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A Local Treatment of Nonlocal Relativization in Korean

JONG-BOK KIM
Kyung Hee University, Seoul

1. Issues
One of the long standing issues in the analysis of Korean relative clause is how to treat relativization out of a double relative clause as given in examples like (1).\footnote{I am grateful to Chan Chung, Sae-Youn Cho, Byung-Soo Park, Ivan Sag, Peter Sells, and the audience of the 25th BLS for their valuable comments and criticism. I also wish to acknowledge the financial support of the Korea Research Foundation in the program year of 1997. All errors and misinterpretations are, of course, mine.}

(1) a. \([NP [S [\_\_ \_j thako tani-num] cha\_ka] mesci-n] \textit{sinsa,}\\ ride\ \text{drive-PN}\ \text{car-NOM}\ \text{stylish-PN}\ \text{gentleman}\\ \text{\textquote{lit.}\ gentleman, who the car, that [he,] is driving is stylish}\)

b. \([NP [S [\_\_ \_j kacko iss-nun \textit{khemphwute\_ka}] MAC-i-n]\\ in\text{possession-PN}\ \text{computer-NOM}\ \text{MAC-COP-PN}\\ kyoswu,\\ professor\\ \text{\textquote{lit.}\ professor, who the computer, that [he,] has is MAC}\)

In (1), the relative heads \textit{sinsa} 'gentleman' and \textit{kyoswu} 'professor' have been relativized out of complex NPs, violating the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint (CNPC). Such island violating cases have been the main reason for accepting either a base-generation approach or a genitive analysis (cf. Kang 1987).

Na and Huck (1993) provide a new analysis to account for cases like (1). They recapture such properties as subjacency violations through the application of their Argument Condition in (2) to the semantic interpretation of the constructions.\footnote{The abbreviations adopted in the paper are as follows: PN (Prenominal Modifier Marker), COP (Copula), NOM (Nominative), ACC (Accusative), DAT (Dative), LOC (Locative), PL (Plural), DECL (Declarative marker), COMP (Complementizer), GEN (Genitive), and PART (Particle).}

\footnote{X is \textit{thematically subordinate} to an entity Y iff Y's having the properties it does entails that X has the properties it does. Na and Huck (1993) classify this thematic subordination relation into five: \textit{part-whole} (e.g., cover vs. book, voice vs. man), \textit{quality-to-entity} (e.g., use vs. tool, color vs. eyes), \textit{conventional} (e.g., car vs. man, dog vs. girl), \textit{hierarchical} (e.g., parent vs. child, doctor vs. patient), and \textit{taxonomic} (apple vs. fruit, chair vs. furniture) relation. These classifications are a central part of their analysis.}
(2) The Argument Condition (Na and Huck 1993:200)
   A relative clause must contain an element E that the clause predicates
   something of, where E is either
   A. A gap coindexed with the clause head; or
   B. A nominal whose denotation is thematically subordinate to that of the
      clause head.

Within this Argument Condition, examples like (1) are acceptable because of
Condition B, even though they violate subjacency restrictions: that is, there is a
'thematic (i.e. conventional) subordination' relation between the head sinsa
'gentleman' and the nominal cha `car' in (1)a and between kyoswu `professor' and
khempwhute `computer' in (1)b. The relationship between one nominal element
within the relative clause and the head NP thus determines the grammaticality of
subjacency violation cases. Na and Huck's analysis is insightful in factoring out
semantic and pragmatic factors of complicated Korean relative clauses as well as
in providing an account for language differences between English and Korean.

However, such an analysis is too restrictive to cover all nonlocal relatives. One
main problem it suffers from has to do with its focusing on just two nominal
elements involved. It appears that there are more than just these two nominals
involved in the formation of relative clauses:

(3) a. [[__i__] kapo-n cek-i eps-nun] talnala-f-ka
   go.see-PN perience-NOM non.ist-PN moon.country-NOM
   kuliw-un Tomi
   miss-PN TOM
   `Tom, who misses the moon, where [he], has never been before.'
   b. [[__i__] ticinha-n] phyoci-i-ka tangsentoy-n ku haksaying,
   design-PN cover-NOM selected-PN the student
   `(lit.) the student, who the cover, that [s/he], designed was selected'
   c. *John-i [[__i__] ssu-n] sosel-ul
   John-NOM write-PN novel-ACC Mary-DAT give-PN writer
   `the writer, who the novel, that [e], wrote John gave to Mary'

