Progress in Korean linguistics has been notable in recent years. Formerly most works on the Korean language were written in Korean, and many of those were philological in character. Today studies in Korean are increasing in quality and quantity both in the West and in the East. In 1975 the International Circle of Korean Linguistics (ICKL) was founded for the international promotion of Korean language studies and linguistics. In 1977 the symposium on Korean linguistics was held at the University of Hawaii, which was the first international meeting on Korean bringing scholars from both East and West together in one place. One of the volumes reviewed here reports this symposium (in which I could not participate, unfortunately), and the other the inaugural number of the official journal of ICKL (of which, incidentally, I am a member).

*Papers in Korean linguistics* is the report of the symposium on Korean linguistics carried out during August 18–20, 1977. ‘The present volume is a crystallization of this meeting, and contains a broad spectrum of Korean linguistics from a reconstruction of proto-stress-accents to pragmatics of compound verbs, from Middle Korean phonology to language policies in divided Korea’ (preface). It consists of a preface by Chin-W. Kim plus 26 papers grouped in four sections: ‘Historical Linguistics’, ‘Phonology’, ‘Syntax’, and ‘Sociolinguistics’.

There are five papers on historical linguistics. Lloyd B. Anderson, writing on ‘Sound-changes and pitch-accent systems in Korean dialects: two results of original differences in *stress-accents*’ (3–36), claims that stress-accent existed in Korean, and attempts to reconstruct proto-stress-accent from the segmental differences between Korean dialects, using data from Ogura Simpei (1940). Then, using data on Korean and Japanese pitch-accent systems, he tries to explain the history of the accentual systems of Korean and Japanese dialects by postulating proto-stress-accents in both languages. Anderson asserts that ‘It is much too easy to jump from the obvious statement that it is hard to get evidence on reconstructing *stress*, to the empirical (and usually false) assumption that *stress* did not play a major role in earlier stages of a language (family) just because it is no longer directly attested: ‘we can’t prove it exists, therefore it does not exist’ is the crudest form of this jump’ (34).

In the second paper, Wanjin Kim suggests ‘A tense-lax hypothesis for Middle Korean’ (37–39). He has already postulated a tense-lax theory for modern Korean vowels in order to obtain a phonological solution of the so-called -ri
irregular verbals. He assumed that the phonetic substance of the tenseness is identical to so-called vowel length, and that after the application of something like lax-ı-deletion in certain environments, an absolute neutralization rule called *tenseness sweeping* erases tenseness or vowel length in all positions other than the first syllable of a word of a breath group. Examples would be: /irir-ı/ ‘arriving’ → (lax-ı-deletion inapplicable) → [irirə] (*tenseness sweeping*), but /orir-ı/ ‘ascending’ → orir-ı (lax-ı-deletion) → [olla] (other rules). While synonymy of vowel length with tenseness is conceivable for Modern Korean, claims Kim, there may be recognized for Middle Korean only some sort of correlation between the oppositio. ns high tone vs. low tone and tense vs. lax. Examples would be: /nirir-ı/ ‘arriving’ → [nirirə], /orir-ı/ ‘ascending’ → orir-ı → [olla], but /morir-ı/ ‘not knowing’ → morir-ı → [olla]. /är-iini/ → [ami], /är-iisi/ → [asisi]. Whatever phonetic correlate may be assumed, he sets up an underlying distinction between vowels not alternating with zero and vowels alternating with zero.

Ki-Moon Lee, in ‘The reconstruction of *ya in Korean’ (41–43), demonstrates steady and solid reconstruction of earlier *ya in initial syllable, which had been lost in Middle Korean (MK) by the 15th century, from the correspondence between MK ya and the Ceycwu dialect (CD) (ya). He reconstructs not only initial *ya, but also initial *nya, *nya, *nya, *nya, *nya, *nya, *nya, *nya. CD yaas, MK yas ‘six’ <*yasas; CD yarim, MK yarim ‘summer’ <*narim; CD marir, MK marir ‘leisure’ <*narir; CD marir, MK marir ‘to be short’ <*arir; CD mas, MK mas ‘breasts’ <*mara; CD mas, MK maw ‘to stand’ <*maras; CD mas, MK maw, (rarely) maw ‘to light’ <*maw; CD mas, MK maw ‘to pull’ <*maras. ‘Thus, palatalization and y-deletion occurred in CD, while *ya>y occurred in MK’ (42). He adds ‘that CD shows ya in some Sino-Korean pronunciations; for example, yap-čan 業錢 (a type of Korean coin), yaam-ča’ 勸諫 ‘honor’ ... the above examples are enough to indicate that at one time Sino-Korean had *ya’ (42).

