書 評・紹 介


This book is a generative treatment of the accentual phenomena of Korean dialects, written in "an attempt to clarify historical relationships between the dialects, and in so doing, to infer as much as possible about what the Korean language was like before our earliest records". The study is based mostly on data of a South Hamkyeng (SH) dialect taken from native informants, data of the Kyengsang (Ky) dialect from He Wung 1955, and written records of Middle Korean (MK). The book consists of an introduction, seven chapters which deal with the accent and its interaction with the segmentals of the dialects, and an appendix comprising a transcription and translation of a story told by an old native speaker of a South Hamkyeng dialect.

The first chapter is divided into three sections: 'General remarks on Korean accent', 'The transcription of pitches in historical texts', and 'Previous work on Korean accent'. The remaining six chapters are 'Historical perspective on the segmental phonology of a South Hamkyeng dialect', 'Lexical accent', 'Compound nouns', 'The realization of accent in the South Hamkyeng dialect', 'Word classes', and 'Concluding remarks'.

Chapter 1 gives general surveys on Korean accent and explicates importance of the hitherto unavailable Hamkyeng dialects of North Korea, as well as the Kyengsang dialects of South Korea. The SH accentual data are all from native speakers of the Hamkyeng dialect of Pukchsong Kwun (北青郡) who are presently living in Seoul, South Korea. R tells us that "In the present study my method is first to establish the synchronic Hamkyeng phonological system and then to analyze Kyengsang accent. From the vantage point of these two modern dialects I take a fresh look at MK accent and try to determine what the proto-system was like." Following general remarks, the two documents of Korean in Chinese characters, which antedate the invention of the Korean alphabet, are treated as potential source of informations about Korean pitches: the *Cháoxiān guān yì yǔ* (朝鮮館譯語) and the *Jì lín lèi shì* (鷙林類事). In each of them the Chinese tone distribution for, at least, MK Low-High words is found to be statistically non-random. After giving some remarks on the *Huwunmin cengum* (訓民正音) R reviews previous work up to 1973 on Korean accent.

Chapter 2 treats SH segmental phonology with special attention given to a comparison with MK phonology. In this book R transcribes all modern Korean dialects in Yale Romanization "which is intended to reflect the form of the original script than actual phonetic
value.” The use of Yale Romanization in generative phonology is, I think, questionable. In this transcription a segment [u], for example, is transcribed as $\text{wu}$, and segments [w] and [i] are transcribed as $w$ and $u$ respectively. Therefore the process (1) below would be transcribed as in (2).

(1) $[w] + [i] \rightarrow [u]$

(2) $w + u \rightarrow \text{wu}$

The expression (2) would be ambiguous. It cannot tell us whether the $\text{wu}$ in (2) consists of two segments, $w$ and $u$, and the process is simply the deletion of $+$, or this $\text{wu}$ is a single segment [u]. In my opinion, Yale Romanization is valid only in a single level of representation, e.g. phonemic or systematic phonetic representation. Thus it is good for syntax and phonemics, but not for generative or process phonology. In Yale Romanization (modified by R?), [e:] and [e] seem to be transcribed as $\text{eye}$ and $\text{aya}$ respectively. Then, how about the distinction between [e:] and [eye], and between [e:] and [aya]? If [e:] is transcribed as $\text{aya}$ and [aya] as something like $a+y+a$, a required rule would have to specify that $\text{aya}$ is to be converted into [e:] if no boundary intervenes, or at least a certain boundary does not intervene, between $a$ and $ya$. In addition some readers will object to R’s theoretical framework relating to the abstractness controversy. R claims on this point that “instead of taking a stand on the issue, I will assume that the abstract analysis of C. Kim 1968 is valid since it recognizes the Yale Romanization form as underlying. These forms represent to a large extent the historical development of Korean vocalism and make it easier to present historical materials. Therefore, all instances of [u], for example, are transcribed here as $\text{wu}$ regardless of whether they are those instances of the vowel which reveal a $w$ in alternations or not.” Although I do not agree with R, I will, as a rule, use that system of Romanization modified by R only for the sake of convenience in this review. My own transcription will, in principle, only be used inside / / and [ ].