In the grammatical examples (3)a and (3)b, there is no conventional relation
between talnala `moon' and `Tom' or between phyoci `cover' and haksayng
`student'. In contrast, the two nominals in (3)c are in a thematic subordination
relation but it is unacceptable. What we can observe from these examples is that it
is not just the relationship between the head noun of the relative clause and a
nominal element within it that determines the grammaticality of such cases. We
also need to look at phrases other than these two elements involved.

2. A Reinterpretation of the Data
If we look into the data that allow relativization from a relative clause, we can
notice that the highest verb in such cases is always the one that allows a multiple
nominative construction. For example, the verbs of the highest relative clause in
the grammatical examples of (1) and (3) all allow multiple nominative constructions as shown in (4).

(4) a. ku sinsa-ka cha-ka mesci-ta
   the man-NOM car-NOM stylish-DECL
   'The man's car is stylish.'

b. ku kyoswu-ka khemphwute-ka MAC-i-ta
   the professor-NOM computer-MON MAC-COP-DECL
   'The professor's computer is MAC.'

c. Tom-i talnala-ka kulipta
   Tom-NOM moon.country-NOM miss
   'Tom misses the moon (country).'

However, the situation is different with ungrammatical cases. The examples in (5) are cases that do not allow relativization of the lower subject:

(5) a. *[____,i tulkoiss-nun] ai-ka pappu-n] wusan,
   holding-PN child-NOM busy-PN umbrella
   '(lit.) the umbrella that the child is holding is busy.'

b. *[____,i ilkessta-nun] chayk-i pissa-n] yeca,
   read-PN book-NOM pensive-PN woman
   '(lit.) the woman that reads the book is pensive'

c. *[____,i ilepel-i-n] chayk-i simoha-n] Mary,
   lost-PN book-NOM delicate-PN Mary
   '(lit.) Mary who lost a book is delicate'

What is interesting is that none of the highest predicates in the relative clauses (5) allow multiple nominative constructions.

(6) a. *ku wusan-i ai-ka pappu-ta
   the umbrella-NOM child-NOM busy

b. *ku yeca-ka chayk-i pissa-ta
   the woman-NOM book-NOM expensive

c. *Mary-ka chayk-I simoha-ta
   Mary-NOM book-NOM delicate

The relativized phrase in such Korean nonlocal cases as (1) and (3)a and b seems to be the subject of the lower relative (cf. see Hasegawa (1984) for Japanese). Further, the head of the complex NP containing it serves as the subject of the higher clause. This is also the starting point of Na and Huck's analysis.

However, my proposed analysis takes a different track: it claims that the top relativized phrase is coindexed with the subject of the highest relative clause, not with that of the lower relative clause. Within this approach, the traditional nonlocal relative clause in (7)a will have the structure (7)b:3

---

3 As hinted by the tree representation in (7)b, I assume that multiple nominative constructions are base generated without gaps (cf. Na and Huck 1993). As shown by Na and Huck (1993), there
(7) a. ssu-n sosel-i manh-un cakka
write-PN novels-NOM many-PN writer
‘(lit.) writer, who the novels that [pro] wrote are many’

b. 

\[
\text{NP} \quad \text{NP}_1
\]

\[
\text{S} \quad \text{NP}_1 \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{cakka}_i
\]

\[
\text{e}_i \quad \text{NP}_2 \quad \text{V}
\]

\[
\text{S} \quad \text{N}^* \quad \text{manh-un}
\]

\[
\text{NP}_3 \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{sosel-i}_j
\]

\[
\text{pro}_i \quad \text{NP}_4 \quad \text{V}
\]

\[
\text{e}_j \quad \text{ssu-n}
\]

A major difference of my analysis from the previous ones, including Na and Huck's, is that the subject of the lower relative clause is a pro element coindexed with the subject of the highest verb (e_i) which is in turn coindexed with the relative head (cakka). Thus NP_1 and NP_2 are in the proposition that the writer's novels are many, whereas NP_3 and NP_4 are in the relation such that the writer pro wrote the novels.