Sang Oak Lee, in ‘Conspiracy in Korean phonology revisited: from a diachronic point of view’ (45–57), investigates historical changes in Korean, and casts some doubt on Chin-W. Kim’s idea about the conspiracy of ‘close and peripheral articulations’ in Korean (many, e.g. 1972a,b, 1973), i.e. the tendency to minimize the aperture between the upper articulator and the lower articulator in producing speech sounds, and the tendency to articulate sounds in labial or velar regions.

S. Robert Ramsey, in ‘S-clusters and reinforced consonants’ (59–66), convincingly shows that at least in Yong pi e chen ka and Hwunmin cengum enhay the grapheme s is intended to represent just [s] even in clusters such as sp, st, sk, and pst, rather than to represent the reinforcement of the following consonant.

The phonology section contains five papers. Sang-buun Cheun, in ‘#-
deletion as a phonological rule' (69–74), claims, in treating compound nouns in Korean, that the deletion of # is not convention but an ordinary phonological rule which should be ordered with respect to other rules.

Kong-On Kim, in 'Vowel system of Korean revisited' (75–83), discusses two underlying vowel systems in Korean, an abstract one proposed by Chin-W. Kim (1968) consisting of four vowels i, e, a, o, and the other quite concrete one proposed by B. Lee (1974) consisting of ten vowels i, e, ẽ, ẽ, ɔ, ɔ, i, a, a, u, o. Kong-On Kim states '[Chin-W.] Kim’s abstract system using y as off-glide does not have its claimed merits. . . . The inadequacy of the system is revealed by the implausibility and inoperativeness of the proposed rules. B. Lee’s recognition of the two front rounded vowels ẽ and ɔ as underlying vowels is undesirable in view of the implausible rules needed to account for the relation between these vowels and their respective free variants' (82–83). Finally he proposes a system with eight vowels ẽ, ẽ, ẽ, ẽ, ẽ, a, a, u, o and three glides y, ẽ, ẽ.

Young-Kei Kim-Renaud, writing on ‘The syllable in Korean’ (85–98), presents syllable boundary assignments, and shows that many phonological processes in Korean are governed by 1) a tendency to weaken the syllable coda; and 2) the strong nature of the initial syllable. ‘The apparent counterexample to the tendency to minimize the syllable coda was shown to be governed by another tendency to keep the first syllable of the major lexical item strong’ (96). P. 86 and p. 87 in this paper must be interchanged.

Takao Ooe, in ‘Negative adverbs in southern dialects from an accentual point of view’ (99–112), furnishes ample data of verb paradigms of two negative forms, inability and simple-negative, in the Tayku (Taegu), Antong (Andong) and Cincu (Chinju) dialects. Of the three dialects, Tayku shows a least straightforward, therefore most interesting, accent system in simple negative verbs. P. 109 of this paper should be inserted between p. 294 and p. 295 of F. Lukoff.

Han Sohn, writing on ‘Tension in compound boundaries in Korean’ (113–117), claims that the different tensifications in compounds as in il=to [ilt’o] ‘one degree’ /il=pun [ilbun] ‘one minute’, which cannot be explained by a t-insertion rule, should be explained by the following rule: t, c, s → [+tense]/

The syntax section includes twelve papers. Rafael Abasolo, in ‘Semantic trends in verbal compounding’ (121–128), examines the Korean verb structure, the V₁-a-V₂ compounds, by taking the semantic point of view proposed by Chafe (1970). He selects the productive members and combinations and classifies them semantically, observing their distribution.

