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It has been claimed in the literature that Korean allows the relativization of another relative clause, deriving the so called ‘double relative clause’. The presence of ‘double relative clauses’ has led some researchers to argue that Korean relative clauses do not involve any operator movement, but rather a mechanism such as unselective binding (H.-M. Sohn 1980, Y.-S. Kang 1986), where an operator binds variables in situ. In this paper, we argue that there is no true ‘double relative clause’, thus no real threat to the operator movement analysis for relative clauses in Korean. More specifically, we propose that the so-called ‘double relative clauses’ are derived from double nominative constructions, through relativizing the first nominative NP which originates from an IP-adjoined position. Given our analysis, ‘double relative clauses’ are not instances of island violations, and the operator movement analysis for relative clause formation in Korean can thus be maintained.

1 Issues

In Korean, the main verb in a relative clause is inflected with an adnominal morpheme -(n)un (glossed as Adn), which indicates that the clause is modifying a noun. The head noun occurs to its right, Korean being a head-final language. An example of a relative clause with a subject gap is given in (1).
Although Korean does not have any overt relative pronoun, it is standardly assumed that there is an empty relative pronoun operator in [Spec,CP] which is syntactically associated with a gap in the relative clause (cf. D.-W. Yang 1989 and H.-K. Yang 1990). The relative clause in (1) can be structurally represented as in (2). The syntactic relation between the empty operator and the subject gap is instantiated by coindexation. Under the operator movement analysis, the subject gap $e_i$ is a trace of the empty operator $OP_i$.\(^1\)

(2)

The presence of the so-called ‘double relative clauses,’ however, poses a problem for the operator movement analysis because they appear to involve relativization of another relative clause. For instance, in (3a), the object NP which is associated with kangaci-ka (‘dog-Nom’) has relativized and then the subject NP which is associated with ai (‘kid’) has relativized (dog is the subject of die). The problem for the operator movement analysis is caused by the subject gap ($e_i$): it appears to be a trace left by an island-violating movement out of another relative clause. This is illustrated in the tree structure in (3b).\(^2\)

(3) a. $[RC_1 [RC_2 e_i e_j cohaha-nun] kangaci-ka_j cwuk-un] ai_i$

$e_i e_j$ like-Adn dog-Nom$_j$ die-Adn kid$_i$

‘the kid [RC$_1$ who$_i$ the dog [RC$_2$ which$_j$ $e_i$ liked $e_j$] died]’

‘the kid who the dog which [he] liked died’
More examples of ‘double relative clauses’ are given in (4).

(4) a. \[
[RC1 [RC2 ei ej tha-ko tani-nun] cha-ka ej mesci-n] sinsa ei ej]
\]
‘the gentleman [RC1 who ei the car [RC2 which ej is driving ei] is stylish]’

b. \[
[RC1 [RC2 ei ej kackoiss-nun] khemphwute-ka ej MAC-i-n] kyoswu ei ej]
\]
‘the professor [RC1 who ei the computer [RC2 which ej has ej] is MAC]’

Because of examples like (3a) and (4), some have taken an unselective binding approach to the analysis of relative clauses in Korean. Under such an approach, the gaps in the relative clause are pronominal variables and are bound by the empty operator in situ (H.-M. Sohn 1980, Y.-S. Kang 1986). This approach then predicts that there should be no island effects in relative clauses. However, there are many cases where island effects are clearly observed, as illustrated in (5) (cf. D.-W. Yang 1989 and H.-K. Yang 1990):

John-Nom thief-Nom ei steal-Past-Adn news-Acc hear-Adn jewel ei
‘the jewel which John heard [CN Pi the news that the thief stole ei]’

b. * [wuli pan haksayng-i \[CN Pi [ei kapcaki mikwuk-ey ka-n] sasil-ul]
our class student-Nom ei suddenly America-to go-Adn fact-Acc
mola-ss-ten] sensaygnim ei
not-know-Past-Adn teacher ei
‘the teacher who our class student didn’t know \([CNP\) the fact that \(e_i\) suddenly went to America]’

c. * \([AC\) John-i ku namca-lul \(e_i\) manna-ss-ki ttaymwuney] Sue-ka
    John-Nom that man-Acc \(e_i\) meet-Past-Nominal because Sue-Nom
    hwakana-ni be_angular-Adn time\(i\)
    ‘the time when Sue was angry \([AC\ because John met that man \(e_i\])’

An object and a subject have relativized out of a complex NP (CNP) in (5a) and (5b) respectively, and an adjunct has relativized out of an adjunct clause (AC) in (5c). ³

Another possible approach is to say that the problematic gap in the lower relative clause is an empty resumptive pronoun whose licensing conditions are not subject to movement constraints.⁴ This approach appears to be supported by the fact that the problematic gap in the examples (3a)-(4) can be replaced with an overt pronoun, although the result is slightly degraded.