One piece of evidence for assuming pro here comes from the possibility of replacing this pro with an overt pronominal or a reflexive which can occupy the subject position of an independent clause as illustrated in (8).

the writer-NOM he-NOM/self-NOM write-PN novel many
‘The writer has many novels that he wrote.’

b. [[caki-ka/ku-ka __j ssu-n] sosel-i] manh-un cakka
self-NOM/he-NOM write-PN novel-NOM many-PN writer
‘(lit.) writer who the novels that [himself] wrote are many.’

are problems in generating multiple nominative constructions from genitive clauses, in particular for cases which have no corresponding genitive sources:

flower-NOM roses long
‘As for flowers, roses last long.’

b. *Kkoch-uy cangmi-ka olaykanta
flower-GEN rose-NOM long

Another main difference from genitive and multiple nominative cases lies in meaning differences with respect to the number of predications involved (see Na and Huck 1993).
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One constraint that exists here is the coindex relation between this pro and the head NP, which we can expect from semantic constraints on multiple nominative constructions that require nominative NPs involved in a tight semantic relation (cf. Na and Huck 1993). It is hard to have a context violating this coindexation relation.

But if given a proper context, it is possible to violate this constraint. The examples in (9) illustrate that this pro position can be substituted by an unbounded pronominal.

(9) a. [___][[talun-salam-i ___ mollay ssu-n] sosef-i]
other-people-NOM secretly write-PN novel-NOM
manh-un] cakka,
many-PN writer
'(lit.) the writer who the novels that other people wrote in secret (for him) are many'

b. [__][[John-i ___ pillyekass-ten] (casin-uy) osf-i]
John-NOM borrow.away-PN (self-GEN) clothes-NOM
cciseci-n] sinsa;
Torn.up gentleman
'(lit.) the gentleman who the clothes John borrowed from him were torn up'

One desirable consequence of this analysis is that it can easily predict subject/object asymmetries given from (10) to (11).

(10) a. [ip-un] yangpok-i] telew-un sinsa
wear-PN suit-NOM dirty-PN gentleman
'the gentleman whose suit that he is wearing is dirty'

b. *[ip-un] yangpok-ul] nay-ka po-n sinsa
wear-PN suit-ACC I-NOM see-PN gentleman
'(lit.) the gentleman whose suit that he is wearing I saw'

(11) a. [ssu-n chayk-i] cal phalli-nun cakka
write-PN book-NOM well sell.out-PN writer
'the writer whose book sold well'

write-PN book-ACC John-NOM borrow.away-PN writer
'(lit.) the writer whose book he wrote John borrowed'

If we simply look at the relationship between the head noun and one nominal

---

4 Huang's (1984) Generalized Control Rule ('coindex an empty pronominal with the closest nominal element') could be another way of accounting for this control relation: since sosef-i is coindexed with the ep, it cannot be a potential antecedent. Then the control domain for pro will be the higher relative head noun.

5 There should be a certain conventional relation between two NP's, NP₁ and NP₂ in multiple nominative constructions. This relation is so strict that no expression that modifies the second NP can change this 'conventional' or 'thematic subordination' relation. If this changing process happens, we could no longer hold the conventional relation between the two, eventually generating a semantically anomalous sentence.
element in the relative clause as Na and Huck claim, we would predict the examples (10) b and (11) b to be grammatical. But in my analysis, they are ruled out since the highest predicates such as po-ta 'see' and pillyeka-ta 'borrow.away' do not allow multiple nominative constructions. The only possible source sentence of (10) b would be something like (12).

   'I saw the suit that the gentleman wears.'

The relativization of the subject sinsa 'gentleman' from the lower clause thus violates the subjacency condition.

Further tests with more acceptable cases, borrowed from Na and Huck, support my claim that these types are the relativization of the first nominative NP of the multiple nominative constructions. As the data from (13) through (15) prove, all the acceptable nonlocal relatives have counterpart multiple nominative constructions:

(13) a. sal-ko-iss-nun ahatu-ka acwu khu-n chinkwu
    live-COMP-is-PN apartment-NOM very big-PN friend
    'the friend whose apartment he is living in is very big'

b. chinkwu-ka ahatu-ka acwu khuta
    friend-NOM apartment-NOM very big
    'My friend's apartment is very big.'

