It is precisely this apparently so undisciplined and arbitrary orthography, this An-orthography in Korean texts ... There is still no telling if and when science will be in a position to bring order to this situation. The only thing worse than a non-literary language is a language which, though used for literary purposes, is neither cultivated literarily nor stabilized. (as cited in King, 2004, p. 14)

Considering his comments, it is possible that von der Gabelentz may not have intended for his assessment of *Han'gŭl* as “the simplest” be taken as a compliment since he also found anarchy, indiscipline, and arbitrariness, and called it an uncultivated, unstable An-orthography.

Soon, there were other critiques of the Korean alpha-syllabary such as the following made by Carles (1894):

A drawback, attending upon the little attention paid to the teaching of this language, is that the spelling has become very loose. Even in well-printed books, the faults of pronunciation, committed by a careless speaker are perpetuated, and the final and initial letters of syllables are assigned to the wrong syllable. In a polysyllabic language, every syllable of which has its own signification, the meaning of the whole work is gathered from the syllables of which it is compounded; but for foreigners, at any rate, the component parts are likely to be misleading rather than to form a clue, if there is any carelessness in the separation of the syllables. (as cited by King, 2004, p. 14)

The analysis of the problems of *Han'gŭl* before its reform and standardization are clearly delineated by Carles in the above excerpt as are their pernicious effects on readers who are not fully fluent in Korean.

Following shortly upon the missionaries spelling debate (1902-1906) in which the Board of Translators sought consensus for their proposed reforms for the standardization and modernization of *Han'gŭl*, King (2004) tells us that the Koreans began to move in the direction of reform as the government took its first official steps toward corpus planning.

Established on July 8, 1907, under the Ministry of Education (*Hakpu*), the National Script Research Institute was Korea's first national research body, and Korea's first language planning institution. Its main research brief was to solve problems related to Korean writing system and orthography,... (p. 27)

King (2004) makes clear his stance regarding the origin of the corpus planning undertaken by the missionaries when he writes,

the point I would emphasize here, before turning to other questions, is that Westerners, at first scholars outside Korea, but joined later by missionaries working inside Korea, initiated a wide-ranging discussion of Korean writing which soon spilled over into the Korean Christian community. This discussion ran parallel with, and seems likely to have helped instigate, similar discussions in Korean among Korean reformers and intellectuals. (p. 17)

King recognizes the existence of parallel discussions in the missionary and Korean communities but suggests that it was the efforts of the missionaries that instigated standardization and modernization of *Han'gŭl*.

Han'gŭlization sub-theme 4: The missionaries contributed to the revaluation of Han'gŭl by choosing it as the medium for their written materials despite the risk of stigmatization. The choice to print the Korean Bible and other evangelizing literature using *Han'gŭl* was a conscious decision made by the missionaries that reflected their belief that all Koreans should have access to the Christian faith regardless of their socio-economic class. Referring to the contributions of Silva (2002) to this sub-theme, King (2004) writes,

Silva introduces valuable primary source materials written by Western missionaries that reveal their intellectual prejudices and racial biases towards the Koreans and their language, and shows how Western missionaries "effectively exploited Korea's language situation" in order to maximize the breadth and depth of their evangelization. (p. 7)

King recognizes that the missionaries behaved hypocritically towards a people for whom they harbored prejudices and biases.

In writing about the choice of the missionaries to use *Han'gŭl* for their publications, Kang (1997) tells us that "when Christian missionaries arrived in Korea, they began to use Hangeul for all their printed matter.... Practically all Korean Christian literature, hymnals, and Bible translations continue to be published in Hangeul" (p. 31). It is clear from this excerpt that Kang is drawing a connection between the decision of the missionaries to use *Han'gŭl* exclusively and its continual use through the present day.

The credit which Kim Yun'gyŏng gives the missionaries for the establishment of *Han'gŭl* as the national script is clear when he writes, "such a gem could not remain buried forever, and so ultimately it was the great contribution of Protestantism . . . , by illuminating the value of han'gŭl, to demonstrate its brilliance to the entire world" (as cited in King, 2004, p. 9). According to Kim, it was the missionaries who revealed the importance of *Han'gŭl* to the world.

Griffis (1912), in the following excerpt, also compares *Han'gŭl* to a gem, a hidden treasure that was discovered by the missionaries:

Nevertheless, to the rapturous surprise of the missionaries, there lay, as in a cave, an invaluable treasure awaiting them. No Ali Baba, with the filched secret of "Open Sesame," was more thrilled by the discovery of gold and jewels, than were Underwood and Appenzeller over the trove of the Enmun alphabet. ... missionaries made this despised earthen vessel the receptacle of a heavenly treasure. ...the translated Bible, besides quickening the Korean mind and heart, called into life not only an unknown world of thought, but by setting a new standard of speech and writing induced the beginnings of a true national literature. (p. 189)

In addition to the theological implications for the Korean people that Griffis makes regarding *Han'gŭl*, he credits it with stimulating their intellectual and literary national identity.

Silva (2008) shows us in the following excerpt the connection between the use of *Han'gŭl* by the government and the importance of literacy to the evangelization efforts of the missionaries:

Official rendering of Korean in its native script, particularly in government records, did not begin until 1894, as part of broader reforms precipitated by Korea's diplomatic and commercial opening to the West. It was also around this time that Korea experienced concerted efforts by Christian missionaries to evangelize, a process in which matters of literacy inevitably came to the fore, given the centrality of scripture to the endeavor. (p. 57)

The contemporaneous use of *Han'gŭl* in both government publications and Christian literature suggests the parity of the roles that each party played in the implementation of *Han'gŭl* as the national script contrary to the argument of King and Silva.

When the missionaries arrived in Korea and discovered *Han'gŭl*, they began to evaluate its advantages and disadvantages as pointed out in this next excerpt from Silva (2008):

In addition to its relative ease of acquisition, Hangeul had advantages over Hanja because of its adaptability to the rendering of non-Korean terms. As Congregationalist minister William E. Griffis (1885: 155) writes, [Hangeul] “is chiefly for the unlearned. It is, however, beautifully phonetic, and hence can be easily used to note down foreign names and words” (p. 66).

While acknowledging the stigma suffered by *Han'gŭl* as being for the “unlearned”, Griffis also recognizes that *Han'gŭl* is very useful in the transliteration of non-Korean vocabulary.

James Scarth Gale (1909), couching his description in Christian imagery, gives this account of the revaluation of *Han'gŭl*:

Korea's native script ... has come quietly down the dusty ages, waiting for, who knew what? Never used, it was looked on with contempt as being so easy. Why yes, even women could learn it in a month or little more; of what use could such a cheap script be? By one of those mysterious providences it was made ready and kept waiting for the New Testament and other Christian literature. Up to this day these have had almost exclusive use of this wonderfully simple language. This perhaps is the most remarkable providence of all, this language sleeping its long sleep of four hundred years, waiting till the hour should strike on the clock, that it might rise and tell of all Christ's wondrous works. They

call it Un-mun, the “dirty language,” because it is so simple and easy as compared with proud Chinese picture writing. God surely loves the humble things of life. (pp. 137-138)

Gale describes the prejudices and negative stereotypes that *Han’gŭl* faced at the turn of the 20th century including the belittlement of the intelligence of women. He also disparages Chinese characters through a casual, judgmental comparison.

Silva (2008) explains the ability of the missionaries to engage in matters of script choice regarding the publication of their written materials in the following excerpt:

Having established themselves as educators and publishers, missionary leaders eventually found themselves in a position to become engaged in questions of language use and policy, particularly with regard to how they would present their evangelistic materials. For example, efforts to establish a common translation of scripture began in February 1887, when a joint committee for translating the Bible into Korean was formed by missionaries. The work of the committee ultimately culminated in the eventual publication of the first widely accepted Korean Bible in 1900, a document printed exclusively in the vernacular script. (p. 68)

The missionaries considered the adoption of *Han’gŭl* as a critical issue because its stigmatized status might complicate their desire for their literature to be taken seriously.

The record of the following discussion comes from the Annual Meeting of the Presbyterian Mission:

Dr. Moffett brought up the question of the use of the Unmoon (National alphabet characters) in all Church literature instead of the Mixed Chinese and Unmoon or the pure Chinese characters, and he asked a vote on the matter. Teacher Kim Pil Soo spoke in favor of the pure Unmoon. Yang Chun Paik, Saw Kyung Jo Elders, and Helper Han Suk

Jin spoke against it. Elder Pang Keui Chang and Helper Kim Heung Kyung opposed any formal decision being taken on the matter. (as cited in Silva, 2008, p. 69)

The options under consideration were clear: 1) the exclusive use of *Han'gŭl*; 2) the mixture of *Han'gŭl* and *Hanja*; and 3) the continued use of pure *Hanja*. In 1903, there were both proponents and opponents of *Han'gŭl* which indicates the concern of some of the participants for the stigma that they might face for using the national script. On the other hand, the existence of an indigenous script in Korea provided the missionaries with an opportunity that yielded an unusual outcome. Silva (2008) explains that,

although discussions of script and language issues at such meetings are overwhelmed by administrative matters (e.g., mission funding, property acquisition, medical concerns), they are noteworthy as they present evidence of active engagement in linguistic issues. While missionary involvement in matters of language and literacy is not unique to the Korean context, most striking is the commitment to a script that was not devised by the missionaries themselves, but rather, was extant in the community. The result was a synergistic development of an unequivocally local cultural asset by foreign stakeholders, leading ultimately to a more favorable revaluing of the indigenous resource by the indigenous people. (p. 69)

In other national contexts, the missionaries might have preferred the development of their own script to the use of a native script as the vehicle for their publications. With *Han'gŭl*, they encountered a script that was more than adequate for their purposes and whose use would endear them to the Koreans.

As a final view on sub-theme 4, some writers have reached the conclusion that the reevaluation of *Han'gŭl* is attributable entirely to the efforts of the missionaries as in this excerpt from Brown (1936):

...a dialect called Un-mun, or En-mun, consisting of twenty-five characters ...was regarded with contempt until the missionaries, finding that it was better adapted to their purpose than the cumbersome Chinese characters and more easily taught to the illiterate people, used it in the translation of the New Testament and in books, tracts, grammars and dictionaries. (pp. 445-446)

What Brown omits to tell the reader is that, since its inception, there had always been Koreans who valued *Han'gŭl*, had never regarded it with contempt, and had worked for its reevaluation for many of the same reasons as the missionaries.

Han'gŭlization sub-theme 5: Han'gŭl, the stigmatized script, was more accessible, more widespread, and easier to learn than the prestigious, yet cumbersome Hanja. The digraphic state which existed in Korea in the 19th century confused the missionaries. It exposed the difference between their philosophy and that of the Koreans. Silva (2008) writes the following:

As this ethnological account of work written between 1885 and 1919 reveals, it was difficult for the newcomers to negotiate the relationship between their beliefs regarding literacy and learnedness and those of Koreans: although Hangeul was easy to learn and use, it lacked the prestige associated with Hanja, thereby creating a sociolinguistic dilemma. (p. 58)

Several authors confirm the widely held opinion regarding the simplicity of *Han'gŭl*. For example, W. R. Carles (1894) says, “the language is alphabetical, and contains eleven vowels

and fourteen consonants. These being purely phonetic, to read and write Korean are considered feats so easy as not to require teaching” (p. 309), and Nisbet writes, “Korea has an alphabet . . . , which is extremely simple and very easily learned. . . . But for a foreigner to learn to speak the Korean language is another thing” (as cited by Silva, 2008, p. 58).

Underwood also confirms the ease of learning *Han’gŭl* and the difficulty of speaking Korean when he writes,

the question will naturally be asked, is the language easy of acquisition? For an Occidental, we must reply in the negative. While, as has been noted, the alphabet can be mastered almost at a sitting, the train of Korean thought and method of expression are so diametrically opposed to that of the Westerner that it is no easy matter to put oneself where one can think as the native does in Korean. . . . (as cited in Silva, 2008, p. 61)

Why, the missionaries seemed to ask, would the Koreans not want to use *Han’gŭl*, which is easy for everyone to learn, and insist that *Hanja*, which requires decades of study, be the only acceptable form of writing? Silva (2008) seems to offer an answer to this question in the following excerpt:

The problem lay in Hangeul’s lack of social prestige: Hangeul was not Hanja. Under the *sadae* [‘serving the great’] system, Korea’s vassalage to imperial China extended beyond the political realm and into the cultural domain, thereby bestowing upon Hanja a status that was not accorded to King Sejong’s orthographic innovation. (p. 60)

Kim-Renaud (2004) contributes more to Silva’s explanation when he writes that *Han’gŭl* "gained little acceptance by the elite Literati and was used mainly by women and Buddhist monks until the end of the 19th century, and it was widely dismissed as Enmun (vernacular writing)" (p. 168).

As we have seen above, not all scholars agree with the stereotypes regarding *Han 'gŭl*, but the stigma was real. The domain of the literature determined whether *Hanja* or *Han 'gŭl* was used for printing the text. Underwood (1890) explains that,

in the writing of Korean, two forms of characters are used, the native Ernmun [Hangeul] and the Chinese. In all official correspondence, philosophical books, and in fact in nearly all books of real value, the Chinese character is used, the native Ernmun being relegated to a few trashy love stories and fairy tales. (p. 4)

Here, Underwood clearly reveals his stance toward *Han 'gŭl* when he refers to “books of real value” and “a few trashy love stories.” In another article, he refers to *Han 'gŭl* being used for “a comparatively few cheap, trashy, and miserably printed novelettes and books of songs” (1908, pp. 71-72).

In explaining the stigmatization of *Han 'gŭl*, many authors reveal the prejudices of the time using often repeated stereotypes. For example, Savage-Landor (1895) notes,

the Korean alphabet is rather despised by the male ‘blue stockings’ of Chosen, and is considered as fit only for poor people, children and women; in short, those whose brains are unable to undergo the strain of mastering ... the meaning of the many thousands of Chinese characters. (p. 208)

And Carles (1894) describes the dilemma caused by the simplicity and stigma of *Han 'gŭl* in the following excerpt:

Owing to the great ease with which Koreans can learn to read and write their own language, as a written language, it is regarded with great contempt, and its use is in great measure confined to women and uneducated men. In official documents it is seldom employed except in proclamations to the people ... The literature is exceedingly small,

but it is worth noting that circulating libraries on an exceedingly petty scale do exist in the capital. (as cited in Silva, 2008, p. 63)

So, the question the missionaries grapple with is, should we risk using the stigmatized script for printing a prestigious, sacred genre of literature? Silva (2008) addresses this issue in the following excerpt:

In light of such associations between Hangeul and low-status genres, however, the missionaries had another obstacle to overcome: the cultural disconnect that would come with promoting the value of scriptural texts and religious tracts written in a script that was deemed “common” or “vulgar.” (p. 63)

In other words, will Koreans perceive the Bible and the message it contains as being worthless because it is printed using *Han’gŭl*, the stigmatized script, and therefore reject the missionaries’ religion? The missionaries found themselves in the following digraphic dilemma as described by Silva (2008) in the next excerpt:

On the one hand, effective evangelization required a means of producing literature (especially scripture translations) that would be accessible to the majority of Koreans: Hangeul. On the other hand, Korea’s centuries-long cultural domination by China dictated that any literature worthy of serious consideration would (or “should”) be rendered in the high prestige script: *Hanja*. (p. 65)

Finally, Silva (2008) analyzes the problem the missionaries faced, their potential solution, and the conclusion they draw.

...the missionaries were confronted with two options: either increase the accessibility of Hanja (e.g., through educational efforts, beginning with themselves) or increase the prestige of Hangeul (e.g., through the contemporary equivalent of a “public relations

campaign”). In light of the difficulties inherent in learning thousands of Chinese characters, the choice was clear: despite its association with less prestigious users and unsavory literary genres, Hangeul had to be promoted as a credible medium for serious literature, including scripture. (p. 65)

Han’gŭlization sub-theme 6: The reform of Han’gŭl proposed by the missionaries was stymied by an emotional attachment to it among the Koreans. As an illustration of this sub-theme, let us look at the following excerpt by Yi Ik-seup (1892), written in response to Hulbert (1892) who suggests that the Korean graphemes were related to the Tibetan or Devanagari scripts:

Since the foreigner has come to Chosen, there has been considerable consultation and writing on subjects that we had thought scarcely worthy of attention heretofore. ...

If relationship exists in the midst of such dissimilarity, who knows but that I and my dog may have been one some time [*sic*] in the past, for while I claim on the whole to being his superior I certainly bear much more resemblance to him than does our Chosen Enmoun to these so-called near relations. (p. 293)

Yi clearly displays his emotional attachment to *Han’gŭl* through his vociferous repudiation of the conjecture that it is derived from a script he considers to be more dissimilar to it than his dog is to him.

The desire of the missionaries to reform *Han’gŭl* is clearly expressed in the data, especially in a later article written by Hulbert as we shall see. The opposition of the Koreans to the proposed reforms is equally evident. In the following excerpt, Hulbert (1904) refers to the need for reform:

It gets out of alignment, so to speak. The question is whether we shall draw the spelling back into alignment with the pronunciation or not. ... It is the desire of the advocates of the reform to give the people a system which will make the spelling of the words absolutely phonetic ... It should be borne in mind that the vagaries of Korean spelling are nothing so wild as those of English. ... To our mind one of the most glaring imperfections of the Korean alphabet is the lack of distinction between the long and short sound of vowels ... But if we are to manipulate the alphabet in favor of the coming generations why not make a thorough job of it and give them something that will be approximately perfect? (pp. 388-391)

And Hulbert (1904) points out the importance of the question of literacy when he writes, the difficulty that has been raised because of dialectic differences of pronunciation has never been properly answered. In a large section of the country the y is not silent in the vowels with the double spot and the t and ch are not interchangeable. ... So far as reading is concerned the old system works well enough. When it comes to spelling, however, the new method would be simpler ... One of the staunchest advocates of the reform spelling says that the great difficulty with a Korean text is its lack of visual perspicuity. ... After all is said does it not come down to this, that the reform spelling will make it easier to write Korean and harder to read it?... Which is the more important, to read or to write? (pp. 391-392)

Koreans were aware of these issues but, nevertheless, opposed the reform efforts of the missionaries.

Regarding the attitude of Koreans toward *Han'gŭl* and identity, and in response to Hulbert's article, an anonymous reader writing under the pseudonym O.W.W.K. (1904) wrote,

... they may affect to despise it, yet they know and love every character. It is connected in their minds with childhood, home, mother and everything which they have a right to hold sacred and dear, and which no men may presume to lightly tamper with or take away. ... There are Koreans who resent this. ... to such a Korean the attempt on the part of a body of foreigners to reduce his written mother tongue to a dead level of phonetic sameness is not only unnecessary, but unwarrantable and unjustifiable from any standpoint of right and fairness. (pp. 441-442)

Finally, Kang Sun-pil (1906) also mentions the sub-theme of an emotional attachment of Koreans to *Han 'gŭl*.

We want to make the Koreans proud of their own native written character. You will not make them proud of it by telling them that there is no such things [*sic*] as correct spelling in Korea and that it all ought to be changed and simplified ... What I plead for is that all the energy that foreigners have to spend along the line of literary work for Korea should be concentrated upon the main proposition and not frittered away upon side issues. (pp. 286-289)

Theme regarding Romanization: The shifting ideology in Turkey that threatens the Turkish script change. The following are the sub-themes regarding Romanization which were derived from the above theme. They have been described and illustrated using excerpts from the data.

Romanization sub-theme 1: The policy decision to incorporate Ottoman Turkish into the high school curriculum emerged as part of the national identity reconstruction promoted by the neo-Ottomanist government led by the Justice and Development Party (JDP) of President Erdoğan. The current support for this corpus planning policy of the Turkish

government is an indication of the popular movement in Turkey to rehabilitate Ottoman Turkish (OT). It also signals a potential reconsideration of the Turkish Language Reform which led to the celebrated script change of the Republic of Turkey. Yazan (2015) tells us the following:

OT does not enjoy any official role or status in governmental or legal spheres in present-day Turkey. However, this fact has not impeded the growing momentum of the language, especially in the last decade or so, under the Justice and Development Party (AK Parti) administration, which is often characterized as a bastion of neo-Ottomanism. (p. 340)

The JDP is creating the conditions through its language plans and policies for a resurgence of OT regardless of its previous marginalization and the official status of Modern Turkish (MT).

Several entities have taken steps to advance the national identity reconstruction and many people have responded. In the following excerpt, Yazan (2015) tells us that,

specifically, beginning in the 2013–2014 academic year, OT has become a compulsory course for Social Studies High Schools and an elective course in other types of high schools. These efforts were extended by the establishment of OT courses open to the public and a magazine entitled “Ottoman Turkish” initiated by the *Hayrat Vakfı* (Charity Foundation) and the General Directorate of Lifelong Learning of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE). Within 6 months, more than 30,000 people from various backgrounds joined these language courses to learn OT in over 900 public education centers (Ongur 2014). (p. 340)

Official government entities have created compulsory and elective Ottoman Turkish courses in the high schools. Their efforts were complimented by those of private entities which created a magazine and established courses for the public to learn Ottoman Turkish in governmental

centers of education. The policy of offering OT courses in high schools is one facet of national identity reconstruction, a project of the ruling party.

In the following excerpt, Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) tell us more about the JDP, its ideology, and its plans.

First, making Ottoman Turkish a high school course is one of the significant manifestations of the national identity reconstruction endeavors of the ruling political party with neo-Ottomanist nostalgia and ideals. Second, this language policy represents the ideological construction of the introduction of Ottoman Turkish as a course, through which Mr [*sic*] Erdoğan and the ruling party exert their power, and practice covert discursive control, to reinforce their supporters' adherence. (p. 2)

The JDP is driven by the ideology of neo-Ottomanist values, and the policies enacted by the government, such as teaching OT in high schools, are intended to solidify its power covertly.

Regarding the Facebook groups that they researched, Yazan and Üzümlü (2016), citing two scholars, show the connection of the members to the JDP, its ideology, and its program of national identity reconstruction.

Those online communities aim to reconnect their membership with Ottoman-Islamic culture and support the government's macro policies of teaching Ottoman Turkish at high school levels. Also, Altun (2015) examined the discussions through YouTube comments for a video clip about the current policy decision about Ottoman Turkish. He found that those discussions turned into a virtual platform for negotiating "the ideologies, political parties, social groups, religious beliefs and historical characters they represent," rather than the actual policy (p. 42). Providing a macro observation, Ongur (2014) understands the burgeoning interest in the nostalgia for the glorious Ottoman past as part of the

national identity reconstruction in Turkey, which reimagines Turkishness as the continuation of Ottoman-Islamic identity and restores the cultural connection supposedly lost during the foundation of the Republic. He situates the government-supported services to supply free Ottoman Turkish courses for the public (through school curricula and beyond) in the scope of this reconstruction project. (p. 6)

Here, Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) cite evidence that the Facebook group members support the government policies, that the YouTube commentators subscribe to the discourses that arise from the policies, and that there is increased interest among Turks in the JDP's national identity reconstruction program.

That the governments of *Atatürk* and the Kemalists and Erdoğan and the JDP would use language planning based on their ideology should not surprise us according to this excerpt from Yazan and Üzümlü (2016), who cite both Spolsky and Shohamy in support of their argument:

In the policy decision about the teaching of Ottoman Turkish, state stands out as the macro-level institutions that are relevant domains of language management. Spolsky (2009) defines language management as “the explicit and observable effort by someone or some group that has or claims authority over the participants in the domain to modify their practices or beliefs” (p. 4). He argues that states use their power and authority to establish, enforce, and modify language policies which are intended to regulate language practices and beliefs in the nation (Spolsky, 2004). Language-management efforts have been a crucial part of the nation-building projects oriented by the one-nation, one-language ideology that couples nation-state with language and turns the latter into “an identifier of inclusion and exclusion” (Shohamy, 2006, p. 27). Therefore, government-led management efforts to execute a reform plan in “some aspect of a language (usually its

writing system, orthography, or lexicon) often serve a political purpose” (Spolsky, 2009, p. 167). (Yazan & Üzümlü, 2016, p. 7)

The government in power engages in corpus planning according to its ideological goals to consolidate its political base. As Shohamy (2006) explains, they use “propaganda and ideologies about language loyalty, patriotism, collective identity and the need for ‘correct and pure language’ or ‘native language’ as strategies for continuing their control and holding back the demands of these ‘others’” (p. 46).

Romanization sub-theme 2: Ottoman Turkish is essential to reconnect Turks with their Ottoman cultural heritage. The reforms undertaken during the first decade of the Republic of Turkey were intended to sever the ties of Turks with their Ottoman past. The corpus planning currently underway in Turkey resembles those reforms in that it is intended to sever the ties of modern Turks with their Kemalist past. In the following excerpt, Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) tell us that,

similar to the way the Turkish Language Reform contributed to the definition and construction of national identity in the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, the current policy of Ottoman Turkish functions as a supporting instrument in the national identity reconstruction. The incorporation of Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum is a small-scale policy as compared to the extensive, fundamental changes led by the Turkish Language Reform. However, the supporters of the current policy argue that making Ottoman Turkish available for students will play a cardinal role in reconnecting with the Ottoman cultural heritage, which was forgotten because of the Turkish Language Reform. (p. 9)

Here, Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) emphasize the considered importance of OT in the recovery of Ottoman culture and history, the loss of which is blamed on the Turkish Language Reform.

In discussing the Facebook names of the groups researched, Yazan (2015) points out how the titles of the groups reflect the desire of their members to rekindle Ottoman Turkish heritage.

Some group names merit particular attention. For instance, the name of group 2 underscores the linguistic disconnect between ancestors and their descendants (“Ancestors’ language that descendants don’t know”). In the name of group 5, the use of two adjectives considerably contributes to the message: “our” and “ageless.” In using the possessive adjective, creators of the page convey that they still have the right to claim ownership of this language, although it is not the alphabet in use in the RoT [Republic of Turkey] anymore. Describing OT with the adjective of “ageless” might be considered a reaction to those who believe it is old and obsolete. This consideration relies on the fact that OT script is usually referred to as “old Turkish” in public. (p. 345)

Yazan (2015) tells us how one title underscores the right of the members to reclaim the language of their ancestors and another rejects the purported obsolescence of the Arabic script for writing Turkish. Continuing his analysis of the titles of the Facebook groups he studied, Yazan (2015) explains that,

moreover, the phrase in the name of group 6, “genuine Turkish (OT) words” is quite telling, in terms of understanding the administrator(s)’ stance regarding genuineness in the language and the lexical purification campaigns in Turkey. Additionally, the use of brackets in this phrase is quite strategic. “OT” in brackets follows “genuine Turkish,” which implies the administrator(s)’ reaction to the lexical purification discourse which positioned pre-Islamic words or those derived from known Turkish roots as genuine and

those commonly used in Ottoman times as the opposite, i.e. false or questionable. Lastly, the words “ecdad” (ancestors) and “evlad” (descendants) in the name of group 2 are intentionally spelled differently than they would be in MT [Modern Turkish]. These are Arabic loanwords and the spelling in the group name reflects the original phoneme and character correspondence. However, because of the phonological characteristics of Turkish, the /d/ sound at the end of these words is turned into a /t/ sound in actual pronunciation. That is why, in MT dictionaries, these words are spelled as “ecdat” and “evlat.” This divergence from MT and convergence with original Arabic pronunciation might be viewed as a strategic attempt to produce linguistic order in this sense. (pp. 345-346)

The stance of the administrator of one group is revealed by his equating Ottoman Turkish with genuine Turkish, thereby refusing to accept the Kemalist premise that pre-Modern Turkish words are not truly Turkish. Also, the use of non-Turkish Language Reform spellings for words in the title of another group to indicate their Ottoman Turkish origin proves that words borrowed from another language can conserve their original spelling and still be pronounced correctly according to the Turkish writing system and regardless of which script is used.

The data from Yazan (2015) delineate the belief that a growing number of Turks consider OT to be crucial to the recovery of pre-Turkish Language Reform culture and history. Consider the following excerpt from Yazan (2015):

When these textual and visual artifacts were scrutinized through the lens of language policing, three major themes emerged: (1) instructional support and practice to help members acquire literacy skills in OT, (2) ideological conviction that OT is an essential

component of Turkish people's cultural repertoire, and (3) reaching out to macro language policing in an educational context at the national level. (p. 346)

The postings, comments, cartoons, illustrations, and didactic materials found in the Facebook groups studied by Yazan (2015) underscore the fervent belief of the members of the groups that OT is indispensable for achieving their purpose of reclaiming their Ottoman heritage and culture.

In the following excerpt, Yazan (2015) describes a post from one of the Facebook groups that he studied regarding a talk given by a professor at a university:

The headline says: "Everyone in this country should be able to read and write in OT," which is the newspaper editor's interpretation of his talk at a university in Turkey. The other sentence below the headline reads: "Prof. Dr. İlber Ortaylı stated that recent history needs to be interpreted well enough in order to produce national and international policies." (p. 350)

The described artifact supports the premise of this sub-theme, that OT is indispensable for understanding the history of Turkey and reconnecting with the Ottoman past. Yazan (2015) continues explaining that,

the news article, which was not posted on the page, included his exact quote, which highlights the significance of having a true interpretation of recent history. As quoted in the article, he notes in his talk that this interpretation can be possible only with OT literacy because history should be researched by reading the original sources. While such news articles may not be regarded as examples of Facebook-specific data, their reproduction on Facebook performs several important functions— (1) giving access to relevant materials (which members might otherwise not be aware of) and (2) providing

opportunities for language policing manifested at the levels of consciousness-raising and discussion. (p. 351)

Professor Ortaylı makes his stance clear that it is impossible to interpret history accurately without being literate in OT because otherwise, access to original sources would be unavailable.

As we see in the following excerpt from Yazan (2015), because the members of the Facebook groups share the beliefs of the ruling party, their participation in social media empowers them to support the government's national identity reconstruction initiative.

Through these postings, the Facebook groups seem to impact upon their membership in two ways: (1) they encourage the individual users to imagine themselves as part of a community forged in participation with like-minded people, who feel empowered to make an impact on a macro language policing practice; (2) they emphasize that their cause is shared by policy actors at [the] national level, which presumably makes them feel more powerful. Thereby, the groups connect Facebook-based micro language policing with the OT initiative by the current government which seems to be holding the same ideological stance about OT. (p. 352)

Since the motivating ideology of the JDP is informed by neo-Ottoman ideals, the policies they enact (e.g., teaching OT in high schools, OT educational programs in public places) attract the attention of like-minded citizens thereby solidifying the political power of the government to pursue its neo-Ottomanist agenda.

The techniques and strategies for learning OT employed by the Facebook members reflect the aim of the groups to reconnect with their Ottoman heritage as Yazan (2015) tells us when he writes,

these practices were made possible through the relatively continual process of convincing participants that only through OT literacy will they be able to remedy the cultural disconnect with their ancestors. Thereby, the online communities in question justify their cause and fuel their instructional activities. As their purpose is to reinvigorate OT both in its writing system and lexis, this justification represents a reaction or resistance to the pervasive language reform executed in the 1930s. (p. 353)

Not only do the participants receive ideological reinforcement from their fellow group members, they also experience the shaping of language policy by the government and its project of national identity reconstruction. This feedback loop benefits both the JDP and the members of the Facebook groups and “articulates the necessity to reintegrate OT literacy in a Turkish cultural base and to bridge the cultural chasm between modern Turkey and the Ottoman Empire” (Yazan, 2015, p. 353). Yazan (2015) also points out that by “collecting, manipulating, and sharing artifacts on Facebook group pages, the actors of language policing not only contribute to the regulatory practices of language use, but also negotiate their cultural and linguistic identities” (p. 353). In this way, the members of the various group pages strengthen their ties to their Ottoman heritage.