(6) a. \([RC1] [RC2 ku-ka_i e_j cohaha-nun] kangaci-ka_j cwuk-un] ai_i
    he_i e_j like-Adn dog-Nom_j die-Adn kid_i
    ‘the kid who the dog which [he] liked died’

b. \([RC1] [RC2 ku-ka_i e_j tha-ko tani-nun] cha-ka_j mesci-n] sin\(sa_i
    ku-ka_i e_j ride drive-Adn car-Nom_j stylish-Adn gentleman_i
    ‘the gentleman who the car that [he] is driving is stylish’

c. \([RC1] [RC2 ku-ka_i e_j kackoiss-nun] khemphwute-ka_j MAC-i-n] kyoswu_i
    he_i e_j have-Adn computer-Nom_j MAC-Cop-Adn professor_i
    ‘the professor who the computer which [he] has is MAC’

Given that resumptive pronouns are shown to ‘amnesty’ island effects when an extraction has occurred from an island (Kroch 1981), it seems reasonable to suspect that something similar might be going on in ‘double relative clauses’. If, however, resumptive pronoun strategy is available to rescue the relativization of another relative clause, it should also be available to rescue the relativization of complex NPs and adjunct clauses. But such resumptive pronoun strategy does not appear to be readily available in these cases, as evidenced by the unacceptability of (5a)-(5c). Further, unlike the problematic gap in ‘double relative clauses’, the gap in (5a)-(5c) cannot be replaced with an overt pronoun, as illustrated in (7).⁵
The resumptive pronoun approach then raises the question why relative clauses are different from other island environments when it comes to relativization, taking us back to our original problem of ‘double relative clauses’.  

So far we have seen that island effects attested in relative clauses provide strong evidence for the operator movement analysis, but also that this analysis cannot handle ‘double relative clauses’. We have also seen that resorting to the resumptive pronoun approach does not help us in resolving the problem because under this approach we are led to the conclusion that only relative clauses freely allow resumptive pronouns, while very restricted in other island-violating contexts. In section 2, we briefly discuss two other analyses of ‘double relative clauses’ proposed in the literature: J.-I. Han’s (1992) syntax-based account, and Na and Huck’s (1993) semantics-based account. We then present our analysis in section 3, where we provide an alternative syntax that does not involve relativization of another relative clause.
2 Previous Analyses

2.1 J.-I. Han 1992

J.-I. Han (1992) points out a couple of restrictions on ‘double relative clauses’. First, the double relative clause formation is possible only when the lower relative clause is in a subject position, as in (3). An example of a bad case where an NP has relativized out of a relative clause in an object position is given in (8a) (with the corresponding tree structure in (8b)).

(8) a. * [RC1 wuli pan haksayng-i [RC2 e_i e_j ip-un] yangpok-ul po-n] sinsa_i our class student-Nom e_i e_j wear-Adn suit-Acc_j see-Adn gentleman_i
   ‘the gentleman [RC1 who, a student from our class saw the suit [RC2 which, e_i wore e_j]]’
   ‘the gentleman who a student from our class saw the suit which [he] wore’

   b. 

Second, non-subject NPs cannot relativize out of another relative clause, as illustrated in (9a) (with the corresponding tree structure in (9b)). The example in (9) is degraded because an object NP has relativized out of the relative clause RC2, leaving the gap $e_j$.

(9) a. ?? [RC1 [RC2 e_i e_j khiwecwu-n] ai-ka_i cwuk-un] kangaci_j
    $e_i e_j$ kept-Adn kid-Nom_i die-Adn dog_j
J.-I. Han (1992) argues in the spirit of Huang (1989) that in Korean relative clauses, the subject gap is a base-generated pro, and is constrained by Huang’s Generalized Control Theory. This theory states that an empty pronominal should be coindexed with the closest nominal element. She further argues that the object gap is a variable left by the movement of the empty operator. Accordingly, (8a) is bad because the presence of a closer potential antecedent wuli pan haksayng-i (‘our-class-student-Nom’) blocks the subject gap from being coindexed with the head noun sinsa (‘gentlemen’). Crucially, the ungrammaticality of the example in (8a) is not caused by an island violation. In contrast, (9a) is bad because the object gap is a variable (trace) left by the movement of the empty operator out of another relative clause, which is an island violation.