The obstruents $\text{w} [\beta], z [z], \cdot [\ddot{h}]$ or $[\gamma]$ form a series of voiced fricatives in MK. (In R’s notation the symbol “. “ (raised dot) in MK is distinct from the symbol “.” (on-line dot) which denotes a bound morpheme boundary in modern dialects.) These obstruents do not occur in any modern dialect: “in the central dialects (which include the Seoul dialect) they have either been lost or survive only as zero or (-w)-semivowel realizations in alternation with the corresponding stops, and in other dialects (such as South Hamgyeong) we find only /p, s, k/ in their places.” R showed that in most environments these fricatives appear to be the result of the lenition of */p, s, k/. R concludes that a voiced fricative series need not be reconstructed for proto-Korean.

In chapter 3 the realization of lexical accent in SH, South Kyengsang (SKy),
and MK is discussed. Pitch patterns of SH can be specified, like those of Tokyo Japanese, by the location of, at most, one accent that can occur on any mora. Therefore, the total number of pitch distinctions for any noun of $n$ moras is equal to $n+1$. When lexical entries are combined to form phonological phrases, pitches are assigned to each mora by the following rule:

(3) R’s Pitch Assignment Rule (PAR) 1.

"Within a phonological phrase, the initial mora is low pitched, unless it is accented, and all the moras following an accented mora are also low pitched. All the remaining moras are high pitched."

Examples:

(4) \[
\text{param} \xrightarrow{\text{PAR 1}} \text{param}
\]

'wind'

\[
\text{pilengparyng} + \text{lo.puthé} \xrightarrow{\text{PAR 1}} \text{pilengparyng|lo.puthé}
\]

'beggar' 'starting from'

\[
\text{cintallay} + \text{chélém} \xrightarrow{\text{PAR 1}} \text{cintallay|chélem}
\]

'azalea' 'resembling'

R’s analysis of Ky accent deserves special mention. According to R, the types of noun accent in the lefthand column in (5) are to be lexically marked as given in the middle column:

(5) a. \[
\text{pa\underline{lam}}
\]

\[
\text{palam}
\]

“wind”

b. \[
\text{ha\underline{nul}}
\]

\[
\text{hánul}
\]

“sky”

c. \[
\text{say\underline{tali}}
\]

\[
\text{saytali}
\]

“ladder”

d. \[
\text{kka\underline{ma\underline{kwu}}}
\]

\[
\text{kkamákwu}
\]

“raven”

e. \[
\text{ka\underline{muchi}}
\]

\[
\text{kámuchi}
\]

“mullet”

R says that the nouns \text{palam} (a) and \text{saytali} (c) are atonic, because the accent of tonic particles like \text{mánkhum} “as much as” appears on the surface when they are the immediately following enclitics of an atonic noun:

(6) \[
\text{pa\underline{lam.man\underline{khum}}} \xrightarrow{\text{PAR 1}} \text{palam.mánkhum}
\]

\[
\text{say\underline{tali.man\underline{khum}}} \xrightarrow{\text{PAR 1}} \text{saytali.mánkhum}
\]

\[
\text{ha\underline{nul.mankhum}} \xrightarrow{\text{PAR 1}} \text{hánul.mánkhum}
\]

\[
\text{kka\underline{ma\underline{kwu.mankhum}}} \xrightarrow{\text{PAR 1}} \text{kkamákwu.mánkhum}
\]
According to R, atonic nouns like *palam (5a) and *saytali (5c) have previously been “incorrectly analyzed” as having an accent on the final mora because of the fact that atonic nouns followed by one-mora particles have pitch patterns like those in (7):

(7)  
\[ \text{pa} \text{lam}. \text{i} \]  “wind (+Subject Marker)”  
\[ \text{pa} \text{lam}. \text{kwa} \]  “wind (+Conjunctive Marker)”  
\[ \text{pa} \text{lam}. \text{to} \]  “even the wind”

R claims that the accent in these forms must belong to the particle, not to the noun, and that the lexical entries for these particles must be *pre-accented* as ‘i, ‘kwa, and ‘to. Now consider the following examples:

(8)  
\[ \text{a. pap}.i \]  “rice (+SM)”  
\[ \text{b. pholı} \]  “fly”  
\[ \text{c. pholı}.ka \]  “fly (+SM)”  
\[ \text{d. mucı kay}.ka \]  “rainbow (+SM)”

These nouns have been believed to be atonic because they do not contain a distinctiv fall in pitch (/mucikay.ka/ would be actualized as *mucı kay.ka*). But, according to R, this analysis is in error since the accent of tonic enclitics following these nouns is suppressed:

(9)  
\[ \text{mucı kay.mankhum} \]

R infers that “rainbow” is tonic, i.e. *pre-accented*, and is represented as ‘mucikay. Thus, R claims that in the accentual system of Ky, an additional rule is required to account for preaccent:

(10) **Pitch Assignment Rule (PAR) 2.**

“Within a phonological phrase, if there is an accent in front of the first mora, the first two moras are high pitched, and all succeeding moras are low pitched.”

I will discuss R’s analysis of patterns like *pa* lam. i and mucı kay after considering the “rising tone” correspondences.

From a comparison of the lexical accent in SH and Ky, R concludes that an accent shift has occurred in the Ky dialect rather than in the SH dialect, i.e. Ky has undergone the following rule:
(11) **Kyengsang Accent Shift (KAS) Rule:**

“Shift the accent one syllable to the left.”

See the following illustrative chart of R's analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>Ky</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>kkoc</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>kkoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó</td>
<td>káp</td>
<td>’o</td>
<td>’kaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oo</td>
<td>palam</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>palam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>óó</td>
<td>atúl</td>
<td>óó</td>
<td>átul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>óóó</td>
<td>móki</td>
<td>’oo</td>
<td>’mokwu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ooó</td>
<td>saytali</td>
<td>ooó</td>
<td>saytali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ooóó</td>
<td>kamákwi</td>
<td>oóó</td>
<td>kkamákwu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ooóó</td>
<td>kamúlchi</td>
<td>óóó</td>
<td>kámuchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ooóó</td>
<td>thókkaypi</td>
<td>’ooó</td>
<td>’thokkaypi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R tells us that MK “attests the same location of lexical accent as South Hamkyeng.” “Remember that a completely ad hoc rule (PAR 2 [(10)]) had to be formulated to account for” “the abberant pre-accented forms; it is difficult to imagine that such a rule could have been original.” Note that in this section the pitch pattern whose first syllable is a reflex of the “rising tone” of MK is excluded from consideration. R says that the KAS Rule (11) means “the South Hamkyeng dialect has preserved lexical accent identical to the lexical accent of an earlier stage of the Kyengsang dialect”, but in consideration of the “rising tone” correspondences it is impossible to say that SH has preserved lexical accent identical to that of an earlier stage of Ky. I will discuss this point later.

According to R the SH accented mora corresponds to the MK first occurrence of a high-pitched mora, marked with the “departing tone”, in a phonological phrase. R gives an MK rule as follows:

(13) “Within a phonological phrase, the first accented mora is high pitched, and allmoras up to that point are low pitched.”

However, R notes that “this rule is based on literal interpretation of the ‘side dots’ and the intermediate moras between the first mora and the accented mora were possibly high pitched.” I do not agree with R on this point. In MK the syllables up to the first “departing tone”, or high pitch, are consistently marked with “level tones”, or low pitch, while those to the right of the first “departing tone” vary to some extent. This means that in MK only the point of a rise in pitch from low to high is distinctive, that is, MK is a language with a rise-
in-pitch accent system. Hattori 1964:43 notes on the Ainu dialects which are characterized by rise-in-pitch accent that the accented syllable “is always high, and the preceding syllables, if any, is always low, but the following syllables(s) may be low or high according to the sentence intonation.” (See Hayata 1974:91). Compare this note with R’s pitch assignment rule for SH, a language with a fall-in-pitch accent in contradistinction to MK. The following is a revised version of R’s PAR 1 for SH:

(14) Pitch Assignment Rule (PAR) 1’

“Within a phonological phrase, the initial mora is low pitched, unless it is accented, and all the moras following an accented mora are also low pitched. The first accented mora is high pitched, and all the remaining moras are non-low [not always high—TH] pitched.”