The following excerpt is from a speech that Erdoğan (2014) presented before the Religious Council in which he equates Ottoman Turkish and Turkish identity and decries the inability of Turkish youth to read the tombstones of their forebears:

Despite the oppressions we bore for 200 years, the attempts to sever our ties with our books, classics, letters and archives, thank God Turkey’s religious scholars are on their feet ... Some people in this country are uncomfortable with the teaching of Ottoman Turkish to this nation’s youth. Actually [*sic*] it is ageless Turkish. It is not something

foreign. We will learn the truths [sic] with it. They ask if we will teach how to read the epitaphs on gravestones. This is the problem. There is a history, a civilization lying on those gravestones. Are [sic] there a more serious ignorance and helplessness than a generation's not knowing who is in their ancestors' graves? It [Turkish Language Reform] was indeed the cutting of our 'carotid artery' and our 'carotid arteries' were cut ... Whether they like [it] or not, yes, Ottoman Turkish will also be learned and taught in this country. (as cited in Yazan and Üzümlü, 2016, p. 13) [Translated from Turkish by Yazan and Üzümlü]

In this speech, Erdoğan is no longer the cautious politician he was in 2003 when he became prime minister of the Republic of Turkey as head of the JDP which he had founded. Here, he freely expresses his ideological, neo-Ottomanist opinions regarding the Turkish Language Reform of the Kemalists, his support for the Turkish religious scholars, and his defiance of the secularism which *Atatürk* had imposed upon the nation. As Erdoğan proclaimed defiantly at the end of the previous excerpt, "Whether they like [it] or not, yes, Ottoman Turkish will also be learned and taught in this country" (as cited in Yazan and Üzümlü, 2016, p. 13).

Romanization sub-theme 3: The national identity reconstruction is a reversal of the Turkish Language Reform under Atatürk and Kemalism. The reestablishment of the Arabic script and the restoration of the PA lexicon which the ruling party proposes through its national identity reconstruction program is a continuation of the opposition to the Turkish Language Reform instituted by the Kemalists during the formation of the Republic of Turkey. Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) encounter this sub-theme in their research into the government policy to teach OT in the high schools. They describe the intention of the Turkish Language Reform in the following excerpt:

As part of its nation-building endeavors after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the emergent Republic of Turkey implemented a language reform that is often referred to in the recent discourses of Ottoman Turkish in today's Turkey. This reform was intended to contribute to the construction of Turkishness, which largely entailed renouncing the Ottoman legacy. Comprising the two phases of orthographic revolution and lexical purification, the Turkish Language Reform replaced the Arabic script with the Latin one and purged Turkish of the Arabic and Persian lexical and syntactical elements. (p. 4)

This concise summary of the Turkish Language Reform sets the stage for understanding the status planning of the JDP and the implementation of its policy to teach OT in the high schools. One of the reasons for the creation of the Facebook groups that Yazan (2015) researched is to show support for this policy.

One justification put forward for the Turkish Language Reform was the imperative of changing from an "Eastern" to a "Western" script to facilitate modernization and integration with Europe, an idea that members of the Facebook groups studied by Yazan (2015) combat using examples that expose it to the deeper consideration of logic. Yazan (2015) points this out to us in the following excerpt:

Moreover, some postings compare Turkey with other nations to demonstrate opposition to the orthographic revolution in Turkey and to rationalize the necessity of acquiring literacy in OT. For this comparison, countries are carefully selected to make sure that certain key historical features are similar to those of Turkey, with a specific focus on Japan and Great Britain. The message in such comparisons is the following: these countries have used the same writing system both before and after undergoing political change and are still among the most developed countries, although they went through a

transition from an empire to their current political system, like the RoT. This comparison implies that the alphabet change in the RoT was not a prerequisite for becoming a developed nation state. (p. 351)

Yazan (2015) cites one statement supporting this argument in the Facebook groups that reads, “today the Japanese and the British can read their ancestors’ literary works produced hundreds of years ago, explore their culture, and preserve their cultural bonds with the past, yet the Turkish youth cannot” (p. 351). The author of this comment blames the Turkish Language Reform for taking away from the Turks the same access to cultural continuity enjoyed by the Japanese and British. If the participants in the Facebook groups can present a comparison which shows a nation (e.g., Japan, Great Britain) that succeeded in its efforts to modernize and integrate with the West without a script change, they can argue in favor of overthrowing the Turkish Language Reform and reverting to the Arabic script.

Using postings to the Facebook groups, Yazan (2015) reveals the stance of the members as they argue for the reversal of the Turkish Language Reform. One member asked, how many of you can read and comprehend Mustafa Kemal’s book named *The Speech* in its original text? Many words used in this book no longer exist... We took most of them out, leading to the deficiency of our language... We didn’t think about it. What’s more, we granted superiority to those who committed this murder. We commended them because they modernized the language. (pp. 351-352) [Translation by Yazan]

The Speech uses many of the words of PA origin that the Kemalists sought to replace with “authentic” Turkish words and was written in the PA script which was changed to Roman.

Ironically, both of these aspects of the Turkish Language Reform make it impossible for most

Turks today to read The Speech which argues for, among other things, the Turkish Language Reform. Another member of the same Facebook group posted,

we are the only nation who [*sic*] cannot read what is written on our ancestors' gravestones. I'm talking to those who are dogmatizing; if you don't know OT, it means history started a century ago for you. Before that, history is prehistory for you! (as cited in Yazan, 2015, p. 352) [Translation by Yazan]

The message of this member, an echo of the speech given by Erdoğan (see above) to the Religious Council in 2014, seems to be, "What could be more devastating to the identity of a nation than to lose the ability to read what is written on the tombstones of its ancestors!" Granted, there are experts with the ability to read and translate important community monuments and essential historical documents, but the need to understand something as intimate as family memorials and obituaries is, in general (even cross-culturally), very meaningful, and the quantity of cemeteries filled with tombstones written in OT so overwhelming that the majority of speakers of MT are bereft of a critical facet of their identity.

Yazan (2015) chooses three discourses while studying the Facebook groups and underlines their importance to the sub-theme of reversing the Turkish Language Reform.

The interplay between multiple political discourses deeply rooted in the sociohistorical background of Turkish society deserves significant attention within the scope of the current study. First of all, the Ottoman Empire--a major actor of world politics controlling not only three different continents for over six centuries but also leading Islam by serving as the home to the Caliphate until [the] 1920s ; second, the RoT--a nation-building project based on the pillars of Westernization, secularism, and democracy until [the] 2000s; finally, the AK Party [JDP] administration operating under neo-

Ottomanism, recognizing and promoting Muslim subjectivity, pan-Islamism, and the geostrategic positioning of the country for the purposes of wider influence in the Balkans, Caucasus and Middle East. (p. 353)

In this excerpt, Yazan contrasts the nation-building efforts of the Kemalists and the neo-Ottoman tendencies of the JDP, the current ruling political party of the Republic of Turkey, to show how national identity reconstruction works to reverse the Kemalist reforms, preparing a collision of ideologies.

The decision of the government to include OT in the high schools is consistent with its plan for national identity reconstruction and, as Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) tell us in the following excerpt, for the reversal of the Turkish Language Reform:

Supporters of the integration of Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum believe they can “repair” this discontinuity and reverse the “damage” caused by the orthographic revolution and lexical purification activities. Therefore, political and public conversations about the teaching of Ottoman Turkish include historical references to the Turkish Language Reform, particularly its necessity and consequences. (p. 5)

Increased access to OT will both reconnect the proponents of its inclusion in the high schools to their Ottoman heritage and contribute to the reversal of the Turkish Language Reform by questioning its need and underlining its negative effects.

The ideological reactions from the supporters of the government’s policy to include OT instruction in the high schools is predictable. Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) point out that, whereas supporters applauded this decision mostly because they believe that it will help new generations to reconnect with their Ottoman cultural heritage, it received considerable disapproval and criticism (even condemnation) from the opposition, largely

because they believe it is useless for children's modern education and it is part of the ruling Justice and Development Party's agenda to reverse Atatürk's language reform. (p. 2)

Here, the opposing parties bring out their ideological arguments: the proponents of Kemalism trumpet "modern education" and those of the JDP exalt "cultural heritage" and the chasm between the two sides appears impossible to span, even as it did in the days of the Turkish Language Reform.

The on-going clash between reform-minded Kemalism and conservative neo-Ottomanism prompts Yavuz (1998) to write, the "Ottoman-Islamic origins of Turkish nationhood in particular have become more assertive and effective in conditioning and shaping the state's policies and the society's perception of 'self'" (p. 22). To achieve its project of national identity reconstruction, the JDP must reverse the Turkish Language Reform which it blames for the loss of Turkey's Ottoman heritage. Ironically, by allowing its ideology to drive its policies, the JDP is attempting to reverse the Turkish Language Reform using the same methodology of ideological politics that the Kemalists employed during the formation of the Republic of Turkey.

In a speech he gave before becoming president, Erdoğan describes how the Turkish Language Reform mutilated Ottoman Turkish:

While every language in the world borrows words from other languages and this is a completely natural process, there were attempts to purge foreign [Persian and Arabic] words from Turkish ... Unfortunately, those unnatural ideological attempts seriously 'castrated' the Turkish language. They 'blinded' the profound imagination that Turkish used to provide. Most importantly, the operations conducted on Turkish amputated the most vital connection, [the] bridge between today and our history. That is, they

eliminated the language unity between generations. They cut our 'carotid artery,' so to speak. (as cited in Yazan and Üzümlü, 2016, p. 12) [Translated by Yazan and Üzümlü]

This very graphic, medical metaphor by Prime Minister Erdoğan of an experimental linguistic surgery performed on the body of the Turkish language by the “unnatural” Kemalist physicians, seems to have left it vitiated and mortally wounded. According to the ideology of the JDP, only the healing process of national identity reconstruction can restore life and vigor to the language so that it may become the bridge reconnecting the Turkish nation to its glorious Ottoman past.

Romanization sub-theme 4: The Kemalists gave overt linguistic reasons while guarding their covert ideological reasons for the Turkish Language Reform. In the following excerpt, Yazan (2015) sets the stage for the drama which was unfolding in the Middle East during the formation of the Republic of Turkey. The conditions for the change had been created by the end of World War I, the Great War to end all wars.

When the RoT was founded in Asia Minor in 1923, after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the War of Independence, the identity of the infant nation state was principally structured around the goals of secularization, nationalization, modernization, and westernization determined by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, its first president. These goals fueled Turkish Language Reform, comprised of the adoption of the Latin alphabet and the purging of the language of Ottoman variants. Therefore, as with most cases of language reform, the reform was sociopolitical in nature, not solely linguistic or cultural, and its impact would “color the speech and literature of succeeding generations” (Perry 1985:295). (p. 338)

The ostensible justification for the Turkish Language Reform was expressed by the Kemalists as an extension of the identity of the Republic of Turkey: a secular, modern, westernized nation.

The actual motivation for the reform was “sociopolitical in nature, not solely linguistic or cultural” (Yazan, 2015, p. 338).

In the following excerpt, the sub-theme of overt and covert justifications is clearly stated by Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) who also give examples.

On the other hand, the reformist followers of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of Kemalist ideology, argued that the terribly low literacy rate was because of the Arabic script which had been in use for a long time and needed to undergo fundamental renovations (Lewis, 1999). They also stressed the incompatibility between Arabic letters and Turkish phonology and asserted that Arabic consonants and vowels were not capable of representing the Turkish sounds in written texts. However, the unspoken reason behind this reform was at the epicenter of [the] Turkish nation-building project and complementary to the other social and institutional reforms. That is, as their implicit ideological and political goal, the Kemalist reformists intended to “cut the umbilical cord” (Perry, 1985, p. 306) of the young nation with the Ottoman heritage to facilitate the integration of the newly established nation-state into the occidental world (Doğançay-Aktuna, 1995, 2004). (p. 4)

Overtly, the Kemalists blamed the Arabic script for the high rate of illiteracy in Turkey by proclaiming its “incompatibility” with Turkish phonology. Covertly, the goal was always to take whatever actions were necessary to divorce the newly founded Republic of Turkey from its Ottoman past. This sub-theme is fully summarized and supported as well by Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) in the following excerpt:

The reformist policy decisions about the Romanization of [the] alphabet and the attempts to eradicate the Persian and Arabic (lexical and grammatical) elements from Turkish

were based on the covert ideological agenda of the single ruling party at that time along with the overtly expressed practical and phonological reasons. This agenda was primarily guided by Kemalism, the official ideology of the Republic of Turkey that relied on Atatürk's "secularist-nationalist political project" and constituted the foundations of the Republic (Taşpınar, 2008, p. 16). Ideologically driven by their principal goals of secularization and Westernization of the young nation-state, the founders of the Republic of Turkey designed and orchestrated the Turkish Language Reform (along with other reforms) to ensure the disjointedness from the Islamic culture of the Ottoman Empire. (p. 11)

The corpus planning (e.g., script change and lexical reform) undertaken by the powerful ruling party of *Atatürk* and the Kemalists was prompted by the hidden ideological agenda of the government which had concealed its true intentions and objectives under the guise of literacy and language purity to appeal to the ethnic pride of the Turkish people. To repurpose the end of the above speech of Erdoğan to the Religious Council, whether religious conservatives liked it or not, the Westernization, secularization, and modernization of the Republic of Turkey would occur.

Romanization sub-theme 5: The Turkish Language Reform was intended to break the Ottoman cultural connection. The Turkish Language Reform, in addition to facilitating the government's objective of being welcomed into the Western group of nations, also accomplished the complementary objective of breaking the religious hold of Islam on the hearts and minds of the Turks. Yazan (2015) states this sub-theme with clarity when he writes,

the other argument behind the Kemalists' determination for alphabet revolution was not explicitly voiced, but was at the top of their political agenda. They purposefully aimed to

“cut the umbilical cord” (Perry 1985: 306) linking the infant nation with the religious and cultural heritage of the Ottoman Empire, through the abolition of the Arabic script as well as other social and institutional reforms, so that the newly established nation state could readily become part of occidental culture (Tachau 1964). (p. 338)

The objective of de-coupling the citizens of the Republic of Turkey from their memories of and attachments to the Ottoman Empire was a stealth project cleverly concealed by the Kemalists and obfuscated by talk of literacy and alphabetic inadequacy. The Arabic script served the Ottoman Empire as more than the vehicle for its official communications. It also symbolized Islam and its Holy Book, the Qur’án, and thereby supported and sustained the Caliphate. The Turkish script change from Arabic to Roman symbolically severed the tie between Modern Turkish and Islam.

In his research of the postings and comments in the Facebook groups, Yazan (2015), uncovering evidence of this sub-theme, telling us that this, ideological conviction is substantiated by discussions of newspaper articles stressing the significance of OT literacy for rebuilding ties with Ottoman culture. For example, a newspaper article published in Zaman by Mustafa Armagan, a writer and historian, triggered a heated debate among group 2 members regarding the consequences of orthographic revolution in Turkey. The article itself questions whether this revolution was really necessary for modernization in Turkey, and whether it was able to fulfill its goals at the time and in the long run. The author explicitly contends that the OT alphabet was not a hindrance to the development of Turkey, and the actual goal was to become closer to the Occident by abandoning Oriental and Islamic culture. This article received a lot of comments by group 2 members, especially from those who completely agreed with the author and those who demonstrated stark opposition to his ideas. (p. 351)

The contention of the author of the article referred to is that the Turkish Language Reform was intended to separate the Turkish people from their culture of Islamic religiosity thereby facilitating the acceptance of the new, secular Turkey by the Western nations. Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) also encounter references to the covert intentions of the Turkish Language Reform in their research of the policy to teach OT in the high schools. The opposition to the reform, which originated at the time of the discussions in the 1920s, is demonstrated by the following excerpt from Yazan and Üzümlü (2016):

Although these groups are fairly diverse in terms of the reasons of their opposition, a good number of critics have directed attention to the sociocultural consequences of this reform, that is, the disconnection from the Ottoman-Islamic culture. They believed the educational and linguistic rationales were pretexts to actually “obliterate all signs that reminded one of the republic’s Islamic, oriental and multi-ethnic predecessor” for the purpose of constructing a Westernized, secular, and modern nation-state for Turks (Aytürk, 2008[a], p. 13). Sustained through generations, the resentment toward this strategically deliberate construction of cultural discontinuity in Turkey still remains in today’s discourse. (p. 5)

The critics indicate their disbelief in the “educational and linguistic rationales” given by the proponents of the Turkish Language Reform. They suspected the presence of the covert nature of the Kemalist ideology and how it was intended to sever the new Turkish identity from the heritage of the Ottoman Empire.

Citing three different studies by two different authors, Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) continue to provide evidence for this sub-theme.

In the context of the foundation of the Republic of Turkey, its major architects imagined this young nation as modern, Westernized, and secularized, so the social, economic, linguistic, and educational reforms were all shaped by that imagination, which resulted in the loss of connection with the Ottoman cultural heritage. The Turkish Language Reform was part of this nation-state-building process which required conscientious methods of national identity formation in many spheres of society (Aslan, 2007; Aytürk, 2004, 2008). Like [*sic*] in most of the other reforms then, there was substantial opposition to the Romanization of alphabet [*sic*] and purification of lexis [*sic*] in Turkish from the very beginning. (p. 8)

The Kemalists had an ideological vision of the new nation they were forming. The reform policies they planned and implemented for building the new national identity were motivated by that vision. They mobilized state institutions, organizations, and agencies to accomplish their goal of breaking the Ottoman cultural connection as shown in this excerpt from Yazan and Üzümlü (2016):

In the case of Turkey, the TLI [Turkish Language Institute] and MoNE [Ministry of National Education] were strategically used as language-management agencies by the Republican People's Party, the single ruling party in the first two decades of the Republic, which prioritized the implementation of the language reform in the government's agenda. The very goal was to construct a distinctly "Turkish" language in stark opposition to "Ottoman." In Shohamy's (2006) conceptualization, such construction serves as "a powerful symbol and indication of belonging and membership" and a determiner of national identity (p. 27). The construction of Turkishness then contributed

to the determination of the dominant social and cultural order, which marginalized everything that is Ottoman. (pp. 8-9)

The creation of Modern Turkish as distinct from Ottoman Turkish destroyed the most powerful connection between the new Turkish nation and the Ottoman Empire because the Arabic script and the PA words of Ottoman Turkish made it the identifying symbol of Islam, the Ottoman Empire, and the Ottoman Turks.

The new Turkish identity, created by the Kemalists, was branded upon every aspect of Turkishness that they controlled, imposed upon every Turk, and was intended to drive Ottoman culture into the shadows, an argument supported by the following excerpt from Yazan and Üzümlü (2016):

Those who opposed the Turkish Language Reform (in the parliament, intelligentsia, and public) contended that the orthographic revolution and lexical purification were purposefully intended to disconnect the new nation's cultural and religious ties with the Ottoman heritage by making everyone illiterate overnight (Ahmad, 1993). Considering the ramifications of this reform for the upcoming generations, they were concerned that the emerging nation's identity involved an utter repudiation of the Ottoman cultural and linguistic elements. (p. 9)

Romanization sub-theme 6: Conservative and religious ideologies opposed the Turkish Language Reform. This sub-theme is summarized succinctly by Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) who write,

from the moment Atatürk and his supporters in the parliament started the conversations about the necessity of a language reform, there have always been groups displaying

criticism, opposition, and resistance who are against the fundamental and revolutionary reforms in the Turkish language. (p. 5)

That there has been opposition to the Turkish Language Reform since its inception is evident. During the early years of the new Turkish Republic, it pitted two ideologies against each other. This ideological divide between the secular republicans and the religious conservatives has now entered a new phase because neo-Ottomanist, religious conservatives support the policies of the JDP, the current ruling party of Turkey, and the JDP actively seeks them out.

Yazan (2015) gives a clear description of the debate between the opposing ideologies and how the behavior of each group manifested its ideological stance when he writes,

this linguistic legitimacy and normativity was enforced through the entire body of state institutions. However, such policies encountered resistance from certain sectors of the public, especially those ascribing to conservative and religious ideologies. As a result, there was a growing gap between the language of the common people and that of the elite, as neologisms were usually embraced by leftists who were generally educated intellectuals, while conservative and religious people resisted the use of neologisms (Doğançay 1995). Word choice thereby indicated the political ideology of the speaker (i.e. leaning towards Arabic and Persian-origin words vs. 'pure' Turkish neologisms) (Cüceloğlu and Slobin 1980). Today, the linguistic landscape of Turkey still bears witness to a similar resistance to lexical purification and alphabet change (i.e. MT in Latin script vs. OT in Arabic script). (p. 340)

The ideological battle lines were clearly drawn at the time of the Turkish Language Reform between the leftist, intellectual elites and the conservative, religious masses. A republican would choose the Modern Turkish lexicon and the Roman script. The loyal opposition would choose

the Perso-Arabic and the Arabic. The content of the Facebook groups studied by Yazan indicates that the troops are still deployed today along the same lines.

Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) point out in the following excerpt that the ideology behind the Turkish Language Reform threatened the religious and conservative members of the new nation and solidified an opposing ideology among them.

The reform was intended to eliminate the well-entrenched Arabic and Persian linguistic elements adopted in the construction of the Ottoman-Islamic culture, and the religious-conservative community viewed this intention as a threat for their values, beliefs, and identities. This attests to Spolsky's (2004) argument that language planning efforts might contradict the beliefs, values, and the actual language use in the community. (p. 8)

Even though its overt intentions were presented in linguistic terms, the religious-conservatives understood that the Turkish Language Reform endangered their Islamic religious belief and Ottoman-Turkish identity. To accomplish its political agenda, the Kemalist government needed to establish a new Turkish identity within the new republic. Therefore, it sought to impose revolutionary changes on a community that was not fully willing to relinquish its lexicon, its script, or its identity. As Yazan (2015) explains, "Since its inception, this top-down policy has been resisted by certain sections of the population, generally conservative and religious groups yearning for the maintenance of Ottoman culture" (p. 354). Tachau (1964) adds that the opposition was convinced that "the adoption of Latin letters ... would lead to utter confusion and eventual loss of contact with a great and holy religious and historical literary tradition" (p. 194).

Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) explain in the following excerpt that the pendulum in this everlasting struggle between the Kemalists and the religious conservatives is now swinging in the opposite direction.

Another strand of studies examines the current conversations about the teaching of Ottoman Turkish. Those studies revealed that the discussions about Ottoman Turkish in public and political venues end up becoming debates between the two sides of the ideological divide (religious conservative vs. secular republican) in Turkey, and the current government explicitly gravitates toward one side of this divide in its grand project of national identity reconstruction with neo-Ottomanist ideals. (p. 5)

So, Erdoğan and the JDP, as the heirs to the conservative-religious opposition to the Turkish Language Reform of *Atatürk*, are using the machinery of the state to accomplish its goal of national identity reconstruction and overturn the identity of “Turkishness” imposed for ideological purposes upon the citizens of the Republic of Turkey in the first decade of its existence.

As a final note to the sub-themes on Romanization, I offer this excerpt from Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) which neatly summarizes the status of the script change in the Republic of Turkey and further strengthens the argument that ideologically motivated script change endures only if the ideology that motivated it also endures.

The JDP is currently leading a similar ideological construction that centers on the introduction of Ottoman Turkish. Colored by the nostalgia for the Ottoman-Islamic culture and glory in its discourse, the JDP voiced its disapproval of the Turkish Language Reform and blamed the founders of the Republic for deliberately effacing the Ottoman-Islamic culture from the fabric of Turkish society. Propelled by neo-Ottomanist ideals, they assign themselves the responsibility to resuscitate this culture, which is intimately connected to the national identity reconstruction. (p. 11)

If the JDP succeeds where the RPP is presently in danger of failing, we might expect that national identity reconstruction will have the same success as the Turkish Language Reform and that the next political power will be waiting for its opportunity to find fault with the national identity reconstruction project of the JDP and redirect Turkish identity along a new, or previous ideological path.

Synthesis

In brief review, I began this QRS seeking to understand the causes and factors of script change as a branch of linguistics and arrived at the understanding that script change is a branch of language planning and language policy. Starting with a group of 180 languages that had undergone one or more script changes, I reduced that number to 22 by identifying which languages had sufficient studies available, held an interest for me and others, and might prove adequate for the QRS. After reviewing my list, I determined that it contained seven languages from the Central Asian Republics that had all followed nearly identical paths of script change and could be considered collectively as one model. I chose Uzbek to represent this group because of the larger number of studies available for it than for the others, reducing the list to 16 languages.

My continued research revealed that the script change models for Javanese and Persian are each of such a complexity that they merit their own QRS. Likewise, other languages that I considered with multiple script changes in Categories C and D proved counterproductive to my research aims because each additional script change introduced more confounding variables (e.g., increased literacy, previous experience with script change). Furthermore, the Turkish and Uzbek language communities proved to be so similar that they could be considered varieties of one model of script change. This process of elimination reduced the total number of languages

to seven, all from Category B. During the consideration of these final 7, I noted the scholarly consensus that the Turkish script change epitomizes the typical model by which script change occurs. At the same time, the distinctive nature of the Korean script change became evident. Because of this, I made a final choice of comparing the Turkish script change to the Korean, a result of my shift away from examining many similar models to comparing two distinct ones. This step focused my dissertation and gave it a reasonable scope.

As part of my comparison of Korean and Turkish, I wrote case studies detailing their historical development and the process of their script changes. These case studies showed me that, despite the similarities that exist between them, Han'gŭlization and Romanization are indeed two distinct models of script change. Allow me to clarify at this time that the terms Han'gŭlization and Romanization as used in this QRS refer to the Korean model of script change from *Hanja* to *Han'gŭl* and the Turkish model from Arabic to Roman. If a language community wishes to follow the Han'gŭlization or evolutionary model, it would not change to the *Han'gŭl* script because Han'gŭlization entails the creation of an original script linguistically tailored to the language of the community, nor would a community wishing to follow the Romanization or revolutionary model necessarily adopt the Roman. It could adopt another existing script.

The following are examples of the similarities between Han'gŭlization and Romanization: 1) both encountered opposition (i.e., the *yangban* resisted Han'gŭlization and the religious conservatives distrusted Romanization); 2) both faced high rates of illiteracy; 3) both struggled against an entrenched philosophy or religion (i.e., Confucianism ruled Korean thought and Islam dominated Turkish culture); and 4) both were governed by autocratic rulers (i.e., King Sejong, the Great and Mustafa Kemal, the Father of Turks). Within this last similarity also lies

the distinguishing difference between the two models: the intention of those autocratic rulers. King Sejong was benevolent. *Atatürk* was ideological.

Intention. King Sejong demonstrated through his actions and royal decrees that his benevolent conception of the Korean nation included all the peoples of Korea because the best interests (e.g., literacy, gender equality, the elimination of all forms of prejudice) of the nation can most effectively be accomplished by serving the best interests of all the peoples. Literate and illiterate, male and female, high and low born alike, all the peoples of Korea could contribute to the well-being of the nation according to King Sejong. His intention in creating *Han'gŭl* was to enable every Korean “who, having something they want to put into words” would, with ease and convenience, be able “to express their feelings” (as cited in Ledyard, 1966, p. 124). Despite his royal authority, King Sejong did not force *Han'gŭl* on the nation or on his peoples, nor did he silence the voice of opposition. He allowed the quest for identity, both national and individual, to evolve organically over time.

In contrast, it could be said that the intention of the *yangban* who opposed their King was, in their own opinion, also good for the Korean nation, but their limited conception of nation included only themselves and excluded the functionaries, commoners, and women whom the elites acknowledged only as servants. The determination of the *yangban* to continue the use of *Hanja* for writing Korean was self-serving because it preserved their privileged, elite status and was not in the best interest of all the peoples of the nation.

In the case of Turkey, *Atatürk* pretended, through his expedient actions and executive fiat, to demonstrate his good intentions for the Turkish nation, but his conception of that nation failed to include all its peoples, for example, the religious conservatives. Even his justification for the Turkish Language Reform, based deceptively on pseudo-linguistic reasoning, concealed

his true, ideological intention to completely break Turkey away from its Ottoman past and Islamic culture. Like the *yangban*, the intention of *Atatürk* was self-serving because it advanced the ideological objectives of the Kemalists and silenced the opposition of the religious conservatives. Thus, we see that the distinguishing difference between Han'gŭlization and Romanization in the Korean and Turkish models is the intention of the language planners. When it is for the good of the nation and all its peoples as in the Han'gŭlization model, script change is more useful and long-lasting. When intention is limited to the privileged portion of the peoples of the nation (selected by the privileged language planners themselves) as in the Romanization model, it is less useful and potentially short-lived.

I chose the studies included in my QRS based on how they addressed the status of my target language communities. As referred to above, the status of the Korean language community reveals that the process of Han'gŭlization is now complete to the degree that the question of its success is mostly resolved, and any remaining doubts revolve around the purported disagreement between Korean and non-Korean linguists and historians regarding who should receive credit for the reevaluation of *Han'gŭl*. The status of the Turkish language community however, is different. What was once prematurely lauded as the most successful example of script change known to language planners is now experiencing a reevaluation. It is the status of each community that has led me to the conclusion that the variable that makes script change either more useful and durable or less useful and short-lived is the intention of the language planner. There will be more regarding this notable variable, this distinguishing feature, in my conclusion.

Themes. The two themes and the 12 sub-themes (six for each model of script change) elaborated upon them above provide the substance for this QRS. Many of the sub-themes

overlap and can be combined. For example, sub-themes 1, 2, and 3 regarding Han'gŭlization all refer to the purported attitude of the Korean linguists and historians that the linguistic work of the missionaries was less important than their own, even though both groups worked to standardize and modernize *Han'gŭl*. Sub-themes 4 and 5 both address the very real stigma attached to *Han'gŭl* from the time of its unveiling until the middle of the 19th century and the social risk that both Koreans and Christian missionaries accepted when using it. Unique among the sub-themes regarding Han'gŭlization is sub-theme 6 which speaks of the legitimate emotion that Koreans feel for their royal, indigenous script. All six sub-themes, despite their different foci, are united by their positive valuation of *Han'gŭl*.

The same merging and fusion of sub-themes can be found among the ones regarding Romanization as well. Sub-themes 1 and 2, for example, address Ottoman Turkish and national identity reconstruction, sub-themes 4 and 6 describe the Turkish Language Reform, and sub-themes 3 and 5 overlap with, and can be included in either of the previously mentioned groups of sub-themes. These six sub-themes, unlike the ones related to the revaluation of *Han'gŭl*, break into two opposing, antagonistic, and competing camps, one dedicated to Modern Turkish and the other to Ottoman Turkish.

Logically, there is no overlap between the themes and sub-themes for each language community because each one, having followed a distinct model of script change, has achieved a different status. That these themes and sub-themes reveal a glimpse of the Korean and Turkish language communities in search of their identities is the theme that ties the two sets of sub-themes together. Therefore, identity is the overarching theme produced by my synthesis.

Identity. Identity is essential to the formation of community. The languages and scripts of most communities are emblematic of their identity. Identity combines many different facets

of life such as ethnicity, origin, religion, heritage, and language to name a few. Identity creates choices and promotes actions. Consider the following examples: 1) the Uzbeks negotiated their Islamic, Turkic, Uzbek, and Soviet identities (Fierman, 1991); 2) the language communities that emerged from the Chinese sphere of influence (e.g., Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese) had to negotiate their own cultural heritage apart from the Chinese (Haarmann, 1993); 3) because ethnic Russians embrace Cyrillic as a symbol of their national identity, they resist Romanization in the Central Asian Republics where they are in the minority (Aytürk, 2010); 4) because Norwegians sought an independent identity apart from the Danes, they accepted as their national language a variety of Norwegian written with Danish script, Dano-Norwegian (Daniels, 1996); 5) because the population of Vietnam struggled to establish a national identity during French colonialization, they sought the same opportunities for the citizens who did not speak French as were enjoyed by the Vietnamese elites who did (DeFrancis, 1977); and 6) because his Turkish identity was stronger than his Muslim identity, a Bukharan patriot named Fiträt accepted the loss of the Arabic script for writing Uzbek as a compromise to achieve Turkic purity (Fierman, 1991).

