

COMMENTS

Jang H. Koo

(University of Alaska)

Ramsey: Professor Ramsey's work is definitely a welcome addition to the phonology of Middle Korean. He is quite right in postulating the two syllable stems for Class 1b verb forms and distinguishing two types of vowels: (1) the vowel of the enclitic ending with an accent (such as *-ó1/ú1*, *-óni/úni*, *-omye/úmye*); (2) the stem final vowel of Class 1b verb forms. In addition, Professor Ramsey has convincingly strengthened his hypothesis with evidence of the "unlenited" *p* and *s* from South Hamkyeng dialect for their corresponding Middle Korean *W* and *z*.

In Professor Ramsey's paper, Rule 1, which deletes an enclitic initial vowel if it is preceded by a stem final vowel, and Rule 2, which deletes a stem final vowel if it is followed by the infinitive ending *-a/-e*, are, however, somewhat in the sense that, 'phonetically, they are not well motivated. There seems to be some sort of principle underlying the two rules, which we may call "durativity" principle. In other words, the vowel deletion is, apparently, not without a phonetic support. The deletion is, seemingly, guided by the durativity principle (although such a principle is, of course, subject to further research for its validity). So it is the vowel of less durativity that is deleted when two vowels occur at morpheme boundary. For instance, in (16b) the vowel *u* is deleted before the *e* because the *u* is of less durativity than the *e*. Consequently, Rule 1 and Rule 2 can be collapsed to one rule (i. e., the durativity principle) thus simplifying the phonological statement.

Another comment is that data used in some area is too meager to be justified (e.g., only one item for *W*-verb stems in Class 2). In the case of the stem final *-l*, there is not a single item used in the list. I might as well cite here for reference Hayata Teruhioo's article "Accent in Korean: Synchronic and Diachronic Studies" appeared in Gengo Kenkyu 66, which I think is pertinent to the present work.

Ree: In the past, no serious work on the subject of the subordinate conjunctions of *-ni* and *-se* has been made available, as Professor Ree reports. Professor Ree is, probably, the first linguist who has made most insightful observations and has systematically discussed the subject, for which he deserves good credit. My only comments are as follows:

No doubt, there is a complex interplay among semantic features of the verb in the main clause which is largely responsible for the determination of either *-ni* or *-se*. To

make a complete discussion, I think that it is necessary to treat *-nikka* more rigorously, although he uses it as a variation of *-ni*. It seems that the *-nikka* is more than the 'emphatic' variation of *-ni*, since it is not interchangeable with *-ni* in some cases. Consider sentence (31b) which is marked with * as unacceptable, and sentence (34b), which is marked with double question marks as quite dubious. If we replace the *-ni* in the sentences with *-nikka*, they become perfectly acceptable (as far as my own judgment is concerned).

Besides those features of *-ni* and *-se* which Professor Ree has correctly pointed out, we might also include another important feature that makes distinct *-ni* form *-se*, the copulative *-la*. The copulative *-la* (or *-ye*) is absent before *-ni*, whereas its presence is obligatory before *-se*. See the examples below:

kunun hakcalase kongpwuman hamnita. (He only studies because he is a scholar.)

* kunun hakcase kongpwuman hamnita.

Sohn: Professor Sohn truly deserves congratulations for his excellent work which is very thorough and well organized, leaving little room for dispute. Above all, his establishing a superordinate sentence for *-TE* is an eminent idea. Only one comment will suffice.

It seems to me that in the deep structure representation, creation of a node for HEARER is necessary to correctly derive the 'retrospective' suffix *-TE*, because REPORTER must have an audience who will listen to his observation, or report, of an event. Along with this, it may as well be pointed out that in (13), (14), (15), and (22b), the participant in the observation may also include the hearer (besides the reporter himself).

Song: I agree with Professor Song that plurality in Korean is a complicated matter and that the plural marking is not entirely arbitrary nor optional. Professor Song was very successful in handling the plurality of pronouns and nouns under one umbrella, for which he is entitled to be congratulated.

It seems to me that a plural noun (which excludes nonanimate nouns) must, underlyingly, be marked for its plurality unless it is generically used; otherwise, there must be some sort of quantifier denoting plurality in the sentence in order to avoid semantic ambiguity. Then the postulated plural marker *-tul* is optionally deleted by a rule if a plural quantifier, such as *manh(i)* 'many', *yeles(i)* 'quite a few', or *myet(i)* 'several', is present along with the plural noun. Accordingly, [sentences (1) and (2) below are semantically interpreted as the same, and so are sentences (3) and (4).

(1) ku cip-ey-nun ay-ka manh-ase kekceng i-ta. (The trouble is that they have many kids in the family.)

(2) ku-cip-ey-nun ay-tul-i manh-ase kekceng i-ta.

(3) keki-ey yele-salam-i moye-iss-ta. (Many people are gathered there).

(4) keki-ey yele-salam-tul-i moye-iss-ta.

The plural quantifier apparently plays an important role in the plural construction in Korean.