

# Morphology of Partial Reduplication in Korean<sup>1)</sup>

**Kabyong Park**  
(Namseoul University)

Park, Kabyong. 2000. **Morphology of Partial Reduplication in Korean.** *Journal of the Linguistic Association of Korea*, 8(3), 1-19. Korean abounds in the examples of reduplication. Along with full morpheme reduplication, Korean also exhibits an interesting set of partial reduplication. The goal of the present paper is to focus on a certain set of partial reduplication and propose a prosodic account of the derivation of the partially reduplicated forms. Following Marantz (1982) generally, I propose that the unmarked cases of partial reduplication involve the affixation of a CV(monosyllabic) or a VCCVC(bisyllabic) template. I claim that affixation of a syllable does not exist in Korean, whether the affixation takes place before the base, internally, or after the base. I also show that Korean exhibits the marked case of the association between the phonemic melody and CV slots: from right to left. (Namseoul University)

## 1. Introduction

Reduplication, of which we can easily find examples cross-linguistically, has long been a problem for theories of phonology and morphology. Korean is not an exception. Rather, Korean might be one of the languages that employ reduplication as a very productive process to derive a certain set of empirical data. No wonder it has been one of the hot issues in the recent literature of Korean phonology. Many analyses have been proposed in various perspectives, most

---

1. This is a revised version of the paper presented at the Conference of the Linguistic Association of Korea held in Nov. 2000. I thank Professors Jaesul Ko, Sukkeun Kang, Ongmi Kang, Yongnam Um and the audience for their discussions. I also thank an anonymous reviewer for his/her valuable comments.

recently from the angle of the Correspondence Theory(Davis and Lee 1996, Kang 1998, Kim 1996 Jun 1994, McCarthy and Prince 1986 among others). Marantz(1982) proposed a simple model of reduplication in which he claims that reduplication rules are, like other morphological processes, just normal affixation processes, and that reduplication should be regarded as the affixation of a consonant-vowel(CV) skeleton. According to Marantz, the entire phonemic melody of the stem is copied over the affixed C-V skeleton and linking to the C and V slots in the skeleton is carried by some general principles he has established.

In the present paper, I examine examples of partial reduplication in Korean and discuss relevant issues, following generally Marantz(1982). I focus on a certain set of partial reduplication and hope to show that the affixation of a C-V skeleton would derive a range of Korean data. Interaction between phonology and morphology must play a key role in any attempt to provide a plausible account of the examples under discussion. However, in this paper, I am mainly interested in the morphology of the data under analysis: how to derive the reduplicated forms and how to list the entries in the lexicon. I attempt to address the following questions: (i) What kinds of reduplication processes exist in Korean? (ii) How do we list the reduplicated words under analysis in the lexicon? (iii) How do we account for these reduplication processes without losing any generalization and without adding any redundancy to pursue minimalism?

I claim that Korean exhibits reduplication of a CV template: CV or VCCVC. One of the consequences that lie under this proposal would be that reduplication of a syllable does not exist in Korean. The current proposal predicts that copying of a heavy syllable CVC from a word with more than two syllables is not allowed.<sup>2)</sup>

The present paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses well-known common properties of reduplication in Korean. The

---

2. I do not intend to address the allegedly phonological question why the affixation of a heavy syllable is generally ruled out.

following section classifies various types of reduplication. Section 4 is devoted to the discussion of a proposal, which is followed by conclusion.

## 2. Common Properties of Reduplication in Korean

There are some linguistically significant generalizations (syntactic, semantic and phonological) in the examples of reduplication. First, most of the examples showing reduplication are adjectives or adverbs as shown below. Children's vocabulary<sup>3)</sup>, on the other hand, include many examples of reduplicated nouns.

- (1) a. salsal jemjem duledule  
b. dudu ŋ sil pudedek alsongdalsong
- (2) a. pungpung ccicci kkakka  
b. mamma ppabppa

The data in (a) exemplify total reduplication, whereas the examples in (b) show partial reduplication.