Time. Another factor in the realization of identity in both the Han'gülication and Romanization models of script change, although conceived differently by each, is time. Time, as a physical quantity, is used to measure the reciprocal occurrences of an action, as in the swing of a pendulum or the orbit of a planet. This conception of time enables us to speak of the 500 years that passed between the promulgation of *Hunminchōng'üm* and the implementation of *Han'gül* in Korea or the 25 months between the founding of the Language Council and the prohibition of Perso-Arabic letters in Turkey. With this conception of time in mind, *Atatürk* believed that the Turkish Language Reform could “overcome the will of the people just because of power

relations and the necessity to conform for survival...” (J. Petrovic, personal communication, January 5, 2019). This is true of the people opposed to the Turkish Language Reform, who previously conformed to the decrees of the ruling regime to survive, then began to wait patiently for the pendulum of power to swing in their direction. This “physical quantity” conception of time made it possible for the early proponents of the Turkish script change to proclaim it as the touchstone of script changes and declare prematurely, “Mission Accomplished”! Its continued acceptance as a *fait accompli* seems to lie in the absence of more careful consideration on the part of the above-mentioned scholars. The status of the Turkish Language Reform of the Kemalists, under the harsh, glaring light of the national identity reconstruction of the neo-Ottomanist government of Erdoğan, presents the opportunity for the two sides to engage in a deeper exchange of ideas regarding the Turkish script change.

Alternatively, time, as a subjective quantity, is an expression of the perceived duration of events by an individual, as in a striker awaiting the whistle in a penalty kick shootout in the World Cup Final or a doctoral candidate awaiting the decision of the committee following the dissertation defense. This “subjective quantity” conception of time enables us to speak of the allowance of sufficient time for each individual member of a language community to accept the proposed script change, an indispensable factor for the success of the Han’gŭlization model. This is because when an individual accepts the script change willingly, it becomes part of the identity of the person and the script change becomes a sign of inclusion and belonging. The period of time may be of short or long duration. For example, although we speak of the script change from *Hanja* to *Han’gŭl* as taking 500 years, it was the evolution of the sociopolitical conditions in Korea that occurred over those five centuries, that came into focus during the century preceding World War II, and that brought the script change to completion in the middle

of the 20th century. With the end of World War II and Japanese occupation, the Korean peninsula moved quickly to implement the national script (especially in North Korea) and literacy became almost universal in South Korea soon after the legacy of King Sejong had been fully embraced by his grateful heirs (Pieper, 2011).

In sum, the over-arching theme of identity is manifest throughout the themes and sub-themes of my data and there are two distinctive reasons why Han'gŭlization is a more useful model of script change than Romanization: 1) it allows completely sufficient time for the conclusion of the quest for identity; and 2) the intention of the language planners is benevolent. If the language planners offer a script change motivated by service to the best interests of the community and allow all the members of the community to seek their collective and individual identities through the script change, and if they give them sufficient time to complete their quest satisfactorily, the script change will be more useful and long-lasting.

Comparative Analysis

Identity and intention are manifest in both the Korean and Turkish script changes. As each language community evolved, the language planners and policy makers developed plans, then enacted policies for achieving them. The changing sociopolitical conditions of the two nations created an interplay among three different elements: 1) their language plans and policies; 2) the intentions of their language planners and policy makers; and 3) the search for identity of their various peoples. This interplay caused the plans and policies to evolve. The following section is a comparison of this phenomenon based on this QRS.

Korea. The Koreans formed a nation after centuries of conflict among competing families, tribes, city states, and kingdoms. Not long after that event, the Chinese arrived and made Korea a subject province. From that moment on, the Koreans sought their own national

identity in the face of Chinese subjugation. The Chosŏn Dynasty (1392-1897 CE), to which King Sejong belonged, began to solidify that identity in opposition to the dominant Chinese culture and Confucian philosophy promoted by the *yangban* and their acceptance of being a *sohwa* ‘small China’. The actualization of the Korean national identity began with the struggle to break from Chinese dominance under the rule of King Sejong, continued for centuries, endured Japanese occupation and annexation, and culminated in Korean independence from Japan at the end of World War II. An interesting aspect of the status of Korean identity is the interplay between its religious and cultural identities.

The status of religious and cultural identity in Korea reflects the diversity of the peoples there. Historically, native Koreans practiced shamanism and sought the protection of good spirits against bad ones. In the previously mentioned origin story of *Han ’gŭl* it is evident that King Sejong used his peoples’ belief in good omens to help them look favorably upon *Hunminchŏng ’ŭm*. Confucianism arrived with the Chinese in the 2nd century BCE followed by the arrival of Buddhism in the 4th century CE. As mentioned above, the Buddhist scriptures introduced King Sejong to the principles of alphabetic writing.

The status of religion in Korea can be seen in the following statistics. To be sure, they apply only to South Korea (the Republic of Korea) where freedom of religion is guaranteed by the constitution (North Korea, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, is officially an atheistic nation where no freedom of religion is granted). According to the Asia Society (2019), in 1995, 49.3% of the population had no religious affiliation. Traditional cultural beliefs in shamanism and Confucianism continued to be important to this half of the population. Of the remaining 50.7 % that professed religious affiliation, 23% practiced Buddhism, 19.5% were Protestant Christians, 6.5% were Catholic Christians, and 1.7% belonged to other religions

including Islam, Hinduism, and the Bahá'í Faith. These statistics show that the status of religion and culture are well-balanced in the part of Korea for which statistics are available. The imagined feud between the proponents of the linguistic contributions to the revaluation of *Han'gŭl* of the Christian missionaries and those of the native linguists would appear to engage a mere 26% of the South Korean population while the support throughout the peninsula for the most clearly identifiable symbol of Korea is solidly behind *Han'gŭl*.

The importance of the overarching theme of identity is highlighted by the many references to its multiple facets found in the data collected for this QRS, for example, the emergence of the Korean national identity and how *Han'gŭl* became its symbol. King (2004) states that “it is orthography, especially, that lends a standard language its 'look' and 'feel', and that, as much as any script or writing system itself, can assume tremendous importance for different forms of identity...” (p. 8). The references to identity relating to the adoption of *Han'gŭl* are mostly associations of the script with the pride, the hope, and the aspirations of the Korean peoples as they sought political independence, cultural authenticity, philosophical freedom, and national identity. Concerning the identification of Koreans with *Han'gŭl*, O.W.W.K. (1904) writes that “it is connected in their minds with childhood, home, mother and everything which they have a right to hold sacred and dear, and which no men may presume to lightly tamper with or take away” (pp. 441-442). Yu mentions that “when it came to writing, we had fallen into the evil practice of abandoning our national tongue and taking pleasure in using *hanmun* [Chinese writing] ...” (as cited in King, 2004, p. 11), and that “the exclusive-han'gŭl usage movement used in proselytizing contributed greatly to creating a new awareness of the national language” (as cited in King, 2004, p. 11).

Sylva (2008) states that “several authors have remarked upon the role of Hangeul as symbolizing Korea’s nascent cultural and political independence near the turn of the twentieth century...” and have recognized “the untapped potential of Hangeul as a vehicle for promoting universal communication and education in Korea” (p. 58). Ch’oe writes that “as Koreans, there is probably nobody who does not feel gratitude for the great contribution of Protestantism to han’gŭl propagation...” and lists several examples, including that “it propagated han’gŭl among the masses...”, and “...promoted respect for han’gŭl and fostered a spirit of protecting han’gŭl” (as cited in Yi, 1987, p. 428). Continuing in this vein, Cho, Y.-h. writes that “the most concrete contribution that it [Protestantism] left was the encouragement of *kungmun* [national script]” (cited in Yu, 1967, pp. 59-60). To these appreciations Cho, Y. adds that, even though “people in the past had assumed that public and private documents needed to be written in *hanmun*, they now came to realize that using just *kungmun* was entirely sufficient” (as cited in King, 2004, p. 10). One final reference to the overarching theme of identity found among the Han’gŭlization sub-themes refers to the above-mentioned interplay between religious and cultural identity. Because it was written in *Han’gŭl*, Griffis (1912) declares that “the translated Bible, ... by setting a new standard of speech and writing induced the beginnings of a true national literature” (p. 189). Here we observe a religious artifact contributing to the creation of a new literary tradition.

King Sejong encountered opposition from the Korean aristocratic elites whose identity was more in line with that of the Chinese than with their own countrymen. The *yangban* solidified their privilege and prolonged their power by maintaining their allegiance to China including their adherence to Confucian philosophy, their mastery of Classical Chinese, and the use of Chinese ideograms to write Korean. The Korean native script was a symbol of, and a

vehicle for Korean national identity. The struggle to establish it as the script of the nation lasted almost five centuries. Today it is firmly fixed in the hearts and minds of the Korean peoples.

Turkey. Turning now to Turkey, Shohamy (2006), writing in general about the power of identity, explains how it can be exploited ideologically, pointing out that groups with power use “propaganda and ideologies about language loyalty, patriotism, collective identity and the need for ‘correct and pure language’ or ‘native language’ as strategies for continuing their control and holding back the demands of these ‘others’ [the opposition].” He also says that language planning can turn language into “an identifier of inclusion and exclusion...” and “a powerful symbol and indication of belonging and membership” (p. 46). For example, the identity of the Ottoman Empire was bound by the ideologies of the Caliphate (based on Islam) and the Sultanate (based on the governance of its far-flung dominions). The specific references to ideological manipulation of Turkish identity abound in the data for this QRS as in this excerpt from Yazan and Üzümlü (2016):

... Ongur (2014) understands the burgeoning interest in the nostalgia for the glorious Ottoman past as part of the national identity reconstruction in Turkey, which reimagines Turkishness as the continuation of Ottoman-Islamic identity and restores the cultural connection supposedly lost during the foundation of the Republic. (p. 6)

On the other hand, Yazan (2015) points out that the Facebook group users support national identity reconstruction and that the groups “encourage the individual users to imagine themselves as part of a community forged in participation with like-minded people...” (p. 352). Reinforcing the idea that identity forms community, Altun (2015) writes that the discussion of “the ideologies, political parties, social groups, religious beliefs and historical characters they [the YouTube comments] represent” (p. 42), are more important than the discussion of the issues

themselves. One Facebook user, referring to cultural identity, wrote that “today the Japanese and the British can read their ancestors’ literary works produced hundreds of years ago, explore their culture, and preserve their cultural bonds with the past, yet the Turkish youth cannot” (as cited in Yazan, 2015, p. 351). Referring to the decision to include OT instruction in the high schools, Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) note that “supporters applauded this decision mostly because they believe that it will help new generations to reconnect with their Ottoman cultural heritage...” (p. 2), and Erdoğan himself comments that “the operations [the Turkish Language Reform] conducted on Turkish amputated the most vital connection, [the] bridge between today and our history. That is, they eliminated the language unity between generations” (As cited in Yazan & Üzümlü, 2016, p. 12) [Translation by Yazan and Üzümlü]. Another Facebook user, referring to historical identity writes, “we are the only nation who [*sic*] cannot read what is written on our ancestors’ gravestones. ... if you don’t know OT, it means history started a century ago for you. Before that, history is prehistory for you!” (as cited in Yazan, 2015, p. 352) [Translation by Yazan]

The theme of ideological identity is unavoidable in the discussion of the Turkish script change. For example, Yazan (2015) writes that “the identity of the infant nation state [the Republic of Turkey] was principally structured around the goals of secularization, nationalization, modernization, and westernization determined by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk...” (p. 338), and that the Kemalists “purposefully aimed to ‘cut the umbilical cord’ (Perry 1985: 306) linking the infant nation with the religious and cultural heritage of the Ottoman Empire...” (p. 338). Yazan and Üzümlü (2016) explain that the intention of the Kemalists was “to facilitate the integration of the newly established nation-state into the occidental world...” (p. 4), that “the Turkish Language Reform was part of this nation-state-building process which required

conscientious methods of national identity formation in many spheres of society...” (p. 8), that “the construction of Turkishness then contributed to the determination of the dominant social and cultural order, which marginalized everything that is Ottoman...” (p. 9), that “the religious-conservative community viewed this intention [to eliminate Perso-Arabic elements] as a threat for their values, beliefs, and identities...” (p. 8), and that “considering the ramifications of this reform for the upcoming generations, they [the religious, conservative opposition] were concerned that the emerging nation’s identity involved an utter repudiation of the Ottoman cultural and linguistic elements” (p.8).

The Ottoman Empire ruled many peoples across three continents for three centuries until it was finally toppled by the tumult and turmoil of the Great War. The Republic of Turkey was born out of the aftermath of World War I, the ruins of the Ottoman Empire, and the Turkish War of Independence. The political power behind the new Turkish nation successfully broke it away (if only temporarily) from the traditions, culture, heritage, and language of the Ottoman Empire. The Republican Peoples Party (RPP) of Mustafa Kemal *Atatürk* wielded its ideological beliefs unbendingly, silencing all dissent and opposition by using the instruments of state at its disposal to create a new identity for the nation based on its ideologically driven understanding of Turkishness. It saw religion and conservative values as its enemies and sought to eliminate their vestiges to facilitate the acceptance of Turkey by the European nations. But as the 20th century came to an end other ideologies began to gain power.

The neo-Ottomanist Justice and Development Party (JDP) of President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has replaced the RPP which has now become the party of opposition. The JDP is struggling with the Kemalists to redefine the Turkishness that had been created in the first decades of the new republic. They desire that Turkey engage in a national identity

reconstruction based on the values of the former Ottoman Empire. The struggle for political domination continues as indicated by the very recent election of Ekrem Imamođlu, the candidate of the RPP, as mayor of Istanbul over the JDP nominee in the re-run election on 23 June 2019 (Erkoyun & Kucukđocmen, 2019). Turkish identity is far from being decided and the Turkish Language Reform finds itself on the verge of destabilization after only four score years.

Having established that the religious and cultural identities of the various peoples in Korea provide a balanced national identity and that Turkish identity swings upon an ideological pendulum, a comparison of how identity has affected script change in the two nations would be in order. At the time when King Sejong offered *Hunminchōng'ŭm* to his peoples, most Koreans practiced Confucianism or Buddhism alongside their native shamanism. His offer was not restricted to any particular group but, rather, included them all. As new socio-economic and religious groups formed in Korea, they were also included, for example, both Protestant and Roman Catholic Christians. Eventually, the first Koreans to accept *Hunminchōng'ŭm* were joined by other, like-minded groups who found that King Sejong had proposed the script change out of benevolence towards them, with respect for their identities, and incorporating knowledge and understanding of Korean phonology and cosmology in the development of its graphemes. He then gifted it to them and allowed them the time necessary to choose it for themselves. Century by century, *Hunminchōng'ŭm* overcame the objections of its opponents until finally, the newly named *Han'gŭl* 'high script' or 'Great letters' was accepted by all the diverse, united peoples of the Korean nation.

In contrast, the Ottoman Empire, embodying a world religion and a great culture, had reached the end of its political viability. The republic built upon its remains was constructed according to the vision of a man who viewed that empire, its religion, and its language (with its

Perso-Arabic script, lexicon, and grammar) as obstacles to the realization of that vision: a modernized, nationalized, secularized, and Westernized nation. Ottoman Turkish had to be reformed if the Republic of Turkey was to join the Western nations economically, politically, and culturally. This plan resulted in the policies of the Turkish Language Reform: 1) change the Pero-Arabic script to the Roman; 2) eliminate all Perso-Arabic grammatical constructions, and 3) replace the Perso-Arabic lexicon with a Turkish one. *Atatürk* had succeeded in creating a new Turkish identity. As previously mentioned, his success is now being challenged by the religious conservatives who have found favor with the current administration of the government of Turkey. Under the leadership of President Erdoğan, Turkey is embarked upon a program of national identity reconstruction intended to “correct” the errors of the Turkish Language Reform. His government behaves as if it intends to restore the Arabic script and revive Ottoman Turkish to reconnect Turks with their Ottoman past and culture as demonstrated by the policy of requiring Ottoman Turkish to be taught in the high schools. Alternatively, this populist position could be an egregious example of partisan politics: “The current government is using it just as a political instrument or leverage to keep their base happy and refer to the nostalgic Ottoman times” (B. Yazan, personal communication, March 18, 2019).

Despite their differences, both the Korean and Turkish manifestations of identity function similarly as forms of power. King Sejong had the power of his royal throne behind him, granting him the authority to rule his kingdom and all its peoples, even the recalcitrant *yangban* who eventually capitulated to the power of all the Korean peoples. *Atatürk* had the power of the office of the presidency and the instruments of state which supported it, allowing him to impose his will upon the Turkish nation and all its peoples regardless of the objections of his opponents. The power of the Korean people is built upon a firm foundation of consensus forged over

centuries of consultation and compromise among the participating Korean peoples. The power of the Turkish people is built upon the ephemeral base of ideology foisted upon the politically weaker faction of Turkish society which would later rise to contest that power, assume the presidency, and pretend to overturn the previous decrees of the former president.

To recapitulate, as was mentioned above, the twelve sub-themes of this QRS overlap. They can be combined into five categories, three for Han'gŭlization and two for Romanization: A) Han'gŭlization sub-themes 1, 2, and 3 refer to the two groups (i.e., the Korean linguists and the Protestant missionaries) who worked to standardize and modernize *Han'gŭl*; B) sub-themes 4 and 5 address the stigma attached to *Han'gŭl* and to the Koreans and Christian missionaries who used it; and C) sub-theme 6 is unique because it speaks of the emotional attachment that Koreans feel for *Han'gŭl*. These three categories are consistent in their positive valuation of *Han'gŭl*.

Continuing with the Romanization categories: D) Romanization sub-themes 1, 2, 3, and 5 address Ottoman Turkish and national identity reconstruction; and E) sub-themes 3, 4, 5, and 6 describe the Turkish Language Reform and Turkishness (i.e., the new, post-Ottoman identity). Kindly note that sub-themes 3 and 5 overlap both categories D and E. These two categories break into ideologically opposed camps, one dedicated to Modern Turkish and the other to Ottoman.

The Han'gŭlization sub-themes of category A speak clearly to the religious orientation of the Protestant missionaries and their desire to improve *Han'gŭl* so that it could be used for printing their literature. They also demonstrate the recognition by the Koreans of the contributions made by the missionaries towards the standardization of *Han'gŭl*. The sub-themes of category B address the concerns of the missionaries concerning the societal attitudes towards *Han'gŭl* as a stigmatized script and the impact their choice would have upon the acceptance of

their message. These sub-themes also show that the Koreans recognized that the choice made by the missionaries elevated the status of *Han'gŭl* from stigmatized to prestigious, assisting in its establishment as an icon of national identity. The emotional attachment of the Koreans to *Han'gŭl* discussed by the sub-theme in category C speaks to the importance of identity in the Han'gŭlization model and explains the resistance that the Koreans exhibited towards some of the changes proposed unilaterally by the missionaries.

Although ideology is usually associated with economic and political theory, the religious endeavor of the missionaries could be construed as ideological because of the societal changes which can occur with the arrival of a new religion. Nevertheless, as seen above, there is a balance between the religious and non-religious populations of Korea (and also among the existing religions) that allows the secular forces and religious forces to maintain a check on each other. The effect of the various forces upon the adoption of *Han'gŭl* has also proven to be balanced. Therefore, religion as an ideology does not seem to affect the Han'gŭlization model of script change.

The Romanization sub-themes of category D address the national identity reconstruction program championed by the neo-Ottoman government of the current Turkish administration with its view of reestablishing Ottoman Turkish, seen as vital to reconnecting Turks to their Ottoman culture and to reconstructing their Ottoman identity. The sub-themes of category E discuss the policies which contributed to the Turkish Language Reform and the conservative religious opposition to it. This opposition led eventually to the rise of the conservative religious party in Turkey. Both category D and E expose the ideologies of their proponents: the Kemalists with their beliefs in modernism, nationalism, secularism, and their desire to associate with the West, and the neo-Ottomanist Justice and Development Party of Erdoğan playing to its conservative

and religious base. Each ideology proposes a new identity, a new form of Turkishness, and each views its own ideology as the remedy for the ills caused by the previous government. The Kemalist ideology prompted the Turkish script change and the ideology of the JDP is prompting (potentially) the return to Ottoman Turkish. The effect of these ideologies confirms the Romanization model of script change.

Table 13. Comparative Analysis of the Categories of Han'gŭlization Sub-themes.

	Category A) Sub-themes referring to the two groups (i.e., the Korean linguists and the Protestant missionaries) who worked to standardize and modernize Han'gŭl.	Category B) Sub-themes addressing the stigma attached to Han'gŭl and to the Koreans and Christian missionaries who used it.	Category C) Sub-theme speaking to the emotion that Koreans feel for Han'gŭl.
Sub-theme 1: The linguistic research of Christian missionaries had no tangible or lasting effect on the work of Korean scholars and language reform of the time.	Concepts: Religion, Ideology		
Sub-theme 2: The role of missionaries in the revaluation of Han'gŭl has been acknowledged but underestimated by Korean linguists and historians.	Concepts: Religion, Ideology		
Sub-theme 3: The missionaries initiated the discussion of the standardization and modernization of Korean writing, instigating similar discussions among the Koreans.	Concepts: Religion, Ideology		
Sub-theme 4: The missionaries contributed to the revaluation of Han'gŭl by choosing it as the medium for their written materials despite the risk of stigmatization.		Concepts: Society, Identity	
Sub-theme 5: Han'gŭl, the stigmatized script, was more accessible, more widespread, and easier to learn than the prestigious, yet cumbersome Hanja.		Concepts: Society, Identity	
Sub-theme 6: The reform of Han'gŭl proposed by the missionaries was stymied by an emotional attachment to it among the Koreans.			Concept: Identity

Table 14. Comparative Analysis of the Categories of Romanization Sub-themes.		
	Category D) Sub-themes addressing Ottoman Turkish and national identity reconstruction;	Category E) Sub-themes describing the Turkish Language Reform and Turkishness (i.e., the new, post-Ottoman identity).
Sub-theme 1. The policy decision to incorporate Ottoman Turkish into the high school curriculum emerged as part of the national identity reconstruction promoted by the neo-Ottomanist government led by the Justice and Development Party (JDP) of President Erdoğan.	Concepts: Identity, Ideology	
Sub-theme 2. Teaching Ottoman Turkish is essential to reconnect Turks with the Ottoman cultural heritage.	Concepts: Identity, Ideology	
Sub-theme 3: National identity reconstruction is a reversal of the Turkish Language Reform under Atatürk and Kemalism.	Concepts: Identity, Ideology	Concepts: Religion, Identity, Ideology
Sub-theme 4: The Kemalists gave overt linguistic reasons while guarding their covert ideological reasons for the Turkish language reform		Concepts: Religion, Identity, Ideology
Sub-theme 5: The Turkish language reform was intended to break the Ottoman cultural connection.	Concepts: Identity, Ideology	Concepts: Religion, Identity, Ideology
Sub-theme 6: Conservative and religious ideologies opposed the Turkish Language Reform.		Concepts: Religion, Identity, Ideology

By following the Han'gŭlization model, a balanced, cultural identity in Korea developed over the centuries, uniting the disparate Korean peoples into a unified nation. At first, the loyal, obedient subjects of King Sejong supported *Hunminchŏng'ŭm*, learned the new script, and

expressed themselves using its letters. Meanwhile, the *yangban* endeavored to maintain their privilege and social status to the detriment of their fellow Koreans. Eventually, the sociopolitical conditions on the peninsula evolved and the various Korean peoples were united in their quest for a national identity which finally led to the successful implementation of *Han'gŭl*.

On the other hand, by following the Romanization model, the pendulating iterations of ideologically motivated administrations have sought to impose a succession of new Turkish identities on the Turkish nation using subterfuge, or catachresis, and the power of the instruments of government. As one ideology ceded to the next, the economic and political changes operated without any checks or balances. This state of affairs has brought the Turkish script change (hailed presumptuously as the epitome of all script changes) under the magnifying lens of a sharper, deeper focus for a reevaluation of the Romanization model.

Therefore, the status of the language community representing the evolutionary model of script change, Korean, is resolved in favor of *Han'gŭl* while the status of the community representing the revolutionary one, Turkish, is now unresolved, thrown into doubt by the swing of the ideological pendulum. If the JDP continues in power and their policies encourage more Turks to reconstruct the national identity along neo-Ottomanist lines, the famed Turkish script change could meet its demise.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Han'gŭlization and Romanization are two distinct models of script change and the former is more useful than the latter. This is because, despite their similarities, Han'gŭlization leads to more durable script change and Romanization leads potentially to unstable, serial script change, the former being preferable to the latter for language planners. This is because, as a branch of LPLP, script change should serve the long-term needs of the language community and assist it to strengthen its identity. As mentioned above, the script changes undergone by Korean and Turkish (the representative examples of the evolutionary and revolutionary models that I investigated) share common features (e.g., opposition, entrenched beliefs, illiteracy, autocratic rulers) but the distinguishing features revealed by my research are the difference in motivation and the intention of the rulers at the time of the proposed script changes, and the time-allotted opportunity to successfully complete their quest for identity by the peoples of the affected language community. If the language planners and policy makers of a community are interested in effecting successful script change that is more useful and durable, they should pursue the evolutionary model of Han'gŭlization because it demonstrates its usefulness by providing linguistic stability, achieves its durability based on benevolent intentions, and constructs its identity through deep, thoughtful consideration of the issues.

In the case of Korea, King Sejong was a benevolent ruler who was motivated by his desire to help all his subjects. Even before he undertook the creation of *Han'gŭl* he had urged the privileged members of Korean society to educate the commoners, including the women and girls, because he viewed literacy as a benefit for his subjects and his dynasty. He felt that even

the uneducated masses had something to contribute to Korean society, but because of the unsuitability of *Hanja* for conveying the Korean language (not to mention the decade of intense study needed to master Chinese writing), they were unable to express themselves in writing. For that reason, King Sejong created *Han'gŭl* and bequeathed it to his subjects. (By taking this step, he was engaging in corpus planning centuries before the field of LPLP had been formalized.) The script change was not imposed upon the Koreans by decree, nor was its usage enforced by the apparatus of the kingdom, and King Sejong allowed his aristocratic opponents to express their uncensored objections to which he responded logically and wisely without silencing their voices.

Five centuries before the beginning of LPLP, King Sejong knew instinctively that he must evaluate his plan to be sure that it was focused not just on himself and his dynasty, but on the diverse peoples who were the objects of his plan. When he died, both his noble and common-born beneficiaries put their inheritance aside until, almost 500 years later, the changing sociocultural conditions in Korea made it possible for *Han'gŭl* to be recognized and enthusiastically accepted as the Korean national script. Among those changing sociocultural conditions would be included the mid-nineteenth century nationalism movement in Korea. Nationalism is one of the early sociolinguistic concepts included in the understanding of early language planning. An additional example of status planning that occurred during this time was the movement to raise the social prestige of *Han'gŭl* and to remove its stigma. The intention of King Sejong to benefit all his peoples led to the useful and durable script change from *Hanja* to *Han'gŭl* which is enjoyed today by all Koreans.

One additional, critical, corpus planning feature of the Han'gŭlization model is that the script was specifically designed with the Korean language in mind, both linguistically and

philosophically. As was previously mentioned, rather than continuing to adapt an existing script (i.e., *Hanja*) or to adopt another available script (e.g., Devanagari, Cyrillic, Hebrew) which had itself evolved from previously existing scripts, King Sejong created an original script whose graphemes represented the articulation of Korean phonemes and incorporated Korean cosmological beliefs. I argue that the suitability of a script for making a language visible contributes to its acceptance as a visual symbol of identity by the language community.

This method of creating an original script did not mean that *Hunminchŏng'ŭm* would remain unchanged eternally. Recall that language planning and policy begins when there is a perceived need to reform some aspect related to the standardization of a language, and as time passed and Korean experienced natural language change, the need for reform was inevitable. The modernization and reform of *Han'gŭl* proposed by the Protestant missionaries and Korean linguists would be categorized as a form of corpus planning. Also, one of the four language ideologies mentioned previously came into play during the acceptance of *Han'gŭl*: script assimilation which guaranteed that “every member of a speech community” would be able to write in the national script.

Han'gŭlization also represents a dialogical approach to modern LPLP. This dialogical approach submits the language policies and implementation plans to public debate regarding the deeper, careful social vision of the language community. The Korean script change exemplifies this approach because the affected peoples engaged in ongoing public debate to determine the plans and policies that were eventually implemented by North and South Korea. The timing of the full implementation of *Han'gŭl* by the governments of the Koreas coincided with that liminal moment when they achieved their political independence from Japan, the sort of moment that

language planners recognize as a trigger for the rise of new language policy. The plan to eliminate illiteracy was one of the prompts for the policy of whole-hearted adoption of *Han'gül*.

In the case of Turkey, Mustafa Kemal *Atatürk* was an expedient leader who was motivated by the ideology of modernization, nationalization, secularization, and Westernization. He and his followers came to power after the fall of the Ottoman Empire and the end of the Turkish War of Independence. This is a textbook example of a language policy springing from a period of sociopolitical unrest such as the end of the Turkish War of Independence. Once the Republican Peoples Party had consolidated its power, it initiated the Turkish script change based overtly on the unsubstantiated linguistic claims that the incompatibility of the Arabic script with the Turkish language caused high rates of illiteracy and that the new republic needed a Western script to facilitate *rapprochement* and harmonious relations between Turkey and Europe.

Even in the early 20th century, the Kemalist government exhibited traits of language planning by first establishing the Turkish Language Institute which was charged with fact-finding to assist with the formulation of goals. This decision by the RPP administration, based on the ideological objectives of its political leaders, falls neatly into the category of status planning in which the political aspect of language planning is addressed. The Language Institute also set for itself the corpus planning goal of eliminating Perso-Arabic vocabulary and grammatical structures, a goal of language purity that aligned it with institutions such as the Académie Française or the Real Academia Española.

The covert goal of the Kemalists was to break the ties binding the new Republic to the old Ottoman Empire by eliminating the most visible symbol of Islam, the Arabic script, and by creating a new, secular Turkish identity. The Kemalists imposed their reforms rapidly, silenced the religious and conservative opposition to the reforms, and used the apparatus of state to

enforce compliance. The course of action that they chose to follow during the implementation stage of language planning succeeded in reducing complaints, resistance, and rejection, but failed to acquire the full support of all segments of Turkish society, leaving the durability of the script change open to political reevaluation and, therefore, instability. After all, one of the discoveries made by early language planners and policy makers was the necessity of explaining ideologically based goals to prevent backlash and avoid social tumult during implementation. Had the RPP evaluated the effects of its language plan and policies, it might have discovered that they were focused on the political gains of the Republic of Turkey and were not concerned with the peoples who were the object of the plan.

The analysis performed by the Turkish Language Institute did not consider the questions of power, identity, and the sociopolitical interactions between the various Turkish peoples. It only considered the benefit of the Kemalists and their political party, an associational approach in which the national government and its supporters are the principal center of power and the primary source of identity, and the religious conservatives and other minorities are the outlying associated nations receiving benefits from the principal. This associational approach of language planning and policy making of the RPP benefited the principal party and penalized the associated ones.

As stated above, the Turkish script change is frequently mentioned as the quintessence of script change. By carefully considering this conjecture more deeply, I became aware that, as we approach the centenary celebration of the inception of the Turkish script change, its previous valuation could be called into question because a new ideology has taken control of the Republic of Turkey. Here we have another textbook example of new language policy replacing old following the change of political party. This new ideology is the motivation behind the

government of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and the Justice and Development Party. It is ostensibly based on neo-Ottomanist ideals which include the overthrow of the Turkish Language Reform and the return of Ottoman Turkish written in the Arabic script, although it could also be a populist ploy to remain in power by cultivating the allegiance of the religious conservatives. The intention of the JDP is ideological as is its project of national identity reconstruction. The pendulum is in motion.