However, there are problems with J.-I. Han’s analysis. For instance, we can construct good examples where non-subject NPs do appear to have relativized out of another relative clause. The example in (9a) becomes perfectly acceptable, simply by changing the first head noun ai (‘kid’) to cwuin (‘owner’), as illustrated in (10).

(10)  [RC1 [RC2 ei ej khiwecwu-n] cwuin-i, cwuk-un] kangaci, ei ej kept-Adn owner-Nom, die-Adn dogj

‘the dog [RC1 which, the owner [RC2 who, ej kept ei died]]’

‘the dog which the owner who kept [him] died’

Furthermore, J.-I. Han’s proposal wrongly predicts that subject relativization of a complement clause will be bad, since the matrix subject counts as a potentially closer antecedent of the subject
gap. For instance, the example in (11) should be bad because the matrix subject Mary is a potentially closer antecedent for the gap $e_i$, blocking the coindexation between $e_i$ and the head noun ku namca (‘that man’). But clearly, the example in (11) is well-formed.

(11) \[
\text{RC [Mary-ka [ } e_i \text{ chencay-lako] malha-n]} \text{ ku namca}_i \\
\text{Mary-Nom } e_i \text{ genius-Comp say-Adn that man}_i \\
\text{‘the man that Mary said is a genius’}
\]

2.2 Na and Huck 1993

Na and Huck (1993) propose to recapture subjacency in relative clauses through the application of an interpretive condition called Argument Condition, as given in (12).


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.

According to Na and Huck, “X is 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: 194). Na and Huck classify this thematic subordination into five relations: part-whole (e.g., cover vs. book, voice vs. man), quality-to-entity (e.g., use vs. tool, color vs. eyes), conventional (e.g., car vs. man, dog vs. girl), hierarchical (e.g., parent vs. child, doctor vs. patient), and taxonomic (apple vs. fruit, chair vs. furniture). These classifications are the central part of their analysis.

Na and Huck’s analysis accounts for the (un)acceptability of a wide range of island-violating relative clauses. In (13a-b), the gap $e_i$ in each example is coindexed with a nominal which is not the head of the minimal complex NP containing the gap – thus violating the A-clause of the Argument Condition. Each of them also violates the B-clause of the Argument Condition because the head noun of the higher relative clause and the nominal within it are not in a thematic subordination relation. Meanwhile, examples like (3a) and (4) are acceptable because of the B-clause,
even though they do not conform to the A-clause. For instance, in (3a), there is a ‘thematic (i.e. conventional) subordination’ relation between the head ai (‘kid’) and the nominal kangaci (‘dog’). The semantic relationship between the head nouns involved thus determines the grammaticality of ‘double relative clauses.’

(13) a. *[
_{RC1} [_{RC2} e_i e_j ilkkoiss-nun] ai-ka_j  
pappu-n]  chayk_i
  
  e_i e_j read-Adn  child-Nom_j  busy-Adn  book_i
  
  ‘the book [RC1 which_i the kid [RC2 who_j e_j is reading e_i] is busy]’

b. *[
_{RC1} [_{RC2} e_i e_j ponaycwu-n] salam-i_j  Seoul-ey  iss-nun]  senmwul_i
  
  e_i e_j send-Adn  person-Nom_j  Seoul-Loc  be-Adn  present_i
  
  ‘the present_i [RC1 which_i the person [RC2 who sent e_j e_i] is in Seoul]’

Na and Huck’s analysis is insightful in factoring out semantic and pragmatic effects from complicated Korean relative clauses as well as in providing an account for language differences between English and Korean. However, counterexamples to their analysis are found as soon as a wider range of data is considered.

(14) a.  [
_{RC1} [_{RC2} e_i e_j kapo-n  cek-i  eps-nun]  talnala-ka_j  kulwi-un]
  
  e_i e_j go-Adn  experience-Nom  non_exist-Adn  moon-Nom_j  miss-Adn
  
  Tom_i
  Tom_i
  
  ‘Tom_i who_i misses the moon [RC2 where_j e_i has never been e_j before]’

  ‘Tom who misses the moon where [he] has never been before’

b.  [
_{RC1} [_{RC2} e_i e_j ticainha-n]  phyoci-ka_j  tangsento-n]  ku  haksayng_i
  
  e_i e_j design-Adn  cover-Nom_j  selected-Adn  that student_i
  
  ‘that student [RC1 who_i the cover [RC2 which_j e_i designed e_j] was selected]’

  ‘that student who the cover which [s/he] designed was selected’

c.  *[
_{RC1} John-i  [_{RC2} e_i e_j ssu-n]  sosel-ul_j  Mary-eykey cwu-n]  cakka_i
  