Secondly, all the reduplicated words in (1) have something common in their meaning. Generally speaking, the Korean language abounds in vocabulary to express the senses and emotions. Most of the examples of reduplication come from onomatopoeic words and mimetic words designed to express mimicry of appearance, smell, size, color, taste, movement, or other perceptual experiences. Some Korean linguists call these words under analysis 'sound symbolic words' in the sense that the vowels in the given words can allow native speakers of Korean to be able to predict the delicate connotation of the words. For example, *malangmalang* is used to refer to something small and soft, and *mulengmuleng* to refer something softer and perhaps a little bigger.

---

3. One might speculate that even their basic words like *appa* 'daddy' are the result of partial reduplication.

#### 4 Kabyong Park

The third common characteristic has something to do with vowel harmony. Korean vowels fall into three subgroups with respect to vowel harmony; light vowels, dark ones, and neutral ones. Light and dark vowels can not co-occur in the context which is subject to the vowel harmony principle. The principle of vowel harmony was strongly restrictive in Middle Korean: any combination of roots or stems and suffixes was subject to the vowel harmony constraint. But it has tended to be weak gradually in later times. All the examples under analysis exhibit the strict case of vowel harmony. Moreover these words seem to be the only group of words still associated with the vowel harmony principle.<sup>4)</sup>

- (3) a. muleng mulengmuleng
- b. molang molangmolang
- c. malang malangmalang
- d. \* mulangmolang
- e. \* molangmuleng

We might lose some generalizations if we list the reduplicated forms as separate lexical entries along with the bases. Later we will discuss how we should derive these forms to capture those generalizations.

### 3. Various Types of Reduplication

#### 3.1 Total Reduplication

The first type of reduplication is the whole morpheme reduplication (or 'total reduplication'), by which we mean copying entire morphemes. Examples of total reduplication are found cross-linguistically. Korean also exhibits a wide range of data for this type of morphological process. Some more examples are given below in (4).

---

4. Another case of vowel harmony can be found only in the environment of verb stems plus e-initial affixes; e.g. *mek-ess* 'ate' vs *mak-ass* 'blocked'.

## (4) Total reduplication

- a. chalangchalang      pelekpelek      chulengculeng      arunarun  
pingkulpingkul      bancakbancak      dengsildengsil      julengjuleng  
bisilbisil jajangjajang      hulccekhulcek      bangsilbangsil      hijukhijuk
- b. kolkol ppelppel mengmeng gomgom loljol dongdong kwalkwal  
haha hoho selsel kkengkkeng

Both the bases in (4a)--prior to reduplication process--and those reduplicated forms can appear in isolation. There is a systematic difference in meaning between the two sets: the latter has an intensive connotation and it is likely that the latter sets are used to express a little longer duration of time. For example, in *pingkelpingkel*, the circle involved is smaller and the movement is assumed to be faster and longer. This means of reduplication for the emphasis of meaning is highly productive in the sense that (i) the native speakers can produce new reduplicated forms when they hear exotic sounds or when they try to describe the shape of something new, and that (ii) they can predict the form and connotation of the paired words resulting from reduplication. Thus it is clear that the examples in (4a) are genuine examples of reduplication, full morpheme reduplication. In this case of whole morpheme reduplication, it thus seems reasonable to list only the stems in the lexicon and derive the reduplicated forms in (a) by a reduplication rule. But I claim that this is not done by a reduplication rule but by the addition of a morpheme carrying the relevant semantic features with a phonological form of a morpheme skeleton. They could be explained by the addition of a morphemic skeleton to a stem.