It will be clear that in a language with a rise-in-pitch accent like Ainu and MK all the syllables (moras) preceding an accented one are consistently low-pitched and all the syllables (moras) following the accented one may be low or high, while in a language with a fall-in-pitch accent like many Japanese dialects and SH all the syllables (moras) following an accented one are consistently low-pitched and all the syllables (moras) preceding the accented one may be low or high.

According to R, PAR 1 (or 1') of SH did not exist in MK. R raises the possibility that PAR 1 (or 1'), or at least a very similar rule, did exist in the proto-language but was lost in the central dialects (which include MK) some time before the fifteenth century. “It would then have been replaced by a rule which specified that an accented mora must be higher in pitch than the preceding moras within the same morpheme.” The alternative is, R tells us, that PAR 1 (or 1') was an innovation of the noncentral dialects. R claims “but it is difficult to imagine that the complex and inconsistent MK pitch assignment rules could be original”, because after the first occurrence of a “departing tone”, or high pitch, the pitch variation becomes very complex.

Before discussing the MK “rising tone” and the dialect correspondences, R gives lists of accent correspondences of nearly five hundred words between MK and the two modern dialects, SH and Ky, to the exclusion of the correspondences of the “rising tone”.

In examining the following forms in (15) of the MK “rising tone”, R concluded that “there is good evidence” for the hypothesis that the “rising tone” is composed of one low-pitched mora plus one high-pitched mora which formed one syllable. In the transliteration of the MK “side dots”, V denotes the “departing tone” ('high-level' pitch), Ê the “level tone” ('low-level' pitch), and Ê the “rising tone” ('low-to-high rising' pitch).
(15) 1. In MK there are a number of alternations similar to the following one:
   
   kahí ~ káy  
   'dog'

2. The contraction of -í (SM) with a low-pitched open syllable is common.
   
   kú + í → kúy  
   'that'

3. A low-pitched noun plus the copula í.
   
   kú + í·wó → kúywó  
   'that'

4. A low-pitched verb stem plus the causative postverb -í.
   
   ná+í' → náy   
   'to be born'  
   'to give birth to'

5. Certain verb stems plus the purportive postverb -wó/wú-. 
   
   pwó + wó' + m → pwóm  
   'to see'  
   'nominalizing suffix'

In the above-cited forms, however, I cannot see any good "evidence" for the hypothesis that a syllable marked with the "rising tone" is composed of two moras. The forms in (15) do show that the "rising tone" syllable was probably pronounced with a low-to-high rising pitch, and that the syllable was perhaps elongated, but do not show that the syllable should consist of two moras. A long syllable [CV:] can be interpreted as consisting of two moras, 1) if there is a contrast between two different kinds of accented long syllable, e.g. CVV/CVÚ or 2) if a long syllable consists of two units in terms of which distances are measured to put stress (high pitch, etc.) in rules such as 'put stress (high pitch, etc.) n units before (after) X.' Take an example of the second case. If in a language a phonological phrase CVCVCV is always pronounced [CVCV | CV] and a phonological phrase CV:CV always [CV: | CV], then the long syllable CV: in the latter is considered to be equivalent to the two short syllables CVCV, that is, this CV: consists of two moras, CV and V, and this language has a rule "put high pitch on the first two moras of a phonological phrase, and low pitch on all the succeeding moras". In MK, however, there is no contrast between two kinds of long syllables like CVC and CVÚ, nor is there any rule of accent measuring phonological distances in terms of units of which a long syllable consists of two. Since in view of the above considerations the "rising tone" syllable is considered to consist of one mora and the location of a rise in pitch is distinctive in MK, my solution is that at most one accent can occur on any syllable boundary and that the "rising tone" syllable is pre-accented, i.e. preceded by an accent. The phonetic length of a syllable is irrelevant to whether it is of two moras or not. Phenomena such as vowel
contraction in low-level phonetic detail do not concern the distinction between syllable and mora. Thus, using the symbol \( \Gamma \) (in MK, rise-in-pitch accent) I represent words like \( k\ddot{a}y \) “dog” and \( s\check{a}lom \) “person” as \( \Gamma k\ddot{a}y \) and \( \Gamma s\check{a}lom \) respectively. (See Hayata 1974, 1976a, 1976b.)

