

Tgeqxgt lpi 'E wwt cniK gpvkw' 'c'pf 'T ght guj lpi 'Ej lpgug' Hcxqt u' ' Hqwt 'Ncpi wci g'Rqdekgu'lp'vj g'T gr wdike'qhMqt gc '3; 6: /4232''

Ik-sang Eom 严翼相
Hanyang University

This paper attempts to examine how the language policies in Korea since 1948, when the republic was founded, are related with the Chinese language in the context of globalization. It will point out that old Chinese flavor has been diluted in the Korean language in the past six decades while new Chinese flavor has been added to the language through changing the Chinese name of Seoul, reading Chinese proper names in Mandarin pronunciations, exclusively using *Hangül*, the Korean alphabet, in writing and so on. It notes also that the Korean language policies have been moving toward globalization.

30Kpvtqf wvkwq''

One can find an interesting phenomenon from the language policies of the Korean government since 1948, when the Republic of Korea was founded, up to date. The followings are those policies that this paper is going to deal with. "

- (1) a. 2005 Changing Chinese Name of Seoul from *Hancheng* to *Shouer*
- b. 1986 Birth of Koreanization System of Chinese Loan Words
- c. 1948 Law of Using *Hangül*, the Korean Alphabet, in Writing
- d. 1948-2010 Conflicts on Korean Romanization Systems

The goal of this study is to present a consistent tendency in the Korean language policies in the past 60 years or so such as (a) the change of Chinese name of Seoul from *Hancheng* to *Shouer* (2005), (b) reading Chinese proper nouns not in Sino-Korean pronunciations but in Mandarin pronunciations, and (c) the policy of using *Hangül* in public writings (1948), which was extremely controversial until the beginning of the 70's. In addition, this paper will examine the reason why Korean Romanization systems have never successfully settled down even up to now. It will attempt to point out the efforts to establish Korean identity, which was sometimes favorable or unfavorable as the country strived from nationalism and globalism.

40Shouer<Vj g'P gy 'Ej lpgug'P co g'qhUgqwl'

Hancheng has been the Chinese name of Seoul for the past 700 years or so. It was the

official name of the capital city of the *Chosŏn* dynasty.¹ However, it was used only in the written language and *Hanyang*, the name of the city during the *Koryŏ* dynasty, was still in use in the colloquial language. The name of the city underwent the following changes:

(2) Koryŏ (918-1356)	Hanyang
Chosŏn (1392-1910)	Hanyang (C), Hansŏng (L)
Japanese Occupation (1911-1945)	Kyŏngsŏng
Republic of Korea (1946/48-present)	Seoul

One can notice that *Hansŏng* or *Hancheng* in Chinese has been used for a long time. If so, why did the Koreans want to change it? There were several reasons.

Firstly, both *Sŏul* (Seoul) and *Hansŏng* are commonly used in the Korean language. For instance, there are many institutions named after *Sŏul* (Seoul) and *Hansŏng* in Korea. Some examples are as follows:

(3) a. Seoul National University	Hansŏng University
b. Seoul High School	Hansŏng High School
c. Seoul Food Company	Hansŏng Food Company
d. Seoul Daily	Hansŏng Daily Newspaper

There is no confusion between two names in each set in Korean. Nevertheless, when they are translated into Chinese, the apparent distinction between them often disappears because both of them are translated as *Hancheng* into Chinese as shown below:

(4) a. (Guoli) Hancheng daxue	(Sili) Hancheng daxue
b. Hancheng gaozhong	Hancheng gaozhong
c. Hancheng shipin gongsi	Hancheng shipin gongsi
d. Hancheng ribao	Hancheng ribao

Due to such ambiguity, mails from China were often delivered mistakenly to a wrong institution, which caused inconvenience in daily life.

Secondly but more importantly, the name of Seoul has been widely used in the world except for the regions where Chinese is spoken. Considering the population of Chinese speakers, this weakened the brand power of Seoul to a great degree. Having two different names, Seoul and *Hancheng*, in the international community was not beneficial for the Seoul Metropolitan Government to promote the city to be widely known to more and more people in the world.