The bisyllabic forms in (b) are, on the other hand, used only as reduplicated forms. Still, we are led to posit a monosyllabic half as the base and derive these reduplicated forms in order to capture the generalization under investigation. Then, the lexical entries for these examples would look like the following. The only difference between the two seems to be the optionality of the affixation, which is indicated in the parenthesis in (5).<sup>5)</sup>

(5) Total reduplication

- a. *pelek*: (m) [pelek]
  - b. [pelek] = *pelekpelek*
- |
- m + m

(6) a. *gomgom*: [m] [gom]

- b. [gom] = *gomgom*
- |
- m + m

The only difference between the two (5) and (6) is the obligatoriness of reduplication. The parenthesis of the lexical entry in (5) indicates that the reduplication process is optional. What it means is that there are not two separate lexical entries for *pelek* and *pelekpelek*. In order to reduce redundancy the lexical entry with the option of reduplication accounts for the existence of the two forms.

### 3.2 Various Kinds of Partial Reduplication

Various kinds of partial reduplication are found in Korean. Some typical examples are given below.

(7) Partial reduplication: Vowel change

*tigyektagyek*

(8) Partial Reduplication: copying of a vowel

*ssuk - ssuuk ttuk - ttuuk puk - puuk hwik - hwiik*

I assume that the example in (7) is a case of the whole morpheme

---

5. Whether we treat the affixation as prefixation or suffixation would not make any difference empirically. I do not know of any plausible reason to prefer any of the two possibilities.

reduplication with a V slot pre-specified with a particular vowel. Whichever is the base for reduplication, the other vowel is associated with the V slot to derive the reduplicated form. As for the data in (8), I take the examples as an example of vowel lengthening rather than reduplication. Speakers of every language seem to use this device to emphasize the meaning of the word and even spell it with an additional vowel. Languages may vary in the degree to which they allow different orthography. In English, one might pronounce the word *soon* as [swuuun] and spell it as *soooon* to signify the emergency of time or to emphasize the nearness of time: very soon.

Let us take other examples of real reduplication. (9-11) exemplify attachment of a prefix and a suffix, respectively. The discussion of the derivation of these examples will follow in the next section.

(9) Prefixation

- a. kujeke - kukujekke
- b. kulpi - kukulpi -kukulpi
- c. dungsil -dudungsil

(10) Suffixation

- a. pule -pulele
- b. kkolelek pududuk hudadak jululuk

An interesting set of what we might call 'This-and-That Reduplication' is given below.

(11) Partial Reduplication: This-and-That reduplication

- a. alsongdalsong olmangjolmang omokjomok ulkekbulket omiljomil  
ultungbultung osondson
- b. akijaki ongkijongki

The question seems to arise as to how we should list and deal with the examples in (11) in the lexicon. The question arises due to the fact

that neither the alleged affixes nor the stems can appear in isolated forms independently and they do not have independent meaning. Thus, neither *jolmang* nor *olmang* in (11) can appear as a separate word or with any other morphemes. They can appear only in the whole word *olmangjolmang*. We could take those reduplicated forms in (11) as lexical entries and list them in the lexicon, keeping our mind on the fact that neither the first half like *olmang* nor the second half like *jolmang* constitute independent words and have any meaning. This approach, however, accounts for nothing. It is just accidental that a bunch of words have the same phonological structure and these words show the reoccurrence of almost identical sequences of phonemes. We will also return to these words in the next section.

## 4. Morphology of Partial Reduplication

### 4.1 Previous Analyses

Various kinds of analyses have been proposed in the recent literature. McCarthy and Prince (1986) proposes that Korean partial reduplication involves a simple copying of a syllable, with the final coda being left out as extrametrical. Jun (1993, 1994) appeals to a filter on the output and the code deletion hypothesis to deal with Korean partial reduplication.

#### (12) Jun's Metrical Weight Consistency (MWC)

The foot number of output to partial extension must be identical to that of the input.

The ill-formed *julukluk* is ruled out, since the foot number increases by 1. Thus, according to Jun (1993, 1994), a coda must delete to obey the MWC. Both analyses are mainly concerned with the examples in (10) and assume that the unit that is copied is a syllable.



Davis and Lee (1994) proposes a foot-based approach and crucially uses the concept of prosodic circumscription: circumscription of the bisyllabic foot and the final consonant of the foot. At the heart of this proposal is the view that a syllable is suffixed to an initial bisyllabic foot, with the final consonant being extraprosodic. Reduplication applies to the result of the process of circumscription. In other words, in contrast to Jun (1993, 1994), Davis and Lee (1994) rules out ill-formed results in the course of derivation rather than by a constraint on the output.