(14) a. pom-hakki-ey kaluchi-l salam-i kyelcengtoy-n kwamok
    spring-term-in teach-PN person determine-PN course
    'the course such that the person who will teach [it] in spring term has been decided'

b. ku kwamok-i salam-i kyelchengoysta
    the course-NOM person-NOM determined

(15) a. chihna-n chinkwu-ka manh-un sonye
    close-PN friend many girl
    'girl who has many close friends'

b. ku sonye-ka chinkwu-ka manhta
    the girl-NOM friend-NOM many

The merit of my analysis becomes clearer when compared with Na and Huck's analysis of examples (14) and (15). There is no subordinate relation between salam 'person' and kwamok 'course' in (14). The extra proposal that Na and Huck (1993) have to make for this case involves the claim that there exists a noun compound such as pomhakki-kangsa 'spring-term-instructor' as shown in (16).

(16) pomhakki-kangsa-ka kyelcengtoy-n kwamok
    spring-term-instructor-NOM determined course
    'the course such that the spring-term-instructor has been decided'
What they claim is that a productive morphological process allows the compound pomahkki-kangsa in (16) to be replaced by the relative clause (14)a pomhakki-ey kaluchi-l salam. It is rather a retreat from current practice to allow a morphological process to turn a compound into such a phrasal or sentential level element.

Another problem in Na and Huck (1993) arises from examples like (15): here again there is no subordinate relation between chinkwu ‘friend’ and sonye ‘girl’. The escape hatch that Na and Huck introduce is to adopt the level of Full Interpretation with the representation given in (17).

\[(17) \ s[e_i \ NP[s[e,e_i \ a-nun] \ salam,-i] \ manh-un] \ sonye_i \ know-PN \ person-NOM \ many-PN \ girl\]

In (17), the head noun e, in the embedded clause is first topicalized and then becomes the argument of the higher relative clause predicate manh-un ‘many’. Thus the subject is no longer an argument of the lower clause predicate al-ta ‘know’. This process then satisfies the syntactic condition of their Argument Condition A, stating that a gap in the relative clause should be coindexed with the relative head. But the question remains of what the applicable domain is of this syntactic process and how a topicalized element can turn into an argument of the higher predicate from the lower predicate.

Note that my analysis requires neither such a powerful morphological process that can look into syntax nor an escape hatch that allows an additional syntactic process to avoid a subjacency violation. The only thing we need to check out is whether the highest predicate allows a multiple nominative construction or not.

3. More on Nonlocal Relatives

3.1 Relativization from an embedded sentential complement clause

Another nonlocal type we can observe involves an element being relativized from an embedded sentential complement as given in (18).

\[(18) \ a. \ John-i \ [Mary-ka_i \ mekessta-ko] \ *(malha-n) \ sakwa_i \ John-NOM \ Mary-NOM \ ate-COMP \ say-PN \ apple \ 'the \ apple \ that \ John \ said \ Mary \ ate \ yesterday'\]
\[b. \ John-I \ [Mary-ka_i \ ilkessta-ko] \ *(mit-nun) \ chayk_i \ John-NOM \ Mary-NOM \ read-COMP \ believe-PN \ book \ 'the \ book \ that \ John \ believes \ Mary \ read'\]

If we simply rely on a semantic or pragmatic analysis such as that of Na and Huck’s, an additional mechanism is required for cases like (18). According to their condition B, if there is a gap in the relative clause, it should be an argument of the higher predicate. However, the gaps in (18)a and (18)b are not. Na and Huck’s (1993: 214-217) solution is to treat assertive predicates like malha-ta ‘say’ and mit-ta ‘believe’ as sentential modifiers, thus not counted as ‘clause predicates’.