In sum, because the intention of King Sejong was beneficent, because he created *Hunminchōng'ŭm* with Korean phonology and cosmology as his guiding principles, and because he gave his peoples sufficient time to accept *Han'gŭl* as their national “badge of identity”, ‘the correct sounds for the instruction of the people’ has been successfully and durably enshrined in the hearts of the Korean peoples. Language planners and policy makers would do well to consider the lessons learned from Han'gŭlization, the evolutionary model of script change.

As I researched and wrote my dissertation, many interesting topics hopped into view. But for the very useful advice that I received from one member of my committee I would have followed them each down a rabbit hole instead of focusing on the topic at hand. Now, here at the end, I have a few topics to recommend for future research.

Before making my recommendations, I would like to mention a limitation contained within this study. One basis for comparing Han'gŭlization and Romanization is the time factor: 500 years to 28 months. The tremendous disparity between the two time periods means that these examples are not fully parallel. A similar study featuring two more-parallel models (if they can be identified) would be beneficial.

As mentioned in the body of my dissertation, Ch'oe, while discussing the contribution of the missionaries, mentions the question of Romanization in his section on "Research on han'gŭl"

(as cited by King, 2004, p. 9). Further research into the attempt to Romanize the Korean language researched by Ch'oe and alluded to by King might bring additional clarity to the distinctiveness of the Han'gŭlization model through direct juxtaposition with the attempt to Romanize Korean.

The Korean peninsula was divided into North (the Democratic People's Republic of Korea) and South (the Republic of Korea) at the end of World War II when the victorious Allies split it at the 38th parallel, allowing the USSR to occupy the northern part and the USA the southern. North Korea acted swiftly to adopt *Han'gŭl* and limit the use of *Hanja*. South Korea responded more slowly, allowing the digraphic situation to continue, experimenting with a plan to restrict *Hanja* in the 1970s, then scrapping the plan and making *Hanja* optional. Today, most South Koreans have opted to use *Han'gŭl*. As mentioned above, if the status quo of the peninsula remains the same, the two nations might suffer linguistic division caused by natural language change and their different language policies, further complicating the issue of reunification. Much could be learned by language planners and policy makers through unfettered research into *Han'gŭl* in the two Koreas.

The following topic was suggested to me by a question from my eldest brother. Because my dissertation was focused on the Han'gŭlization and Romanization models, he asked me if there were other models. I am sure that much could be learned through research into other models of script change such as Cyrillization, Hellenization, Hebraization, and Devanagarization. Research into these and other models could provide language planners and policy makers, as well as script linguists like myself, with valuable information to expand the knowledge in this field.

As mentioned above, during the process of choosing my final language communities I considered many others and my research showed that the Javanese and Persian ones are each of such a complexity that they both deserve to be studied separately. Whereas this QRS compared two language communities that have experienced one script change, perhaps a synthesis of two that have experienced two script changes (like Javanese and Persian) might reveal additional knowledge to assist language planners and policy makers.

Finally, future research could also be conducted on script initiation (i.e., making a spoken language visible by adopting an existing script or creating a new one). Because preliterate speech communities interested in script initiation share many of the same circumstances and motivations as literate speech communities considering script change (e.g., identity/separation; involvement with larger movements, etc.), my dissertation may also benefit them. However, there are issues (e.g., the need for members with literacy skills; the selection of a dialect to become standardized, etc.) that are specific to script initiation and beyond the scope of this study. For that reason, script initiation was excluded from it. Research into this topic could yield many benefits to the language planners and policy makers assisting such communities.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Altun, A. (2015). A review about the discussion culture in the online environment: Ottoman Turkish discussions. *Turkish Studies: International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 10(12), 39-56.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections of the spread of nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.
- Asia Society. (2019, January 26). *Historical and Modern Religions of Korea*. Retrieved from Center for Global Education: <https://asiasociety.org/education/historical-and-modern-religions-korea>
- Aslan, S. (2003). "Citizen, speak Turkish!": A nation in the making. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 13(2), 245-272.
- Aytürk, İ. (2004). Turkish linguists against the West: The origins of linguistic nationalism in Atatürk's Turkey. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 40(6), 1-25.
- Aytürk, İ. (2008a). Politics and language reform in Turkey: The 'academy' debate. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 98, 13-30.
- Aytürk, İ. (2008b, July). The first episode of language reform in republican Turkey: The language council from 1926 to 1931. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Third Series*, 18(3), 275-293. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27755954>
- Aytürk, I. (2010). Script charisma in Hebrew and Turkish: A comparative framework for explaining success and failure of romanization. *Journal of World History*, 21, 97-130.
- Aytürk, I. (2013). Language policy and planning: Kemal Atatürk's contribution. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1-3). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Bahá'u'lláh. (n.d.-a.). *Gleanings from the Writings of Bahá'u'lláh*. Retrieved from Bahai Reference Library: <http://www.bahai.org/r/877770890>

- Bahá'u'lláh. (n.d.-b.). *Tablets of Bahá'u'lláh*. Retrieved from Bahá'í Reference Library: <https://www.bahai.org/library/authoritative-texts/bahauallah/tablets-bahauallah/5#906199825>
- Bai, J., Shi, J., Jiang, Y., He, S., & Weng, X. (2011). Chinese and Korean characters engage the same visual work form area in proficient early Chinese-Korean bilinguals. *PLoS ONE*, 6(7), 1-8.
- Baldauf, R. B. (2006). Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7(2-3), 147-170.
- Bassetti, B. (2006). Orthographic input and phonological representation in learners of Chinese as a foreign language. *Written Language and Literacy*, 9(1), 95-114.
- Bigler, D. (1998). *Forgotten kingdom: The Mormon theocracy in the American West*. Spokane, WA: Arthur Clark.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York, NY: Holt.
- Brendemoen, B. (1998). The Turkish Language Reform. In L. Johanson, & E. A. Csato (Eds.), *The Turkic Languages* (pp. 242-247). London, UK: Routledge.
- Brown, A. J. (1936). *One hundred years: A history of the foreign missionary work of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.* New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell.
- Çalışkan, N. (2013). Evaluating the implementation of high school Ottoman Turkish courses on the basis of students' opinions. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty Education*, 2(2), 239-243.
- Campbell, G. L. (1995). *Concise compendium of the world's languages*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Carles, W. R. (1894). *Life in Corea*. New York, NY: MacMillan.
- Chew, P. G.-L. (2009). *Emergent lingua francas and world orders: The politics and place of English as a world language*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Chiang, W. W. (1995). *We two know the script: We have become good friends*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Cobarrubias, J., & Fishman, J. A. (Eds.). (1983). *Progress in language planning: International perspectives*. Berlin, DE: Mouton.
- Cook, V., Vaid, J., & Bassetti, B. (2009). Writing Systems Research: A new journal for a developing field. *Writing Systems Research*, 1(1), 1-3. doi:10.1093/wsr/wsp003
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Cottrell, L. (1971). *Reading the past: The story of deciphering ancient languages*. New York, NY: Crowell-Collier Press.
- Coulmas, F. (1989). *The writing systems of the world*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Coulmas, F. (2003). *Writing systems: An introduction to their linguistic analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, F. (2009). Evaluating merit: The evolution of writing reconsidered. *Writing Systems Research*, 1(1), 5-17. doi:10.1093/wsr/wsp001
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom*. (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Education Services.
- Daldeniz, E. (2014). From an empire to a nation state: Importing the concept of nation into Ottoman/Turkish thinking. *Translators' Journal*, 59(1), 72-96.
- Dale, I. (1980). Digraphia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 26, 5-13.
- Daniels, P. T. (1996). The study of writing systems. In P. T. Daniels, & W. Bright (Eds.), *The world's writing systems* (pp. 3-12). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Daoust, D. (1991a). Terminological change within a language planning framework. In D. F. Marshall (Ed.), *Language planning. Focusshrift in honor of Joshua A. Fishman* (pp. 281-309). Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins.
- Daoust, D. (1991b). The evaluation of sociolinguistic and terminological change in a commercial enterprise. *Terminology Science and Research*(2), 44-60.
- Daoust, D. (1992). Le rôle du poste comme facteur de changement des habitudes terminologiques dans une entreprise privée montréalaise [Occupation as a factor of change in terminological behavior within a private Montreal enterprise]. *Revue de l'ACLA, Actes du 23e Colloque annuel tenu à l'Université de Moncton à Moncton [ACLA Bulletin. Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Colloquium held at Moncton University, Moncton]*, 14, pp. 71-93. Moncton.
- Daoust, D. (1994). L'importance de quelques opinions et attitudes sur le comportement terminologique dans un milieu de travail [The role of opinions and attitudes on terminological behavior in the workplace]. *Les actes du colloque sur la problématique de l'aménagement linguistique (enjeux théoriques et pratiques)*. 1, pp. 137-77. Québec: Government of Quebec.
- Daoust, D. (1997). Language planning and language reform. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 436-452). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

- Darling, L. T. (2012). Ottoman Turkish: Written language and scribal practice, 13th to 20th centuries. In B. Spooner, & W. L. Hanaway (Eds.), *Literacy in the Persinate world: Writing and the social order* (pp. 171-195).
- DeFrancis, J. (1977). *Colonialism and language policy in Viet Nam* (Vol. 19). Mouton de Gruyter.
- DeFrancis, J. (1984). Digraphia. *Word*, 35(1), 59-66.
- DeFrancis, J. (1989). *Visible speech: The diverse oneness of writing systems*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive interactionism*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Derrida, J. (1974). *Of grammatology*. (G. C. Spivak, Trans.) Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dixon-Woods, M., Cavers, D., Agarwal, S., Annandale, E., Arthur, A., Harvey, J., . . . Sutton, A. J. (2006). Conducting a critical interpretive synthesis of the literature on access to healthcare by vulnerable groups. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 6(35), pp. 1-13.
- Doğançay, S. A. (1995). An evaluation of the Turkish Language Reform after 60 years. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 19(3), 221-249.
- Erkoyun, E., & Kucukgocmen, A. (2019, June 22). *Blow to Turkey's Erdogan as opposition wins big in Istanbul*. Retrieved from Reuters: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-turkey-election/turkeys-opposition-headed-for-big-istanbul-win-in-blow-to-erdogan-idUSKCN1TO010>
- Fasold, R. (1984). *The sociolinguistics of society*. New York, NY: Blackwell.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word*, 15, 325-340.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1968). Language development. In J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson, & J. Das Gupta (Eds.), *Language problems of developing nations*. (pp. 27-35). New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Fierman, W. (1991). *Language planning and national development: The Uzbek experience*. New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society*. Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (1974). *Advances in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J. A. (1982). Whorfianism of the third kind: Ethnolinguistic diversity as a worldwide societal asset. *Language in Society*, 11(1), 1-14.

- Fishman, J. A., Ferguson, C. A., & Das Gupta, J. (Eds.). (1968). *Language problems of developing nations*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Gale, J. S. (1909). *Korea in transition*. New York, NY: Eaton & Mains.
- Garry, J., & Rubino, C. (Eds.). (2001). *Facts about the world's languages: An encyclopedia of the world's major languages, past and present*. New York, NY: H.W. Wilson.
- Gelb, I. J. (1963). *A study of writing* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Griffis, W. E. (1912). *A modern pioneer in Korea: The life story of Henry G. Appenzeller*. New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell Company.
- Grivelet, S. (2001). Introduction. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 150(special issue), 1-10.
- Haarmann, H. (1993). The emergence of the Korean script as a symbol of Korean identity. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *The earliest stage of language planning* (pp. 143-157). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haas, W. (1970). *Phono-graphic translation*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Hannas, W. C. (1997). *Asia's orthographic dilemma*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Haugen, E. (1959). Language planning in modern Norway. *Anthropological linguistics*, 1, pp. 8-21.
- Heyd, U. (1954). *Language reform in modern Turkey*. Jerusalem, IL: Israel Oriental Society.
- Hulbert, H. B. (1892). The Korean alphabet. *Korean repository*, 1-9, 70-74.
- Hulbert, H. B. (1904). Spelling reform. *Korea review*, 4, 385-393.
- Jones, D. V., & Martin-Jones, M. (2004). Bilingual education and language revitalization in Wales: Past achievements and current issues. In J. W. Tollefson, & A. B. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* (pp. 43-70). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kang, S.-p. (1906). Korean writing. *The Korea review*, 6, 285-289.
- Kang, W.-J. (1997). *Christ and Caesar in modern Korea*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Kaplan, R. E., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language planning: From practice to theory*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kara, G. (1996). Aramaic scripts for Altaic languages. In P. T. Daniels, & W. Bright (Eds.), *The world's writing systems* (pp. 536-558). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kerslake, C. (1998). Ottoman Turkish. In L. Johanson, & E. A. Csato (Eds.), *The Turkic Languages* (pp. 179-202). London, UK: Routledge.
- Kho, S. (1987). *Koreans in Soviet Central Asia*. Helsinki, FI: The Oriental Society of Finland.
- Kim, I. S. (1993, May). Protestants and the formation of modern Korean nationalism, 1885-1920: A study of the contributions of Horace Grant Underwood and Sun Chu Kil. Ann Arbor, MI, USA: Univerity Microfilms International.
- Kim, J. (2005). *The history and future of Hangeul, Korea's indigenous script*. (R. King, Trans.) London, UK: Global Oriental.
- Kim-Renaud, Y.-K. (2004). Mixed script and literacy in Korea. *Korean Linguistics*, 12, 161-182.
- King, J. R. (1987). The Korean elements in the Manchu script reform of 1632. *Central Asiatic Journal*, 31(3/4), 252-286.
- King, R. (1996). Korean writing. In P. T. Daniels, & W. Bright (Eds.), *The world's writing systems* (pp. 218-227). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. *Journal of International and Area Studies*, 11(3), 7-38.
- Kloss, H. (1968). Notes concerning a language-nation typology. In J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson, & J. Das Gupta (Eds.), *Language problems of developing nations* (pp. 69-86). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kôno, R. (1969). The Chinese writing and its influence on the scripts of the neighboring peoples with special reference to Korea and Japan. *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Tôyô Bunko*, 27, pp. 84-140.
- Kuipers, J., & McDermott, R. (1996). Insular Southeast Asian scripts. In P. Daniels, & W. Bright (Eds.), *The world's writing systems* (pp. 474-484). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Laforge, L. (Ed.). (1987). Proceedings of the international colloquium on language planning. Ottawa, May 25-29, 1986. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Ledyard, G. K. (1966). The Korean language reform of 1446: The origin, background, and early history of the Korean alphabet. *Ph.D dissertation*. University of California, Berkeley.

- Lee, J. (2000, August). A model of writing variety: Language attitudes toward Korean writing varieties. Arlington, TX: The University of Texas at Arlington.
- Lee, K.-m. (1975). Language and writing systems in traditional Korea. In P. H. Lee (Ed.), *The traditional culture and society of Korea: Art and literature* (pp. 15-32). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii.
- Levitt, J. (1978). The influence of orthography on phonology: A comparative study (English, French, Spanish, Italian, German). *Linguistics*, 208, 43-67.
- Lewis, E. G. (1972). *Multilingualism in the Soviet Union: Aspects of language policy and its implementation*. The Hague, NL: Mouton.
- Lewis, G. (1999). *The Turkish Language Reform: A catastrophic success*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2014). The interface between macro and micro-level language policy and the place of language pedagogies. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 9(2), 118-129.
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Baldauf, R. B. (2008). Language planning in local contexts: Agents, contexts and interactions. In A. J. Liddicoat, & R. B. Baldauf (Eds.), *Language planning and policy: Language planning in local contexts* (pp. 3-17). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Liu, L. H. (2015). Scripts in motion: Writing as imperial technology, past and present. *PMLA*, 130(2), 375-383.
- MacCulloch, D. (2009). *Christianity: The first three thousand years*. New York, NY: Viking Penguin.
- Mair, V. H. (1996a). Modern Chinese writing. In P. Daniels, & W. Bright (Eds.), *The writing systems of the world* (pp. 43-67). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Mair, V. H. (1996b). Discussant's remarks. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association*, 31(3), 56-58.
- Major, C. (2010). Do virtual professors dream of electric students? College faculty experiences with online distance education. *Teachers College Record*, 112(8).
- Major, C. H., & Savin-Baden, M. (2010). *An introduction to qualitative research synthesis: Managing the information explosion in social science research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Marshall, D. F. (Ed.). (1991). *Language planning. Focusshrift in honor of Joshua A. Fishman*. Amsterdam, NE: John Benjamins.

- Maurais, J. (1987). *Politique et aménagement linguistiques [Language planning and language policies]*. Paris: Le Robert.
- Mazrui, A. M. (2002). The English language in African education: Dependency and decolonization. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 267-281). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McLuhan, M. (1962). *The Gutenberg galaxy: The making of typographic man*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Miller, R. A. (1971). *Japanese and the other Altaic languages*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Moumouni, A. (1998). *L'éducation en Afrique [Education in Africa]*. Paris, FR: Présence Africaine.
- Nahir, M. (1984). Language planning goals: A classification. *Language problems & language planning*, 8, 294-327.
- Neef, M. (2012). Graphematics as part of a modular theory of phonographic writing systems. *Writing Systems Research*, 4(2), 214-228.
- Noblit, G. W., & Hare, R. D. (1988). *Meta-ethnography: Synthesizing qualitative studies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- O.W.W.K. (1904). The reform spelling. *Korea Review*, pp. 440-442.
- Ogden, C. K. (1935). *Basic English: A general introduction with rules and grammar* (5th ed.). London, UK: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.
- Ongur, H. O. (2014). Identifying Ottomanisms: The discursive evolution of Ottoman pasts in the Turkish presents. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 51(2), 416-432.
- Pae, H. K. (2011). Is Korean a syllabic alphabet or an alphabetic syllabary? *Writing Systems Research*, 3(2), 103-115.
- Páez Urdaneta, I. (1982). The history of Spanish orthography, Andrea (sic) Bello's proposal and the Chilean attempt: Implications for a theory on spelling reform. *Spelling Progress Bulletin*, 22(3), 8-12.
- Paterson, B. L., Thorne, S. E., Canam, C., & Jillings, C. (2001). *Meta-study of qualitative health research: A practical guide to meta-analysis and meta-synthesis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perfetti, C. A. (2003). The universal grammar of reading. *Scientific studies of reading*, 7, 3-24.

- Perry, J. R. (1985). Language reform in Turkey and Iran. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 13(2), 295-311.
- Petrovic, J. E. (2015). *A post-liberal approach to language policy in education*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Petrovic, J. E., & Kuntz, A. M. (2013). Strategies of reframing language policy in the liberal state: A recursive model. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 12(1), 126-146.
- Pieper, D. O. (2011). Han'gul for the nation, the nation for Han'gul: The Korean language movement, 1894-1945 (Master's thesis). Saint Louis, MO: All Theses and Dissertations (ETDs). Retrieved from <http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/etd/450>
- Porter, D. (2001). *Ideographia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Reischauer, E. O., & Fairbank, J. K. (1960). *East Asia: The great tradition*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, H. (1995). Optimal orthographies. In I. Taylor, & D. R. Olson (Eds.), *Scripts and literacy* (pp. 45-58). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic.
- Romaine, S. (2007). Linguistic diversity and language standardization. In M. Hellinger, & A. Pauwels (Eds.), *Handbook of language and communication: Diversity and change* (pp. 685-713). The Hague, NE: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rubin, J. (1971). Evaluation and language planning. In J. Rubin, & B. Jernudd (Eds.), *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations* (pp. 217-252). Honolulu, HI: University Press of Hawaii.
- Rubin, J. (1984). Bilingual education and language planning. In C. Kennedy (Ed.), *Language planning and language education* (pp. 4-16). London, UK: George Allen & Unwin.
- Rubin, J., & Jernudd, B. (Eds.). (1971). *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations*. Honolulu, HI: University Press of Hawaii.
- Ryle, G. (1971). *Collected Essays, 1929-1968* (Vol. II). London, UK: Hutchinson.
- Sampson, G. (1985). *Writing systems*. London, UK: Hutchinson.
- Savage-Landor, A. H. (1895). *Corea, or Cho-Sen: The land of the morning calm*. London, UK: William Heinemann.
- Savin-Baden, M., & Fisher, A. (2002). Negotiating 'honesties' in the research process. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 65(4), 191-193.
- Savin-Baden, M., & Major, C. H. (2004). *Foundations of problem-based learning*. Maidenhead, UK: SRHE/Open University Press.

- Savin-Baden, M., & Major, C. H. (2007). Using interpretive meta-ethnography to explore the relationship between innovative approaches to learning and innovative methods of pedagogical research. *Higher Education*, 54(6), 833-852.
- Schofield, J. W. (1990). Increasing the generalizability of qualitative research. In E. W. Eisner, & A. Peshkin (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate* (pp. 201-232). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Shohamy, E. G. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Silva, D. J. (2002). Western attitudes toward the Korean language: An overview of late 19th and early 20th century mission literature. *Korean Studies*, 26(2), 270-286.
- Silva, D. J. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the reevaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 192, 57-74. doi:10.1515/IJSL.2008.035
- Sjoberg, A. (1966). Socio-cultural and linguistic factors in the development of writing systems for pre-literate peoples. In W. Bright (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the 1964 UCLA Conference* (pp. 260-273). The Hague: Mouton.
- Tachau, F. (1964). Language and politics: Turkish Language Reform. *The Review of Politics*, 26(2), 191-204.
- Taşpınar, Ö. (2008). *Turkey's Middle East policies: Between Neo-Ottomanism and Kemalism*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment of International Peace.
- Taylor, I. (1979). The Korean writing system: An alphabet? A syllabary? A logography? In P. A. Kolers, M. E. Wrolstad, & H. Bouma (Eds.), *Processing of visible language* (Vol. 2, pp. 67-82). New York, NY: Plenum.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2011). Language planning and language policy. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of sociolinguistics*. (pp. 357-376). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Underwood, H. G. (1890). *An introduction to the Korean spoken language*. Yokohama, JP: Kelly and Walsh.
- Underwood, H. G. (1908). *The call of Korea: Political, Social, Religious*. New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell.
- Unger, J. M. (1996). Taking digraphia seriously: Future software for East Asia. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association*, 31(1), 45-55.

- Unseth, P. (2005). Sociolinguistic parallels between choosing scripts and languages. *Written Language and Literacy*, 8, 19-42.
- Unseth, P. (2008). The sociolinguistics of script choice: An introduction. *International Journal of Society & Language*, 192, 1-4.
- Vaillancourt, F. (1993). Le statut socio-économique du français et des francophones du Québec, 1977-1992: Le rôle et l'avenir des politiques linguistiques [The socio-economic status of French and Francophones in Québec, 1977-1992: The role and future of language policies]. In P. Bouchard (Ed.), *Les actes du colloque sur la situation linguistique au Québec [Proceedings of the Colloquium on the linguistic situation in Québec]* (pp. 67-89). Québec: Government of Québec, Office de la langue française.
- Voegelin, C. F., & Voegelin, F. M. (1961). Typological classification of systems with included, excluded and self-sufficient alphabets. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 3(2), 55-94.
- von der Gabelentz, G. (1892). Zur Beurteilung des koreanischen Schrift-und Lautwesens. *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, XXIII, 587-600.
- Vovin, A. (1999). Once again on the reading of the Old Korean. *The emergence of the modern language sciences*, 289-300.
- Walker, W. B. (2000). Entrapment in large technical systems: Institutional commitment and power relations. *Research Policy*, 29, 833-46.
- Wang, J. (1996). On the modernization of the Chinese language: Bilingualism and digraphia in China. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association*, 31(1), 10-14.
- Watanabe, K., & Suzuki, T. (1981). *Chôsen-go no susume [Recommendation of Korean]*. Tokyo, JP: Kôdansha.
- Weinstein, B. (1980). Language planning in Francophone Africa. *Language problems & language planning*, 4(1), 55-77.
- Weinstein, B. (Ed.). (1990a). *Language policy & political development*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Weinstein, B. (1990b). Language policy and political development: An overview. In *Language policy and political development*. (pp. 1-21). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Wi-vun, T. C. (2007). Language, literacy, and nationalism: Taiwan's orthographic transition from the perspective of Han sphere. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 28(2), 102-116.
- Yavuz, M. H. (1998). Turkish identity and foreign policy in flux: The rise of Neo-Ottomanism. *Critique: Critical Middle East Studies*, 14(4), 19-411.

- Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. *Language Policy*, 335-355. doi:10.1007/s10993-015-9355-1
- Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1-19. doi:10.1080/14664208.2016.1264735
- Yi, I.-s. (1892). The alphabet (panchul). *Korean repository*, October, 293-299.
- Yi, M. (1987). *Han'guk kidokkyo munhwa undongsa (Cultural history of the Christian movement in Korea)*. Seoul, KR: Taehan Kidokkyo Ch'ulp'ansa.
- Yin, B. (1991). Pinyin-to-Chinese character computer conversion systems and the realization of digraphia in China. In V. H. Mair, & Y. Liu (Eds.), *Characters and the computers* (pp. 26-36). Amsterdam: IOS.
- Yu, C. (1967). Kugyök söngsö ka kugö ūi paltal e mich'in yŏngyang: T'ŭkhi öhwŭi ūi kaesinmyon ūl chungsim ūro (Influence upon the Korean language of the translated Korean Bible: Focusing especially on innovation in the lexicon). *Tong'a munhwa*(1), 59-76.
- Zhao, S. (2011). Actors in language planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. II, pp. 905-923). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zhou, Y. (1986). Modernization of the Chinese Language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 59, 7-23.
- Zima, P. (1974). Digraphia: The case of Hausa. *Linguistics*, 124, 57-69.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. QRS Data for King, R. (2004)

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 7	Silva introduces valuable primary source materials written by Western missionaries that reveal their intellectual prejudices and racial biases towards the Koreans and their language, and shows how Western missionaries "effectively exploited Korea's language situation" in order to maximize the breadth and depth of their evangelization.	LAN, REL, ISM
p. 8	In this paper, I look not so much at Western missionary attitudes toward Korean language and writing, as to the concrete effects of their research and translation activities on the standardization and modernization of Korean language and writing — in particular, on orthography. It is orthography, especially, that lends a standard language its 'look' and 'feel', and that, as much as any script or writing system itself, can assume tremendous importance for different forms of identity, be they regional, national or denominational. Thus, I will be arguing that while the role of Western Protestants missionaries has been generally acknowledged by (South Koreans), it has nonetheless been underestimated.	LAN, ORT, SCR, REL, NAT
p. 8	Here, I use 'modernization' as a cover term for Ferguson's three dimensions above. In the context of turn-of-the-twentieth century Korean language, 'modernization' meant, first and foremost, orthographic reform — the establishment of the Korean script as an (if not the) official writing system, and reform and standardization of Korean spelling.	LAN, ORT, SCR
p. 9	"Such a gem could not remain buried forever, and so ultimately it was the great contribution of Protestantism . . . , by illuminating the value of han'gul, to demonstrate its brilliance to the entire world."	REL, SCR, IDE

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 9	Kim praises the missionaries for introducing Korean language and han'gul to Western academia, and enumerates other contributions: assistance in promoting widespread literacy in han'gul (for instance, he notes on p. 182 that the British Bible Society, between 1895 and 1936, distributed 18,079,466 Bibles translated into Korean in Korea); promotion of Korean language and script through church services and Bible study groups; development, through pure-kungmun/onmun 'style', of a widely-recognized and regularized spelling system - so much so, that he speaks of three different munch'e or orthographic styles prior to Liberation - the kŭrisŭdo p'yogich'e or 'Christian spelling', the 'Japanese Colonial ch'ongdokpu spelling', and the Chosŏn Hakhoe (Korean Language Society) spelling; inspiration and training of many prominent Korean linguists and grammarians.	REL, LAN, SCR, LIT
p. 9	"We must not forget to mention the Protestant missionaries for their enormous contribution to the revival, reform and propagation of han'gul, both before and after the revival period . . . As Koreans, there is probably nobody who does not feel gratitude for the great contribution of Protestantism to han'gul propagation."	REL, ISM, LAN, SCR
p. 9	According to Ch'oe (1962: 73), what han'gŭl did for Protestantism was to 1) facilitate propagation of Protestantism, and 2) render propagation even easier because of 'indigenous monotheistic beliefs and the word <i>hanŭnim</i> '.	SCR, REL
p. 10	By contrast, Ch'oe's list of things that Protestantism did for han'gul is somewhat longer: 1) it propagated han'gul among the masses; 2) it helped Koreans learn to read and write han'gul; 3) it promoted respect for han'gul and fostered a spirit of protecting han'gul; 4) it recognized the scientific value of han'gul; 5) it propagated the "Paedal" language and writing to the world; and 6) it fostered an atmosphere conducive to han'gul-only orthography. But Ch'oe shies away from delving into the specific research or policy-related contributions of individual missionaries, and his section on "Research on han'gul" covers only the question of Romanization.	REL, SCR, PEO, LIT

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 10	"Generally speaking, in examining the development process of <i>kungmun</i> in early modern times, it is impossible to forget the weighty influence of developments in 'Western learning' [sohak, i.e., Christianity — RK]; as soon as this Western learning arrived in Korea, translation of the Bible into Korean was begun in order to propagate its tenets widely to the general masses. . . . As a result, it goes without saying that the propagation of Protestantism was an easy matter, and as a consequence, not only was a new culture propagated to the common masses, but this also had a huge relevance to the development of our <i>kungmun</i> . That is to say, we believe that <i>kungmun</i> 's debt to Protestantism in early modern times looms extremely large; whereas people in the past had assumed that public and private documents needed to be written in <i>hanmun</i> , they now came to realize that using just <i>kungmun</i> was entirely sufficient."	KNO, REL, PEO, SCR
p. 11	"This assistance on the part of Protestantism to Korea's modern development was especially evident in Korea's modernization process, and the most concrete contribution that it left was the encouragement of <i>kungmun</i> and the movement for direct intercourse with the West. The <i>onmunilch'i</i> movement represented by <i>kukhanmun</i> [mixed script] was a very important element in the modernization movement, but outside of the confines of fiction and the translated Bible, it was not easy to find use of exclusive <i>kungmun</i> . Even when Japanese imperialism crushed the use of Korean language and writing from the public sphere, our language continued to be pronounced in the churches. The merits bequeathed on Korean linguistic and literary life by the translation of the Bible into Korean can by no means be rated any less than its theological salvation work."	REL, ISM, LAN, SCR

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 11	The only other significant work that I am aware of is Yu Ch'anggyun's (1967) article on the Korean Bible and its influence on Korean language development, in which he details the lamentable digraphia of premodern Korea, and admits that ". . . when it came to writing, we had fallen into the evil practice of abandoning our national tongue and taking pleasure in using <i>hanmun</i> . There is no hiding the fact that the translation of the Bible was a stimulus freeing us from this mistaken notion."	REL, LAN, ORT, SCR
p. 11	One frequently cited article on Protestantism and <i>han'gŭl</i> is Chŏn T'aekpu (1980: 142), who concludes simply that "The <i>han'gŭl</i> Bible was the greatest event in the history of the Korean language."	REL, SCR, LAN
p. 11	Both his landmark study of the Korean Protestant cultural movement (1987), as well as the handsomely produced and lavishly illustrated Ryu Taeyong, Ok Songfik and Yi Many'61 (1993, 1994), include extremely valuable information and rich archival primary source materials that have been overlooked by Korean language scholars on the one hand, and under-appreciated by Korean historians of Christianity, on the other.	NCE
p. 11	Kim Sŏktŭk ([1983]1986) is exceptional in this regard, as he includes absolutely nothing on Western missionaries (or non-Korean research of any kind), giving the impression (reinforced in any case by other works in this genre), that early modern Korean linguistic scholarship developed in a kind of intellectual vacuum.	LAN, NCE
pp. 11-12	Kang Sinhang (1986: 143-6, 165-8) devotes some remarks to the works of Western missionaries (especially the French Catholic missionaries), but includes nothing on the influence of these works on the Korean grammatical tradition of Korean language policy. Kim Hyongju (1983: 213-26) devotes a section to "Korean language research by foreigners," in which he notes that "genuine [grammatical] research was begun by the missionaries," but is short on analysis as well as on Bible-related specifics.	REL