Kim (1996) and Kang (1998), among others, account for the derivation of partial reduplication by means of interactions and relative ranking between constraints on derivation: No-Coda, RightMost and Final-C in Kim (1996) and I-O Faithfulness, B-R Identity and Phono-Constraints in Kang (1998).

#### 4.2 A proposal

The traditional definition of a morpheme seems to fall short of accounting for the data under investigation. A morpheme-based account would lose some significant generalization. I hope to show that CV morphology/phonology, that employ multiple tiers, encoupled with general principles of association would provide a desirable account. Following Marantz (1982) generally, I propose that Korean partial reduplication involves affixation of a CV template: CV or VCCVC. Section 4.2.1 deals with monosyllabic reduplication, that copies CV and in 4.2.2 I discuss 'This and That reduplication' that involves bisyllabic doubling that copies VCCVC. I hypothesize that Korean does not allow reduplication of a syllable. Some examples appear to result from affixation of a syllable; *gomgom*, *jemjem*, and etc. In these examples the copied syllable is a full morpheme by itself. In other words, those words can be taken as examples of full reduplication. What it means that there are three possible ways of reduplication: the whole morpheme reduplication, affixation of either a CV prefix or a CV suffix, and a

VCCVC template.

4.2.1 Monosyllabic Reduplication

Consider again the example *pulele-ta* in (10a). These examples apparently show that the shape of reduplicant form is a syllable. Thus, we could explain the derivation as a case of a syllable reduplication. The lexical entry would look like (13a), and the second syllable of the base is copied.

(13) Apparent Syllable Reduplication: suffixes

- a. *pulele*: [pule] [σ]
- b. p u l e p u l e
- | | | = *pulele*
- σ σ + σ

As an alternative, I take (13) as an instance of CV affixation, which seems to exist also in the case of prefixation as in (14) and the controversial internal reduplication as illustrated in (15).

(14) prefixation

- a. *dungsil - dudungsil*
- b. *sak - sasak*
- c. *dung - dudung*

(15) suffixation

- a. b. *juluk - jululuk*
- c. d. *wajak - wajajak*
- e. f. *pud<sup>ㄷ</sup> - pudedek*

Then, the example in (13) and (14) can be analyzed as involving a CV suffix and a CV prefix, respectively, as illustrated in (16-17) below.

## (16) Suffixation

- a. pule: [pule] ([cv])  
 b. derivation of pulele  
 p u l e      p u l e  
           +      | |      = pulele  
                   C V

## (17) Prefixation

- a. du η sil: ([cv]) [du η sil]  
 b. derivation of dudu η sil  
 d u η s i l      d u η s i l  
           | |           +                   = dudu η sil  
           C V

(16a) and (17a) are the representations of the lexical entries. The lexical entries for both the base and the reduplicated forms would look like the same. We do not need to list two separated entries in the lexicon. If we did, we would fail to reduce redundancy. The parenthesis in both words indicates that the reduplication process is optional. Which one is selected depends on whether the speaker employs the option of reduplication.<sup>6)</sup> The association between the melody and the CV slots takes place from left to right in the case of prefixation as illustrated in (17) and from right to left in the case of suffixation as in (16). We could follow the same line of thought to describe the morphology of internal reduplication.

## (18) Internal reduplication

- a. juluk: [culu-k] ([cv])  
 b. derivation of cululuk  
 c u l u      c u l u    -k  
           +      | |           = cululuk  
                   C V

---

6. As noted by many scholars, the option can be taken many times to derive words like *jululuk*.

Again, we do not need to posit a separate lexical entry for the reduplicated form. One lexical entry given in (a) suffices for both the nonreduplicated *culuk* and the reduplicated *cululuk*. The parenthesis in the lexical entry indicates the optionality of reduplication. To sum up, whether the affix is a prefix as in (17), a suffix as in (16) or an infix (18), the shape of the copied unit is a CV template not a syllable. The analysis under discussion would at least account for the morphology of these three apparently distinct cases of partial reduplication.