Young-Hie Han, in ‘The Korean verb of existence, iss’ (129–135), argues against D. Yang 1972 who postulates that the two sentences (1) John i ton i iss-ta and (2) John eykey ton i iss-ta are synonymous, (2) being the underlying form
of (1). Enumerating various different syntactic behaviors and meanings which differentiate (1) from (2), Han claims that these two sentences are not synonymous and that they are derived from different and separate underlying configurations: roughly (1) [John_{NP}[ton_{NP}iss{Pred}], (2) [ton_{NP}John_{LOC}iss{Pred}].

Nam-Kil Kim, writing on ‘Tolok sentential complements in Korean’ (137–147), shows that tolok clauses should be treated as sentential complements, discusses differences between tolok sentential complements and other types of sentential complements, examines and considers types and characteristics of predicates which occur with tolok complements.

Chungmin Lee, in ‘Negative imperatives in Korean’ (149–156), shows various aspects of the negative imperative construction ‘Verb Stem -ci mal-al-a’ in Korean.

Ik-Hwan Lee, in ‘Some aspects of indirect speech acts in Korean’ (157–165), examines two principles from Gordon & Lakoff’s (1975) conversational postulates: request by questioning the hearer’s ability and request by questioning the hearer’s willingness. He shows that, in English, the first principle may be true, but that the second principle does not seem to be true. It was argued that neither of the principles works in Korean. He suggests that we need the notion of ‘indirect order’ in addition to ‘indirect request’. Thus, he claims, Gordon & Lakoff’s analysis is weakened, especially their universality assumption. The same seems to be true with Japanese.

Keedong Lee, writing on ‘The deictic motion verbs kata and ota in Korean’ (167–176), tries to present principles underlying the proper use of the Korean deictic motion verbs kata and ota.

Joe J. Ree, in ‘A re-analysis of (u)ni and (e)se’ (177–184), provides a detailed analysis of the causal particles (u)ni and (e)se. Ree states ‘The sentence or the proposition containing (e)se is embedded within one and the same major sentence, and consequently the (e)se-subordinate clause and the co-occurring main clause are in the scope of just one underlying performative sentence. In the case of the (u)ni clause, on the other hand, it is not dependent on the main clause, but it is an independent clause, underlying which is a separate performative sentence’ (177). It is suggested that ‘the verb of the highest clause involving the (u)ni is, in both clauses, cvucanghata ‘assert’, while the performative verb in the case of (e)se is non-assertive malhata ‘say, inform’ ’(177). All this is roughly shown as follows: [1stPer 2ndPer [SubCl (e)se MainCl] malhata] and [[1stPer 2ndPer SubCl cvucanghata] (u)ni [1stPer 2ndPer MainCl cvucanghata]]. From the point of view of Japanese it is especially interesting in that the same might be true of the Japanese causal particles kara and node.

Paul T. Sato, writing on ‘Adjectives and copula in Korean’ (185–196), argues that the Korean copula i- has diachronically derived from the nominative case suffix -i, and that the original phonological shape of the copula was zero. It is claimed that since the nominative case suffix is used only when the nominal
is substantivized, and adjectives, which were originally nominals, are by definition non-substantivized, in the case of adjectives the conjugational endings were added to this zero-shaped root of the copula. Thus the Korean adjectives exhibit virtually the same set of conjugational endings with the copula.

Ho-min Sohn, in ‘Contractions as a mechanism of polysemic breeding: a device for speaker involvement in Korean’ (197–205), attempts to explain how and why the contraction of sentences like ‘John un kongpuha-n-ta ko ha-n-ta’ into those like ‘John un kongpuha-n-ta-n-ta’ not only retains the original reading [They (someone or John) say(s) that John is studying] but also has developed an additional reading [I say that John is studying].

Seok Choong Song, in ‘Causes of confusion in descriptions of causatives in Korean’ (207–216), shows various problems that follow from deriving both the periphrastic and lexical causatives in Korean (e.g. *cwuk-i* ‘to kill’ and *cwuk-key ha* ‘to cause to die’) from a single underlying structure.