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 12	Pak Chongguk (1994: 175) devotes two short paragraphs to "Protestantism" in his chapter on "Korean language studies in the early modern period," but confines his remarks to an enumeration of some Bible translation titles and publication statistics, concluding that, "Protestant missionary activity rendered a huge contribution to the revival, regularization (<i>chongni</i>) and propagation of han'gŭl."	REL, SCR
p. 12	Yu Ch'anggyun (1995:329-32) also includes a brief section on "Korean language research by foreigners: in which he is rather generous with his praise for the 'amazing research' of the first Western dictionary compilers, whom he credits with the first scientific analyses of the Korean language. Some pages earlier (322-3), in his chapter on the "Importation and development of modern linguistics," Yu writes: "It is impossible to ignore the contribution of Protestantism to modernization . . . the exclusive-han'gŭl usage movement used in proselytizing contributed greatly to creating a new awareness of the national language."	REL, SCR, LAN
p. 12	Yu summarizes the various contributions of Protestantism to Korean language studies as follows: 1) establishment of schools and strengthening of education in the national language; 2) Bible translation and exclusive-han'gŭl usage; and 3) compilation and publishing of new textbooks in <i>kungmun</i> . Yu concludes by emphasizing that the Korean Bible was extremely influential in 'propagating <i>kungmun</i> '.	REL, LAN, SCR
p. 12	Kim Minsu ([1964]1982: 226-236), though largely bibliographic in nature, is one of the more detailed and insightful treatments of early studies by Westerners (mostly missionaries), and he acknowledges the pioneering efforts in lexicography of first the French Catholic missionaries, then the Protestant Underwood. Likewise, he emphasizes the importance of Ridel's <i>Grammaire coréenne</i> for later Western grammatical descriptions of Korean (especially Underwood's grammar of 1890). In his later in-depth study of Chu Sigyŏng, Kim Minsu ([1977]1986) also uncovers some interesting points of contact between Chu and Western missionaries.	REL, LAN

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 12	Without question the most authoritative student of early Western scholarly writing on Korean is Ko Yönggün. Ko (1985) contains extensive discussion of missionary materials, as does his most recent book (1998). Particularly mindful of the work of James Scarth Gale, Ko Yönggün (1998: 268) notes, for example, that Gale's dictionaries were the third large-scale Korean-Western language dictionary (after the French missionary dictionary (1880) and Gale, et al. (1890) and that. . . "it is believed that they had a huge influence on Koreans, too."	REL
p. 12	With specific regard to orthography, Chi Ch'unsu (1971) is an excellent (and apparently the first) analysis of the <i>orthography</i> in the earliest Bible translations, and begins by lamenting the lack of attention to orthography in research to date.	ORT
pp. 12-13	"Bible orthography" had a number of distinguishing features, among which were its conservatism, its strict adherence to just ten <i>patch'im</i> or syllable-final consonants (» p, A s, 1 k, E 1, E m, t n, 0 ng, plus the three clusters Cl 1k, au /m, EU 1p), its efforts to maintain a consistent and strict division between verb roots and endings, and between nouns and particles (in other words, its attempts to write root morphemes consistently in the same shape, within the limits of the patch 'im system), its consistency, its regularized system for rendering Western personal and place names in han'göl, its widespread but unspoken acceptance throughout Korea, and above all, word-spacing.... And according to Chi, this "Bible spelling," as "an attempt to bring order to sloppy current practice,," spread far and wide until it became a sort of "unwritten law (<i>pulmunyul</i>)." He concludes: "Even just forcing upon Koreans during the Kaehwagi period the realization of the need for establishing an orthography and regularizing <i>kugö</i> and <i>kungmun</i> was a huge contribution."	ORT, LAN, REL, SCR
p. 14	Von der Gabelentz (1892: 587) wrote of the Korean script that it was "...to my knowledge, the simplest writing system possessed by any people.	SCR

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 14	On top of this we find an anarchy in the orthography and even in certain parts of the declension system which is well understandable if one recalls the contempt in which the Korean language is held in its own country. ... The Japanese, at least, have an old, indigenous literature which they hold in high regard and study with philological methods. ... In Korea, there is nothing of the sort. So far as I can tell, there has never even been an attempt to standardize the indigenous language. ... It is precisely this apparently so undisciplined and arbitrary orthography, this An-orthography in Korean texts ... There is still no telling if and when science will be in a position to bring order to this situation. The only thing worse than a non-literary language is a language which, though used for literary purposes, is neither cultivated literarily nor stabilized."	ORT, LAN, LIT
p. 15	A drawback, attending upon the little attention paid to the teaching of this language, is that the spelling has become very loose. Even in well-printed books, the faults of pronunciation, committed by a careless speaker are perpetuated, and the final and initial letters of syllables are assigned to the wrong syllable. In a polysyllabic language, every syllable of which has its own signification, the meaning of the whole work is gathered from the syllables of which it is compounded; but for foreigners, at any rate, the component parts are likely to be misleading rather than to form a clue, if there is any carelessness in the separation of the syllables.	
p. 15	Nevertheless, to the rapturous surprise of the missionaries, there lay, as in a cave, an invaluable treasure awaiting them. No Ali Baba, with the filched secret of "Open Sesame," was more thrilled by the discovery of gold and jewels, than were Underwood and Appenzeller over the trover of the Enmun alphabet. ... missionaries made this despised earthen vessel the receptacle of a heavenly treasure. (Griffis 1912:189)	SCR, REL
p. 15	"[T]he translated Bible, besides quickening the Korean mind and heart, called into life not only an unknown world of thought, but by setting a new standard of speech and writing induced the beginnings of a true national literature."	REL, KNO, LAN, IDE

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 15	Griffis' last point is much exaggerated, but serves nonetheless as an appropriate reminder of the Western missionary contribution to language modernization in Korea.	NCE, REL, LAN
p. 16	Since the foreigner has come to Chosen, there has been considerable consultation and writing on subjects that we had thought scarcely worthy of attention heretofore. Among these I have been more especially interested in the Panchul, ... He, this foreigner, asks me to see a likenessbetween of the Panchul, and the Thibetan , and Sanscrit g ; between H and q and4 ; A and 41 and El &c. &c. &c. 15 If relationship exists in the midst of such dissimilarity, who knows but that I and my dog may have been one some time in the past, for while I claim on the whole to being his superior I certainly bear much more resemblance to him than does our Chosen Enmoun to these so-called near relations. ... (Yi 1892: 293)	NCE
p. 17	It was no blind slavish borrowing from the Chinese and the Thibetan but a careful selection of useful parts and a remodeling according to a scientific plan and the result is the most perfect because the most simple and comprehensive that can be found. ... If the people of Korea had then and there thrown away the intellect-overloading, time-wasting, caste-conserving, prejudice-confirming, indolence-breeding Chinese character and adopted their new phonetic system it would have been an immeasurable blessing to Korea. But it is never too late to mend. (Hulbert 1896a: 236-7)	SCR, NCE, ELI
p. 17	"I believe that the Koreans will eventually discard the Chinese just as the English did the Latin and for this reason the study of the origin of the magnificent Korean Alphabet is interesting and important."	SCR, IDE

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. *Journal of International and Area Studies*, 11(3), 7-38.

<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 17	The point I would emphasize here, before turning to other questions, is that Westerners, at first scholars outside Korea, but joined later by missionaries working inside Korea, initiated a wide-ranging discussion of Korean writing which soon spilled over into the Korean Christian community. This discussion ran parallel with, and seems likely to have helped instigate, similar discussions in Korean among Korean reformers and intellectuals.	KNO, REL, SCR
p. 21	It gets out of alignment, so to speak. The question is whether we shall draw the spelling back into alignment with the pronunciation or not. ... It is the desire of the advocates of the reform to give the people a system which will make the spelling of the words absolutely phonetic ... It should be borne in mind that the vagaries of Korean spelling are nothing so wild as those of English. ... To our mind one of the most glaring imperfections of the Korean alphabet is the lack of distinction between the long and short sound of vowels ... But if we are to manipulate the alphabet in favor of the coming generations why not make a thorough job of it and give them something that will be approximately perfect? (Hulbert: 388-91)	
p. 21	The difficulty that has been raised because of dialectic differences of pronunciation has never been properly answered. In a large section of the country the <i>yis</i> <i>not</i> silent in the vowels with the double spot and the <i>t</i> and <i>ch</i> are <i>not</i> interchangeable. ... So far as reading is concerned the old system works well enough. When it comes to spelling, however, the new method would be simpler ... One of the staunchest advocates of the reform spelling says that the great difficulty with a Korean text is its lack of visual perspicuity. ... After all is said does it not come down to this, that the reform spelling will make it easier to <i>write</i> Korean and harder to <i>read</i> it?... Which is the more important, to read or to write? (Hulbert: 391-2)	

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 21	... They may affect to despise it, yet they know and love every character. It is connected in their minds with childhood, home, mother and everything which they have a right to hold sacred and dear, and which no men may presume to lightly tamper with or take away. ... There are Koreans who resent this. ... to such a Korean the attempt on the part of a body of foreigners to reduce his written mother tongue to a dead level of phonetic sameness is not only unnecessary, but unwarrantable and unjustifiable from any standpoint of right and fairness. ... (O.W.W.K. 1904: 441-2)	SCR, IDE
p. 23	I expect that the "go-slow" party will be horrified at the iconoclastic suggestion herein embodied, or laughingly regard it as the <i>Reductio ad absurdum</i> of spelling reform gone mad. Nevertheless I would submit these considerations to them and to all who care for Korea's preparation for a future close relationship with the horizontal writing nations, and the welding together of the literatures of the East and West (Argos 1904: 541-2).	ORT, IDE
p. 23	This fascinating, visionary passage is the first published example of <i>karo p'urŏ ssŭgi</i> , or 'horizontalized' and de-syllabified Korean writing. It predates Chu Sigyong's first unpublished mention of horizontalized writing (under the Sino-Korean term <i>hoengsŏ</i>) in his research report to the National Script Research Institute of 1908 by four years, and predates his own first printed example of horizontalized writing in 1913 by nearly a decade. Oddly, this particular example, and the entire debate and context in which it occurs, appear to have been overlooked by Korean students of the history of Korean linguistics and language reform.	ORT, NCE
p. 26	To be more specific; a large number of people in Korea are convinced that there will be no such thing as genuine education in Korea until the use of the native character supplants the use of the Chinese ideograph ... a knowledge of Chinese, on the part of a few, splits the nation up into castes and cliques from which no possible good could come ... the sooner Chinese is thrown overboard the better ...	EDU, SCR, KNO, ELI, PEO, NCE

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 26	Now how to do this is the question. The first and most obvious way is to put before the people a literature in the native alphabet so much more interesting and valuable than anything that they can find in Chinese that they will be driven to adopt the innovation. In the second place encourage the use of the mixed script among all young men who are not ready to accept the native character as a whole... We want to make the Koreans proud of their own native written character. You will not make them proud of it by telling them that there is no such things [sic — RK] as correct spelling in Korea and that it all ought to be changed and simplified ... It is a greater drop for him from the Chinese to the Korean than it would be for us to be condoned to read all our English books written in the dot and dash system of the telegraphic code.	IDE, SCR, STA, ORT
p. 26	Another thing, do not lay a further burden on the Korean by spacing between words as yet... Has it never occurred to any of the foreign students of Korean that until Koreans begin to study Korean grammar and the values of inflectional endings they will not be able to discern any reason why At p -5- el should be one word while Al- n Tel must be two words? ... What I plead for is that all the energy that foreigners have to spend along the line of literary work for Korea should be concentrated upon the main proposition and not frittered away upon side issues.	LAN, IDE, NCE
p. 27	Established on July 8, 1907, under the Ministry of Education (<i>Hakpu</i>), the National Script Research Institute was Korea's first national research body, and Korea's first language planning institution. Its main research brief was to solve problems related to Korean writing system and orthography.	LPL, IDE, ORT
p. 29	Strictly speaking, and with the exception of the case of Kim Kyusik, there is scarcely any reason to speak about whether or not [these works] had any influence on the Korean language research of Koreans. (Kim, [1964] 1982: 230) ...But their dictionary compilations and grammatical descriptions were carried out for the sake of their own goals and convenience. Because they were not purely scholarly works, they were unable to work any great effect on Koreans." (Kim, [1964] 1982: 240)	REL

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
pp. 29-30	And with respect specifically to orthographic reform and the National Script Research Institute, Chi (1971: 20) is wide of the mark when he complains that the Korean scholars who participated in the Kungmun Yŏn'guso " . . . seem to have been completely oblivious that the spelling in the Bible was a fixed orthography. Thus, the basic theory of Bible orthography was of no assistance to the committee members in determining their research direction."	ORT, REL
p. 30	In my view, it is astonishing that the missionary spelling reform debate of 1902-1906 has been passed over in silence by Korean historians of Korean linguistics and language reform.	
p. 30	"The question as to what extent Gale was influenced by the reports of the Kunmun Yŏn'guso is a topic for future research." (Ko, 1998: 270-2)	
p. 31	Ko asserts that Gale knew Chu through the YMCA, and concludes: "I believe that Gale's research on Korean language needs to be re-evaluated — not just from the point of view of the history of linguistics, but from the perspective of the history of the Korean language."	REL, LAN
p. 31	I wholeheartedly concur with Ko Yŏnggŭn's calls for re-evaluation of James Scarth Gale's research on and contribution to Korean language studies, and submit that the data presented in this paper call into question the apparently widespread notion that the direction of influence was one-sided, and in the direction from Chu to Gale. Tracing "influence" in situations like these is a sticky business under the best of circumstances, but at the very minimum, it seems clear there must have been a mutually enriching and stimulating give-and-take of ideas about Korean writing and orthography between Gale and Chu over a period of many years.	

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 32	The official orthography announced by the colonial authorities in April, 1912 — Korea's first official orthography ever — was in fact based in large part on the Bible's "historical orthography." But it abolished the `arae a', changed and a followed by y to A and and got rid of `silent y' after A, A , and As Ryu, et al. (1994: 174, Fn.61) note, it is "interesting that these were identical with the ideas proposed in 1902 by Gale."	AUT, ORT, REL
p. 32	Writing two years after Japan had made Korea its colony, Griffis (1912: 189) articulated clearly the European romantic/nationalist notion of Language = Nation (an idea embraced by Korean intellectuals and reformers barely two decades earlier), and bemoaned the failure of this equation in Korea: "If De Quincey's dictum, that next to the flag of his native country, a scholar should be loyal to his own language, be true, then it seems little wonder that Korean sovereignty was lost and that Japanese may yet become the official language of Cho-sen." But for many people in Korea, Western missionaries and Korean patriots alike, the Korean indigenous script held out hope for the future. Indeed, the roots of Korea's particular brand of modern 'script nationalism' must be traced back to both Western missionary and Korean indigenous sources.	IDE, NAT, LAN, SCR
pp. 32-33	Men of truly enlightened nations declare of our Kookmoon alphabet that the fine discrimination of its principles, and its accuracy in indicating sound, are such as to constitute a cause for just pride, and to give it a place in the front rank of written languages. If, by the preparation of an unabridged dictionary, and by reducing the rules of grammar and composition to a system, the scope of the Kookmoon should be increased, then Chinese with its bare ideographs, Japanese with its imperfect alphabet, English with its inconsistencies of spelling, and others of like ilk, would be left to blush over their deficiencies. The first and foremost duty of very wellwisher of the cause of education in Korea, lies right here. (Cited in Baird 1910: 205)	SCR, IDE, LIT, EDU

QRS Data for King, R. (2004). Western protestant missionaries and the origins of Korean language modernization. <i>Journal of International and Area Studies</i> , 11(3), 7-38.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p.33	... the fact remains that the strongest force at work for Unmoon is Unmoon itself. ... The so-called literati ... may be counted on to contend stubbornly every step of progress. They might be safely left to the logic of events, however, were it not for the attitude of the government favoring the use of mixed script instead of Unmoon in the schools. This constitutes the only lion, but a real one in the way.	SCR, GOV, EDU, ISM, IDE
p. 33	The position of the government is a perfectly reasonable one from their standpoint. With a very little effort on their part, the Japanese find themselves in possession of a medium of communication with the educated classes of Koreans, ... we can assist its realization materially by standing pat for the Unmoon, by preparing a good literature in it, and by popularizing it in every way. ... (Baird 1910: 205)	SCR, GOV, EDU, ISM, IDE
p. 33	In this paper, we have tried to marshal further evidence in support of Yi Manyŏl's (1987: 461) insightful comment that, whereas it is usual to distinguish two traditions in modern Korean grammar, one descending from Chu Sigyŏng, and the other from Western missionaries, ultimately, both go back to a Protestant missionary source.	NCE, REL, IDE

Appendix 2. QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008)

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the revaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. <i>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</i> , 192, 57-74.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 57	With its shapes grounded in both articulatory phonetics and Confucian cosmology (Ahn 1997; Shin et al. 1990; inter alia), Hangeul is infused by an ethos of practical wisdom and entrenched in the Korean cultural psyche. It is an inexorable symbol of Koreanness.	ISM, KNO, IDE
pp. 57-58	Official rendering of Korean in its native script, particularly in government records, did not begin until 1894, as part of broader reforms precipitated by Korea's diplomatic and commercial opening to the West. It was also around this time that Korea experienced concerted efforts by Christian missionaries to evangelize, a process in which matters of literacy inevitably came to the fore, given the centrality of scripture to the endeavor.	GOV, REL, LIT
p. 58	Several authors have remarked upon the role of Hangeul as symbolizing Korea's nascent cultural and political independence near the turn of the twentieth century. Still others have noted the role played by missionaries in recognizing the untapped potential of Hangeul as a vehicle for promoting universal communication and education in Korea.	IDE, POL, LIT, EDU
p. 58	"When Christian missionaries arrived in Korea, they began to use Hangeul for all their printed matter.... Practically all Korean Christian literature, hymnals, and Bible translations continue to be published in Hangeul."	REL, SCR

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the reevaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. <i>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</i> , 192, 57-74.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 58	As this ethnological account of work written between 1885 and 1919 reveals, it was difficult for the newcomers to negotiate the relationship between their beliefs regarding literacy and learnedness and those of Koreans: although Hangeul was easy to learn and use, it lacked the prestige associated with Hanja, thereby creating a sociolinguistic dilemma. While the missionaries were ostensibly motivated to embrace Hangeul for linguistic reasons, they were also driven (in part) by a more general desire to turn Korea away from Confucian China and toward the Christian West. The result was a series of thoughtful, practical, and socially responsive solutions to a complex and sociopolitically volatile matter.	LIT, KNO, IDE, SCR, STA
p. 58	In the end, Western missionaries played an important role in accomplishing what King Sejong was unable to realize: the use of Hangeul as an accepted, socially legitimate means of orthographic representation in a broader range of functional domains.	REL, AUT, LIT, IDE
p. 59	Whether the script was ever diffused among the common people to any meaningful extent during the 15th century is doubtful ... in spite of the great efforts of Sejong and [his successor] Sejo to propagate the new alphabet, its influence in this early period did not go significantly beyond the walls of the palace and the large Buddhist community among the royal family.	SCR, PEO, AUT, REL
p. 59	Some feared that Hangeul “would lead to the collapse of public order and the overturning of their system of values” (Lee 1997: 26).	KNO, SCR
p. 60	Indeed, the ability to read and write Chinese characters served as a powerful linguistic shibboleth throughout much of Korea’s history: only those willing, able, and worthy enough to study the intricate forms were considered “learned,” and there-by fit to assume the highest positions in society.	LIT, LAN, ELI, STA

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the reevaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. <i>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</i> , 192, 57-74.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 60	The problem lay in Hangeul's lack of social prestige: Hangeul was not Hanja. Under the <i>sadae</i> system, Korea's vassalage to imperial China extended beyond the political realm and into the cultural domain, thereby bestowing upon Hanja a status that was not accorded to King Sejong's orthographic innovation. As Kim-Renaud (2004: 168) writes, Hangeul "gained little acceptance by the elite Literati and was used mainly by women and Buddhist monks until the end of the 19th century, and it was widely dismissed as <i>Enmun</i> (vernacular writing)."	SCR, POW, POL, AUT, STA
p. 60	As Hangeul was employed by low-prestige users in low-prestige domains, it never successfully competed with Hanja in certain echelons of society, thereby laying the groundwork for the establishment of a di-graphic community of practice: Hangeul served as the vernacular, or low ("L"), script and Hanja (or a mix of Hanja and Hangeul) functioned as the high ("H") script (Kim-Renaud 2004). This domain-driven use of Hangeul and Hanja (including mixed script uses) would persist into the late nineteenth century, a situation that the first long-term Western visitors to Korea would encounter, puzzle over, and ultimately have to reckon with.	SCR, PEO, REL, STA

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the revaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. <i>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</i> , 192, 57-74.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 61	The idea that there are two languages in Korea is strengthened by the fact that foreigners, who are perhaps tolerably well acquainted with words purely Korean, have, when they heard conversations carried on between officials and scholars, been unable to understand what was said. They have been on their way to the houses of the officials and passing through the streets and hearing the merchants, the middle classes, and the coolies, talking among themselves, have been able to understand, while when they came into the presence of the officials, they have been unable to comprehend the meaning of statements and questions addressed directly to them. At once they have said “There are two languages” while the truth is that the officials have simply been using those Korean terms which have been derived from the Chinese. Chinese may be called the Latin of Korea. It is more polite and scholarly to use “Latinized” Korean; but among merchants, middle classes, and in common daily conversation this is not used: the learner does not hear it, hence the difficulty. (Underwood 1890: 4–5; italics in the original)	LAN, ELI, GOV
p. 61	"Korea has an alphabet . . . , which is extremely simple and very easily learned. . . . But for a foreigner to learn to speak the Korean language is another thing."	
p. 61	The question will naturally be asked, is the language easy of acquisition? For an Occidental, we must reply in the negative. While, as has been noted, the alphabet can be mastered almost at a sitting, the train of Korean thought and method of expression are so diametrically opposed to that of the Westerner that it is no easy matter to put oneself where one can think as the native does in Korean. . . .	
p. 62	Indeed, many Westerners made it a point to report to their constituents back home that the Korean indigenous writing system was easy to learn— perhaps, if anything, to compensate for the difficulties associated with learning the language <i>per se</i> . But the matter of reading and writing in Korea was not as simple as these Western writers suggest. (Underwood 1908: 71)	SCR, LAN

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the reevaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. <i>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</i> , 192, 57-74.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 62	In the writing of Korean, two forms of characters are used, the native Ernmun [Hangeul] and the Chinese. In all official correspondence, philosophical books, and in fact in nearly all books of real value, the Chinese character is used, the native Ernmun being relegated to a few trashy love stories and fairy tales. This difference in the written language, has led to the assertion that there are two languages in Korea, and we sometimes hear foreigners talk of “speaking in the Emmun.” There are not two languages and this expression is wrong, for the “Emmun” is simply a system of writing, and it would be as sensible to talk of “speaking in Munson’s system of short hand.” (Underwood 1890: 4)	LAN, SCR
p. 62	Given the cultural uniqueness of Hangeul, it garners a good deal of attention from Western visitors to Korea. The majority of their reactions explicitly reference the writing system’s ease of acquisition and use by Koreans and foreigners alike: Hangeul was variously described as “extremely simple,” “easily learned,” “perfect,” and “very ingenious” (Silva 2002). W. R. Carles (1894: 309) describes it thus: “The language is alphabetical, and contains eleven vowels and fourteen consonants. These being purely phonetic, to read and write Corean are considered feats so easy as not to require teaching.”	SCR, LIT
p. 63	Despite the praise lavished upon Hangeul, its lack of standing was clear to Westerners. The irony lay in the fact that Hangeul’s “cost of ease was its social debasement” (Silva 2002: 276), particularly given its primary community of users: women, children, and “the uneducated masses” (Scott 1893: xvi). Englishman A. Henry Savage-Landor (1895:208) notes how “The Corean alphabet is rather despised by the male ‘blue stockings’ of Chosen, and is considered as fit only for poor people, children and women; in short, those whose brains are unable to undergo the strain of mastering ... the meaning of the many thousands of Chinese characters.”	SCR, POW, ELI, PEO, STA

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the reevaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 192, 57-74.

<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 63	Carles (1894) spells out the correlation between simplicity and low status: Owing to the great ease with which Koreans can learn to read and write their own language, as a written language, it is regarded with great contempt, and its use is in great measure confined to women and uneducated men. In official documents it is seldom employed except in proclamations to the people ... The literature is exceedingly small, but it is worth noting that circulating libraries on an exceedingly petty scale do exist in the capital.	
p. 63	Yet even among the “uneducated masses,” it would appear that literacy in Hangeul was limited. Consider the account of a visit to the Korean countryside by Canadian Malcolm Fenwick (1911: 21): “There was no organized work in the village; so I got a class of boys together, and, as one of my hostesses, Mrs. Ann, was the only woman in the village who could read, I was proud when she promised to teach the women and girls.”	LIT, PEO
p. 63	Such descriptions reveal that literacy even in Hangeul was far from universal. As such, evangelization efforts would need to be preceded by a campaign to teach reading and writing.	LIT, EDU
p. 63	But would investing in the non-prestige writing system be worthwhile? The answer was “yes.” Even though native Hangeul documents were only few in number and limited to “a comparatively few cheap, trashy, and miserably printed novelettes and books of songs” (Underwood 1908: 71–72), they had readers, nonetheless. In light of such associations between Hangeul and low-status genres, however, the missionaries had another obstacle to overcome: the cultural disconnect that would come with promoting the value of scriptural texts and religious tracts written in a script that was deemed “common” or “vulgar.”	POW, IDE, STA

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the reevaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. <i>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</i> , 192, 57-74.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 64	For all of the admiration they accorded to Hangeul for its simplicity and scientific nature, the missionaries leveled a comparable degree of contempt toward Chinese characters. They likewise lamented the degree to which the Chinese forms were valued over the indigenous system, giving further credence to the overwhelming power of <i>sadae</i> and the accompanying centuries-long cultural adherence to the principle of <i>mohwa</i> ‘adulate China’ (Kim-Renaud 2004). For the most part, any mention of Korean digraphia (a term <i>not</i> invoked by any missionary writers) is couched in terms of incredulity or frustration.	SCR, ISM, IDE
p. 64	One asks oneself how a nation which possesses such great advantages concerning the characters used for writing [i.e., Hangeul] would impose upon itself, by its own will, the study of Chinese hieroglyphics, and consider with such a profound disdain, its [own] national language.... The lettered men of the country do not like [Hangeul] and pretend not to know how to read books in Korean characters. They say that they find in them no taste, and that they leave them to children[...]. (Piacentini 1890: 322) (translation from French original by DJS)	IDE, SCR, LAN, ISM, ELI, PEO
p. 64	Despite what foreigners might have thought about the Koreans’ apparent “disdain” for the indigenous script, the earliest arrivals among them had no choice but to work either with (or around) Chinese, as it was the chief medium through which they were first able to evangelize using literature. Save for limited copies of Hangeul-only New Testament portions prepared by Scottish missionary John Ross in the late 1870s, there were no Korean-based written materials with which to advance the mission.	SCR, NCE, REL
p. 64	We have no Bible yet in Korean, but every educated Korean understands Chinese and so we use the Chinese Scriptures. It is very peculiar. They see the Chinese character and understand it but they do not pronounce it as a Chinaman would. They pronounce the Korean word for the [...] same thing. As a result every one hearing, whether educated or not, can understand what is read, though perhaps they could not read it themselves. Is not this peculiarity of the nation one of God’s ways of introducing truth into this land?	REL, IDE

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the reevaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 192, 57-74.