Thirdly, some Korean intellectuals were concerned about the literary meanings of the name. Although it may not carry the following images to most Chinese, *Hancheng* can

¹ The Romanization of Korean in this paper follows McCune-Reischauer system.

literary mean any of the followings:

- (5) a. a city of the *Han* people
b. a wall of China

Lastly, in relation with the literary meaning of *Hancheng*, Seoul carries significance as an indigenous Korean name. As one can see in (2), the names of the city were all in Chinese style in the past. There is no distinction between Korean and Chinese place names because most of place names except for some small villages have Chinese style names. It is not difficult to find place names being shared by both Korea and China. Following are some examples:

(6) Name	Location in Korea	Location in China
安山	【京畿】	【冀鲁】
板桥	【京畿】	【京苏皖豫鄂湘琼川黔滇甘】
城东	【首尔】	【冀】
大田	【大田】	【浙皖赣粤琼】
东海	【江原】	【沪浙闽台】
高城	【江原】	【赣鲁鄂】
湖南	【全罗】	【湘浙】
江北	【首尔】	【川】
江东	【首尔】	【湘】
江南	【首尔】	【湘川】
江西	【首尔釜山】	【滇】
金川	【庆北】	【吉】
金村	【京畿】	【浙】
锦江	【忠清】	【赣】
晋州	【庆南】	【冀】
丽水	【全南】	【浙】
梁山	【庆南】	【鲁】
马山	【庆南】	【浙粤】
南海	【庆南】	【闽台粤琼】
清平	【京畿】	【鲁川】
全州	【全北】	【桂】
太白	【江原】	【赣黔甘】
天安	【忠南】	【琼】
西山	【忠南】	【赣京】
新安	【全南】	【蒙古黑苏赣湘】

The above list is, of course, not exhaustive. Yet, it implies that there are many places names that are exactly identical between Korea and China. Korean place names, in fact, were changed to Chinese style names in 757 A.D. by King *Kyōngdōk* of the Unified Silla dynasty. *Mich'uhol*, for instance, was changed to *Inchōn* or *Renchuan*. It was the turning point when many indigenous place names in native Korean were changed to Chinese style names in Sino-Korean. Since then, many place names in Korea could be written in Chinese characters. Since Seoul is a native Korean word, meaning the capital city, it cannot be written in Chinese characters. That is why the Chinese people continued to call the city *Hancheng* even after the name was no longer in use in Korea from the early twentieth century. Since *Sōul* is almost the only indigenous place name among big and small cities in Korea, it carries a significantly symbolic meaning. The native Korean name was given to Seoul in 1946, a year after liberation from Japan. It was certainly an announcement of Korea's independence from Japanese occupation and heavy influence from China and other foreign powers for hundreds of years in the past.

The new Chinese name of Seoul, *Shouer*, was chosen from close to one thousand candidates suggested from 1,041 people in 2004. The committee for selecting a new Chinese name finally chose *Shouer*, which Ik-sang Eom and 36 more people proposed, after careful examinations and internet votes both in Korea and China over the year.² As a matter of fact, Eom suggested *Shouer* in his journal article as early as 2003. The new Chinese name, *Shouer* now matches to the spirit behind an indigenous name of Seoul. It is, thus, related to rebuilding their cultural identity. It is also a step closer to globalization because all the people in the world now call the city Seoul or similar to it.

50Mqtgcplk cvlqp 'U{ wgo 'qhlEj lpgug'Nqcp'Y qtf u'

The Koreans called Chinese personal and place names in their own Sino-Korean pronunciations for thousands of years. For instance, the following personal and place names were called and written in Sino-Korean pronunciations:

(7) Chinese Proper Names	Sino-Korean Pronunciations
a. Mao Zedong	毛澤東 모택동 Mo T'aektong
b. Deng Xiaoping	鄧小平 등소평 Tong Sop'yōng
c. Jiang Zemin	江澤民 강택민 Kang T'aekmin
d. Beijing	北京 북경 Pukkyōng
e. Shanghai	上海 상해 Sanghae
f. Chongqing	重慶 중경 Chungkyōng

² For detail, one may refer to Ōm (2005), Yan (2005) or Eom (2010).