#### 4.2.2 This-and-That Reduplication: Bisyllabic Reduplication

Now let us turn to 'This-and-That Reduplication', whose examples are repeated below for the sake of convenience. All the examples involve doubling of more than a syllable.

##### (19) Partial reduplication: This-and-That reduplication

- a. *alsongdalsong olmangjolvmand omokjomok ulkekbvket omiljomil ultungbvtung osondson*
- b. *akijaki onkijongki*

Now, the main question on this set of data comes down to how we should list these lexical units in the lexicon. How are they listed with what semantic/syntactic features? How to derive the reduplicated forms is closely related to what they look like in the lexicon. How do we specify that they can not occur by themselves? As mentioned in the introduction, there seem to be two crucial working principles. We do not want to miss any linguistically significant generalizations. At the same time, we do not want to leave unnecessary redundancy untouched in the theory.

A simple way of listing these words in the lexicon would be to list as they are. In other words, one might argue that these words can not be cut into any smaller meaningful units, and thus they should be stored as reduplicated forms in the lexicon. What it means is that the

generalization that a part of the second part is copied is just an accident, which seems to be far away from a plausible explanation.

If we abandon this simple account, then, we should develop a theory of affixation for the derivation of reduplicated forms. One way would be to assume that the first half of these words, such as *olma ŋ* as the base or stem and to copy it as an example of full reduplication to derive those forms in (19). This is not an absurd idea since Korean is very rich in full reduplication. However, this proposal entails that a different consonant should be added for each of the examples in (19). The assumption of suffixation would tell us that a different consonant should be preattached to the first C slot in every word. It does not look general. It would not be easy to establish any relationship between the added consonants and the corresponding forms of reduplication. The only possibility left, then, seems to be to assume that the second half of the reduplicated forms is the stem that should be listed as the base of the derivation of the words. Still, we are forced to explain the property of partial reduplication. Let us take the example *olma ŋjolma ŋ*. One possibility would be to posit *jolma ŋ* as the base and copy the full morpheme *jolma ŋ*. The required step would be to delete the first consonant of the copied part. The question is why we should delete the first consonant. There seems to be no reliable account of the relationship between the two steps: total reduplication and deletion.

I propose that the second half of these forms be the stem and a C-V skeleton be prefixed to the base. And a certain set of general principles of association would yield the results we need. The lexical entry for this word and the derivational process is given below.

(20) Partial reduplication

a. The lexical entry for *olma ŋjolma ŋ*

*olma ŋjolma ŋ*: [vccvc] [j o l m a ŋ ]  
 | | | | |  
 C VC C V C

## b. Derivation of the word

j o l m a η	j o l m a η	+		=	olma ηjolma η
	CVC CVC				
VCCVC					

## c. Derivation of the word: association of the prefix to the melody from left to right

j o l m a η	j o l m a η	+		=	*joljolma η
\ \					
VCCVC					
	CVC CVC				

We treat VCCVC as a morpheme like English *-ceive*. That is, each of the words in (19) would contain two parts and be listed like this: [VCCVC] [jolma η]. The first part, the [VCCVC] part is a morpheme with features common to all the forms in (19). And the second part [jolma η] is a morpheme with features that distinguish the forms in (19) from one another. Note that the prefix [vccvc] is not included in a parenthesis. What it means is that affixation of this prefix is a required process. (20b) illustrates how we derive the reduplicated form. Each of the phonemes at the melody tier is already linked to one of the CV slots. The reduplication process, then, takes place. Each of the copied phonemic melody goes through association process to one of the the copied prefix VCCVC. The association can take place either from right to left, as illustrated in (20b) or from left to right as in (20c). According to Marantz(1982), reduplicating prefixes are supposed to associated with their melodies left to right in the unmarked case. Thus, the examples in (19-20) are clear cases of marked association as in Chukchee reduplication. Unmarked association of prefixes with their melodies from left to right would yield incorrect results displayed in (20c).