<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 65	Again, several themes emerge: the primacy of Chinese in defining “literacy”; the central role of education in defining which Koreans could serve as intermediaries between the text and the people; and the potential stigma of using the indigenous script for mission work, a fact that discouraged many missionaries. As Fenwick (1911: 80) notes, “As no one is considered a scholar in Korea unless familiar with the Chinese language, I was glad to find that Mr. Son had a good education”	LIT, EDU, POW, REL, ELI
p. 65	On the one hand, effective evangelization required a means of producing literature (especially scripture translations) that would be accessible to the majority of Koreans: Hangeul. On the other hand, Korea’s centuries-long cultural domination by China dictated that any literature worthy of serious consideration would (or “should”) be rendered in the high prestige script: Hanja.	REL, LIT, ISM, SCR, STA
p. 65	Given that success would come only by filling this empty cell, the missionaries were confronted with two options: either increase the accessibility of Hanja (e.g., through educational efforts, beginning with themselves) or increase the prestige of Hangeul (e.g., through the contemporary equivalent of a “public relations campaign”). In light of the difficulties inherent in learning thousands of Chinese characters, the choice was clear: despite its association with less prestigious users and unsavory literary genres, Hangeul had to be promoted as a credible medium for serious literature, including scripture.	EDU, STA

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the reevaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. <i>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</i> , 192, 57-74.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 66	In addition to its relative ease of acquisition, Hangeul had advantages over Hanja because of its adaptability to the rendering of non-Korean terms. As Congregationalist minister William E. Griffis (1885:155) writes, [Hangeul] “is chiefly for the unlearned. It is, however, beautifully phonetic, and hence can be easily used to note down foreign names and words.”	KNO, SCR
p. 66	Such arguments in favor of having missionaries actively promote the wider use of Hangeul and, by extension, alleviate the stigma associated with its use in a broader range of contexts, ultimately presented themselves in unabashedly spiritual terms. Canadian missionary James Gale (1909: 137–138) attributed the resurrection of Hangeul to divine providence:	REL, POW
p. 66	Korea’s native script ... has come quietly down the dusty ages, waiting for, who knew what? Never used, it was looked on with contempt as being so easy. Why yes, even women could learn it in a month or little more; of what use could such a cheap script be? By one of those mysterious providences it was made ready and kept waiting for the New Testament and other Christian literature. Up to this day these have had almost exclusive use of this wonderfully simple language. This perhaps is the most remarkable providence of all, this language sleeping its long sleep of four hundred years, waiting till the hour should strike on the clock, that it might rise and tell of all Christ’s wondrous works. They call it Un-mun, the “dirty language,” because it is so simple and easy as compared with proud Chinese picture writing. God surely loves the humble things of life.	SCR, POW
p. 66	The affectation of Gale’s rhetoric notwithstanding, the parallels that he draws between the risen Christ and a re-invigorated Hangeul speak to yet another emergent theme: the indigenization of Christianity in the Korean context. While Christianity was greeted as foreign element in late nineteenth-century Korean society, it was not long before church leaders were able to point to an authentically Korean version of the faith.	REL, IDE, KNO

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the reevaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. <i>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</i> , 192, 57-74.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 67	The cause, however, would have to commence with a concerted effort to promote Hangeul literacy among the Korean people, a campaign that took several forms. First and foremost were direct educational endeavors. In addition to planting churches and establishing medical facilities (D.Clark 1986: 8), Protestant missionaries founded schools for not only boys, but also girls (an innovation to Korea), several of which survive today as some of Korea’s leading universities, including Yonsei University and Ehwa Womans University. Given Korea’s long-established belief that education was to be equated with the learning of Chinese classical literature (hanmun), however, the missionaries had to develop a recruitment strategy that not only conformed to local cultural norms but also “secure[d] the foundation for the provision of universal education encompassing pupils from a broader stratum of society” (Hong 1973: 162).	LIT, EDU, ISM, KNO
p. 68	Educational efforts were not limited to children; they extended to adults in the community, seeking to bring literacy to as large an audience as possible. In many letters and reports, one finds mention of women’s groups being established by female missionaries, with the multiple purposes of teaching Korean women modern hygiene, basic catechism, and Hangeul literacy.	EDU, LIT, IDE, SCR
p. 68	Grass-roots educational efforts presumably raised the number of literate people in Korea, and democratically so: the capacity to read and write in Hangeul was proffered as a benefit to associating with the Christian missionaries, regardless of one’s social status.	EDU, LIT, SCR, REL

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the revaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. <i>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</i> , 192, 57-74.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 68	Having established themselves as educators and publishers, missionary leaders eventually found themselves in a position to become engaged in questions of language use and policy, particularly with regard to how they would present their evangelistic materials. For example, efforts to establish a common translation of scripture began in February 1887, when a joint committee for translating the Bible into Korean was formed by missionaries. The work of the committee ultimately culminated in the eventual publication of the first widely accepted Korean Bible in 1900, a document printed exclusively in the vernacular script.	EDU, REL, LPL
p. 69	Dr. Moffett brought up the question of the use of the Unmoon (National alphabet characters) in all Church literature instead of the Mixed Chinese and Unmoon or the pure Chinese characters, and he asked a vote on the matter. Teacher Kim Pil Soo spoke in favor of the pure Unmoon. Yang Chun Paik, Saw Kyung Jo Elders, and Helper Han Suk Jin spoke against it. Elder Pang Keui Chang and Helper Kim Heung Kyung opposed any formal decision being taken on the matter.	REL, SCR, IDE
p. 69	Although discussions of script and language issues at such meetings are overwhelmed by administrative matters (e.g., mission funding, property acquisition, medical concerns), they are noteworthy as they present evidence of active engagement in linguistic issues. While missionary involvement in matters of language and literacy is not unique to the Korean context, most striking is the commitment to a script that was not devised by the missionaries themselves, but rather, was extant in the community. The result was a synergistic development of an unequivocally local cultural asset by foreign stakeholders, leading ultimately to a more favorable revaluing of the indigenous resource by the indigenous people.	LAN, SCR, IDE

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the revaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. <i>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</i> , 192, 57-74.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
pp. 69-70	Missionary efforts to work squarely within the Korean cultural context by promoting more universal literacy in the nation's vernacular script all contributed not only to the remarkably rapid spread of Christianity in Korea (where today, Christians are arguably in the majority), but also led to the repositioning of Hangeul as a legitimate means of written expression in a broader range of functional domains. It would be too easy, however, to attribute this success solely to the work of the missionaries, as Brown (1936: 445–446) mistakenly does when he writes:... a dialect called Un-mun, or En-mun, consisting of twenty-five characters ...was regarded with contempt until the missionaries, finding that it was better adapted to their purpose than the cumbersome Chinese characters and more easily taught to the illiterate people, used it in the translation of the New Testament and in books, tracts, grammars and dictionaries.	REL, IDE, SCR, POW, LIT, NCE
p. 70	What Brown fails to acknowledge was the birth and growth of a nationalistic movement in Korea, which emerged out of Korea's new-found independence from Chinese imperial dominance, and persisted throughout Korea's half-century of political domination by the Japanese (1905–1945). During this time, Korean patriots sought to forge a clear national identity, one distinct from that of its former political sovereign, China, and its eventual political sovereign, Japan. The founding of non-missionary Korean universities (e.g., Korea University, originally established as Bosung College in 1905), along with the establishment of the <i>Tongnip Hyeophoe</i> 'Independence Club' and the publication of the nation's first Hangeul newspaper in 1896, the <i>Tongnip Shinmun</i> 'The Independent', were all evidence of a growing sense of national pride and confidence.	NAT, ISM, POW, IDE, SCR

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the reevaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. <i>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</i> , 192, 57-74.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
pp. 70-71	There is debate regarding the degree to which Korea's indigenous nationalism movement should be viewed as independent of the arrival of Christianity. There is no doubt, however, as to a clear connection. Grayson (1985: 112) explains how "Christians took a lead in the establishment of ... schools which became the first link in the chain which bound together Korean nationalism and the new religion." Kang (1997: 30) specifically attributes the Nevius method as having directly influenced Korean patriotism: "The emphasis on <i>self</i> -support and <i>self</i> -government aroused the Korean spirit of independence long repressed under the influence of Confucian thought" (italics in the original). As a result of these efforts, Korean Christians — many of whom were educated in mission schools— figured prominently in the 1919 independence movement (D. Clark 1986: 8–10). Even <i>The Independent</i> , with its nationalistic Hangeul-only policy when printing Korean, was more than a vehicle for informing the Korean people of domestic and international events. As Wells (1990: 57) points out, the publication's tone was Christian, and several leading articles dealt with allegedly harmful socio-economic effects of Shamanism." Christianity and nationalism were indisputably intertwined.	ISM, REL, KNO, EDU, SCR, NCE, ISM
p. 71	Establishing the central premises of his book, <i>New God, New Nation</i> , Wells (1990: 29) argues that grass-roots evangelization precipitated a bottom-up spread of Christianity in Korea, thereby fostering authentic ownership of the faith: "The cumulative effect ... was to enable Protestantism to take root among the rural commoners and merchant class before noticeable interest arose in urban centres and among the higher classes." In doing so, missionaries set important precedents for education and literacy in modern Korea, which were then embraced by new Korean converts. The result was the establishment of a Christian presence that, by the early twentieth century, was already discernibly Korean, having been presented to the Korean people in the uniquely Korean script, Hangeul.	REL, IDE, PEO, ELI, LIT, EDU, SCR

QRS Data for Silva, D. (2008). Missionary contributions toward the reevaluation of Hangeul in late nineteenth-century Korea. <i>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</i> , 192, 57-74.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 71	The promotion of Hangeul by Christian missionaries as a means of fostering universal literacy was but a practical component of a larger effort to democratize and westernize Korea's social, political, and educational institutions, thereby replacing the kingdom's traditional Confucian frame-work with a more democratic, ostensibly Christian-based system.	SCR, REL, LIT, POL, EDU, KNO
p. 71	In this light, what we witness here is perhaps not so much a matter of "script choice" in a traditional sense, but rather, the demise of digraphia in the Korean context: the ultimate destigmatization of Hangeul neutralized the prestige imbalance precipitated by the promulgation of the new writing system in 1446, allowing the matter of accessibility to come to the fore. While Chinese characters continue to play a role in the intellectual life of many Koreans (at least in the Republic of Korea), the use of Hanja has been increasingly marginalized, typically relegated to academic and ceremonial domains.	SCR, POW, AUT, ELI, PEO
pp. 71-72	It is perhaps ironic that King Sejong's desire to provide his subjects with an authentic, indigenous "voice" in the written medium would eventually realize itself (in part) through the efforts of outsiders. The timing of this positive reevaluation of Hangeul during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was fortuitous, indeed, as the encroachment of exogenous regional powers — Russia, China, and most critically, Japan — would require the Korean people to fight hard to retain their political sovereignty and cultural identity. In this struggle, language and script proved valuable defenses. As Jeong (2004: 237) argues, "the Korean language functions as a statement of independence, a memorial of both oppression and liberation." Although Korea lost her political independence for 35 years (1910–1945), she never completely lost her voice in the face of Japanese oppression, thanks in part to the embracing of Hangeul as a fully legitimate vehicle for personal expression, national identity, and cultural survival.	AUT, NCE, PEO, SCR, POW, POL, IDE, LAN, ISM

Appendix 3. QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015)

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. <i>Language Policy</i> , 335-355.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 338	The investigation in the current paper utilizes the lens of language policing to discuss how institutionalized language regulation has worked at state level and to explore how individuals resist this regulation in an online milieu by employing digital communication tools 80 years after the fact.	LPL, PEO
p. 338	When the RoT was founded in Asia Minor in 1923, after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the War of Independence, the identity of the infant nation state was principally structured around the goals of secularization, nationalization, modernization, and westernization determined by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, its first president. These goals fueled Turkish language reform, comprised of the adoption of the Latin alphabet and the purging of the language of Ottoman variants. Therefore, as with most cases of language reform, the reform was sociopolitical in nature, not solely linguistic or cultural, and its impact would “color the speech and literature of succeeding generations” (Perry 1985:295).	IDE, ISM, NAT, AUT, SCR, LAN, NCE
p. 338	The other argument behind the Kemalists’ determination for alphabet revolution was not explicitly voiced, but was at the top of their political agenda. They purposefully aimed to “cut the umbilical cord” (Perry 1985:306) linking the infant nation with the religious and cultural heritage of the Ottoman Empire, through the abolition of the Arabic script as well as other social and institutional reforms, so that the newly established nation state could readily become part of occidental culture (Tachau 1964).	POL, IDE

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. <i>Language Policy</i> , 335-355.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 339	As an acute consequence of the alphabet revolution, “At a stroke, even the literate people were cut off from their past. Overnight, virtually the entire nation was made illiterate” (Ahmad 1993:80). This situation entailed comprehensive nationwide educational mobilization campaigns to teach literacy to citizens of all age groups in the newly adopted alphabet. The establishment of “National Schools” was a significant part of these mobilization efforts, playing a crucial role in increasing the literacy rate. Moreover, Ataturk called the Turkish intelligentsia to action by asking them to “teach the new Turkish alphabet to every citizen,...take this as [their] patriotic and national duty...It is time...to eradicate root and branch of the errors of the past.” Thanks to this nationwide literacy campaigns, the literacy rate steeply “rose from around 8 % in 1928 to over 20 % in 1935” (Ahmad 1993:82).	REV, LIT, EDU, ELI, NCE
p. 339	Orthographical change constituted the basis for the subsequent major phase of language reform in modern Turkey. This reform was mostly orchestrated by the Turkish Language Society (Turk Dil Kurumu or TDK), established with Ataturk’s leadership in 1932, and became the prominent institution leading “deliberate linguistic engineering” (Perry 1985).	LAN, LPL
p. 339	After a change of the ruling party at the beginning of the multiparty era post World War II, the official power and status that the Society enjoyed during the presidency of Ataturk and Inonu was abolished and all governmental financial support was cut off. The subsequent ruling parties were mostly moderate regarding the ongoing construction of the national language compared to the earlier dominant “truculent purism” (Perry 1985:302).	GOV, POL, POW, LAN
P. 340	Although it was not always explicitly stated, the engineers of the nation state had the intention of breaking the cultural connection with the Ottoman past. Their efforts were institutionalized in language policing practices, with their ultimate goals relating to the generation of a new linguistic order in Turkish, both in alphabet and lexicon, the policing of linguistic conduct in the	LPL, IDE, LIT

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. *Language Policy*, 335-355.

<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
	country through law enforcement, literacy campaigns, and the publication of dictionaries.	
p. 340	This linguistic legitimacy and normativity was enforced through the entire body of state institutions. However, such policies encountered resistance from certain sectors of the public, especially those ascribing to conservative and religious ideologies. As a result, there was a growing gap between the language of the common people and that of the elite, as neologisms were usually embraced by leftists who were generally educated intellectuals, while conservative and religious people resisted the use of neologisms (Dogançay 1995). Word choice thereby indicated the political ideology of the speaker (i.e. leaning towards Arabic and Persian-origin words vs. ‘pure’ Turkish neologisms) (Cüceloglu and Slobin 1980). Today, the linguistic landscape of Turkey still bears witness to a similar resistance to lexical purification and alphabet change (i.e. MT in Latin script vs. OT in Arabic script).	LPL, ISM, LAN, PEO, ELI
p. 340	OT does not enjoy any official role or status in governmental or legal spheres in present-day Turkey. However, this fact has not impeded the growing momentum of the language, especially in the last decade or so, under the Justice and Development Party (AK Parti) administration, which is often characterized as a bastion of neo-Ottomanism.	GOV, LAN, POL

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. <i>Language Policy</i> , 335-355.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 340	Specifically, beginning in the 2013–2014 academic year, OT has become a compulsory course for Social Studies High Schools and an elective course in other types of high schools. These efforts were extended by the establishment of OT courses open to the public and a magazine entitled “Ottoman Turkish” initiated by the <i>Hayrat Vakfı</i> (Charity Foundation) and the General Directorate of Lifelong Learning of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE). Within 6 months, more than 30,000 people from various backgrounds joined these language courses to learn OT in over 900 public education centers (Ongur 2014). The curricular integration of OT was supported by the current chairman of the Turkish Language Society, Dr. Mustafa Sinan Kaçalın, who argued that just like Latin in the Western world, it is essential for the Turkish youth to be equipped with OT in order to maintain Turkish and the ability to think in Turkish (“TDK Başkanı” 2013).	EDU, IDE, LAN
p. 342	However, Lenihan (2011:50) emphasizes that Facebook should not be considered only as a locus or channel of communication through which users simply present or mis-present knowledge because, “like many other new media, it allows knowledge to be presented from many sources, and then ignored and/or negotiated.” Facebook users, functioning as “intertextual operators” (Androutsopolous 2010), collect, manipulate, play with, and present multimodal and multimedia sources from various online environments in their Facebook interactions with varying motives.	KNO, IDE
p. 342	DuBois defines stance as “a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subject (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field” (cited in Jones et al. 2011:40). Facebook can be regarded as stance-rich, to the extent that it offers virtual contexts in which individuals can (re)construct textual and pictorial “representations of identity, taste, affiliation, and membership for others to respond to” (Jones et al. 2011:40).	NCE, IDE

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. <i>Language Policy</i> , 335-355.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 342	Like many other digital technologies, Facebook has an inherent ideological aspect: “both in terms of [its] political economies of access and control, and also in terms of [its] potential as mechanisms or resources for both normative and resistive representation” (Thurlow and Mroczek 2011:xxvi–xxvii). The spaces evolving through digital technologies represent the arenas where divergent language ideologies crisscross and influence language practices along with personal and commercial concerns (Lenihan 2011). Furthermore, compared to traditional media, whose language policies and styleguides are often overtly stated and detailed, new media like Facebook are far from being top–down in terms of their impact (Lenihan 2011).	ISM, POL, LAN
p. 342	Apart from the ideology-laden online milieu, talking about language is ideological in essence, no matter who does the talking. (Thurlow and Mroczek 2011:xxvii) maintain that “Whether it is done by academics, journalists, teachers, or ‘non-experts,’ talk about language always exposes the vagaries of the symbolic marketplace: competing standards of ‘correct,’ ‘good,’ or ‘normal’ language; debates about literacy and occupational training; the social categorization and disciplining of speakers; and performative construction of language itself.”	ISM, LAN, LIT, EDU, IDE
p. 342	Virtual ethnography or netnography refers to a qualitative research methodology that adopts and adapts traditional ethnographic procedures to explore online spaces where cultural artifacts are produced and identities are (re)negotiated and (re)constructed through social interaction. Essentially relying on “the observation of textual discourse” (Kozinets 2002:64), this methodology affords researchers a lens “to develop an enriched sense of the meanings of the technology and the cultures which enable it and are enabled by it” (Hine 2000:8). The outcome of a netnographic inquiry is a “written account resulting from fieldwork studying the cultures and communities that emerge from on-line, computer mediated, or Internet-based communications” (Kozinets 2002:62).	IDE, KNO

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. <i>Language Policy</i> , 335-355.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 345	Some group names merit particular attention. For instance, the name of group 2 underscores the linguistic disconnect between ancestors and their descendants (“Ancestors’ language that descendants don’t know”). In the name of group 5, the use of two adjectives considerably contributes to the message: “our” and “ageless.” In using the possessive adjective, creators of the page convey that they still have the right to claim ownership of this language, although it is not the alphabet in use in the RoT anymore. Describing OT with the adjective of “ageless” might be considered a reaction to those who believe it is old and obsolete. This consideration relies on the fact that OT script is usually referred to as “old Turkish” in public.	IDE, LAN, STA, NCE
pp. 345-346	Moreover, the phrase in the name of group 6, “genuine Turkish (OT) words” is quite telling, in terms of understanding the administrator(s)’ stance regarding genuineness in the language and the lexical purification campaigns in Turkey. Additionally, the use of brackets in this phrase is quite strategic. “OT” in brackets follows “genuine Turkish,” which implies the administrator(s)’ reaction to the lexical purification discourse which positioned pre-Islamic words or those derived from known Turkish roots as genuine and those commonly used in Ottoman times as the opposite, i.e. false or questionable. Lastly, the words “ecdad” (ancestors) and “evlad” (descendants) in the name of group 2 are intentionally spelled differently than they would be in MT. These are Arabic loanwords and the spelling in the group name reflects the original phoneme and character correspondence. However, because of the phonological characteristics of Turkish, the /d/ sound at the end of these words is turned into a /t/ sound in actual pronunciation. That is why, in MT dictionaries, these words are spelled as “ecdat” and “evlat.” This divergence from MT and convergence with original Arabic pronunciation might be viewed as a strategic attempt to produce linguistic order in this sense.	NCE, LAN, POW LAN

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. *Language Policy*, 335-355.

<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 346	The rest of the written and pictorial data gathered in the analysis pool were derived from: (a) conversations about the use of OT, (b) users' comments on the orthographic revolution in Turkey, (c) their comments as a response to the visual postings, images of texts in the OT alphabet and its rules, (d) newspaper articles shared and commented on, (e) photos of important religious or historical figures with their quotes captioned in OT letters, (f) photos of prominent historians with captions in MT, (g) photos of nature or babies with a caption (morning and night greetings) in OT letters, (h) comics originally published in MT that are posted with Ottoman script, and (i) videos of historians discussing the orthographic revolution.	LAN, SCR, EDU, ISM
p. 346	When these textual and visual artifacts were scrutinized through the lens of language policing, three major themes emerged: (1) instructional support and practice to help members acquire literacy skills in OT, (2) ideological conviction that OT is an essential component of Turkish people's cultural repertoire, and (3) reaching out to macro language policing in an educational context at the national level. This section will proceed with the discussion of these themes with examples from the focal Facebook group pages.	EDU, LAN, ISM, IDE, LPL
p. 347	The participants in these online communities communicate through postings not only to ask other users in the group for assistance in decoding or transcribing a text in OT but also to provide help for members. This interaction for learning purposes largely occurs in three ways: (a) explaining rules of decoding and writing, and defining lexical items, (b) providing texts authentically produced in Ottoman times, and (c) trying to integrate OT into participants' daily life.	LAN, EDU, IDE
p. 348	All these examples clearly demonstrate the members' conscious efforts towards promoting instructional practices in OT literacy. Figure 4 is particularly interesting, as it aims to tether OT literacy to members' English language learning processes. Going beyond the users' presumed first language in this way represents a creative means of language policing.	EDU, LAN

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. <i>Language Policy</i> , 335-355.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 348	Moreover, through administrator(s)' efforts, and the questions of those who need help in decoding a text or part of it, participants are exposed to authentic written texts produced before the orthographic revolution. This exposure is conducive to the creation of an environment that gives users the opportunity to try out their emerging literacy skills. This also creates an environment in which the benchmark of achievement or expertise is to decode these authentic texts. Successful "decoders" are congratulated by group administrators and hailed as experts by other members.	ORT, LIT, IDE
p. 350	Figures 6 and 7, both published by groups 2, 3, and 5, are simple yet powerful examples of integrating OT into members' daily lives, which is often regulated and maintained through MT. In both cases, the crux of the messages conveyed through linguistic elements is encoded in OT and thereby create an immediate need for the reader to decode them.	IDE, EDU, KNO, LAN
p. 350	The strategic use of ideologically convincing rationales is another major theme running through the written and visual postings included in the analysis. Participants in the seven online groups shared many postings highlighting the importance of becoming literate in OT. These sorts of postings mainly include quotes from prominent Turkish historians, comparisons with other nations that did not change their writing system despite their transition from one political system to another, and news articles unpacking the impacts of the language revolution and users' comments on them.	ISM, LIT, LAN, IDE, ORT, POL, REV
p. 350	The headline says: "Everyone in this country should be able to read and write in OT," which is the newspaper editor's interpretation of his talk at a university in Turkey. The other sentence below the headline reads: "Prof. Dr. Ilber Ortaylı stated that recent history needs to be interpreted well enough in order to produce national and international policies."	LIT, LAN, IDE, LPL

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. *Language Policy*, 335-355.

<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 351	The news article, which was not posted on the page, included his exact quote, which highlights the significance of having a true interpretation of recent history. As quoted in the article, he notes in his talk that this interpretation can be possible only with OT literacy because history should be researched by reading the original sources. While such news articles may not be regarded as examples of Facebook-specific data, their reproduction on Facebook performs several important functions— (1) giving access to relevant materials (which members might otherwise not be aware of) and (2) providing opportunities for language policing manifested at the levels of consciousness-raising and discussion.	IDE, LIT, LAN, POW
p. 351	Moreover, some postings compare Turkey with other nations to demonstrate opposition to the orthographic revolution in Turkey and to rationalize the necessity of acquiring literacy in OT. For this comparison, countries are carefully selected to make sure that certain key historical features are similar to those of Turkey, with a specific focus on Japan and Great Britain. The message in such comparisons is the following: these countries have used the same writing system both before and after undergoing political change and are still among the most developed countries, although they went through a transition from an empire to their current political system, like the RoT. This comparison implies that the alphabet change in the RoT was not a prerequisite for becoming a developed nation state. The following statement was published in groups 2 and 4: “today the Japanese and the British can read their ancestors’ literary works produced hundreds of years ago, explore their culture, and preserve their cultural bonds with the past, yet the Turkish youth cannot.” The emphasis is on the cultural disconnect between the people of modern Turkey and their Ottoman ancestors and the language revolution is presented as being to blame for this cultural chasm.	ORT, LIT, LAN, POL, ISM, IDE

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. <i>Language Policy</i> , 335-355.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 351	Finally, ideological conviction is substantiated by discussions of newspaper articles stressing the significance of OT literacy for rebuilding ties with Ottoman culture. For example, a newspaper article published in Zaman by Mustafa Armagan, a writer and historian, triggered a heated debate among group 2 members regarding the consequences of orthographic revolution in Turkey. The article itself questions whether this revolution was really necessary for modernization in Turkey, and whether it was able to fulfill its goals at the time and in the long run. The author explicitly contends that the OT alphabet was not a hindrance to the development of Turkey, and the actual goal was to become closer to the Occident by abandoning Oriental and Islamic culture. This article received a lot of comments by group 2 members, especially from those who completely agreed with the author and those who demonstrated stark opposition to his ideas.	ISM, LIT, LAN, IDE
pp. 351-352	How many of you can read and comprehend Mustafa Kemal's book named The Speech in its original text? Many words used in this book no longer exist... We took most of them out, leading to the deficiency of our language... We didn't think about it. What's more, we granted superiority to those who committed this murder. We commended them because they modernized the language (My translation).	LIT, NCE, ISM
p. 352	This member directs attention to the revolutionary change in the lexis by referring to the nation's founding leader's book and notes that Turkish people cannot fully understand what was written by their iconic leader who actually spearheaded this lexical change. He also implies that purification or modernization of the language led to the demise of very many words.	NCE, REV, LAN, ISM

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. *Language Policy*, 335-355.

<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 352	We are the only nation who cannot read what is written on our ancestors' gravestones. I'm talking to those who are dogmatizing; if you don't know OT, it means history started a century ago for you. Before that, history is prehistory for you! (My translation). This comment implies that illiteracy in OT equates to a complete disconnect from the past. Therefore, it might sound ideologically convincing to those who wish to maintain their connection with their past.	ISM, LIT, LAN, IDE
p. 352	Their postings show users' concerns about the perceived necessity of having an impact on macro changes at the national level through their micro-level efforts on Facebook. During the time of these postings, the MoNE was cognizant of the growing demand for learning OT and was making preparations to sign a protocol with <i>Hayrat Vakfi</i> which was going to provide staffing and material support for such a project (Ongur 2014). The main purpose of this collaboration is to educate individuals who can maximally benefit from understanding the artifacts written in OT and can bring these into cultural life, as well as training teachers of OT. The electronic brochures of this government initiative were also posted on the focal group pages to inform members of this service and encourage them to attend the courses offered.	POW, PEO, LIT, LAN, EDU
p. 352	Through these postings, the Facebook groups seem to impact upon their membership in two ways: (1) they encourage the individual users to imagine themselves as part of a community forged in participation with like-minded people, who feel empowered to make an impact on a macro language policing practice; (2) they emphasize that their cause is shared by policy actors at national level, which presumably makes them feel more powerful. Thereby, the groups connect Facebook-based micro language policing with the OT initiative by the current government which seems to be holding the same ideological stance about OT.	IDE, POW, PEO, LPL, LAN, NCE

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. <i>Language Policy</i> , 335-355.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 353	These practices were made possible through the relatively continual process of convincing participants that only through OT literacy will they be able to remedy the cultural disconnect with their ancestors. Thereby, the online communities in question justify their cause and fuel their instructional activities. As their purpose is to reinvigorate OT both in its writing system and lexis, this justification represents a reaction or resistance to the pervasive language reform executed in the 1930s.	LIT, LAN, IDE, EDU
p. 353	Their counter-policing articulates the necessity to reintegrate OT literacy in a Turkish cultural base and to bridge the cultural chasm between modern Turkey and the Ottoman Empire.	LIT, LAN, IDE
p. 353	The interplay between multiple political discourses deeply rooted in the sociohistorical background of Turkish society deserves significant attention within the scope of the current study. First of all, the Ottoman Empire--a major actor of world politics controlling not only three different continents for over six centuries but also leading Islam by serving as the home to the Caliphate until 1920s; second, the RoT--a nation-building project based on the pillars of Westernization, secularism, and democracy until 2000s; finally, the AK Party administration operating under neo-Ottomanism, recognizing and promoting Muslim subjectivity, pan-Islamism, and the geostrategic positioning of the country for the purposes of wider influence in the Balkans, Caucasus and Middle East. The counter-policing acts shared in the present study closely interact with each of these discourses: they go hand-in-hand with neo-Ottomanism in the form of counter-policing acts serving as a form of resistance against the institutionalized language policies maintained by the RoT.	GOV, ISM, IDE, LAN
p. 353	Efforts to integrate OT into group members' normative language use are greatly supported by the creative ways of modifying certain visuals that members may have come across originally in MT. The use of OT script in comics, Sudoku, shopping lists and daily greetings stands out as a creative way of appropriating and manipulating multimodal resources, making these resources suitable for the cause of the groups.	LAN, SCR

QRS Data for Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish on Facebook. <i>Language Policy</i> , 335-355.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 353	Collecting, manipulating, and sharing artifacts on Facebook group pages, the actors of language policing not only contribute to the regulatory practices of language use, but also negotiate their cultural and linguistic identities.	LAN, IDE
p. 354	Online milieus afford these actors previously unavailable mechanisms to freely voice their resistance towards a language revolution and advocate for its reversion through grassroots efforts. This resistance and advocacy usually involves (re)construction of textual and visual representations of memberships and identities to be responded to by other participants (Jones et al. 2011). Therefore, concomitantly with their language policing practices, members of these online communities become involved in continuous identity articulation, negotiation, and formation through their interactions with other community members.	REV, LAN, NCE, IDE
p. 354	As part of the construction of a nation-state, the RoT went through a language reform which was comprised of (a) the supplanting of Arabic script with Latin letters adjusted for Turkish phonology and (b) the replacement of Arabic and Persian loanwords with words either derived from known Turkish roots or found in pre-Islamic Turkish texts. Since its inception, this top-down policy has been resisted by certain sections of the population, generally conservative and religious groups yearning for the maintenance of Ottoman culture. With the advent of the Internet and SNSs like Facebook, this resistance has found a new platform rife with novel communication tools, although it is practiced only by a select group of people.	NAT, LAN, PEO, IDE
p. 354	The findings reveal that the postings are usually used to convince group members that they need OT to secure ties to and reconnect with their ancestors' cultural heritage, to provide them with instructional support and practice opportunities, and to reach out to or align members of the group with macro language policing practices.	LIT, LAN, IDE, EDU

Appendix 4. QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzümlü, M. (2016)

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzümlü, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 2	Whereas supporters applauded this decision mostly because they believe that it will help new generations to reconnect with their Ottoman cultural heritage, it received considerable disapproval and criticism (even condemnation) from the opposition, largely because they believe it is useless for children's modern education and it is part of the ruling Justice and Development Party's agenda to reverse Atatürk's language reform.	IDE, POW
p. 2	We conceive the construction and maintenance of religious and national identities (particularly their intersection in the case of Turkey) as a powerful influence that shapes the discussions as well as decisions about language education. We approach language policy as a contested arena in which opposing ideologies exercise their voice, and power manifests at the macro and micro levels of language policies and planning.	REL, NAT, EDU, LAN, LPL, POW
p. 2	First, making Ottoman Turkish a high school course is one of the significant manifestations of the national identity reconstruction endeavors of the ruling political party with neo-Ottomanist nostalgia and ideals. Second, this language policy represents the ideological construction of the introduction of Ottoman Turkish as a course, through which Mr Erdoğan and the ruling party exert their power, and practice covert discursive control, to reinforce their supporters' adherence.	IDE, NAT, ISM, POW

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 4	As part of its nation-building endeavors after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the emergent Republic of Turkey implemented a language reform that is often referred to in the recent discourses of Ottoman Turkish in today's Turkey. This reform was intended to contribute to the construction of Turkishness, which largely entailed renouncing the Ottoman legacy. Comprising the two phases of orthographic revolution and lexical purification, the Turkish Language Reform replaced the Arabic script with the Latin one and purged Turkish of the Arabic and Persian lexical and syntactical elements.	NAT, LAN, IDE, ORT, COR
p. 4	The former [conservatives] were against the reform in the writing system, because they believed that “the adoption of Latin letters ... would lead to utter confusion and eventual loss of contact with a great and holy religious and historical literary tradition” (Tachau, 1964, p. 194). On the other hand, the reformist followers of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of Kemalist ideology, argued that the terribly low literacy rate was because of the Arabic script which had been in use for a long time and needed to undergo fundamental renovations (Lewis, 1999). They also stressed the incompatibility between Arabic letters and Turkish phonology and asserted that Arabic consonants and vowels were not capable of representing the Turkish sounds in written texts. However, the unspoken reason behind this reform was at the epicenter of Turkish nation-building project and complementary to the other social and institutional reforms. That is, as their implicit ideological and political goal, the Kemalist reformists intended to “cut the umbilical cord” (Perry, 1985, p. 306) of the young nation with the Ottoman heritage to facilitate the integration of the newly established nation-state into the occidental world (Doğançay-Aktuna, 1995, 2004).	REL, KNO, LIT, NAT, ISM, POL

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 5	<p>From the moment Atatürk and his supporters in the parliament started the conversations about the necessity of a language reform, there have always been groups displaying criticism, opposition, and resistance who are against the fundamental and revolutionary reforms in the Turkish language. Although these groups are fairly diverse in terms of the reasons of their opposition, a good number of critics have directed attention to the sociocultural consequences of this reform, that is, the disconnection from the Ottoman-Islamic culture. They believed the educational and linguistic rationales were pretexts to actually “obliterate all signs that reminded one of the republic’s Islamic, oriental and multi-ethnic predecessor” for the purpose of constructing a Westernized, secular, and modern nation-state for Turks (Aytürk, 2008, p. 13). Sustained through generations, the resentment toward this strategically deliberate construction of cultural discontinuity in Turkey still remains in today’s discourse. Supporters of the integration of Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum believe they can “repair” this discontinuity and reverse the “damage” caused by the orthographic revolution and lexical purification activities. Therefore, political and public conversations about the teaching of Ottoman Turkish include historical references to the Turkish Language Reform, particularly its necessity and consequences.</p>	LAN, IDE, EDU, ORT, POL
p. 5	<p>She examined students’ perceptions of a two-credit mandatory course at Grades 10, 11, and 12 at a Social Sciences High School in Ankara. Empirically drawing from the data gleaned from semi-structured interviews with 35 students, she concluded that the Ottoman Turkish courses needed to be reframed in such a way that students can better comprehend the meaning and purpose of learning Ottoman Turkish and potential benefits for themselves. The findings imply that this mandatory course should be turned into an elective in order to promote positive student attitudes to Ottoman Turkish classes.</p>	IDE, STA