  John-Nom  e_i e_j write-Adn  novel-Acc_j  Mary-Dat  give-Adn  writer_i
  
  ‘the writer [RC1 who_i John gave the novel [RC2 which_j e_i wrote e_j] to Mary]’

  ‘the writer who John gave the novel which [he] wrote to Mary’

In the grammatical examples (14a) and (14b), there is no thematic subordination relation between talnala (‘moon’) and Tom or between phyoci (‘cover’) and haksayng (‘student’). Moreover, al-
though the two nominals in (14c), sosel (‘novel’) and cakka (‘writer’), are in a thematic subordination relation, the example is unacceptable. These examples show that something more is at work in determining the grammaticality of ‘double relative clauses’ than just the semantic relationship between the head noun of the higher relative clause and a nominal element within it.

3 Our Proposal

3.1 Double nominative constructions

We propose an analysis of ‘double relative clauses’ that crucially depends on the availability of double nominative constructions in Korean, as illustrated in (15).

(15) a. ku ai-ka kangaci-ka cwuk-ess-ta.
    that kid-Nom dog-Nom die-Past-Decl
    ‘As for that kid, the dog died.’

   b. ku sinsa-ka yangpok-i telep-ta.
    that gentleman-Nom suit-Nom dirty-Decl
    ‘As for that gentleman, the suit is dirty.’

Interpretation-wise, the first nominative NP is in a certain semantic relation with the second nominative NP, the exact nature of which is determined by pragmatic implicature. For instance, in (15a), the sentence is about a kid, and it implies that the dog that died belongs to the kid. In (15b), the sentence is about a gentleman, and it implies that the suit that is dirty is worn by the gentleman. Such double nominative constructions can only be formed with stative verbs or adjectives (Y.-J. Kim 1990). They cannot be formed with activity verbs as shown in (16).

    that kid-Nom dog-Nom bark-Past-Decl
    ‘As for that kid, the dog barked.’

Syntactically, we assume that the second nominative NP and the predicate form an IP, and the first nominative NP is adjoined onto this IP (cf. J. Yoon 1986, J.-M. Yoon 1989, Heycock and Lee 1989, J.-B. Kim 2001 and references therein for discussion on syntax and semantics of multiple
nominative constructions in Korean). A supporting argument for this assumption is that the second nominative NP and the predicate can by themselves form a complete sentence, as shown in (17).

(17) a. kangaci-ka cwuk-ess-ta.  b. yangpok-i telep-ta.
dog-Nom die-Past-Decl suit-Nom dirty-Decl
‘The dog died.’  ‘The suit is dirty.’

Moreover, the two nominative NPs can be separated by an adverb, as shown in (18). This fact rules out the structure where the first NP is adjoined to the second NP as a possible structure for double nominative constructions.

(18) a. ku ai-ka sasil kangaci-ka cwuk-ess-ta.
   that kid-Nom frankly dog-Nom die-Past-Decl
   ‘As for that kid, frankly, the dog died.’

   b. ku sinsa-ka onul yangpok-i telep-ta.
   that gentleman-Nom today suit-Nom dirty-Decl
   ‘As for that gentleman, today, the suit is dirty.’

The adverb placement fact indicates that there is a position available for adverbs to adjoin between the two nominative NPs. If we assume that the second nominative NP and the predicate compose to form an IP, the adverb can adjoin to this IP. The structures we assume for double nominative sentences in (15) are given in (19). For convenience, we will refer to the position for the first nominative NP as the ‘IP-adjoined position.’

(19) a. IP
   NP  IP
   |    |    V
   kid-Nom  NP  VP
   |    |    
   dog-Nom  V  died

   b. IP
   NP  IP
   |    |    V
   gentleman-Nom  NP  VP
   |    |    
   suit-Nom  V  be_dirty

Importantly, the first nominative NP in double nominative constructions can be relativized. Examples are given in (20a) and (20b).
Moreover, the relativization of the first nominative NP involves operator movement, as evidenced by the fact that it is subject to island constraints (21).

(21) * [RC Sue-ka papokathi [CNP e_i yangpok-i telep-tanun sasil-ul] molu-nun] Sue-Nom foolishly e_i suit-Nom dirty-Adn fact-Acc not-know-Adn sinsa_i gentleman ‘the gentleman who Sue foolishly does not know the fact that his suit is dirty’

3.2 Proposed Analysis

We propose that the source sentences for ‘double relative clauses’ are double nominative constructions, where the second nominative NP contains another relative clause which has an empty pro that is coindexed with the first nominative NP. This is illustrated in (22a) (with the corresponding tree structure in (22b)).