Let us take another example where light syllables constitute the words.

(21) Derivation of *akijaki* in (19b)

- a. *akijaki*: [vcv] [j a k i]  
                                           | | | |  
                                           CVCV
- b. *akijaki*: [vcvc] [jaki]
- c. *akijaki*: [vccvc] [jaki]
- d. j a k i                   j a k i  
    / | |   +   | | | |           = *akijaki*  
    VCCVC    C V C V

The possible lexical entries in (21a-c) would yield the same result. In other words, whether we take [vcv], [vcvc] or [vccvc] as a prefix, the affixation would derive the same result we want: *akijaki*. Then, there is no reason not to assume that the affix has the form of VCCVC. Then, we can provide a unified account of the examples (19a) and (19b). I propose that the entry should look like (21c) to capture the generalization holding for all the examples in (19): VCCVC reduplication. Thus, the copied morpheme contains features common to all the forms in (19). In other words, it does not matter what kind of syllable structure the base has. The affixed template is VCCVC. The same marked association from right to left yields the desired result in (21d). And the unmarked association from left to right would yield *jakjaki*.

To summarize the discussion so far, let us take the base *둥실* again. If a morpheme is a candidate for reduplication and is specified as such in the lexicon, the current analysis predicts that there are three logical possibilities to derive reduplicated forms: (i) total reduplication, (ii) either a CV prefix or a CV suffix, and (iii) a VCCVC prefix. We seem to be safe in assuming that either a CV prefix or a CV suffix can be reduplicated but not both. It would not be a reasonable idea to assume that the same base can take both options. The following data illustrate the possible and impossible derivation. (22b) is an example of total reduplication, (22c) is derived by the addition of a CV prefix. The existence of (22b) rules out the possibility of (22d), which could result

from affixation of a CV prefix. The base in (22a), then, should be specified in the lexicon as taking a CV prefix but not a suffix. (22e) results from a bisyllabic VCCVC template. I take this as an accidental gap. In other words, it is a possible word and it would not be too difficult for native speakers of Korean to imagine the meaning of the hypothetical word. (22f), on the other hand, is ruled out by the assumption that it is not allowed to copy a syllable. Unlike (e), it is an impossible word,

- (22) a. dungsil  
 b. dungsildungsil  
 c. dudungsil  
 d. \* dungsisil  
 e. usildungsil  
 f. \* dungdungsil

It does not mean that all the candidates should exhibit all the three possible derivations. I assume that any combination of the three kinds of reduplication is possible and that the idiosyncratic property of a given lexical item should be specified as such in the lexicon. Some words might allow only the whole reduplication, whereas others allow both the total reduplication and a CV prefix. Still another group of words might allow only affixation of a CV prefix. Consider the following examples. (23c) does not exist in Modern Korean. Then, all we can say seems to be that the base 푸득 takes the CV suffix option, which should be specified in the lexical entry of the base. The ill-formed examples in (23f) and (24) as well, along with the same line of reasoning above, can be readily explained by the assumption that reduplication of a syllable is not allowed in Korean.

- (23) a. pudek  
 b. pudekpudek



- c. \* pupudek
  - d. pudedek
  - e. udukpudek
  - f. \* pudekek
- (24) a. \* julukluk
- b. \* wajakjak
  - c. \* pudekek

One might take words like *kungccakccak* as a counterexample against the view that reduplication of a syllable is not allowed, since it apparently involves affixation of a heavy syllable CVC. I take these examples, however, as an example of total reduplication. Unlike *julek*, this word *kungccak* can be considered as a compound word. Each syllable, *kung* and *ccak* is a full morpheme, which is qualified as the base by itself. This hypothesis, then, predicts that reduplication of the first syllable is also possible. The prediction is borne out, as illustrated in (b). (d) also shows us that CV reduplication is another possibility.