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzümlü, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 5	Another strand of studies examines the current conversations about the teaching of Ottoman Turkish. Those studies revealed that the discussions about Ottoman Turkish in public and political venues end up becoming debates between the two sides of the ideological divide (religious conservative vs. secular republican) in Turkey, and the current government explicitly gravitates toward one side of this divide in its grand project of national identity reconstruction with neo-Ottomanist ideals.	EDU, POL, ISM, IDE, REL
p. 6	Those online communities aim to reconnect their membership with Ottoman-Islamic culture and support the government's macro policies of teaching Ottoman Turkish at high school levels. Also, Altun (2015) examined the discussions through YouTube comments for a video clip about the current policy decision about Ottoman Turkish. He found that those discussions turned into a virtual platform for negotiating "the ideologies, political parties, social groups, religious beliefs and historical characters they represent," rather than the actual policy (p. 42). Providing a macro observation, Ongur (2014) understands the burgeoning interest in the nostalgia for the glorious Ottoman past as part of the national identity reconstruction in Turkey, which reimagines Turkishness as the continuation of Ottoman-Islamic identity and restores the cultural connection supposedly lost during the foundation of the Republic. He situates the government-supported services to supply free Ottoman Turkish courses for the public (through school curricula and beyond) in the scope of this reconstruction project.	STA, EDU, ISM, IDE, REL, GOV

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 6	Even though there is an increasing interest in individuals' receptivity of and agency in language policies at micro levels, initially "the [productive] actors are most likely to be (top-down) politicians, constrained by historical/constitutional circumstances, or else bureaucrats, those involved in education, or religious figures or groups" (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2003, p. 33). Earlier work demonstrates that, driven by dominant ideologies and economic interests and goals, governments' political agendas shape the language policy decisions at macro levels through their discourses of nationalism and globalization (Liddicoat, 2014; Shohamy, 2006; Wright, 2016). Throughout the process of legislation, crafting a policy decision regarding language teaching at the national level necessarily becomes exposed to political discussions. These discussions are the discursive venues in which various ideologies constantly clash or vie with each other and social history plays a significant role in the (re)negotiation of identities (Ricento, 2006). That is largely why Zhao (2011) comments that "language policy and planning also is known as language politics: a human pursuit, subject to all the fallacies and viciousness of social ventures and political campaigns" (p. 917).	LPL, EDU, REL, ISM, GOV, NAT, LAN, POL, IDE
p. 6	To give some illustrative examples from various polities in the world, Chua (2006) discusses how the ideologies (survival, pragmatics, and meritocracy) of the dominant political party determined the language education policies in Singapore through a heavy top-down approach, although there occurred further language planning at micro levels (pp. 216–219). Also, Blommaert (2014) unpacks the ways in which Ujamaa ideology predominantly led the efforts to imagine homogenized Tanzania by building authoritative discourses on Swahili as a politically important language, while "diversification from below" was the sociolinguistic reality (pp. 10–12). Additionally, Liddicoat (2014) describes the sequential shifts of medium of instruction from Malay to English and back to Malay in Malaysia and observes that both language-in-education policy decisions were charged with political and ideological concerns with regard to globalization and nationalism discourses.	ISM, POL, GOV, LPL, AUT, EDU, NAT

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 7	Language policy decisions in South Korea could be another example. Song (2012) explicates the role of politico-ideological proclivities and desires in the orthographic reforms and lexical purification as part of the construction of the Standard South Korean language as well as in the language policies about English in South Korea. Lastly, Kaplan (2011) remarks that the political and ideological conflicts have been impactful on the language planning in the Eastern European and Central Asian countries that had emerged in the wake of the downfall of the Soviet Union and the shift of political borders. In fine, as in all those examples, the national-level decisions are reflective of the dominant ideologies and politics in the governmental actors who hold the power to shape the distribution of state support and resources through the authorization or sanction of policies.	LPL, POL, ORT, ISM, GOV, POW
p. 7	In the policy decision about the teaching of Ottoman Turkish, state stands out as the macro-level institutions that are relevant domains of language management. Spolsky (2009) defines language management as “the explicit and observable effort by someone or some group that has or claims authority over the participants in the domain to modify their practices or beliefs” (p. 4). He argues that states use their power and authority to establish, enforce, and modify language policies which are intended to regulate language practices and beliefs in the nation (Spolsky, 2004). Language-management efforts have been a crucial part of the nation-building projects oriented by the one-nation, one-language ideology that couples nation-state with language and turns the latter into “an identifier of inclusion and exclusion” (Shohamy, 2006, p. 27). Therefore, government-led management efforts to execute a reform plan in “some aspect of a language (usually its writing system, orthography, or lexicon) often serve a political purpose” (Spolsky,2009, p. 167).	LPL, AUT, POW, NAT, ISM, IDE, COR, POL

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzümlü, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 7	The language regulations encompassed in language policy are value-laden manipulations (and impositions) covertly driven by the ideologies of the groups who hold the authority and power (Shohamy, 2006). Those groups exploit “propaganda and ideologies about language loyalty, patriotism, collective identity and the need for ‘correct and pure language’ or ‘native language’ as strategies for continuing their control and holding back the demands of these ‘others’” (p. 46). They use formal education to turn ideology into practice by enforcing language education policies and effecting changes in school curriculum. Thereby, authorities exercise their influence and accomplish their hidden ideological agendas to perpetuate their power.	LPL, ISM, AUT, POW, IDE, EDU
pp. 7-8	Language planning involves an intricate interplay between macro and micro dimensions at different levels of agency because it is not merely “the property of those who hold the institutional power to effect their decisions” (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008, p. 11). Holding their own “personalised policies, goals and strategies” (Chua & Baldauf, 2011, p. 948), the micro-level agents influence how macro-level decisions are implemented in various local sociocultural and educational contexts and this renders language planning an ongoing process situated in the web of local forces. Because of those agents’ powerful role in shaping policy implementation, “No macro-level policy is transmitted directly and unmodified to a local context” (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008, p. 11). Therefore, language policy and planning concomitantly embodies top-down and bottom-up processes that impact each other in a complicated manner (Chua & Baldauf, 2011).	LPL, POW, EDU, ELI, PEO
p. 8	First, the incorporation of Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum is part of the national identity reconstruction efforts stage-managed by the current governing political party. Second, through this language policy, the ruling party has ideologically constructed the teaching of Ottoman Turkish as a key way to reconnect with the Ottoman-Islamic heritage and uses this construction to maintain the discourse and reinforce their supporters’ adherence.	IDE, POL, LPL, ISM, POW

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 8	Spolsky (2004) observes that the search for national identity in the newly independent countries has been a major motivation in the construction of their language policies. In the context of the foundation of the Republic of Turkey, its major architects imagined this young nation as modern, Westernized, and secularized, so the social, economic, linguistic, and educational reforms were all shaped by that imagination, which resulted in the loss of connection with the Ottoman cultural heritage. The Turkish Language Reform was part of this nation-state-building process which required conscientious methods of national identity formation in many spheres of society (Aslan, 2007; Aytürk, 2004,2008). Like in most of the other reforms then, there was substantial opposition to the Romanization of alphabet and purification of lexis in Turkish from the very beginning.	IDE, NAT, LPL, EDU, LAN, SCR
p. 8	The reform was intended to eliminate the well-entrenched Arabic and Persian linguistic elements adopted in the construction of the Ottoman-Islamic culture, and the religious-conservative community viewed this intention as a threat for their values, beliefs, and identities. This attests to Spolsky's (2004) argument that language planning efforts might contradict the beliefs, values, and the actual language use in the community.	LAN, IDE, REL, LPL
pp. 8-9	In the case of Turkey, the TLI and MoNE were strategically used as language-management agencies by the Republican People's Party, the single ruling party in the first two decades of the Republic, which prioritized the implementation of the language reform in the government's agenda. The very goal was to construct a distinctly "Turkish" language in stark opposition to "Ottoman." In Shohamy's (2006) conceptualization, such construction serves as "a powerful symbol and indication of belonging and membership" and a 'determiner of national identity (p. 27). The construction of Turkishness then contributed to the determination of the dominant social and cultural order, which marginalized everything that is Ottoman.	LPL, GOV, LAN, IDE, ISM

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 9	Those who opposed the Turkish Language Reform (in the parliament, intelligentsia, and public) contended that the orthographic revolution and lexical purification were purposefully intended to disconnect the new nation’s cultural and religious ties with the Ottoman heritage by making everyone illiterate overnight (Ahmad, 1993). Considering the ramifications of this reform for the upcoming generations, they were concerned that the emerging nation’s identity involved an utter repudiation of the Ottoman cultural and linguistic elements.	ELI, IDE, REL, LIT, LAN
p. 9	Similar to the way the Turkish Language Reform contributed to the definition and construction of national identity in the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, the current policy of Ottoman Turkish functions as a supporting instrument in the national identity reconstruction. The incorporation of Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum is a small-scale policy as compared to the extensive, fundamental changes led by the Turkish Language Reform. However, the supporters of the current policy argue that making Ottoman Turkish available for students will play a cardinal role in reconnecting with the Ottoman cultural heritage, which was forgotten because of the Turkish Language Reform. In that respect, this state-led policy is apparently an important extension of the project of reimagining the Turkish “self.” Relying on Shohamy’s (2006) view of language policy, we argue that this policy decision embodies the endeavors of the current government to fulfill its agendas of “stating ‘who is in charge,’ creating ‘imagined communities’ and maintaining social and political orders,” which promotes the perpetuation of its power (p. 4). The political authority with power makes language policy decisions in the direction of their desired goals inspired by the reimagining of Turkey as the continuation of the Ottoman Empire.	IDE, LAN, LPL, GOV, POW, POL, AUT, ISM

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 9	This reimagined identity project is guided by the neo-Ottomanist political movement which gained impetus in Turkey in the mid-1980s and has exponentially grown since then (although Ottomanism was always part of the Turkish political arena) (Ongur,2014; Özkural-Köroğlu, 2014; Taşpınar, 2008; Yavuz, 1998). As a major consequence of this movement, “Ottoman-Islamic origins of Turkish nationhood in particular have become more assertive and effective in conditioning and shaping the state’s policies and the society’s perception of ‘self” (Yavuz, 1998, p. 22).	IDE, ISM, GOV
pp. 9-10	Once the Ottoman cultural heritage, selective romanticized recollections of the glorious past, and nostalgic yearning for them have been acknowledged as the norm in the social milieus through “daily routines, printed and visual media, political discourse and public policies,” the society plays a significant role in keeping this norm (Ongur, 2014, p. 10). Becoming literate in Ottoman Turkish is considered as a key to first-hand access to this “idealized” heritage, which is why there has been a tremendous increase in people’s interest to learn Ottoman Turkish and the state-funded courses across the country. It has become a major symbolic marker of collective community membership and identity in the political movement of neo-Ottomanism and it represents the language manipulation for political purposes. Therefore, including Ottoman Turkish as a high school course, the JDP shapes the discourse to maintain and strengthen its political support and to keep its influence on social and educational spheres.	IDE, LIT, POL, ISM, LAN, EDU
p. 10	This remarkable shift in Turkish society is aimed at recovering the disconnection with the Ottoman past which was deliberately “forgotten” in the process of engineering the “young” nation-state in the establishment of the Republic of Turkey. The current reimagining of Turkish identity highlights the continuation between the Ottoman past and the present Turkey, and it belies what Atatürk and his followers envisioned for Turkey as architects of the Republic of Turkey.	IDE

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
pp. 10-11	This is a very powerful comparative illustration of the national identity reconstruction in progress in Turkey. In that illustration, Erdoğan replaces Atatürk, the major architect of the Turkish national identity, whose philosophies (known as Kemalism) shaped the entire set of social, political, economic, and educational reforms during the inception of the “young” nation-state. This replacement represents the reimagination of Turkish identity by the current ruling party, JDP, which is spearheaded by its founding leader, Mr Erdoğan. As the Photoshopped image above demonstrates, the reimagined identity seems to be discursively bolstered and sustained through the symbolic reversal of the Turkish Language Reform. With the sociohistorically constructed meanings associated with this reform, the reintroduction of Ottoman Turkish, once denigrated and marginalized, serves to control the dominant discourse. Thus, through Shohamy’s lens, we view the teaching of Ottoman Turkish as an instrument to direct and manipulate the social and political order and subsumed groups and individuals in the manner desired by those with authority.	IDE, KNO, EDU, SCR, POW, POL, AUT
p. 11	Because of the sociocultural and sociohistorical trajectories of the speech communities (Li& Zhu, 2013), language practices are valorized differently. Therefore, language policies are driven and shaped by the (language) ideologies held by the policy-makers or those with authority and power (Shohamy, 2006; Spolsky, 2009). There are usually inconsistencies between the explicit explanation and reasoning behind language reform and the implicit intentions based on the policy-makers’ ideologies (Shohamy, 2006; Verschueren, 2012). Highlighting their explicit justifications (e.g. potential benefits for language users), policy-makers use government resources (e.g. centralized education system) to implement the language reform and maintain (the normativity of) their ideologies and promote them as the dominant discourse (Shohamy, 2006; Verschueren, 2012). Thus, language policy decisions become discursive ideological constructions. As people with power (Zhao,2011), policy-makers lead and shape those constructions.	LPL, ISM, AUT, POW, LAN

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 11	The reformist policy decisions about the Romanization of alphabet and the attempts to eradicate the Persian and Arabic (lexical and grammatical) elements from Turkish were based on the covert ideological agenda of the single ruling party at that time along with the overtly expressed practical and phonological reasons. This agenda was primarily guided by Kemalism, the official ideology of the Republic of Turkey that relied on Atatürk’s “secularist-nationalist political project” and constituted the foundations of the Republic (Taşpınar, 2008, p. 16). Ideologically driven by their principal goals of secularization and Westernization of the young nation-state, the founders of the Republic of Turkey designed and orchestrated the Turkish language reform (along with other reforms) to ensure the disjointedness from the Islamic culture of the Ottoman Empire.	LPL, SCR, ISM, GOV, LAN
p. 11	It was the Kemalist ideology that received the critique from the opposition in the public, intelligentsia, and parliament that has argued against the Turkish Language Reform. Attending to this veiled ideological agenda, the opposing group accused Atatürk and his followers in the Republican People’s Party of intentionally and strategically distancing and disengaging the Turkish culture from its Ottoman-Islamic roots.	ISM, ELI, GOV
p. 11	The JDP is currently leading a similar ideological construction that centers on the introduction of Ottoman Turkish. Colored by the nostalgia for the Ottoman-Islamic culture and glory in its discourse, the JDP voiced its disapproval of the Turkish Language Reform and blamed the founders of the Republic for deliberately effacing the Ottoman-Islamic culture from the fabric of Turkish society. Propelled by neo-Ottomanist ideals, they assign themselves the responsibility to resuscitate this culture, which is intimately connected to the national identity reconstruction.	ISM, IDE

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 12	While every language in the world borrows words from other languages and this is a completely natural process, there were attempts to purge foreign [Persian and Arabic] words from Turkish ... Unfortunately, those unnatural ideological attempts seriously 'castrated' the Turkish language. They 'blinded' the profound imagination that Turkish used to provide. Most importantly, the operations conducted on Turkish amputated the most vital connection, bridge between today and our history. That is, they eliminated the language unity between generations. They cut our 'carotid artery,' so to speak. (Erdoğan 2013)	
p. 12	Through those metaphors, he depicts the Turkish Language Reform as a “deadly” destructive assault on the Turkish language and its consequences as vital damages to the language. This ideological narrative frames and constructs the introduction of Ottoman Turkish as an essential part of the “recovery” of what was lost after the reform.	LAN
p. 12	Moreover, it is remarkable that Mr Erdoğan chose to share his thoughts about Ottoman Turkish in the opening of the 5th Religion Council meeting held from 8 to 11 December 2014. This choice is closely associated with the fact that Ottoman Turkish holds the status of a revered and sacred language since it uses the Arabic script, which is associated with the language of Islam.	REL, SCR
p. 13	Despite the oppressions we bore for 200 years, the attempts to sever our ties with our books, classics, letters and archives, thank God Turkey’s religious scholars are on their feet ... Some people in this country are uncomfortable with the teaching of Ottoman Turkish to this nation’s youth. Actually it is ageless Turkish. It is not something foreign. We will learn the truths with it. They ask if we will teach how to read the epitaphs on gravestones. This is the problem. There is a history, a civilization lying on those gravestones. Are there a more serious ignorance and helplessness than a generation’s not knowing who is in their ancestors’ graves? It [Turkish Language Reform] was indeed the cutting of our ‘carotid artery’ and our ‘carotid arteries’ were cut ... Whether they	REL, EDU, LAN

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1-19.

<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 13	<p>like or not, yes, Ottoman Turkish will also be learned and taught in this country. (Erdoğan 2014)</p> <p>He pulls his evidence for this chasm from the epitaphs on gravestones from pre-republican times that modern Turkish speakers cannot read; so what is written in those epitaphs becomes a revered representation of Ottoman history and culture in his ideological construction. Referring to the constructed significance of those epitaphs in his narrative, he portrays the teaching of Ottoman Turkish as a crucial key to access Ottoman “history,” “civilization,” and “truths,” which actually instantiates and promotes his ideological agenda.</p>	LIT, IDE, ISM, EDU
p. 15	<p>Additionally, even though he does not explicate exactly why he thinks History graduates can teach Ottoman Turkish as well as the Turkish Literature graduates, he refers to an ongoing controversy that simplistically equates the level of expertise in Ottoman Turkish to the number of courses offered in the two programs. This broad (and dominant) view of expertise only focuses on the advanced literacy and linguistic expertise in Ottoman Turkish and neglects the pedagogical skills teachers need. It also misses the difference in the content of these university-level courses; for example, the field-specific texts to which students are exposed.</p>	NCE, LAN, LIT, EDU
p. 15	<p>These two macro-level decisions by the MoNE were responses to the concerns voiced at the micro level, which demonstrates the interaction between the two levels. However, both decisions were focused on teachers’ linguistic expertise and did not take their pedagogical competence into account, probably on the assumption that they can transfer their instructional skills from their main content area. Thus, policy-makers seem to hold a lay misconception about language teaching that believes that somebody can teach a language just because they know it well enough.</p>	EDU, NCE

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 15	In the case of the introduction of Ottoman Turkish to the high school curriculum, the policy decision presumes a direct causality between the goal (teaching high school students Ottoman Turkish to reconnect them with the Ottoman cultural-religious heritage) and the actual outcomes of policy implementation. Local actors, such as students, school principals who assign teachers to Ottoman Turkish classes, teachers, and students' families, will inevitably approach this policy decision in distinct ways, and their divergent beliefs and values will lead to various interpretations and differing degrees of appropriation of the policy. What is more, since individuals could exert power over other community members to influence their behaviors (Baldauf, 2006; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008), those actors in each context will be influencing each other's beliefs and practices with regard to the teaching of Ottoman Turkish.	LPL, REL, PEO, POW
p. 16	The envisioned goals expressed in the Ottoman Turkish policy for students' literacy in the language do not align with their own plans for themselves, which corroborates the need to consider the local actors' agency in language planning.	LPL
p. 16	The analysis of the policy decision about the integration of Ottoman Turkish into the high school curriculum leads to three main general conclusions about language planning. First, governments' political agendas and ideologies predominantly shape their language planning decisions (Blommaert, 2014; Chua, 2006; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003, 2005; Song, 2012) and "people with power" play a crucial role in those decisions (Zhao, 2011). The current government in Turkey has ideologically constructed the teaching of Ottoman Turkish as a tool to pursue and advance its political agenda, which is oriented by neo-Ottomanist ideals and reimagining Turkishness as the continuation of Ottoman-Islamic identity.	GOV, ISM, POL, LPL, IDE

QRS Data for Yazan, B., & Üzüm, M. (2016). Ottoman Turkish in the high school curriculum: Current language planning discussions in Turkey. <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> , 1-19.		
<i>Page</i>	<i>Excerpt</i>	<i>Codes Applied</i>
p. 16	Second, when justifying their legitimacy and necessity, policy-makers frame and craft language planning decisions as responses to or extensions of earlier language policies and conversations (Liddicoat, 2014; Ricento, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Wright, 2016). In the current case of Ottoman Turkish, the government has targeted the social and cultural consequences of the orthographic reform and lexical purification in the earlier years of the Republic of Turkey and has ideologically packaged the teaching of Ottoman Turkish to high school students as a key to reverse those consequences.	LPL, ISM, IDE
p. 16	Third, representing the people with power, governments tend to make authoritative decisions about language and are interested in shaping the discourse to maintain their power through broad policy texts rather than detailing the translation of language policy to language pedagogy and practice (Chua, 2006; Kaplan, 2011). In such top-down decisions, what is often poorly addressed are teachers' expertise and training (Diallo, 2014; Hawanti, 2014). The authoritative aspect of the Ottoman Turkish policy was evident in the President's words addressing those who are against the decision: "Whether they like or not, yes, Ottoman Turkish will also be learned and taught in this country." Mr Erdoğan, as the most influential individual of the people with power in this case, has built the conversations upon the recommendations of people with expertise at the National Education Council meeting, but the ensuing policy has neglected the agents at the micro level, such as teachers, school principals, students, and parents.	POW, AUT, GOV, LAN, EDU, NCE

Appendix 5. Initial List of 180 Languages Considered

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.							
<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Acehnese	<i>Basa Acèh</i>	Arabic	17th century CE	Yes	yes	<i>vide</i> Jawi script	Durie, Mark. FAWL, p. 1
Afrikaans	<i>Afrikaansch-Hollandsch</i>	Roman	18th century CE	no	yes	Arabic texts	Roberge, Paul T. FAWL, p. 5
Akan	<i>Akan</i>	Roman-modified	20th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Akan Ortho. Comm.	Obeng, Samuel Gyasi. FAWL, p. 8
Akkadian	<i>akkadītu(m)</i>	Cuneiform	24th century BCE	no	no	Assyrian & Babylonian	Foster, Benjamin R. FAWL, p. 11
Albanian	<i>shqip</i>	Roman-modified	15th century CE	yes	yes	<i>vide</i> Veqilharxhi	Bevington, Gary. FAWL, p. 15
Amharic	<i>Amarəñña</i>	Ge'ez	3rd century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> South Arabian WS	Devens, Monica S. FAWL, p. 20
Arabic	<i>al-'Arabiyya</i>	Aramaic	4th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Kūfic; Qur'ān is unifying reference point	Carter, Michael G. FAWL, p. 23

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Aramaic	<i>ārāmāya</i>	Aramaic	10th century BCE	no	yes		Hoberman, Robert D. FAWL, p. 28
Arapesh		Roman	20th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> SIL	Dobrin, Lise M. FAWL, p. 33
Armenian	<i>hayerēn</i>	Armenian	5th century CE	no	yes		Greppin, John A. C. FAWL, p. 39
Assamese	<i>ṛḥamiya</i>	semi-syllabic alphabetic Indic type script	13th century CE		yes	<i>vide</i> Sorjyapada poems	Baruah, Sanjib & Masica, Colin P. FAWL, p. 43
Aymara	<i>aimara</i>	Roman- modified	16th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Aymara grammars	Hardman, M. J. FAWL, p. 48
Azerbaijani	<i>Azərbaycança</i>	Arabic		yes	yes		Johanson, Lars. FAWL, p. 52
Balinese	<i>omong Bali</i>	Aksara		yes	yes	<i>vide</i> Aksara script	Clynes, Adrian. FAWL, p. 55
Balochi	<i>Balochi</i>	Roman	19th century CE	yes	yes		Jahani, Carina. FAWL, p. 60
Bambara	<i>Bamanakan</i>	Roman	15th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Maninka/Dyula	Barlow, Jessica A. FAWL, p. 463
Bangla	<i>Baṅgla</i>	Brahmi- modified	4th century BCE	no	yes	Brahmi<semitic branch of Aramaic	Bhattacharya, Tanmoy. FAWL, p. 66

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Basque	<i>euskara</i>	Roman	10th century CE	no	yes		Trask, R. L. FAWL, p. 73
Belorussian	<i>belaruskaja mova</i>	Cyrillic	10th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> West Russian Chancellery Language	Miller, Raymond. H. FAWL. P. 76
Bemba	<i>icibemba</i>	Roman	20th century CE	no	yes		Spitulnik, Debra & Kashoki, Mubanga E. FAWL, p. 81
Bhojpuri	<i>Bhojpuri</i>	Brahmi	3rd century BCE	no	yes	Brahmi<semitic branch of Aramaic	Shukla, Shaligram. FAWL, p. 86
Bikol		Indic-based syllabary		no	yes		Mintz, Malcolm W. FAWL, p. 91
Bugis	<i>Basa Ugiq</i>	Bugis/Arabic/ Roman	17th century CE	yes	yes	Bugis<Kawi (Old Javanese)<Indian prototype	Tol, Roger. FAWL, p. 96
Bulgarian	<i>Bâlgarski</i>	Greek	7th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Glagolitic	Scatton, Ernest A. FAWL, p. 100
Burmese	<i>bama saka</i>	Burmese	11th century CE	no	yes	Burmese<Tamil (South Eastern India)	Lehman, F. K. (Chit Hlaing). FAWL, p. 105

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Catalan	<i>Català</i>	Roman	12th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Ramon Llull	Díaz-Insensé, Natàlia. FAWL, p. 116
Cebuano	<i>Binisayá?</i>	Roman	20th century CE	no	yes		Wolff, John U. FAWL, p. 122
Cherokee	<i>jalagi/tsalagi</i>	Cherokee	19th century CE	yes	yes	<i>vide</i> Tell them they lie	Pulte, William & Feeling Durbin. FAWL, p. 127
Chichewa	<i>Chinyanja</i>	Roman	19th century CE	no	yes		Mchombo, Sam A. FAWL, p. 131
Chinese	<i>Wényán/Hàny ǔ</i>	Han (Chinese)	5th century BCE	no	yes		Branner, David Prager. FAWL, p. 134
Coptic<Ancient Egyptian	<i>mntrmnkême</i>	Coptic<Greek	4th century CE	no	no	Coptic script<Greek. Liturgical	Loprieno, Antonio. FAWL, p. 169
Creek		Roman- modified	18th century CE	no	yes		Martin, Jack B. & Mauldin, Margaret McKane. FAWL, p. 174
Czech	<i>čeština</i>	Glagolitic	9th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Old Church Slavonic	Townsend, Charles E. FAWL, p. 177

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Dagaare	<i>Dagaare</i>	Roman-modified	19th century CE	no	yes		Bodomo, Adams B. FAWL, p. 180
Danish	<i>dansk</i>	Runic	3rd century CE	no	yes		Allan, Robin & Lundskær-Nielsen, Tom. FAWL, p. 184
Dutch	<i>Nederlands</i>	Runic	3rd century CE	no	yes		Janssen, Theo A. J. M. FAWL, p. 190
Egyptian, Ancient	<i>r3 nj km.t</i>	Hieroglyphic	3rd millenium BCE	no	no		Loprieno, Antonio. FAWL, p. 194
English	<i>English</i>	Runic	5th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> West Saxon orthography	Erickson, Jon. FAWL, P. 200
Etruscan		Etruscan	7th century BCE	no	no	<i>vide</i> Euboean Greek script	Bonfante, Larissa. FAWL, p. 204
Ewe		Roman-modified	19th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> African alphabet	Ameka, Felix K. FAWL, p. 207
Finnish	<i>Suomi</i>	Roman	12th century CE	no	yes		Mitchell, Erika J. FAWL, p. 215
French	<i>le français</i>	Roman	10th century CE	no	yes		Fox, Cynthis A. FAWL, p. 220

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Fula	<i>Pulaar</i>	Roman	19th century CE	no	yes		Paradis, Carole. FAWL, p. 225
Galician	<i>Galego</i>	Roman- modified	12th century CE	no	yes		Monteagudo, Henrique. FAWL, p. 229
Ge'ez		Ge'ez	3rd century CE	no	no	Ge'ez<South Arabian. Liturgical use only	Devens, Monica S. FAWL, p. 234
Georgian	<i>kartuli ena</i>	Georgian	5th century CE	no	yes	<Aramaic, or <Greek. <i>vide</i> King Parnavaz	Vamling, Karina. FAWL, p. 237
German	<i>Deutsch</i>	Roman	8th century CE	no	yes		McCormick, Terrence C. FAWL, p. 242
Gĩkũyu	<i>Gĩkũyu</i>	Roman	20th century CE	no	yes		Njogu, Kimani. FAWL, p. 246
Gonḍi	<i>Gonḍi</i>	preliterate		n/a	yes		Pelletier, Rosanne. FAWL, p. 249
Gothic		Gothic	4th century CE	no	no	<i>vide</i> Bishop Ulfilas	Barrack, Charles M. FAWL, p. 253
Greek, Ancient	<i>hellēnikē</i>	Linear B	16th century BCE	no	no	Greek<Phoenician	Joseph, Brian D. FAWL, p. 257

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Greek, Modern	<i>eliniká</i>	Greek	8th century BCE	no	yes		Joseph, Brian D. FAWL, p. 264
Guaraní	<i>Ava ñe' e</i>	Roman	17th century CE	no	yes	the language of man(kind)'	Velázquez-Castillo, Maura. FAWL, p. 271
Gujarati	<i>Guajarati</i>	Devanāgarī	14th century CE	no	yes	Gujarati<Sanskrit	Mistry, P. J. FAWL, p. 274
Gushii	<i>Ekugusii</i>	Roman-modified	20th century CE	no	yes		Bickmore, Lee S. FAWL, p. 278
Haitian Creole	<i>Kreyòl</i>	Roman-modified	18th century CE	no	yes		Zéphir, Flore. FAWL, p. 283
Hausa	<i>hausa</i>	Arabic	19th century CE	yes	yes		Newman, Paul. FAWL, p. 287
Hebrew, Biblical	<i>ʿIvrit</i>	Hebrew	12th century BCE	no	yes	Hebrew<Phoenician	Rendsburg, Gary A. FAWL, p. 291
Hiligaynon	<i>Ilonggo</i>	Roman	16th century CE	no	yes		Zorc, R. David. FAWL, p. 300
Hindi	<i>hindī</i>	Devanāgarī	13th century CE	yes	yes	<i>vide</i> Hindi/Urdu	Shapiro, Michael C. FAWL, p. 306
Hittite	<i>Neši</i>	Cuneiform	18th century BCE	no	no	<i>vide</i> de Saussure, laryngeals	Shields, Jr. Kenneth. FAWL, p. 310

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Hungarian	<i>Magyar</i>	Roman	12th century CE	no	yes		Hetzron, Robert. FAWL, p. 314
Ibibio	<i>Ibibio</i>	Roman	20th century CE	no	yes		Essien, Okon. FAWL, p. 317
Ìgbo	<i>Ìgbo</i>	Roman- modified	20th century CE	no	yes		Ezè, Éjike & Manfredi, Victor. FAWL, p. 323
Ilocano	<i>Ilokano</i>	Alibata	13th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Alibata (Tagalog)<Indic	Rubino, Carl. FAWL, p. 331
Irish	<i>Gaeilge</i>	Roman- modified	7th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Gaelic script	McCloskey, James. FAWL, p. 336
Italian	<i>l'italiano</i>	Roman	13th century CE	no	yes		Repetti, Lori. FAWL, p. 341
Japanese	<i>Nihongo</i>	kanji (Chinese)	8th century CE	yes	yes		Vance, Timothy J. FAWL, p. 345
Javanese	<i>cara Jawa</i>	Javanese (carakan or hanacaraka)	9th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> carakan	Steinhauer, Hein. FAWL, p. 351
Kam	<i>Kam</i>	Hanyu Pinyin	20th century CE	no	yes	Roman-based	Edmondson, Jerold A. FAWL, p. 357