People in North Korea and the Korean Autonomous Prefecture in Yanbian, China are still reading Chinese names in Sino-Korean pronunciations. In South Korea, however, the Chinese proper names are often read not in Sino-Korean but in modern Mandarin pronunciations. The examples in (7) are supposed to be spelled in Hangŭl based upon their Mandarin pronunciations.

(8) Chinese Proper Names	Mandarin Pronunciations in Hangŭl ³	
a. Mao Zedong	마오쩌둥	Mao Tchöddong
b. Deng Xiaoping	뎡샤오핑	Ttöng Siaop'ing
c. Jiang Zemin	지앙쩌민	Chiang Tchömin
d. Beijing	베이징	Ppeijing
e. Shanghai	상하이	Sanghai
f. Chongqing	충칭	Ch'ongch'ing

This tendency was led by major mass media, such as KBS (Korean Broadcasting Station) and the *Chosŏn Daily* since 1997 and now is rather widely adopted by all the government institutions, almost all the news media and many scholars. This change is based upon the notification of writing foreign loan words, which was revised in early 1986. The first regulations on writing Chinese loan words can be traced back as early as early 1960, when the government regulated how to write the loan words from Chinese, Japanese, French, German and Italian.

However, not many people paid attention to this government notification up to 1997 except for a small group of scholars in the circle of Chinese studies. They were Ch'oe Yöngae and Kim Yongok who first emphasized the necessity of writing Chinese proper nouns in Mandarin pronunciations in Hangŭl writings. They published a table for conversion from Hanyu pinyin to Korean in 1985. The research on Koreanization of Mandarin was conducted by Ik-sang Eom in full scale in 1996. Eom presented his own table of Koreanization of Mandarin in 1996 and the revised table in 2002. In the mean time, he has published a number of articles addressing why and how Chinese proper nouns ought to be spelled in Korean. Although Eom's table is different from that of Choe and Kim, he shares the same reason with them for reading Chinese proper nouns not in Sino-Korean but in Mandarin. That is consistency in writing foreign personal and place names in Korean writings. They questioned why only Chinese names should be written in Sino-Korean pronunciations while all other foreign names are spelled as they are pronounced in the language where the name originated. Eom points out that it is particularly inconsistent to read and write Chinese personal and place names in Sino-Korean pronunciations while Japanese names are read and written in Japanese pronunciations. Eom's successive studies on this issue triggered many other studies by

³ The Korean spellings of Mandarin are based upon Ik-sang Eom's revised system (Öm2002).

many scholars from 1999. The shift of writing Chinese names in Mandarin pronunciations has become visible in the past decade although there are a number of people, including scholars, who still use Sino-Korean pronunciations to write Chinese names.

The new tendency of reading and writing Chinese names in Mandarin has a significant meaning from a Chinese perspective. Although Sino-Korean originated from Chinese, modern Sino-Korean is far different from modern Mandarin. It is because Sino-Korean (SK) is based upon Middle Chinese (MC), which is different from modern Mandarin (MM). The following are examples from Öm (2002:330-331):

(9)	Gloss	SK	MC	MM
學生	student	haksɛŋ	*ɣɔkʃɛŋ	ɛyeʃɛŋ
學校	school	hakkjo	*ɣɔkɣau	ɛyeɕiau
教室	classroom	kjosil	*kauɕt	ɕiaʊʃɪ
英語	English	jɛŋɕ	*ɛŋŋjɔ	iŋɣ
學習	learning	haksip	*ɣɔkzɛp	ɛyeɕi

As one can see in the above, reading Chinese words in Sino-Korean often does not sound like Chinese to the Koreans because more than 70% of the modern Korean lexicon are Chinese loan words or Chinese based words and the Koreans used Chinese characters for more than two thousand years. Accordingly, reading Chinese names in modern Mandarin pronunciations increased Chinese flavor in the Korean language. To be exact, this is more like refreshing Chinese flavor in the Korean language, rather than an addition of Chinese flavors, because Sino-Korean is a Chinese flavor in the past while modern Mandarin is that of the present.