(22) a. ai-ka_i [RC pro_i e_j cohana-nun] kangaci-ka_j cwuk-ess-ta. kid-Nom pro_i e_j like-Adn dog-Nom_j die-Past-Decl ‘As for the kid, the dog that he liked died.’

b. 

\[
\text{IP} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{IP} \\
\quad \text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \text{RC} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \text{pro_i e_j like-Adn} \quad \text{dog-Nom_j} \quad \text{died}
\]
The relative clause in (22a) essentially specifies how the second NP is semantically related to the first NP. In this case, the referent of the second NP ('the dog') is something that the referent of the first NP ('the kid') likes.

By relativizing the first NP in (22a), the relative clause in (23a) (the tree structure in (23b)) is derived. Under our analysis, the problematic gap in the 'double relative clause' originates from the IP-adjoined first nominative NP position, and not from the subject position of a relative clause. Hence, no island violation has occurred.\(^8\)

\[(23)\]

\[\text{a. } [RC1 e_i [RC2 pro_i e_j cohaha-nun] \text{kangaci-ka}_j \text{cwuk-un}] ai_i,\]

\[e_i \text{pro}_i e_j \text{like-Adn} \text{dog-Nom}_j \text{died-Adn} \text{kid}_i,\]

\[\text{‘The kid whose dog which he liked died’}\]

\[\text{b.} \]

\[\text{NP} \]

\[\text{RC1} \]

\[\text{NP} \]

\[\text{IP} \]

\[\text{kid}_i,\]

\[e_i,\]

\[\text{NP} \]

\[\text{VP} \]

\[\text{VR} \]

\[\text{RC2} \]

\[\text{NP} \]

\[\text{VP} \]

\[\text{VR} \]

\[\text{pro}_i e_j \text{like-Adn} \text{dog-Nom}_j \text{died-Adn}\]

Examples in (4) and (14a-b) are derived in the same way, as a corresponding source double nominative sentence can be constructed for each one of them.

\[(24)\]

\[\text{a. ku sinsa-ka cha-ka mesci-ta.}\]

that gentleman-Nom car-Acc stylish-Decl

‘As for that gentleman, the car is stylish.’

\[\text{b. ku kyoswu-ka khemphwute-ka MAC-i-ta.}\]

that professor-Nom computer-Nom MAC-Cop-Decl

‘As for that professor, the computer is MAC.’
c. Tom-i talnala-ka kulip-ta.
   Tom-Nom moon-Nom miss-Decl
   ‘Tom misses the moon.’

d. ku haksayng-i phyoci-ka tangsentoy-ess-ta.
   that student-Nom cover-Nom selected-Past-Decl
   ‘As for that student, the cover was selected.’

The pro we posit in the lower relative clause as in (23) is not a resumptive pronoun, but a
regular pronoun that is subject to general co-reference conditions on pronouns independently at
work in Korean. For example, a pro in an embedded clause can be coreferential with the matrix
subject, as in (25a).

   kid-Nom pro, e_j like-Adn dog-Acc_j hit-Past-Decl
   ‘The kid hit the dog he likes.’

This then is why the pro subject of cohaha-nun (‘like-Adn’) in the lower relative clause can be
coreferential with the IP-adjoined nominative NP in (22) and (23a).

One piece of evidence for postulating the presence of pro in the lower relative clause comes
from the possibility of replacing this pro with an overt pronominal or a reflexive, as illustrated in
(26).

   the writer-Nom he-Nom/self-Nom write-Adn novel_j many-Decl
   ‘As for the writer, the novels he/himself wrote are many.’
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Accordingly, we now have an explanation for why overt pronouns in (6) are possible, in contrast to (7). The pronouns in (6) are not resumptive pronouns. They are regular pronouns coindexed with the extracted IP-adjoined first nominative NP.

An even more compelling piece of evidence comes from the fact that the pro position in the lower relative clause can be filled with a non-pronominal element that is not co-referential with the first nominative NP, as in (27). These examples also show that the co-reference requirement in the ‘double relative clause’ is pragmatic in nature: given a proper context, an example that violates this requirement can be constructed.

What about the cases in which object NPs seem to be able to relativize out of another relative clause, as in (10)? Under our analysis, the source sentence for this is a double nominative construction where the second nominative NP contains a relative clause and this relative clause has a pro object that is coindexed with the first nominative NP. An example source double nominative sentence for (10) is given in (28a) (with the corresponding tree structure in (28b)).
By relativizing the first nominative NP, the relative clause in (29a) (the tree structure in (29b)) is derived with no island violation.