The following chart is a display of the phonological interpretations of MK by R and Hayata:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(16) MK Side Dots</th>
<th>R’s interpretation</th>
<th>Hayata’s interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \ddot{o} )</td>
<td>( \ddot{o} )</td>
<td>( o )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \dot{o} )</td>
<td>( \dot{o} )</td>
<td>( \Gamma o )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \ddot{o} )</td>
<td>( o )</td>
<td>( \Gamma o )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \ddot{o} )</td>
<td>( o )</td>
<td>( \Gamma o )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \ddot{o} )</td>
<td>( o )</td>
<td>( \Gamma o )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \ddot{o} )</td>
<td>( o )</td>
<td>( \Gamma o )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \ddot{o} )</td>
<td>( o )</td>
<td>( \Gamma o )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \ddot{o} )</td>
<td>( o )</td>
<td>( \Gamma o )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “rising tone” correspondences show quite a bit of dialectal diversity. In the Seoul dialect the reflexes of the “rising tone” are distinctively long when they occupy the initial position in a phonological phrase. A small number of non-“rising tone” syllables are also long. In SH the correspondences to the “rising tone” are presently short, and have merged with the accented one-mora syllables.

Examples:

(17) a. mal “horse” (MK m̄ol)
b. māl “mal” (unit of measure) (MK m̄al)
c. māl “speech” (MK m̄al)
d. maal “village” (MK m̄wol̄h)

According to R, native speakers recognize no difference between b and c in (17), and both contrast with a and d in (17), though there is still some morphophonemic evidence that the “rising tone” correspondences were once two moras long.

Since SH has lost the distinction between the patterns b and c in (17), and Ky retains the distinction \( b, m\ddot{a}l \) mid-high-level and short; \( c, m\ddot{a}l \) high-level and long, or low-to-high-rising and long in North Ky (NKy); extra-low and short in South Ky), it is impossible to say “the SH dialect has preserved lexical accent identical to the lexical accent of an earlier stage of the Ky dialect.” The accent patterns of Ky type cannot have developed from those of SH type.
R claims that Ky words like \texttt{palam (.i)} should be analyzed as atomic, and those like \texttt{mucikay} as tonic, and that Hashimoto 1973, Kanno 1972 et al. incorrectly analyzed Ky words like \texttt{palam (.i)} as final-accented and those like \texttt{mucikay} as atomic. Since my analysis (Hayata 1974) is almost in line with Hashimoto 1973 and Kanno 1972 except for the interpretation of NKy initial long syllable of the “rising tone” correspondences, I will examine the two analyses in the following:

(18) R’s analysis:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{palam} + \text{‘i} & \rightarrow \text{pal}\text{.m}.i \\
& \xrightarrow{\text{PAR 1}} \text{pa} \text{lam} (.i) \\
\text{palam} + \text{mankanhum} & \xrightarrow{\text{PAR 1}} \text{pa} \text{lam.man} \text{khum} \\
\text{‘mucikay} + \text{mankanhum} & \xrightarrow{\text{PAR 2}} \text{mucikay.mankanhum}
\end{align*}
\]
R’s analysis requires at least two rules, PAR 1 (3) and PAR 2 (10).

(19) Hayata’s analysis:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{palam}\text{.i} & \xrightarrow{\text{PAR 1}} \text{pa} \text{lam}.i \\
\text{palam} + \text{mankanhum} & \xrightarrow{\text{Asm}} \text{palam} + \text{mankanhum} \\
& \xrightarrow{\text{PAR 1}} \text{pa} \text{lam.man} \text{khum} \\
\text{mucikay} + \text{mankanhum} & \xrightarrow{\text{Asm}} \text{mucikay} + \text{mankanhum} \\
& \xrightarrow{\text{Rule in (26)}} \text{mucikay.mankanhum}
\end{align*}
\]
It is clear from the above examples that Hayata’s analysis requires one more additional rule, Asm (accent assimilation), specifying that an accent (+-accent) in the righthand side morpheme is to assimilate the final accent value (+-accent, --accent) of the lefthand side morpheme in the phonological phrase, that is to say, if a lefthand side morpheme ends with an accent (+-accent), an accent in the righthand side morpheme is to become the accent of that phonological phrase, and if a lefthand side morpheme ends with no accent (--accent), an accent in the righthand side morpheme is to be erased. The rule can be roughly formulated as follows:

(20) Hayata’s Accent Assimilation (Asm)
\[
[+\text{accent}] \rightarrow [\text{accent}]/[\text{accent}]+\ldots
\]
Even the examples R gives as concluding evidence that his solution is correct can be dealt with either analysis:

(21) R’s analysis
\[
\text{kkoch} + \text{cip} \\
\text{‘flower’ ‘house’}
\]

Hayata’s analysis
\[
\text{kkoch}\text{.i} + \text{cip}\text{.i}
\]
Either analysis can treat all the examples R gives. Thus we can say that both analyses are descriptively adequate, and Hayata's analysis looks like having one drawback in that it requires at least one additional rule (Asm). However, consider the following points:

1) According to my observation of native speakers of Taykwu (Taegu), Yengchen, etc., the final syllable of words like palam which R interprets as atonic is in fact pronounced, in isolation, with a high-to-low-falling pitch rather than in a high-level pitch.

Examples:

\[
(22) \quad \text{pa|la|m} \quad \text{“wind”}
\]

\[
\text{pa|la|m.i} \quad \text{“wind+SM”}
\]

This fact shows that Ky pattern like palam is final-accented.

2) By interpreting NKy words like mucikay [muji|ge] as atonic, those like salam(.i) [sara|m(i)] “person (+SM)” and kelta [kæ|ldə] “to hang” can be interpreted as pre-accented, i.e. /æsaram/ and /ægør+da/ respectively. (/ægør/ is ‘to hang’ and /da/ an indicative assertive ending.) By accepting this analysis a completely symmetrical system can be obtained, i.e. a fall-in-pitch accent can occur on any syllable boundary without any restrictions.

3) In many intuitively minimal pairs such as [kaːjəŋ] “hypothesis” vs. [ka|jəŋ] “home”, and [yurɪ] “profitability” vs. [yu|ri] “glass, pane”, there is only one single point of difference instead of two, that is to say, the difference lies only in accent location rather than in accent location and vowel quantity, provided that the underlying forms of these pairs are /ʝgajəŋ/ vs. /ʝgajəŋ/ and /ʝyuri/ vs. /ʝyuri/ respectively.

4) Alternations in vowel quantity and pitch form by inflection and derivation can be explained only in terms of the alternation of accent, e.g.:

\[
(23) \quad /ʝgør+da/ \rightarrow [kæ|lda]
\]

“to hang”

\[
/ʝgør+ə/ \rightarrow əɾ+ə → [kəɾa]
\]

“hanging”

\[
/ʂangyəŋ/ \rightarrow [aŋyəŋ]
\]

“eyeglasses”

\[
/seg+ʂangyəŋ/ \rightarrow seg+angyəŋ
\]

“color+eyeglasses”
As is shown above, in conjugated forms such as [kɔːlda] and [kɔ ɾa] there is only a single point of difference, i.e. accent location, rather than both accent location and vowel quantity, provided that the conjugated stems are /iɡar-/ and /gəɪr-/ respectively.

5) A long vowel due to pre-accent morphophonemically alternates with a short vowel, while a vowel derived by vowel contraction is in principle long. Examples:

(24) A long vowel due to pre-accent

/ɪɡar+da/ → [kɔːlda]  “to hang”
/ɪɡar+ə/ → gəɪrə → [kɔ ɾa]  “hanging”

/ɪboji/ → [poːji]  “the vulva”
/ɪboji+təre]gi/ → boji+təre]gi  → [pojɪtəɾe]gi  “the vulva + hair”

A long vowel due to vowel contraction

/see]mi/ → [seː mi]  “beard”
/see]mi+təre]gi/ → [seːmitəɾe]gi  “beard + hair”

See Hayata 1976a on Ky long vowels.