This shift is closely related with two social changes in relations with China: (a) massive personnel exchanges between Korea and China (b) mutual interests in learning Korean and Mandarin. Since the diplomatic normalization in 1992, the relationships between the two countries have grown very rapidly. China is now number one trade partner with Korea, leaving the long term top and second partners, the U.S. and Japan, behind. Korea is the third to fourth largest trade partner with China now. Chinese students are the largest foreign student body in Korea and Korean students are the largest group among foreign students in China too. Accordingly, Mandarin became one of crucial foreign languages to learn in Korea. Thus, it is a timely change to read and write Chinese names in Mandarin in Korea.

This newly developed tendency, in turn, helps Koreans to cope with the rapidly changing international society in the era of globalization. More importantly, by reading Chinese proper nouns in modern Mandarin pronunciations, Koreans began to practice one

principle in spelling foreign loan words. That is to follow the original pronunciation of a loan word. If not, they follow the conventional pronunciation, mostly the English pronunciation for some European and South American names. This new policy indicates that Chinese names are no exception as well as Japanese names, which were already read and written not in Sino-Korean but in Japanese pronunciations. Since this policy makes a clear distinction between Korean and Chinese personal and place names, it is also more or less related to the issue of recovering cultural identity of the Korean people.

60Gzenwukg'Wug'qhMqtgcp'Crj cdgvlp'Y tskpi "

The two policies discussed above are, in turn, closely related with the earlier policy of the use of Hangŭl in writing in terms of recovering Korean identity. The following examples demonstrate how Korean sentences can be written:

- (10) a. 우리는 民族中興의 歴史的 使命을 띠고 이 땅에 태어났다.
 b. 우리는 민족 흥의 역사적 사명을 띠고 이 땅에 태어났다.
 We were born to carry out a historical mission to prosper the people of the nation. (The National Charter of Education)

The policy of using Hangŭl in public writings was established from the beginning of the Republic of Korea in 1948. However, the mixed writing with Hangŭl and Chinese characters has been the norm in modern Korea until the late 60's. There had been serious debates on whether to accept the Hangŭl only policy or keep using Chinese characters in their Korean writings until 1972 when the former president Park Chunghee promoted to the use of Hangŭl only. It may be true that using some Chinese characters in Korean writings can certainly enhance distinction of meanings as is exemplified below:

- | | | | | |
|---------|-------|----|---------|------------|
| (11) a. | 伸張 | 신장 | Sinjang | expansion |
| | b. 腎臟 | 신장 | Sinjang | kidney |
| | c. 新裝 | 신장 | Sinjang | renovation |
| | d. 身長 | 신장 | Sinjang | height |

In addition, Chinese is often claimed to have a stronger function of word formation compared to Korean. The following may support such a claim because it might be difficult to coin these words in native Korean:

- | | | | | |
|---------|-------------------|-------|-------|---------------------|
| (12) a. | video | 동영상 | 動映像 | tongyöngsang |
| | b. vacuum cleaner | 진공청소기 | 眞空清掃器 | chingong ch'öngsogi |
| | c. excavator | 굴삭기 | 掘削機 | kulsakki |

However, the distinction can be easily made within the context of a sentence. There are also some examples where Sino-Korean words have been replaced by English as follows:

(13) a. printer	인쇄기	印刷機	프린터	p'urint'ō
b. fax	전송사진	電送寫眞	팩스	p'aeksŭ

At any rate, the option of mixed writing was discarded because the exclusive use of Hangŭl gained more support from more people, who might have been tired of learning difficult Chinese characters. The more fundamental reason was that they had a strong sense of recovering the national identity. The policy of exclusive use of Hangŭl was implemented in the past forty years; now it has taken root firmly on the ground among the Koreans under fifty or so. The Japanese colonial policy banned using Korean and Hangŭl in public places such as schools during their occupation. Considering this experience, it is understandable to have such policy. This policy may not seem to be closely related with globalization and/or localization. The exclusive use of Hangŭl may be understood as localization because Hangŭl is used only in the Korean peninsula. However, partly using Chinese characters could be understood as localization too because Chinese characters are used only in East Asia. Thus, even if the Koreans decided to use both Hangŭl and Chinese characters in their writing, it might be difficult to claim it as a policy toward globalization.