(29) a. \[
[RC1 \ e_j \ [RC2 \ e_i \ pro_j \ khiwecwu-n] \ cwuin-i_j \ cwuk-un] \ kangaci_j \\
\quad e_j \ e_i \ pro_j \ kept-Adn \ owner-Nom_i \ die-Adn \ dog_j \\
\text{‘the dog who the owner who kept [him] died.’}
\]

b. 

Under our analysis, (9a) (repeated here as (30) with our proposed structural analysis) is degraded, not because of the syntax but because of the interpretation which is constrained by pragmatics, (30) having the same syntax as (29a).

(30) ?? \[
[RC1 \ e_j \ [RC2 \ e_i \ pro_j \ khiwecwu-n] \ ai-ka_i \ cwuk-un] \ kangaci_j \\
\quad e_j \ e_i \ pro_j \ kept-Adn \ kid-Nom_i \ died-Adn \ dog_j 
\]
While it is easy to establish a relation between a dog and the owner (as in (28a)), it is not so easy to do so between a dog and the child without any contextual information.\(^9\)

### 3.3 Further supporting arguments

Our analysis predicts that a ‘double relative clause’ cannot be formed if a relevant double nominative construction cannot be formed as a source. This prediction is borne out through the restriction (cf., J.-I. Han 1992) that the double relative clause formation is possible only when the lower relative clause is in a subject position. In order to form a ‘double relative clause’ when the lower relative clause is in an object position as in (8a) (repeated here as (31)), the source double nominative construction would have to be formed with a transitive predicate, as in (32). But double nominative constructions cannot be formed with transitive predicates. Accordingly, ‘double relative clauses’ cannot be formed when the lower relative clause is in an object position.

(31) * \[RC_1 wuli pan haksayng-i [RC_2 ip-un] yangpok-ul po-n] sinsa our class student-Nom wear-Adn suit-Acc see-Adn gentleman ‘the gentleman who the student from our class saw the suit which [he] wore’

(32) * \[IP sinsa-ka [IP wuli pan haksayng-i yangpok-ul po-ass-ta]]. gentleman-Nom our class student-Nom suit-Adn see-Past-Decl ‘As for the gentleman, the student from our class saw his suit.’

The only possible source sentence for (31) then would be (33). But relativization of the subject sinsa (‘gentleman’) from the relative clause would result in island violation, hence the ungrammaticality of (8a).

(33) wuli pan haksayng-i \[NP [IP sinsa-ka \(e_j\) ip-un] yangpok-ul\(e_j\)] our class student-Nom gentleman-Nom \(e_j\) wear-Adn suit-Adn po-ass-ta. see-Past-Decl ‘The student from our class saw the suit that the gentleman wore.’
Examples in (13) and (14c) are ruled out for the same reason: a corresponding source double nominative sentence cannot be constructed for any of them (illustrated in (34)), and alternative derivations that are not based on double nominatives would involve extraction out of islands.

   book-Nom kid-Nom busy
   ‘As for the book, the kid is busy.’

   present-Nom person-Nom Seoul-Loc be-Decl
   ‘As for the present, the person is in Seoul.’

   writer-Nom John-Nom novel-Acc Mary-Dat give-Past-Decl
   ‘As for the writer, John gave the novel to Mary.’

Note that this restriction on ‘double relative clause’ formation completely rules out the resumptive pronoun analysis. If ‘double relative clauses’ were simply possible through the employment of resumptive pronouns, there should be no restriction on ‘double relative clause’ formation and examples like (31) as well as the corresponding examples with overt pronouns as in (35) should be grammatical.\(^{10}\)

(35) *? [\(RC_1\) wuli pan haksayng-i [\(RC_2\) ku-ka, ip-un] yangpok-ul po-n]
   our class student-Nom he, wear-Adn suit-Acc see-Adn gentleman
   sinsa
   ‘the gentleman, whose clothes I saw [he,] was wearing’

The question then is why can’t ‘double relative clauses’ employ the resumptive pronoun strategy. We already saw in section 1 that the usage of resumptive pronouns (if possible) is highly restricted in complex NPs and adjunct clauses. We can now conclude that it is just as restricted in relative clauses.

The merit of our analysis becomes clearer when compared with Na and Huck’s analysis of (36a) and (37a). They are both well-formed even though there is no subordinate relation between salam (‘person’) and kwamok (‘course’), and chinkwu (‘friend’) and sonye (‘girl’).
To account for (36), Na and Huck make an extra proposal that the relative clause in (36a) pomhakki-ey kaluchi-l salam (‘the teacher who will teach during the spring semester’) is derived from a compound word pomahakki-kangsa (‘spring-term-instructor’) as in (38), through a morphological process. (38) satisfies the semantic condition of their Argument Condition B: pomhakki-kangsa (‘spring term instructor’) is thematically subordinate to kwamok (‘course’). But the nature of such morphological process is far from clear.