6) It seems that all the data R gives can be dealt with in R’s analysis. However, consider the following data on Kyengsan (慶山) one of the NKy dialects, from Hashimoto 1978 (simplified transcription by TH):

(25) a. [toː chɪ]  “axe”
b. [ceː bi]  “swallow”
c. [kɔːmə ri]  “leech”

In R’s analysis, a and b above could be analyzed as something like ’toochi (like ’mucikay “rainbow”) and ceyebi (like khamakwu “raven”) respectively, but how about c? ’keemerii would be *[kɔː məɾi] and keemeri would be *[kɔː məɾi] or *[kɔː məɾi].

One might be forced to assume an underlying distinction of syllable structure between V$V$ (the symbol “$” denotes a syllable boundary) and VV which are subject to absolute neutralization and are collapsed into one syllable [V:]. In this analysis the underlying forms of a and c in (25) would be ’to$0$si$hi$ and ’kee$me$ri$ respectively, and desired forms could be obtained by applying a rule such as “within a phonological phrase, if there is an accent in front of the first mora, the first two syllables are high pitched, and all succeeding moras are low pitched.”
The alternative solution would be that NKy words like [kəməri] is pre-accented and that the initial syllable carries an ad hoc additional feature [+long] as ‘kemer’ to indicate that an “initial elongation” rule applies to it. [+long]

Hashimoto 1978 supports the first alternative, and R would accept the second alternative in view of his analysis of the extra-low initial syllable of SKy words like salam “person”, which will be discussed later.

Since NKy has the process of vowel contraction anyway as in /aŋa/ [aː] “baby” and /səmi/ [səːmi] “beard”, we can analyze the long vowels in a and b in (25) as those due to vowel contraction and the long vowel in c as that due to accent. Thus I propose that the underlying form of the words in (25) should be as follows:

(26) a. /dooci/
b. /jëčibi/
c. /gəmari/

Neither an abstract syllable boundary nor an ad hoc feature [+long] is necessary in my analysis. Rules to be applied to a and c above are the following two:

(27) In a phonological phrase without an accent mark and a pre-accented phonological phrase, the first two syllables are high-pitched and the remaining ones are low-pitched.

(28) A phonological-phrase-initial syllable with a pre-accent becomes elongated.

It has already been explicated that this pre-accent functions not as a mere feature [+long], but as an accent as in (23), (24) et al.

In R’s opinion the differences in the “rising tone” correspondences form the principal isogloss dividing NKy from SKy. The SKy correspondences of the “rising tone” are short and distinctively low in pitch. Because of this low pitch, there are three perceptively distinct levels of pitch in the dialect. R marks each of the correspondences to the “rising tone” in the lexicon with a feature to indicate that an ad hoc “low pitch” rule applies to it, (R uses the accent mark “.•”). e.g.:

(29) səlam +ˈtul+ˈi → [səramdiri]
“person” PL SM

Since these SKy correspondences to the “rising tone” behave like pre-accented syllables, R concludes that they have both pre-accent and a “low pitch” feature in the lexicon. According to R the situation in NKy dialect is quite different since the “rising tone” correspondences there are two moras long.

According to my analysis, however, NKy and SKy have the identical lexical
accent patterns, and the main, almost only, difference between these dialects lies in some of the rules of actualization, i.e. Pitch Assignment and Vowel Elongation. The SKy rules corresponding to the NKy rules shown in (27) and (28) would be as follows:

(30) In a phonological phrase without an accent mark, the first two syllables are high-pitched and the remaining ones low-pitched.

(31) A phonological-phrase-initial syllable with a pre-accent becomes extra-low-pitched.

The SKy "rising tone" correspondences need not have "both pre-accent and a 'low pitch' feature in the lexicon" as in 'salam' or sâlam, but need only be preceded by an accent as in /\tsaram/. [+long]

In view of the above considerations I cannot help maintaining that, in NKy and SKy, pa[l]a[m(i)] type words are final-accented (/baram\1/), mu:ci[kay type words atomic (/mu:jige/), sa:lam (NKy) ~ sa[lam (SKy) type words pre-accented (/\tsaram/), and long vowels as in [to:] chi and [ce:] bi] are the result of vowel contraction (/tooci/ and /jee\bi/). (See Hayata 1976a in detail.)

At the end of the section R gives some seventy "rising tone" correspondences between MK and the three modern dialects, SH, SKy, and Seoul.