70E qphlew'ŏp'Mqt gcp'Tqo cphk cvkqp'U{ wgo u'

The Korean government is currently reviewing the system of Korean Romanization, which was revised in 2000 (hereafter RR: the Revised Romanization). As a matter of fact, the Korean Romanization system has never firmly settled down to date because the government adopted four different systems in the past 60 years or so. The Korean Romanization system underwent the following changes:

- | | | |
|------|------|---|
| (14) | 1948 | McCune-Reischauer System |
| | 1959 | Ministry of Education System |
| | 1984 | (Slightly revised) McCune-Reischauer System |
| | 2000 | Revised Romanization System of the Government |

When the Republic of Korea was founded in 1948, it adopted the McCune-Reischauer system (hereafter MR). The so called MR system was first designed by George M. McCune with assistance from Korean linguists, such as Ch'oe Hyŏnbae, Chong Insŏp, and Kim Sŏngi, and was revised by Edwin O. Reischauer in 1939. George McCune was born in P'yŏngyang in 1908 as the son of an American educational missionary and received his primary education in Korea. Edwin Reischauer was an East Asian historian, who specialized in Japan. The McCune-Reischauer system is transcriptional so is

considered to be close to the actual pronunciations of Korean. It has been widely used in the world up to now. The following are some examples of Korean personal and place names Romanized in McCune-Reischauer system:

(15) a. Yi Myǒngbak	李明博	e. Sǒul	서울
b. No Muhyǒn	盧武鉉	f. Pusan	釜山
c. Kim Taejung	金大中	g. Taegu	大邱
d. Pak Chǒnghŭi	朴正熙	h. Cheju	濟州

Despite being widely used, the McCune-Reischauer system was often criticized by the Koreans particularly when it was adopted as the official Romanization system of the country. The most crucial criticism concerned its use of the diacritical marks on some vowels and consonants. It uses the breve on vowels u and o to denote the central high vowel [ɨ] and the open mid back vowel [ʌ] or schwa [ə] respectively. The breve is used to differentiate these vowels from high and mid back vowels, [u] and [o] respectively.

(16) a. 음성 Ŭmsǒng	음성 Ŏmsŭng
b. 언양 Ŏnyang	온양 Onyang
c. 신촌 Sinch'on	신천 Sinch'ŏn
d. 울산 Ŭlsan	을산 Ŭlsan

The apostrophe is also used to denote aspiration on obstruents, such as p', t', k', ch'. Some examples are shown in (17):

(17) a. 병장 Pyǒngjang	평창 P'yǒngch'ang
b. 대안 Tae'an	태안 T'ae'an
c. 갈바위 Kalbawi	칼바위 K'albawi

The currently used Revised Romanization system, on the other hand, removed these cumbersome diacritical marks by making following modifications:

(18) ǒ → eo	ǔ → eu
p → b	p' → p
t → d	t' → t
k → g	k' → k
ch → j	ch' → ch

These changes to MR worked well in terms of simplicity. According to the Revised Romanization system, (16a) and (17a) can be Romanized as follows:

- (19) a. 음성 Ŭmsǒng → Eumseong
 엄승 Ŏmsǔng → Eomseung
 b. 병장 Pyǒngjang → Pyeongjang
 평창 P'yǒngch'ang → Pyeongchang

Simplification, however, caused another problem, which is the discrepancy between Romanized words and the actual pronunciations. Since the McCune-Reischauer system is phonetic, it is closer to the actual pronunciations. On the other hand, the revised Romanization system is phonemic. If the former is more like a transcription, the latter is more like a transliteration. As a result, the sound correspondence between Romanized words and the original pronunciations is weaker in RR than in MR. For instance, the syllable with 'eo' or 'eu' is often mistakenly pronounced in two syllables as is in the following examples:

- (20) a. 宣陵 Seon.neung → Se.on.ne.ung
 b. 驪州 Yeo.su → Ye.o.su
 c. 平昌 Pyeong.chang → Pye.ong.chang
 d. 仁川 In.cheon → In.che.on
 e. 陰城 Eum.seong → E.um.se.ong
 f. 京畿 Gyeong.gi → Gy.e.ong.gi

This is certainly a weakness of the current system and has received much criticism.