(38) pomhakki-kangsa-ka kyelcengtoy-n kwamok spring-term-instructor-Nom determined-Adn course ‘the course such that the spring-term-instructor has been decided’

To account for (37), Na and Huck introduce an interpretive level representation called Full Interpretation and assign the structure in (39) for (37a):

(39) [IP1 e_i [NP [IP2 e_i e_j chinha-n] chinkwu-ka_j] manh-un] sonye_i e_i e_j close-Adn friend-Nom_j many-Adn girl_i ‘the girl who the friends [she] is close to is many’ ‘the girl who has many close friends’

They propose that in (39), the empty category e_i in the embedded clause IP2 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 *chinha* (‘be close’). This process then satisfies the syntactic condition of their Argument Condition A: that is, a gap in the relative clause should be coindexed with the relative head. But the question remains as to what the applicable domain of this syntactic process is and how a topicalized element can turn into an argument of the higher predicate from the lower predicate.

Note however that to account for (36a) and (37a), our syntactic analysis requires neither such a powerful morphological process nor an escape hatch for an additional syntactic or semantic process. The only thing we need to check is whether the highest predicate allows a multiple nominative construction or not. For us, the relative clauses in the (a)-examples in (36)-(37) are formed by relativizing the first nominative NP from the double nominative sentences in the (b)-examples.\(^{11}\)

Finally, our analysis also predicts that if a language has a double nominative construction and allows *pro*-drop of the sorts presented here, it should have apparent ‘double relative clauses’. This prediction is borne out by the fact that Japanese has similar types of relative clauses. The acceptability of such relative clauses is reported in Kuno (1973), as illustrated in (40).

\[(40)\]

\[a. \quad [[\text{kite-iru}] \, \text{yoohuku-ga} \, \text{yogorete-iru}] \, \text{sinsi}\]

\[\text{wearing-is} \, \text{suit-Nom} \, \text{dirty-is} \, \text{gentleman}\]

‘gentleman who the suit [he] is wearing is dirty’

\[b. \quad [\text{RC}_1 \, e_i] \, [\text{RC}_2 \, \text{pro}_i \, e_j] \, \text{kite-iru} \, \text{yoohuku-ga} \, \text{yogorete-iru}] \, \text{sinsi}_i\]

\[\text{wearing-is} \, \text{suit-Nom}_j \, \text{dirty-is} \, \text{gentleman}_i\]

In our analysis, *sinsi* (‘gentleman’) has been relativized from the first nominative NP of the predicate *yogorete-iru* (‘is dirty’), and the second nominative NP *yoohuku-ga* (‘suit-Nom’) is modified by a relative clause that contains a *pro* subject that is coindexed with the first nominative NP.

### 4 Conclusion

In this paper, we have argued that the so-called ‘double relative clause’ in Korean is derived from a double nominative construction by relativizing the first nominative NP from an IP-adjoined po-
sition. We have also seen that Japanese, which is another language that has double nominative construction and pro-drop, allows a similar type of relativization. Under our analysis, there is no island violation in the apparent ‘double relative clause’ formation. Therefore, the operator movement analysis for relative clauses in Korean can be maintained.

**Footnotes**

In developing the idea put forth in this paper, we are indebted to many people for their discussions, suggestions, and criticisms. In particular, we are grateful to Jae-Woong Choe, Chan Chung, Daeho Chung, Chungmin Lee, Myong-Kwan Park, Byung-Soo Park, Ivan Sag, Peter Sells, Gert Webelhuth, Alexander Williams, Dong-Whee Yang, and Shûiche Yatabe. The first author would also like to acknowledge the XTAG group at the University of Pennsylvania for helpful comments at the initial stage of this work. Two anonymous reviewers also deserve our special thanks for their critical comments that helped us reshape and improve this paper. All errors are ours. This work was supported in part by SSHRC #410-2003-0544 to Han and the Brain Korea Project in 2003 to Kim.

1 See J.-B. Kim (1998) for a non-movement analysis of Korean relatives clauses that posits no empty operator at all.

2 When representing relative clauses in the rest of the paper, we leave out the empty relative pronoun operator and directly coindex the head noun and the gap in the relative clause for sake of simplicity. We also simplify the tree diagrams to save space.

3 An anonymous reviewer suggests that the examples in (5a)-(5b) are degraded not because of a violation of a grammatical principle but because of a difficulty in processing. As a supporting argument, the reviewer shows that the acceptability of similar examples improves (though the sentence is still not perfect) if the nominative case marker on the higher subject is replaced with a focus particle (a delimiter) -man (‘only’) and/or an adverb is inserted between the subject and the
complex NP.