Chapter 4 gives a brief description of MK compounding followed by a more detailed discussion of SH compounding. R gives two compound rules for SH.

Chapter 5 treats boundaries, the phonological phrase and the phonological clause, and pitch shapes in the SH dialect. R uses three kinds of boundaries: 1) Bound Morpheme boundary indicated with ".", 2) Compound boundary indicated with "-", and Phrase boundary indicated with a single space. R defines the *phonological phrase* as the unit of length which is bounded on both sides by one or more phrase boundary markers, and he describes the *phonological clause* as a "breath group". In this chapter R slightly reformulates Pitch Assignment Rule (PAR) 1, shown in (3), to reflect the actual realization of the pitches within a phonological phrase. The reformulated rule PAR 1' has already been given in (14).

Chapter 6 deals with word classes of MK, SH, and Ky from the accentual point of view. According to R, accentual behavior sheds light on a number of phonological phenomena. R shows many insightful analyses here. Take some examples. In the SH dialect accent is a reliable index for distinguishing particles from nouns. Since particles are bound morphemes, compound rules (R's CR 1 and CR 2) do not apply to them. Compare the following examples:

(32) tåm.pakk.åy \[\text{PAR 1} \rightarrow \text{tåm[pakkey]}

'except for the wall'
tám-pakk.ény → CR 2 → tam-pakk.ény

PARI → tam[pakkey]

The following three words are always classed as particles, and yet in SH they behave accentually like postnouns:

(33) a. -eykkéy → "to"
    ttál-eykkéy → CR 2 → ttal-eykkéy
    ‘to the daughter’

b. -hanthéy → "to"
    apái-hanthéy → CR 2 → apai-hanthéy
    ‘to Grandfather’

c. -mankhúm → "as much as"
    póykseng-mankhúm → CR 2 → paykseng-mankhúm
    ‘as much as the people’

In classifying verbs according to their accentual behavior, R revealed a number of previously unnoticed facts about the segmental shapes of the stems. Among other things he showed that in MK and SH, many verbs which had been thought to have one-syllable, consonant stems in fact have two-syllable, vowel stems. For example, the MK Class 1 verb stems fall into two classes according to whether a following -o/u- is high pitched or low pitched.

(34) Class 1a
tát- → tátol
‘to close’ ‘. . . which will close’

Class 1b
tút- → túl- → túlul
‘to hear’ ‘. . . which will hear’

R claims that the vowel which follows Class 1a stems is an integral part of the enclitic ending (such as -ól/-úl) and always has an accent; the two-syllable vowel in the Class 1b forms, however, is an integral part of the stem. Thus the above-cited examples will be analyzed as follows:

(35) Class 1a
tát + ól → tátol

Class 1b
tútú + úl → túlul

R proposed that "among these two-syllable stems were those stems whose final
consonant in Middle Korean is W, z, or t/l. This means that in Middle Korean W, z, and t/l are in complementary distribution with stem final /p, s, t/1. This fact supports the hypothesis that proto-Korean */p, s, t, k/ lenited under certain phonological conditions in the central dialects.”

Among many splendid solutions R gives in this book, the above-mentioned one is, I believe, especially excellent. I would only like to know the formulation, for example, of t→l conversion, which occurs where t is not followed by a morpheme boundary, for this might be a challenge to Chomsky-Halle’s proposition that any phonological rule of the form A→B/C—D can be expanded to include sequences of segments interspersed with +boundaries.

Chapter 7 which consists of two pages of concluding remarks is followed by an appendix comprising a transcription and translation of a story told by an old native speaker of SH. The text consists of forty two lines, each line transcribed phonetically. The relative height of the pitch of each vowel, a morphonemic transcription and tag translations are below each line.

Even if in some respects I cannot agree with R, the quality of this book is excellent indeed. This book will lead us to a fruitful revision of our notions of MK structure and modern Korean accent. R tells us that the value of this book “lies not in the particular solutions it offers, but hopefully in the information it makes available to other linguists.” Its value is, needless to say, more than that. Professor Ramsey demonstrates a thorough knowledge of both theory and fact in his book. Accent and morphology in Korean dialects will long be indispensable to all who are interested in Korean.
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