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Kannada	<i>kannada</i>	Brahmi-based	5th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Telugu/Kannada script	Steever, Sanford B. FAWL., p. 360
Kanuri		Roman-modified	20th century CE	no	yes		Hutchison, John P. FAWL, p. 367
Kapampangan	<i>Kapampangan</i>	Roman	16th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Tagalog	Kitano, Hiroaki. FAWL, p. 371
Kazakh	<i>Qazaq tili</i>	Roman-modified	20th century CE	yes	yes	In Xinjiang: Arabic>pinyin>Arabic	Johanson, Lars. FAWL, p. 376
Khmer	<i>Khmer</i>	Pallava	7th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Angkor Wat	Headley, Robert K. FAWL, p. 380
Kikongo Kituba		Roman-modified	19th century CE	no	yes	lingua franca/Creole?	Mufwene, Salikoko S. FAWL, p. 383
Kinyarwanda		Roman-modified	20th century CE	no	yes		Kimenyi, Alexandre. FAWL, p. 385
Kirghiz	<i>qırǵız tili</i>	Arabic (1924)	20th century CE	yes	yes		Johanson, Lars. FAWL, p. 387
Konkani		Kannada		yes	yes	<i>vide</i> Canarese	Miranda, Rocky V. FAWL, p. 391

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Korean	<i>hankuko</i>	Hanzi (Chinese)	10th century CE	no	yes		Cho, Young-mee Yu. FAWL, p. 394
Kurmanjî Kurdish	<i>Kurmanji</i>	Arabic?	16th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Emir Djeladet Bedir Khan	Haig, Geoffrey & Paul, Ludwig. FAWL, p. 399
Lakota	<i>Lakhota</i>	none		no	yes		Rood, David, S. FAWL, p. 405
Lao	<i>Lao</i>	Indic-based syllabary		no	yes	similar to Thai script	Gething, Thomas W. FAWL, p. 409
Latin	<i>lingua Latina</i>	Roman (from Etruscan)	7th century BCE	no	no	<i>vide</i> Etruscan script	Wallace, Rex E. FAWL, p. 413
Latvian	<i>Lettish</i>	Gothic	16th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Gothic script	Muizniece, Lalita. FAWL, p. 417
Lingala		Roman-modified	19th century CE	no	yes		Mufwene, Salikoko S. FAWL, p. 421
Lithuanian	<i>lietuvių kalba</i>	Roman	16th century CE	no	yes		Levin, Jules F. FAWL, p. 424
Luganda		Roman-modified	20th century CE	no	yes		Katamba, Francis. FAWL, p. 429

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Macedonian	<i>makedonski</i>	Glagolitic/Cyrillic	9th century CE	yes	yes	<i>vide</i> Glagolitic	Friedman, Victor A. FAWL, p. 435
Madurese	<i>Basa Madura</i>	Indic-based syllabary		no	yes	<i>vide</i> Javanese & Balinese	Stevens, Alan M. FAWL, p. 440
Maithili		Mithilākshar	14th century CE	no	yes	Mithilākshar<Brahmi	Yadava, Yogendra P. FAWL, p. 444
Malagasy	<i>malagasy</i>	Arabic		no	yes		Keenan, Edward L. & Rabenilaina, Roger-Bruno. FAWL, p. 448
Malay/Indonesian	<i>Bahasa Indonesia</i>	pallawa-script	7th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> pallawa-script	Steinhauer, Hein. FAWL, p. 453
Malayalam	<i>MalayāLam</i>	Devanāgarī	10th century CE	no	yes		Moag, Rodney F. FAWL, p. 459
Manipuri	<i>Maitheirón</i>	Meithei Mayek/Bangla	10th century CE	yes	yes	Meithei Mayek<Gupta Brahmi script. Bangle<Proeto-Bangla script	Chelliah, Shobhana L. FAWL, p. 466

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Marathi	<i>marāṭhī</i>	Devanāgarī	11th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Devanagari	Southworth, Franklin C. FAWL, p. 471
Maya	<i>Maya</i>	Hieroglyphic Maya	5th century CE	no	yes		Bevington, Gary. FAWL, p. 475
Mende		Roman-modified		no	yes		Dwyer, David J. FAWL, p. 480
Minangkabau	<i>Bahaso Minang</i>	Arabic-modified		no	yes		Fanany, Ismet. FAWL, P. 483
Mongolian	<i>Mongol khel</i>	Phags-pa	13th century CE	yes	yes	Uighur/Cyrillic	Binnick, Robert I. FAWL, p. 488
Moore	<i>Mooré</i>	Roman	20th century CE	no	yes		Nikiema, Norbert. FAWL, p. 493
Nama	<i>Khoekhoegowab</i>	Roman-modified	19th century CE	no	yes		Haacke, W. FAWL, p. 498
Nahuatl	<i>Mexicano</i>	Hieroglyphic		no	yes	<Zapotec/Maya'Mixtec	Karttunen, Frances. FAWL, p. 502
Navajo	<i>Diné</i>	Roman		no	yes	<Tewa <i>navahuu</i> 'field + wide valley'	Field, Margaret. FAWL, p. 506
Nepali	<i>Nepali</i>	Devanāgarī	13th century CE	no	yes		Verma, Manindra K. FAWL, p. 511

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Nivkh	<i>N'ivx (Amur), N'iyvŋ (Sakhalin)</i>	Roman-based	20th century CE	no	yes		Mattissen, Johanna. FAWL, p. 516
Norwegian	<i>norsk</i>	Roman	14th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide bokmål & landsmål</i>	Weinstock, John. FAWL, p. 520
Occitan		Roman	10th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide Langue d'oc, Provençal</i>	Field, Thomas T. FAWL, p. 524
Oriya	<i>Oḍiya</i>	Brahmi- derived	5th century CE	no	yes		Ramachandran, S. FAWL, p. 528
Oromo	<i>Afaan Oromo</i>	Roman	19th century CE	no	yes		Clamons, Robbin. FAWL, p. 531
Pali	<i>pāli</i>	Brahmi- derived	1st century BCE	yes	yes		Peterson, John Michael. FAWL, p. 534
Pangasinan	<i>Pangasinan</i>	Roman	16th century CE	no	yes		Rubino, Carl. FAWL, p. 539
Pashto	<i>Pašto</i>	Arabic	16th century CE	no	yes		Inozemtsev, Igor. FAWL, p. 543
Persian	<i>fārsi</i>	Cuneiform	6th century BCE	no	yes	Phalavi<Aramaic script	Perry, John R. FAWL, p. 548

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Phoenician	<i>Ponnīm</i>	Cuneiform	14th century BCE	no	no	Phoenician<Semitic script	Krahmalkov, Charles R. FAWL, p. 553
Polish	<i>polski</i>	Roman	12th century CE	no	yes		Dziwirek, Katarzyna. FAWL, p. 556
Portuguese	<i>português</i>	Roman	9th century CE	no	yes		Van den Dool, Karin. FAWL, p. 567
Pulaar		Arabic	13th century CE	yes	yes		Ngom, Fallou. FAWL, p. 572
Punjabi	<i>Panjabi</i>	Ashoka	11th century CE	yes	yes	Gurmukhi<Ashoka <Brahmi. Devanagari & Perso-Arabic	Bhatia, Tej K. FAWL, p. 576
Pwo Karen	<i>[phloŭ11]</i> <i>[phloŭ55]</i>	Monastic/Mission	19th century CE	yes	yes	Monastic<Mon script	Kato, Atsuhiko. FAWL, p. 580
Quechua		Roman	16th century CE	no	yes		Coronel-Molina, Serafín M. FAWL, p. 585
Rajasthani		Devanāgarī	15th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Hindi, Nepali, Marathi	Smith, John D. FAWL, p. 591
Romani	<i>Rromances</i>	Roman		no	yes		Hancock, Ian F. FAWL, p. 595

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Romanian		Cyrillic	16th century CE	no	yes		Carlton, Charles M. FAWL, p. 598
Rundi		Roman	19th century CE	no	yes		Bennett, Patrick R. FAWL, p. 602
Russian	<i>russkij jazyk</i>	Cyrillic	9th century CE	no	yes		Beyer, Thomas R. FAWL, p. 605
Sango	<i>Sango</i>	Roman	19th century CE	no	yes		Samarin, William J. FAWL, p. 608
Sanskrit	<i>saṃskṛtam</i>	Asokan Brahmī	3rd century BCE	no	no	<i>vide</i> Indus logographic script	Witzel, Michael. FAWL, p. 613
Santali	<i>ᱫᱷᱟᱱᱵᱟᱫ</i>	Devanāgarī	19th century CE	yes	yes		Anderson, Gregory D. S. FAWL, p. 624
Serbo- Croatian	<i>српскохрватс ки језик/srpskohr vatski jezik</i>	Glagolitic<Gre ek	9th century CE	yes	yes		Browne, Wayles. FAWL, p. 629

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Sesotho		Roman	19th century CE	no	yes		Demuth, Katherine & Machobane, 'Malillo. FAWL, p. 633
Shan	<i>Tai táj</i>	<Brahmic		no	yes	<i>vide</i> Burmese & Mon	Solnit, David B. FAWL, p. 639
Shona	<i>chi-shóna</i>	Roman- modified	20th century CE	no	yes		Carter, Hazel. FAWL, p. 643
Sindhi		Arabic- modified	8th century CE	yes	yes	<i>vide</i> Sindhi	Cole, Jennifer S. FAWL, p. 648
Sinhala	<i>siṅhala</i>	Grantha<Brah mi		no	yes	<i>vide</i> Dravidian, Kannada & Telugu	Kariyakarawana , Sunil. FAWL, p. 654
Siraiki	<i>sirāēkī</i>	Arabic	17th century CE	no	yes		Shackle, Christopher. FAWL, p. 657
siSwati					yes		Ilunga, Mpunga wa. FAWL, p. 660
Slovak	<i>slovenský jazyk</i>	Roman	16th century CE	no	yes		Short, David. FAWL, p. 665
Slovene	<i>Slovenski jezik</i>	Roman (Carolingian)	10th century CE	no	yes		Greenberg, Marc. L. FAWL, p. 668

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Sogdian	<i>swγδy'w</i>	Aramaic	4th century CE	yes	no	Aramaic>Achaemenian >Sogdian>Uyghur>Mo ngolian. <i>Vide</i> Manichean & Syriac	Yoshida, Yutaka. FAWL, p. 672
Somali	<i>Af soomaali</i>	Roman		no	yes		Saeed, John I. FAWL, p. 675
Spanish	<i>español</i>	Roman	10th century CE	no	yes		López, Luis. FAWL, p. 681
Sukuma	<i>kiSukuma</i>	Roman		no	yes		Batibo, Herman M. FAWL, p. 686
Sumerian	<i>eme Kengir</i>	Cuneiform	31st century BCE	no	no	<i>vide</i> Akkadian	Snell, Daniel C. FAWL, p. 690
Sundanese	<i>Basa Sunda</i>	Sundanese	14th century CE	no	yes		Cohn, Abigail C. FAWL, p. 692
Swahili	<i>Kiswahili</i>	Arabic- modified		no	yes		Njogu, Kimani. FAWL, p. 697
Swedish	<i>svenska</i>	Runic	9th century CE	no	yes		Börjats, Kersti. FAWL, p. 700

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Tagalog	<i>Tagálog</i>	Alibata	12th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Ilocano, Pangasinan, Kapampangan, Cebuano. Brahmic or West Javanese origin	De Guzman, Videa P. FAWL, p. 703
Tajik	<i>zaboni tojik</i>	Arabic	10th century CE	?	yes		Perry, John R. FAWL, p. 708
Tamazight	<i>Tamazight</i>	Tifinagh	3rd century BCE	yes	yes		Alalou, Ali & Farrell, Patrick. FAWL, p. 712
Tamil	<i>tamiḻ</i>		2nd century BCE	no	yes	Tamil & Sanskrit considered classical	Steever, Sanford B. FAWL, p. 716
Tatar	<i>tatar tēļē</i>	Arabic		yes	yes		Johanson, Lars. FAWL, p. 719
Tay-Nung	<i>Tày-Nùng</i>	Tày Nôm	17th century CE	no	yes	<Vietnamese character script	Ross, Peter. FAWL, p. 724
Telugu	<i>Telegu</i>	Brahmi-based	11th century CE	no	yes		Pelletier, Rosanne. FAWL, p. 728
Thai	<i>phaasǎa thay</i>	Indic-modified	13th century CE	no	yes		Coupe, Alexander Robertson. FAWL, p. 735

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Tibetan	<i>phöökää</i>	Tibetan (<Gupta)	7th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Northwest Indian Upright Gupta	Beckwith, Christopher I. FAWL, p. 741
Tigrinya	<i>qwanqwa habəšša</i>	Ge'ez	13th century CE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> Sabeian	Tewelde, Tesfay. FAWL, p. 745
Tocharian B	<i>Kuśiññe</i>	Brahmi-based	6th century CE	no	no		Adams, Douglas Q. FAWL, p. 749
Tok Pisin	<i>Tok Pisin</i>	Roman-based	19th century CE	no	yes	"talk pidgin"	Romaine, Suzanne. FAWL, p. 752
Tshilubà	<i>Tshilubà</i>	Roman	20th century CE	no	yes		Ilunga, Mpungawa. FAWL, p. 757
Tsawana	<i>Setswana</i>	Roman	20th century CE	no	yes		Mistry, Karen. FAWL, p. 762
Turkish	<i>Türkçe</i>	Arabic	13th century CE	no	yes		Underhill, Robert. FAWL, p. 766
Turkmen	<i>Türkmençe</i>	Arabic	19th century CE	yes	yes		Johanson, Lars. FAWL, p. 770
Ukranian	<i>ukrajíns' ka móva</i>	Cyrillic-modified	11th century CE	no	yes		Hornjatkevyč, Andrij. FAWL, p. 773

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
UMBundu		Roman	20th century CE	no	yes		Schadeberg, Thilo C. FAWL, p. 776
Urdu	<i>Urdu</i>	Devanāgarī	13th century CE	yes	yes	Urdu=Hindi	Siddiqi, Tahsin. FAWL, p. 781
Uyghur	<i>Uyghur</i>	Sogdian	11th century CE	yes	yes		
Uzbek	<i>Ozbek</i>	Arabic		yes	yes	<i>vide</i> Chaghatay	Johanson, Lars. FAWL, p. 791
Vietnamese	<i>Việt-văn</i> [written]	Han	2nd century BCE	no	yes	<i>vide</i> chữ nôm	Đìn-Hoà, Nguyễn. FAWL, p. 794
Waráy Waráy	<i>Waráy Waráy</i>	Roman		no	yes		Rubino, Carl. FAWL, p. 797
Welsh	<i>Cymraig</i>	Roman	8th century CE	no	yes		Kibre, Nicholas. FAWL, p. 804
Wolaitta		fidäl	20th century CE	no	yes		Amha, Azeb. FAWL, p. 809
Wolof		an original script [?]		no	yes	<i>vide</i> Wolofal	Ka, Omar. FAWL, p. 816
Xhosa	<i>(Isi)Xhosa</i>	Roman	19th century CE	no	yes		Downing, Laura J. FAWL, p. 822
Yi		Han	5th century CE	yes	yes	<i>vide</i> Yi	Bradley, David. FAWL, p. 826

Initial List of 180 Languages Considered.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Digraphia</i>	<i>Living</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>References</i>
Yiddish	<i>jidiš</i>	Hebrew	13th century CE	no	yes		Glasser, Paul. FAWL, p. 830
Yoruba	<i>Aku</i>	Roman	19th century CE	no	yes		Akinlabi, Akinbiyi. FAWL, p. 836
Yup'ik	<i>Yup'ik</i>	Roman	19th century CE	no	yes		Rubino, Carl & Charles, George. FAWL, p. 842
Zhuang- Bouyei		Han		yes	yes		Edmondson, Jerold A. FAWL, p. 849
Zulu	<i>IsiZulu</i>	Roman	19th century CE	no	yes		Sanneh, Sandra. FAWL, p. 852

Appendix 6. Sixty-Seven Languages with Script Changes

Sixty-Seven Languages with Script Changes.									
<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Script Conversions</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time interval</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Avg</i>
Acehnese	<i>Basa Acèh</i>	Arabic	17th century CE	Roman	1	20th century CE	300	300	
Akkadian	<i>akkadītu(m)</i>	Cuneiform	24th century BCE	Aramaic	1	11th century BCE	1300	1300	
Albanian	<i>shqip</i>	Roman-modified	15th century CE	Greek	1	18th century CE	300		
Albanian	<i>shqip</i>			Arabic-modified	2	18th century CE	50	350	175
Arabic	<i>al-'Arabiyya</i>	Aramaic	4th century CE	Arabic	1	6th century CE	200	200	
Azerbaijani	<i>Azərbaycança</i>	Arabic	13th century CE	Roman-based	1	20th century CE	700		
Azerbaijani	<i>Azərbaycança</i>			Cyrillic-based	2	20th century CE	10		
Azerbaijani	<i>Azərbaycança</i>			Roman-based	3	20th century CE	80	790	263
Balinese	<i>omong Bali</i>	Aksara	11th century CE	Roman	1	20th century CE	900	900	
Balochi	<i>Balochi</i>	Roman	19th century CE	Arabic-modified	1	20th century CE	100	100	

Sixty-Seven Languages with Script Changes.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Script Conversions</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time interval</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Avg</i>
Bangla	<i>Bangla</i>	Brahmi-modified	4th century BCE	Devanāgarī	1	7th century CE	1100	1100	
Bhojpuri	<i>Bhojpuri</i>	Brahmi	3rd century BCE	Nagari/Devanagari	1	8th century CE	1100	1100	
Bikol		Indic-based syllabary	3rd century BCE	Roman	1	16th century CE	1900	1900	
Bulgarian	<i>Bālgarski</i>	Greek	7th century CE	Glagolitic<Greek	1	9th century CE	200		
Bulgarian	<i>Bālgarski</i>			Cyrillic	2	10th century CE	100	300	150
Cherokee	<i>jalagi/tsalagi</i>	Cherokee	19th century CE	Roman	1	19th century CE	50	50	
Czech	<i>čeština</i>	Glagolitic	9th century CE	Cyrillic	1	10th century CE	100		
Czech	<i>čeština</i>			Roman-based	2	10th century CE	50	150	75
Danish	<i>dansk</i>	Runic	3rd century CE	Roman	1	12th century CE	900	900	
Dutch	<i>Nederlands</i>	Runic	3rd century CE	Roman	1	12th century CE	900	900	
Egyptian, Ancient	<i>r3 nj km.t</i>	Hieroglyphic	30th century BCE	Hieratic	1	26th century BCE	400		
Egyptian, Ancient	<i>r3 nj km.t</i>			Demotic	2	7th century BCE	1900		
Egyptian, Ancient	<i>r3 nj km.t</i>			Coptic	3	4th century CE	1100	3400	1133
English	<i>English</i>	Runic	5th century CE	Roman	1	7th century CE	200	200	

Sixty-Seven Languages with Script Changes.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Script Conversions</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time interval</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Avg</i>
Greek, Ancient	<i>hellēnikē</i>	Linear B	16th century BCE	Greek	1	8th century BCE	800	800	
Guajarati	<i>Guajarati</i>	Devanāgarī	14th century CE	Gujarati	1	19th century CE	500	500	
Hausa	<i>hausa</i>	Arabic	19th century CE	Roman-modified	1	19th century CE	50	50	
Ilocano	<i>Ilokano</i>	Alibata	13th century CE	Roman-modified	1	16th century CE	300	300	
Japanese	<i>Nihongo</i>	kanji (Chinese)	4th century CE	hiragana/katakana	1	8th century CE	400	400	
Javanese	<i>cara Jawa</i>	Javanese (carakan or hanacaraka)	9th century CE	Arabic (pegon)	1	17th century CE	800		
Javanese	<i>cara Jawa</i>			Roman-based	2	20th century CE	300	1100	550
Kannada	<i>kannaḍa</i>	Brahmi-based	5th century CE	Kannada	1	10th century CE	500	500	
Kazakh	<i>Qazaq tili</i>	Roman-modified	20th century CE	Cyrillic-based	1	20th century CE	10		
Kazakh	<i>Qazaq tili</i>			Roman-based	2	21st century CE	80	90	45
Kirghiz	<i>qıryıǵ tili</i>	Arabic (1924)	20th century CE	Roman-based (1928)	1	20th century CE	10		
Kirghiz	<i>qıryıǵ tili</i>			Cyrillic-based (1941)	2	20th century CE	10		
Kirghiz	<i>qıryıǵ tili</i>			Roman-based (1991)	3	20th century CE	50	70	23
Konkani		Kannada	10th century CE	Roman-based	1	16th century CE	600		

Sixty-Seven Languages with Script Changes.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Script Conversions</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time interval</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Avg</i>
Konkani				Nagari (official)	2	20th century CE	400	1000	500
Korean	<i>hankuko</i>	Hanzi (Chinese)	10th century CE	Han'gul	1	15th century CE	500	500	
Kurmanjî Kurdish	<i>Kurmanji</i>	Arabic?	16th century CE	Roman (Turkish variety)	1	20th century CE	400	400	
Latvian	<i>Lettish</i>	Gothic	16th century CE	Roman	1	20th century CE	400		
Latvian	<i>Lettish</i>			Cyrillic	2	20th century CE	10		
Latvian	<i>Lettish</i>			Roman-based (1991)	3	20th century CE	50	460	153
Macedonian	<i>makedonski</i>	Glagolitic/Cyrillic	9th century CE	Roman	1	20th century CE	1100	1100	
Madurese	<i>Basa Madura</i>	Indic-based syllabary	9th century CE	Arabic-modified	1	17th century CE	800		
Madurese	<i>Basa Madura</i>			Roman-based	2	20th century CE	300	1100	550
Maithili		Mithilākshar	14th century CE	Kaithi	1	14th century CE	50		
Maithili				Devanāgarī	2	20th century CE	600	650	650
Malagasy	<i>malagasy</i>	Arabic (Sorabe)	17th century CE	Roman-modified	1	19th century CE	200	200	
Malay/Indonesian	<i>Bahasa Indonesia</i>	pallawa-script	7th century CE	jawi script	1	13th century CE	600		

Sixty-Seven Languages with Script Changes.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Script Conversions</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time interval</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Avg</i>
Malay/Indonesian	<i>Bahasa Indonesia</i>			Roman	2	18th century CE	500	1100	550
Maya	<i>Maya</i>	Hieroglyphic Maya	5th century CE	Roman	1	16th century CE	1100	1100	
Minangkabau	<i>Bahaso Minang</i>	Arabic-modified	13th century CE	Roman	1	20th century CE	700	700	
Mongolian	<i>Mongol khel</i>	Phags-pa	13th century CE	Uighur	1	13th century CE	50		
Mongolian	<i>Mongol khel</i>			Roman	2	20th century CE	700		
Mongolian	<i>Mongol khel</i>			Cyrillic	3	20th century CE	50	800	267
Nahuatl	<i>Mexicano</i>	Hieroglyphic	5th century CE	Roman	1	16th century CE	1100	1100	
Nivkh	<i>N'ivx (Amur), N'iyvŋ (Sakhalin)</i>	Roman-based	20th century CE	Cyrillic	1	20th century CE	50	50	
Persian	<i>fārsi</i>	Cuneiform	6th century BCE	Pahlavi	1	3rd century CE	700		
Persian	<i>fārsi</i>			Arabic-modified	2	7th century CE	400	1100	550
Phoenician	<i>Ponnīm</i>	Cuneiform	14th century BCE	Phoenician	1	12th century BCE	200		
Phoenician	<i>Ponnīm</i>			Roman	2	1st century CE	1300	1500	750
Pulaar		Arabic	13th century CE	Roman	1	19th century CE	600	600	

Sixty-Seven Languages with Script Changes.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Script Conversions</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time interval</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Avg</i>
Punjabi	<i>Panjabi</i>	Ashoka	11th century CE	Gurmukhi	1	16th century CE	500	500	
Romanian		Cyrillic	16th century CE	Roman	1	19th century CE	300	300	
Sanskrit	<i>saṃskṛtam</i>	Asokan Brahmī	3rd century BCE	Devanāgarī	1	7th century CE	400	400	
Santali	<i>ḥṛṛ ṛṛṛ</i>	Devanāgarī	19th century CE	Roman	1	20th century CE	100		
Santali	<i>ḥṛṛ ṛṛṛ</i>			<i>olčemet'</i>	2	20th century CE	50	150	75
Serbo-Croatian	<i>crnokoхрватски jezik/srpskohrvatski jezik</i>	Glagolitic<Greek	9th century CE	Cyrillic	1	12th century CE	300		
Serbo-Croatian	<i>crnokoхрватски jezik/srpskohrvatski jezik</i>			Roman	2	19th century CE	700	1000	500
Sindhi		Arabic-modified	8th century CE	Khojaki	1	11th century CE	300		
Sindhi				Nagari/Devanagari	2	15th century CE	400		
Sindhi				Arabic-modified	3	19th century CE	400	1100	367
Sundanese	<i>Basa Sunda</i>	Sundanese	14th century CE	Sunda (<Javanese)	1	16th century CE	200		
Sundanese	<i>Basa Sunda</i>			Arabic	2	18th century CE	200		
Sundanese	<i>Basa Sunda</i>			Roman	3	19th century CE	100	500	167

Sixty-Seven Languages with Script Changes.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Script Conversions</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time interval</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Avg</i>
Swahili	<i>Kiswahili</i>	Arabic-modified	17th century CE	Roman	1	17th century CE	50	50	
Swedish	<i>svenska</i>	Runic	9th century CE	Roman	1	13th century CE	400	400	
Tajik	<i>zaboni tojik</i>	Arabic	10th century CE	Roman	1	20th century CE	1000		
Tajik	<i>zaboni tojik</i>			Cyrillic	2	20th century CE	10		
Tajik	<i>zaboni tojik</i>			Arabic-modified	3	20th century CE	50	1060	353
Tagalog	<i>Tagálog</i>	Alibata	12th century CE	Roman	1	16th century CE	400	400	
Tamazight	<i>Tamazight</i>	Tifinagh	3rd century BCE	Arabic	1	7th century CE	400		
Tamazight	<i>Tamazight</i>			Roman	2	20th century CE	1300	1700	850
Tatar	<i>tatar tǵǵǵ</i>	Arabic	13th century CE	Roman-based	1	1927 CE	700		
Tatar	<i>tatar tǵǵǵ</i>			Cyrillic	2	1939 CE	10		
Tatar	<i>tatar tǵǵǵ</i>			Roman-based	3	1989 CE	50	760	253
Tay-Nung	<i>Tày-Nùng</i>	Tày Nôm	17th century CE	Roman-based	1	19th century CE	200	200	
Turkish	<i>Türkçe</i>	Arabic	13th century CE	Roman-based	1	1928 CE	700	700	
Turkmen	<i>Türkmençe</i>	Arabic	19th century CE	Roman-based	1	1929 CE	100		
Turkmen	<i>Türkmençe</i>			Cyrillic	2	1939 CE	10		
Turkmen	<i>Türkmençe</i>			Roman-based	3	1993 CE	50	160	53

Sixty-Seven Languages with Script Changes.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Script Conversions</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time interval</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Avg</i>
Urdu	<i>Urdu</i>	Devanāgarī	13th century CE	Arabic-modified	1	17th century CE	400	400	
Uyghur	<i>Uyghur</i>	Sogdian	11th century CE	Arabic	1	14th century CE	300		
Uyghur	<i>Uyghur</i>			Cyrillic	2	1957 CE	600		
Uyghur	<i>Uyghur</i>			Roman-based <i>pinyin</i>	3	1960 CE	10		
Uyghur	<i>Uyghur</i>			Arabic-based	4	1983 CE	30	940	235
Uzbek	<i>Ozbek</i>	Arabic	13th century CE	Roman-based	1	1927 CE	700		
Uzbek	<i>Ozbek</i>			Cyrillic-based	2	1939 CE	10		
Uzbek	<i>Ozbek</i>			Roman-based	3	1993 CE	50	760	253
Vietnamese	<i>Việt-văn</i> [written]	Han	2nd century BCE	chữ nôm (Chinese-based)	1	11th century CE	1300		
Vietnamese	<i>Việt-văn</i> [written]			quốc ngữ (Roman-based)	2	17th century CE	600	1900	950
Wolaitta		fidäl	20th century CE	Roman-modified	1	20th century CE	50	50	
Wolof		an original script [?]	4th century CE	Arabic-based (Wolofal)	1	11th century CE	700		
Wolof				Roman	2	17th century CE	600	1300	650
Yi		Han	5th century CE	Yi	1	8th century CE	300		
Yi				Roman	2	20th century CE	1200	1500	750

Sixty-Seven Languages with Script Changes.

<i>Language</i>	<i>Autonym</i>	<i>Initial script</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Script Conversions</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time interval</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Avg</i>
Zhuang-Bouyei		Han	10th century CE	Roman-modified	1	20th century CE	1000	1000	

Appendix 7. Korean Glossary

<i>Amkül</i>	‘Female script’
<i>Chiphyǒnjǒn</i>	‘Official academic research institution’
<i>Ch’ongdokpu</i>	‘Japanese colonial spelling’
<i>Chongni</i>	‘Regularization’
<i>Chosǒnǒ Hakhoe</i>	‘Korean Language Society’
<i>Enmun</i>	‘Vernacular writing’
<i>Han’gŭl</i>	‘Great script’, ‘High script’, ‘Great letters’
<i>Han’gŭl hakhoe</i>	‘ <i>Han’gŭl</i> Society’
<i>Hangch’al</i>	‘Mixed Sino-Korean script’
<i>Hanja</i>	‘Chinese writing’
<i>Hanmun</i>	‘Chinese writing’
<i>Hanŭnim</i>	‘God’
<i>Hanwen</i>	‘Chinese characters’
<i>Hànzì</i>	‘Chinese writing’
<i>Hunminchǒng’ŭm</i>	‘The correct sounds for the instruction of the people’
<i>Ido</i>	‘Clerk reading’
<i>Ilbon ch’ongdokbu</i>	‘Government General of Korea’
<i>Kugǒ</i>	‘National language’
<i>Kugyol</i>	‘Phrase parting’
<i>Kukhanmun</i>	‘Mixed Sino-Korean script’

<i>Kukmun</i>	‘National script’
<i>Kungmun</i>	‘National script’
<i>Kukmun yŏn’guso</i>	‘National Script Research Institute’
<i>Kŭrisŭdo p’yogich’e</i>	‘Christian spelling’
<i>Munch’e</i>	‘Orthographic styles’
<i>Munmyŏng kaehwa</i>	‘Civilization and enlightenment’
<i>Ŏnhae</i>	‘Annotation’
<i>Ŏnmun</i>	‘Common script’, ‘Vernacular script’, ‘Vulgar script’
<i>Ŏnmun ilch’i</i>	‘The unification of written and spoken language’
<i>Patch’im</i>	‘Syllable-final consonants’
<i>Sadae</i>	‘Serving the great’
<i>Sohwa</i>	‘Small China’
<i>Un-mun</i>	‘Dirty language’
<i>Urikul</i>	‘Our script’
<i>Wényán</i>	‘Classical Chinese; Classical Chinese writing’
<i>Yangban</i>	‘Korean elite’

Appendix 9. Turkish Glossary

<i>Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi</i>	‘Justice and Development Party’
<i>Atatürk</i>	‘Father of the Turks’
<i>Ecdad</i>	‘Ancestors’
<i>Evlad</i>	‘Descendants’
<i>Garbcılar</i>	‘Westernizers’
<i>Genç Kalemler</i>	‘Young Pens’
<i>Hac</i>	‘Pilgrimage’
<i>Harf devrimi</i>	‘Letter reform’
<i>Hayrat Vakfı</i>	‘Charity Foundation’
<i>İzafet</i>	‘Attachment’
<i>Namaz</i>	‘Prayer’
<i>Oruç</i>	‘Fasting’
<i>Osmanlıca</i>	‘Ottoman’
<i>Peygamber</i>	‘Prophet’
<i>Türk Derneği</i>	‘Turkish Association’
<i>Türk Dil Kurumu</i>	‘Turkish Language Society’
<i>Veni lisan</i>	‘A new language’
<i>Ümmet-i Muhammed</i>	‘Community of Believers’
<i>Ziyaret</i>	‘Pilgrimage’