

## Phonological Representation and Psycholinguistic Manifestation of Korean Glides

Typologically, glides (Gs) are analyzed language-specifically because of their unique phonetic characteristics: status of Gs varies from language to language, and there seems no unitary explanation (Booij 1989 for Frisian; Davis & Hammond 1995 for English; Clynes 1997 for Tagalog; Wan 1999 for Mandarin). Korean is not an exception in this regard. Even after long history of research, the syllable structure status of Gs in Korean is controversial; some linguists argue that Gs are vowels and should be considered as a part of the nucleus (Kim-Renaud 1977, Kim & Kim 1991, Park 2001); others claim that the Gs are consonants and can be the second element in an onset consonant cluster (B.G. Lee 1982, Ahn 1985, Y.S. Lee 1994, Cheon 2002). Even in slips of the tongue research, both claims have been made: Min (1996) supports the onset hypothesis (OH), and Kang (2003) argues for the nucleus hypothesis (NH). However, in both studies, the total number of data was very small to make a definitive argument. In the present study, 93 speech errors involving Gs (6.5% of 1211 phonological speech errors in Korean) were analyzed to investigate behavioral patterns of Gs in terms of speech production planning (SPP) mechanism, and to look at which hypothesis my data analysis supports.

On the basis of data analysis and findings, two major claims are summarized as follows:

1. As for the phonological status within syllable, I argue that Gs behave like Cs, and are tightly bound to another C, and are associated with onset slot. This claim is based on the following evidences.

a. G in GV and C in CV interacted frequently (N=11).

(1) T: ip-ul nəl.k'e → E: ip-ul jəl.k'e / T: ko.jaŋŋ.i → E: ko.maŋ.i

b. C was added to GV, resulting in CGV (N=4), whereas C deletion from CGV and cases of C<sub>1</sub>GV → C<sub>2</sub>GV did not occur. This finding suggests that C and G are reluctant to be separated.

(2) T: co.ki.ju.hak → E: co.ki.cju.hak / T: kju → E: ju (\*) / T: kju → pju (\*)

c. V of (C)GV string was substituted by another V (N=8), which indicates that G and V can be easily split.

(3) T: ta.rɪn mo.jaŋ.i → E: ta.rɪn mo.jəŋ.i

2. However, contradictory cases as shown in examples (4) & (5) cannot be explained by the representational status of Gs because not only CG but also GV in CGV sequence was substituted by another segment (both cases occurred with similar rate of 24 vs. 20).

(4) T: ca.ki səŋ.kjək-e mac-a.ja → E: ca.ki səŋ.cək-e mac-a.ja

(5) T: kjuŋ.c<sup>h</sup>al-i kaŋ.ce.jən.heŋ.he → E: kaŋ.c<sup>h</sup>al-i kaŋ.ce.jən.heŋ.he

Examples above illustrate that the same [kjə] became either [cə] or [ka]; in the former case, CG sequence [kj] was substituted by a single consonant [c], and the latter is the case where GV string [jə] was substituted by another vowel [a]. These behavioral patterns seem to cause the controversy between OH and NH, because one seems to support the OH, whereas the other is the evidence of NH. This problem can be resolved when the structure of whole syllable where G is involved is considered as a functional unit during SPP processing. In other words, when CGV(C) string is planned in the utterance, G is not identified as a part of CG but considered as a

part of CGV sequence. Thus, either CG or GV was substituted by another C or V depending on the structural similarity of source in the vicinity under two conditions: CG was easily substituted by a palatal consonant when it exists in the same utterance as in example (4), which supports the Kang's (2006) argument; GV was substituted by another vowel when a [+back] vowel is available in the ambient syllable having similar structural form to the target as in example (5). Note that both target and source syllables are word-initial, and shared the same onsets and codas in example (5).

Therefore, I claim that the controversy between OH and NH is attributable to the fact that phonological representation of Gs and psycholinguistic manifestation as functional units of Gs were not treated separately. Speech error data under the study suggest that Gs are associated with onset position, but the behavioral pattern of Gs can be explained in the form of CGV(C) syllable structure rather than a part of CG or GV.

#### References

- Ahn, S. (1985) *The Interplay of Phonology and Morphology in Korean*, PhD. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Booji, G. (1989) On the representation of diphthongs in Frisian. *Journal of Linguistics* 25, 319-332.
- Cheon, S-Y. (2002) Glides as Consonants in Korean. *Language Research* 38 (2), 619-645.
- Clynes, A. (1997) On the Proto-Austronesian diphthongs. *Oceanic Linguistics* 36 (2), 347-361.
- David, S. & Hammond, M. (1995) On the status of on-glides in American English, *Phonology* 12, 159-182.
- Kang, K-S. (2003) The status of onglides in Korean: evidence from speech errors. *Studies in Phonetics, Phonology, and Morphology Vol.9 (1)*, 1-16.
- Kang, K-S. (2006) Are the Korean affricates alveolars or palato-alveolars?: Evidence from speech errors and loanwords. *Studies in Phonetics, Phonology, and Morphology Vol 12(3)*, 431-451.
- Kim, C. & Kim H. (1991) The character of Korean glides. *Studies in the Linguistic Science* 21, 113-125.
- Kim-Renaud, Y. (1977) The syllable structure in Korean phonology, In C. Kim (Ed.), *Papers in Korean Linguistics*, 85-98.
- Lee, B. (1982) A wellformedness condition on syllable structure. In Linguistic Society of Korea (Ed.), *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, 489-506.
- Lee, Y. (1994) Onset analysis of Korean on-glides. In Kim-Renaud, Y. (Ed.), *Theoretical Issues in Korean Linguistics*, 133-156.
- Min, H. (1999) *Syllabification in Korean: evidence from speech errors*. Unpublished Ms. University at Buffalo (SUNY).
- Park, J. (2001) A Status of onglide 'j' in Korean. *Journal of Korean Linguistics* 26.4, 715-773.
- Wan, I-P. (1999) *Mandarin Phonology: Evidence from Speech Errors*. PhD Dissertation. University at Buffalo (SUNY).