- (25) a. *kungccak*
- b. *kungkungccak*
  - c. *kungccakccak*
  - d. *kungccajak*<sup>7)</sup>
  - e. *kungccakkungccak*

## 5. Concluding Remarks

We have seen that various kinds of reduplication exist in Korean.

---

7. The tense and aspirated consonants lose their tenseness and aspiration in the derived reduplicated forms; e.g. *ccan* - *ccajan*, *tang* - *tadang ppang* - *ppabang* and etc. A phonological explanation, which is not my concern, is in order. See Jun (1993, 1994) and Davis and Lee (1996) for the discussion of the issue.

The examples under discussion do not constitute a complete list of Korean reduplication. As there are many kinds of reduplication, we are not really sure whether a totally unified account can explain the whole list of various kinds of reduplication. There seems to be an agreement that the traditional definition of a morpheme, the smallest unit of meaning, falls short of explaining the derivation of all the copied forms. Some kind of prosodic approach is in order. I follow CV morphology in that it can account for the derivation of reduplicated forms not by a rule but by the addition of a morpheme carrying relevant semantic features with the phonological form of a morpheme skeleton.

I assume that prefixation of a CV template copies the leftmost consonant and vowel, whereas suffixation of a CV template copies the rightmost consonant and vowel. In order to describe the morphology of the examples under investigation, I propose that the lexical entry of the base takes any of the three options: the whole morpheme reduplication, either a CV prefix or a CV suffix, and VCCVC prefix for bisyllabic reduplication. And this information should be listed in the lexical entry of the base. Furthermore, the reduplicated words do not separate lexical entries. I also showed that Korean reduplication exhibits an unmarked association of the prefixes to the melodies at the CV tier: from right to left. The analysis under discussion might be far from a complete theory of reduplication. Many questions remain unanswered. One of the crucial questions might be why reduplication of a syllable (a heavy syllable CVC) is not allowed in Korean. Descriptively, it seems that the unit of a syllable does not play a role especially in the case of reduplication. Jun's 1994 constraint on the output of the derivation could be considered as an attempt to address the question. Still, the deletion of an internal syllable is not the only option. His MWC would not explain the ill-formedness of *juluklu* and *dungdusil*. The former deletes the coda of the final syllable and the latter deletes the coda of the internal syllable. both outputs obey the constraint of the same foot number. Another question might be why Korean does not exhibit such forms as *dalsongalsong* the initial consonant of the second half being deleted.

## References

- Chung, Jin Wan. 1997. "A Correspondence-Theoretic Approach to Partial Reduplication in Korean" in *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 27: 33-47.
- Davis, Stuart and Jinseong Lee. 1994. "Infixal Reduplication in Korean Ideophones" in *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 4: 447-460
- Davis, Stuart and Jinseong Lee. 1996. "Korean Partial Reduplication Reconsidered" in *Lingua* 99: 85-105
- Jun, Jongho. 1991. "Metrical Weight Consistency in Partial Reduplication in Korean Mimetics. in *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 2: 83-93.
- Jun, Jongho. 1993. "Prosodic Approach on Korean Partial Reduplication" in *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 2: 130-146
- Jun, Jongho. 1994. "Metrical Weight in Korean Partial Reduplication" in *Phonology* 11: 69-88
- Kang, Ongmi 1998. "A Correspondence-Theoretic Analysis of Korean Partial Reduplication" (written in Korean), *Researches in Phonetics, Phonology and Morphology* 4, 31-54
- Kim, Soohee J. 1996. "Emergence of the Unmarked: Korean Partial Reduplication" in *Chicago Linguistic Society* 32: 179-189
- Marantz, Alec. 1982. "Re Reduplication" in *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 435-482.
- McCarthy, John and Alan Prince. 1986. "Prosodic Morphology" ms. University of Massachusetts, Amherst and Brandeis University.

Dept. of Foreign Languages  
College of Humanities, Namseoul University  
Seonghwan-up, Chonan-si 330-707, Korea  
E-mail: kpark@nsu.ac.kr  
Tel: +82-41-580-2162