Dong-Whee Yang, in ‘Tense in Korean adnominal clauses’ (217–226), discusses several factors that decide or affect the interpretation of the adnominal clause tense. Yang presents a hypothesis that, in Korean, the basic or unmarked embedded tense, including that of an adnominal clause, is endophoric, that is, the tense of embedded clauses is interpreted with respect to the matrix clause event time rather than to the speech time.

In-Seok Yang, in ‘Pragmatics of going-coming compound in Korean’ (227–242), treats some semantic and pragmatic behaviors of the going-coming compound verbs in Korean, in the light of the contrast of the V-a Best/fo type and the V-ko ka-/o- type, the literal vs. figurative use, and the nature of verbs in the V₁-slot.

The last section of this volume, sociolinguistics, consists of four papers. Chin-W. Kim’s ‘Divergence in language policies in Korea’ (259–268) is an informative survey on language situation in Korea where, Kim states, the following three factors have been contributing to make the situation quite complicated: a large number of Sino-Korean words; lack of standardization, especially of orthography; and political division of Korea. As concluding remarks he suggests a number of proposals to improve the situation.

Ki-Hong Kim, in ‘Cultural and linguistic variables in the language of emotion of Americans and Koreans’ (259–268), investigates some similarities and differences in emotional words between English and Korean. His research shows that primary emotions such as pleasure, surprise, anger, fear, and sadness are the same in Korean and American cultures, but the following differences are noted: sadness and loneliness are more cultivated in Korean culture; timidity, shyness, shame, guilt, and remorse constitute a single category in Korean culture, whereas in American culture, timidity and shyness constitute one category, and
shame, guilt and remorse another category.

Fred Lukoff, in 'Ceremonial and expressive uses of the styles of address of Korean' (269–296), attempts to show 'first, that the styles of address [grades of politeness] have both ceremonial and expressive uses, and second, that there is an essential relation between their ceremonial and expressive meanings. The concept of objectivity is brought out as formality in ceremonial contexts and as seriousness, etc., in expressive contexts. And the concept of psychological distance is brought out as respect in ceremonial contexts and as personal distance in expressive contexts' (281). Between p. 294 and 295 of this paper, p. 109 should be inserted.

Cheong-Soo Suh, in 'Remarks on subject honorification' (297–304), shows that a nominative NP that refers to a human referent deserving the speaker's esteem can have the property of triggering the honorification of the verb regardless of whether or not it is the subject. It is interesting that this paper is included in the section on sociolinguistics, rather than that on syntax.

*Korean linguistics vol. 1* (1978), the inaugural number of the official journal of ICKL founded in 1975, is to be warmly congratulated on its publication, which is expected to hereafter internationally promote and coordinate Korean linguistic studies. As for the purpose of launching a new journal, Seok Choong Song, President of ICKL, states in the foreword:

'This is the only journal of linguistics that deals exclusively with the Korean language and that is published in English. Most linguists have no direct access to materials written in Korean; by means of this journal, we can provide access for these linguists. At the same time, we hope that the journal will pave the way for two-way traffic, attracting as many works as possible on the Korean language by foreign scholars throughout the world.'

This volume contains the president's foreword plus nine papers, of which only two deal with phonology, six treat syntax, and the last one concerns typology, a syntax-oriented contrastive study.

Young-Key Kim-Renaud, in 'Semantic Features in phonology: evidence from Korean vowel harmony' (1–18) reprinted from *CLS* 12 (1976), claims that the Korean vowel harmony in both affixal alternation and sound symbolic words can be described in a simple, explanatory manner only by adopting in phonology semantic features [light] (yang) and [dark] (yin) which exist in the language independent of vowel harmony rules. Incidentally, I have once proposed an analysis on Middle Korean vowel system and vowel harmony based on purely phonological terms, i.e. without referring to semantic features (Hayata 1975).

Ik-Hwan Lee, writing on 'Korean vowel system: abstract solution?' (19–44), gives a number of interesting discussions. He proposes a concrete analysis like
the above-mentioned one by Kong-On Kim (1978, in Papers in Korean Linguistics) as opposed to the abstract one represented by Chin-W. Kim (1968). It was assumed that eight vowels i, e, æ, ɛ, a, ɑ, u, o and, probably, only two glides y, w should be present at the level of underlying representation in Korean. The difference, if any, of vowel-glide inventory between K-O Kim's system and I-H Lee's system lies only in that the former admits three glides y, w, ɨ while the latter has two glides y, w.