Accordingly, the Presidential Council of National Competitiveness (hereafter PCNC) reviewed the current Romanization system in 2009. The Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism (hereafter MCST) has been also reviewing the current system since 2010. The PCNC conducted a survey on the current status of the Korean Romanization system among 118 specialists on Korea, including scholars, translators, librarians, curators, and businessmen over the world in 2009. The results of their survey, reported by Eom (Ŏm 2009), can be summarized as follows:

- (21) a. MR is being used by almost all the libraries in the world except for the Asian region.
 b. 67% of the scholars of Korean studies are using MR while 25% are using RR.
 c. 64% of the specialists are using MR while 30% are using RR.
 d. 53% of the specialists are considering MR is the most idealistic system while 39% are considering RR.
 e. 49% of the specialists suggest the Korean government to adopt MR while 39% of them do RR.

Now the government seems to have two options:

- (22) a. To maintain the current system and work hard to make it spread more widely in the world.
- b. To discard the current system and adopt MR again with or without modifications.

Since the survey by the MCST is still in process, the final conclusion is still awaited. Regardless of what kind of conclusion the MCST may make, it is apparent that the Korean Romanization system may be still controversial.

As a matter of fact, the Korean government adopted MR during 1948-1959 and 1984-2000. The government replaced MR with their own systems during 1959-1984 and 2000-the present. Policy moved back and forth for four times over 62 years in the past. The strong point of MR is that MR is the most widely used system in the world. If MR is adopted, there is no need for concern about discrepancies inside and outside Korea. On the other hand, there seems to be more reason to refuse MR other than the inconvenience of using diacritical marks and complexity of the system for use. The additional, maybe more fundamental, reason why some Koreans are reluctant to adopt MR might be that fact that MR was designed by foreign hands. If this is the case, the adoption of RR is also tied with the issue of Koreans' cultural identity. Some policy makers in Korea might have strong wish to use a Romanization system that was made by their own hands when they adopted RR in 2000.

They may think now is *Hanyu pinyin* the role to follow because it is the most widely accepted Romanization system of Mandarin Chinese in the world. The Wade-Giles system was the official Romanization system for more than 100 year in almost all the libraries in the west. It was originally developed by Thomas Wade in the mid nineteenth century. He was a British ambassador in China and was the first professor of Chinese studies at Cambridge University. His system was revised by Herbert Giles in 1892 and refined by his son Lionel in 1912. Since then, it became the standard Romanization system of Mandarin in western society. Accordingly, even after the People's Republic of China started to use *Hanyu pinyin* in 1958, the Library of Congress of the U.S. and all other libraries in the western world continued to use Wade-Giles system for decades until very recently. However, as the users of *Hanyu pinyin* consistently increase and the International Organization for Standardization (IOS) accepted it as the international standard in 1982, the Library of Congress (LOC) also started to consider changing it from the late nineties. The Library of Congress finally adopted *Hanyu pinyin* in 2000 after extensive debates and research over many years. This change may sound promising to Korean policy makers because LOC may also adopt the governmental system of Korean Romanization in the near future.

However, there is doubt about such possibilities because Korean case is very different from the Chinese case for the following reasons:

- (23) a. PRC has been using the same system for more than 60 years while ROK adopted four different systems during the same period of time.
- b. PRC has been using *Hanyu pinpin* all the time without any exception but ROK used it much less extensively. For instance, Korean Romanization systems have been used mainly in the public sector while general people have tended to freely Romanize their personal names, addresses, and private institutions and so forth.

Accordingly, it is really a tough question for the Korean government whether or not they have to continue to use the current system of Romanization and make it the international standard or adopt McCune-Reischauer system as the international standard.