One immediate question of treating such assertive predicates as modifiers
comes from differences with English. Unlike English, Korean assertives in relative clauses are not optional as indicated by the star before the parentheses, mainly because they also carry the morphological information of pronominal modification. However, a syntactic analysis that allows the gap in the embedded clause to be locally visible to the head noun could provide a simple analysis. (19) is the tree structure of (18)a represented within the framework of HPSG. The analysis I adopt here is Sag’s (1997) head-driven and traceless analysis of English relative clauses. Leaving aside the details, let me go through some of the main points in the analysis: the object of the embedded verb mek-ess-ta-ko is slashed (gapped). This information, at first passed up to the sentential level, is amalgamated into the lexical head malha-n ‘say’. And this SLASH value is passed up to the higher VP and then to the top S, allowing the SLASH value and the head noun to be in the same local domain. No syntactic constraint is thus violated.

(19)

```
(19) S
   NP [SLASH { }]
      NP_s
         VP
            SLASH {NP_s}
               MOD 2
                   NP
                      "John-i"

S
   NP [SLASH {NP_s}]
      MOD 2
          V
             SLASH {NP_s} malha-n
                NP
                   "Mary-ka"
                   mek-ess-ta-ko
```

More complicated issues arise from cases like (20).

(20) a. [[[__i__] ponay-n] salam-ul] nay-ka cimcakha-nun senmwul
    send-PN people-ACC I-NOM guess-PN gift
    ‘the gift such that I can guess who sent it’

b. mikwuk-i [[[pwukhan-i ___] kaypalha-n] kes-ulo]
    America-NOM N.Korea-NOM developed-PN thing-PART
    cwucangha-nun haykmwuki
    claim-PN nuclear.weapon
    ‘the nuclear weapon that America claimed North Korea had developed’

At first glance, examples like (20)a appear to be counterexamples to my analysis since the highest predicate cimcakha-ta ‘guess’ does not allow a multiple
nominate construction.

Na and Huck's analysis also requires an explanation for cases like (20) since there is no thematically subordinate relation between salam 'person' and senmwul 'gift' or between haykmwuuki 'nuclear weapon' and kes 'thing'. Further, the gaps are not in the higher clauses. Na and Huck (1993: 214-217) again resort to a modifier treatment of assertive predicates. One argument they provide for the modifier treatment is based on the assumption that "the more material that is carried by the upper clause in the relative, the more difficult it becomes to interpret that clause as an adverbial modifier." They claim this condition explains the unacceptability of sentences like (21) (Data from Na and Huck (1993)):

    Seyho-NOM read-PN thing-PART 10.years.ago
    chwucengtoy-n] capci
    surmise-PN magazine
    'the magazine which that Seyho read [it] was surmised 10 years ago.'

b. ??[Seyho-ka [e] ilk-un] kes-ulo] [Mary-uy tongsayng-ey
    Seyho-NOM read-PN thing-PART Mary-GEN sister-LOC
    uyhayse chwucengtoy-n] capci
    by surmise-PN magazine
    'the magazine which that Seyho read [it] was surmised by Mary's sister'

According to their analysis, this 'modifier' (those parts including the assertive predicate) should be simple enough to interpret. However, notice that the amount of material in the upper clause does not determine absolute grammaticality, but is context-sensitive, as shown in (22).

(22) [pwukan-i [e] palsa-n] kes-ulo]
    North.Korea-NOM shoot-PN thing-PART
    mi-kwukpangseng-i kicahoykyen-eyse cwucangha-n misail
    Dept.-of-Defense-NOM news.briefing-LOC claim-PN missile
    'the missile that the Department of Defense claimed in a news briefing that
    North Korea had shot'

It seems that we need to find answers from a different perspective rather than from a semantic or pragmatic one. The solution I adopt here is a lexical specification on the complement of assertive predicates.6 One thing we can notice is that the assertive it cimcakha-ta 'guess' does not combine with a fully saturated NP as shown in (23).


---

6 Another solution that might be possible is to claim that nouns like salam and kes are clitic-like elements, and assertives select sentential complements.
I assume that an assertive predicate such as *cimcakha-ta 'guess' or cwucangha-ta 'claim' can select an unsaturated NP, N'. If we accept the constraint that a fully saturated NP cannot have a SLASH value as a version of the subjacency condition, we would allow the specifier-seeking N' to have a SLASH value. This system then assigns the following structure to sentences like (20)b:

(24)

We can observe a contrast with other verbs that can select a fully saturated NP as its subject. Verbs such as *mit-ta 'believe' are such verbs. My analysis predicts that in the relative clause with this verb, an element in the embedded clause cannot be relativized across of the fully saturated NP. This prediction is borne out from the examples given in (25).