Nam-Kil Kim, in ‘Exclamatory sentential complements in Korean’ (45–60), discusses the differences between the exclamatory sentential complement and the independent exclamatory sentence of Korean. He argues that the exclamatory complements should be distinguished from the question complements, although the former is superficially identical to the latter. General characteristics of exclamatory predicates are also investigated.

Dong Jae Lee, ‘Kuliko: an adverb or a conjunctor’ (61–81), examines the phonology, morphology, syntax, and discourse of kuliko and other similar forms of Korean. He proposes that kuliko and other similar forms (kulela, kuleni(kka), kulechiman, etc.) should be recognized as fossilized forms and classified as a separate class, i.e. conjunctors, rather than as inflected adverbial forms of the verb kuleha.

Choon-Kyu Oh, in ‘Another look at Korean negation’ (82–90), states that in Korean the longer negation (Verb-ci ani ha) seems to be fundamental, while the shorter negation (ani Verb) is obtained by some transformational rules. Discussions are given on some pragmatically oriented complications.

Seok Choong Song, in ‘On an abbreviation phenomenon in Korean’ (91–107), shows that certain compound connectives, verbal endings, and compound postpositions in Korean allow the abbreviation of the second element, e.g. -e(-se), -ko(-se), -mye(n-se), -eykey(-se), -hanthey(-se). Song claims that the two readings of -ko iss-, progressive and resultative, could be derived from the underlying -ko iss- and -ko-se iss- respectively.

Zino Song, in ‘Noun complementation in Korean’ (108–127), shows that the three types of complex noun phrases—complemented NP, nominalized NP, and relativized NP, such as catongcha ka ka-nun soli, catongcha ka ka-nun kes, and catongcha ka ka-nun kil respectively, are different from one another, and that the structural similarity between them can be explained by the existence of the element ku before the head noun in a complex NP as a deep structural element, which is replaced by the embedded sentence. Further, Song proposes the distinction between direct complementation and indirect complementation such as Y ka phiano lul chi-nun soli (the sound of Y playing the piano) and chinkwu ka Pusan eyse o-n-ta-nun cenpo (the telegram saying that my friend is coming from Pusan) respectively, the distinction related to the semantic properties of the head noun [±Direct].
Gerald B. Mathias, in ‘Subject’ and ‘topic’ in Korean, Japanese, and English’ (128–145), treats the nun/ka (wa/ga) problem. As an experiment a simple Korean story was recopied with ‘(-ka/-nun)’ replacing all (twenty four) cases of -ka or -nun. This was presented to two native speakers of Korean (a third native speaker is the original text), and the Japanese version with ‘(-ga/-wa)’ to three native speakers of Japanese, who were asked to select unnatural or more acceptable particles. The English version was marked for possible intonations with Mathias himself. The results are compared and commented. Mathias states ‘It does more to confirm the similarity of Korean and Japanese than to provide the looked-for cases of non-congruence for further analysis. . . . It reveals that certain English intonation patterns are more often ambiguous between theme-comment and neutral description subject-predicate than had been expected. . . .’ (141).

John Young Sohn, in ‘A contrastive study of the Altaic cases’ (146–192), compares the syntactic and semantic aspects of the five languages—Korean, Japanese, Classical Manchu, Classical Mongolian, and Osmanli Turkish—from a contrastive point of view, and states that there are surprisingly divergent syntactic features of the grammatical cases, but that many suffixes are cross-linguistically similar in both phonological shape and grammatical function.

I found myself unequal to the task of reviewing thirty five papers in the two volumes ranging over historical linguistics, phonology, syntax and semantics, pragmatics and sociolinguistics. Some papers are beyond my understanding, some articles seem to contain moot points, but all the studies are more or less of benefit to me. I hope Korean linguistics in every meaning of the word will take a giant leap forward with the publishing of these two volumes providing the momentum.
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