80Egpenwukp"

This paper examined four language policies in Korea from 1948 to the present. They are the following, repeated from (1) above:

- (24) a. 2005 Changing Chinese Name of Seoul from *Hancheng* to *Shouer*
- b. 1986 Birth of Koreanization System of Chinese Loan Words
- c. 1948 Law of Using Korean Alphabet Exclusively in Writing
- d. 1948-2010 Conflicts on Korean Romanization Systems

Concerning Korean language policies, the fundamental controversy arose from the conflict between globalization and localization in the debates on these policies. The issue of cultural identity played a role in decision making. Thus, these policies can be examined from following perspectives: globalization, localization, and cultural identity:

(25)	Globalization	Localization	Identity
a. Seoul	+	-	+
b. Koreanization	+	-	+
c. Hangŭl Only	(-)	(+)	+
d. Romanization	-	+	+

As one can see from the above table, the most apparent characteristic in the four language policies discussed in this paper is the Koreans' efforts to build up their cultural identity. The Koreans wanted to be perceived as different from Japanese, Chinese, or any other people. Another significant characteristic, which can be found from (25ab), is replacing Chinese flavors from Sino-Korean to modern Mandarin along the path to globalization. Replacement of *Hancheng* to *Shouer* in 2004 means departing from

localization and moving towards globalization. The new trend of reading Chinese personal and place names in modern Mandarin pronunciations, started approximately from 1997, was triggered by massive human exchanges between China and Korea since 1992, when the two countries normalized the diplomatic relations. Since then, the Chinese flavors in the Korean language have been changed from old fashioned Sino-Korean, the Tang flavors, to modern Mandarin flavors. As a result, one can hear more words being pronounced in modern Mandarin in both spoken and written language in modern Korea.

Table (25) indicates the two directions the Korean language policies have been moving toward. They are cultural identity and globalization. These findings suggest what kind of decision should be made on the future of the Korean Romanization system. The above table implies also the reason why this issue has been so controversial over the last 60 years. It involved a choice between two contrary values: globalization and localization. If they chose the value of globalization, it deteriorated the identity value. If they chose the value of localization, it satisfied the identity value. The problem, however, was that localization was not the ideal direction of the Korean language policies. If a certain Romanization system could satisfy both values of globalization and identity, it would be the best choice for the Koreans to choose. However, neither system currently available satisfies both values. The only resolution to this contradiction might be for Koreans to regard MR as the Romanization system which does not violate their value of cultural identity. Recall that McCune was born in Korea and he consulted with three eminent Korean linguists when he first developed the system. Korea is now mature enough to accept global standards that are closely related to the Koreans even if the standards were not originally set up by Korean hands. If Koreans are still reluctant to accept MR with or without modifications, the only remaining choice is to wait until the current system of Romanization (RR) becomes the global standard. The final questions are then how thoroughly the Koreans will use the current system and how long it will take to take over the current position of the McCune-Reischauer system. It is not easy to answer these questions at this point.

Tgltgpegu'

Eom, Ik-sang. 2009 "A Never Ending Story: Korean Romanization Systems." Oregon-Hanyang Linguistics Symposium, The University of Oregon, Eugene, August 12-13.

Eom, Ik-sang. 2010. "A Journey from *Hancheng* 汉城 to *Shouer* 首尔: Linguistic Backgrounds and Popular Perception." In Ik-sang Eom et al. eds. *Perspectives on Chinese Language and Culture*. Taipei: The Crane Publishing Company.

Öm Iksang. 2002. *Chungguk öñöhak Hanguksiguro hagi* [Chinese Linguistics from a Korean Perspective]. Seoul: Hanguk munhwasa.

Öm Iksang. 2003. "Chunggugö Hangül p'yogi muötsi munje inga [What are the problems of Koreanization of Mandarin?]" *Chungguk üi ch'ang* [Windows to China], 2:80-92.

Öm Iksang..2005. "The Theoretical Background of the New Chinese Name of Seoul.[In

- Korean]" *Chungŏ Chungmun* [KJCLL], 36:117-149
- Ŏm Iksang. 2009. *A Report on the Current Status of Korean Romanization Systems Abroad*. Seoul: Presidential Council of National Competitiveness.
- Yan Yixiang [严翼相]. 2005. "Cong yuyanxue de jiaodu kan diming Shouer [从语言学的角度看地名首儿]" *Dangdai Hanguo* [当代韩国], 47:54-61.