    John-un gift-ACC sent-PN the man-ACC believed 'John believed in the man who sent the gift (to him).'

b. * [__ ponay-n ku salam-ul] nay-ka mit-nun senmwul
    sent-PN the man-ACC I-NOM guess-PN gift

3.2 Relativization from an Adverbial Clause
Another type that seems to violate an island constraint involves cases where an element is relativized from a modifier clause, as given in (26).7

7 A more canonical word ordering is the one where the adverbial clause is in the sentential initial
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(26) a. motwun haksayng-r-tul [sensaygnim-i _, ilkessul ttay] all student-PL-NOM teacher-NOM read when wuless-ten phyenci, cry-PN letter `(lit.) the letter, which all students cried when the teacher read _' b. [_, cwuke-se] motwu-ka selphuha-nun salam, dead-since all-NOM sad-PN person `(lit.) the person, who everyone cried because tri died'

No satisfactory analysis has yet been given to account for such examples.\(^8\) However, once we accept an analysis where we place an adverbial element or clause in the same level as complements, as Bouma et al. (1998) proposed within the framework of HPSG, we can provide a simple analysis. For example, the intransitive verb *wuless-ten* `cried' can be realized as having an adverbial clause in its DEPENDENTS list in addition to its argument(s), as represented in (27).

(27) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{PHON} & \text{ wuless-ten} \\
\text{HEAD verb} & \text{[MOD nominal]} \\
\text{SUBJ} & \text{<[NP[nom]>} \\
\text{COMPS} & \text{<[>} \\
\text{DEPENDENTS} & \text{<[NP, [HEAD adv]>}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Since we now have the sentential adverbial element as a complement, cases like (26) can be treated similar to relativization from a sentential complement. In both cases, the relativized element is in a sentential complement selected by the highest verb. This, in turn, means that relativization from an adverbial clause is not different from that of a sentential complement clause.

Given this, (26)a will have the syntactic structure given in (28):

(28)

```
  NP
  ┌─────────────┐
  │               │
  │ S[SLASH {]|]| NP
  │     ┌────┐   │
  │     │     │   │
  │     │ NP   │   │
  │     │      │   │
  │     │ motun haksayng-i │
  │     │      │   │
  │     │      │   │
  │     │      │   │
  │     │      │   │
  │     │      │   │
  └─────────────┘

  │ VP[SLASH {]|]
  │     ┌────┐   │
  │     │     │   │
  │     │ S-adv[SLASH {]|] V[SLASH {]|]
  │     │     │   │
  │     │     │   │
  │     │     │   │
  │     │     │   │
  │     │     │   │
  └─────────────┘

  │ sensaynmhnim-i _, ilkess-ul ttay
  │
  │ wuless-ten
```

position.

\(^8\) One could suggest that such examples involve parasitic gaps or the gap in the adverbial clause is *pro*. But issues seem to arise from cases like (26)b where there is no putative gap in the higher clause that could be coindexed with the head noun *salam*.
The predicate ilkess-ul 'read' in the adverbial clause allows its complement to be slashed. And this adverbial sentential clause can serve as the complement of the higher predicate wuless-ten 'cried' so that the SLASH information is amalgamated into this lexical head. We then can pass the SLASH feature up to S thru the canonical SLASH Inheritance Principle. This will again avoid violation of any syntactic island conditions.

4. Conclusions
At first glance, we seem to have two types of Korean relatives; those that obey island constraints and those that do not. Careful examination, however, reveals that those nonlocal or double relatives are not really nonlocal but belong to local relatives. This implies that once we provide a clean analysis for canonical relatives, we can tend the analysis to the so-called double or nonlocal relatives.

In conclusion, flexible Korean relative clauses also observe basic syntactic restrictions such as subjacency or other island constraints. We need not posit any further subconstructions for Korean relative clauses, allowing the grammar to be much simpler.
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