(i) ?? [John-man (papokathi) \[CNPN\] [kangto-ka \(e\) hwumchy-ess-tanun] sosik-ul] mos
    John-only foolishly thief-Nom \(e\) stole-Past-Adn news-Acc not
tul-un] posek, hear-Adn jewel,
    ‘the jewel which foolishly only John didn’t hear the news that the thief stole’

The reviewer further argues that even when islands are not at stake, relativization of an embedded subject over a higher nominative-marked subject is degraded, and that the acceptability improves if the nominative case on the subject is replaced with -man:

(ii) a. [nay-ka \(e\) chencay-lako] sayngkakha-nun] ku salam, I-Nom genius-Comp think-Adn that person
    ‘that person who I think is a genius’ (cf. the reviewer’s judgment: *?)

    b. [na-man \(e\) chencay-lako] sayngkakha-nun] ku salam, I-only genius-Comp think-Adn that person
    ‘that person who only I think is a genius’

We, however, have reasons to doubt that the unacceptability of (5a)-(5b) is mere processing effect. First of all, the unacceptability of (5a)-(5b) sharply contrasts with the acceptability of (3a)-(4).

Second, out of 10 native speakers of Korean we consulted, 9 speakers judged (5a)-(5b) to be unacceptable. If processing difficulty alone were at work, we would expect more variability among different speakers. Third, all the native speakers we consulted judged (iia) to be as perfectly acceptable as (iib), contra the reviewer’s judgments. This shows that the unacceptability of (5a)-(5b) has little to do with the putative processing difficulty caused by the relativization of an embedded argument over a matrix nominative-marked subject. We do not yet clearly understand why manipulating examples such as (5a)-(5b) in certain ways creates an improvement in grammaticality for some speakers, as in (i). We will revisit this issue in footnote 5.

4We thank an anonymous reviewer for raising this question.
Although the unacceptability of (5a)-(5c) indicates that the resumptive pronoun strategy cannot be used in the analysis of these examples, this does not mean that Korean relative clauses never make use of resumptive pronouns. In fact, the improved acceptability of (i) in footnote 3 could be taken to suggest that an insertion of focus marker and adverbs somehow makes easier for the resumptive pronoun strategy to apply to island-violating relative clauses. All these show that the use of resumptive pronouns in Korean (if possible) is highly restricted, subject to many syntactic and discourse constraints not yet clear to us.

Another way of avoiding the island effects is to assume that Korean allows the subject of a relative clause to be “genitivized if the relative clause describes a characteristic property of its head NP” as assumed by M.-Y. Kang (1988) and D.-W. Yang (1989). Within such a system, the subject is first adjoined to the CP and then moved out of the relative clause, avoiding the violation of subjacency or barrierhood. One serious question that arises from such an analysis is how to define the notion of ‘characteristic property’. See section 3 for our discussion of a similar semantic analysis set forth by Na and Huck (1993). Also see J.-B. Kim (1998) for more detailed discussion against such a genitive account.

Na and Huck (1993: 203) note that their Argument Condition is rather different from the various Subjacency Conditions of Chomsky (1981, 1986) in that it is ‘antecedent-oriented’. The condition tells us, given a clause head, where to look for a gap or a thematically subordinate nominal.

An anonymous reviewer has brought to our attention that H.-K. Yang (1990) proposed a similar analysis within the notion of barrierhood. See H.-K. Yang (1990) for details.

A reviewer asks why an apparent gap in an island in double nominative constructions can be treated as a pronoun coindexed with the first nominative NP, while a similar strategy of coindexing a gap in an island and a head noun of a relative clause cannot work for examples such as in (5). That is, if the structure in (ia) is possible with a coindexation between the first nominative NP and a pronoun inside an island, then why isn’t (ib) possible as a derivation for island-violating examples
we gave in (5)? S/he notes that this asymmetry reveals an assumption implicitly presupposed in our analysis, stated as in (ii).

(i)  a. \[RC \ldots t_i (\text{first nominative NP}) \ldots [i\text{sland} \ldots \text{pronoun}_i \ldots ] \ldots ] \text{ head noun}_i\]
    b. \[RC \ldots [i\text{sland} \ldots \text{pronoun}_i \ldots ] \ldots ] \text{ head noun}_i\]

(ii) The head noun (or the empty operator) of a relative clause cannot be coindexed with a regular (null or overt) pronoun contained in an island, while the first nominative NP in a double nominative construction can be.

We clarify that our analysis is not based on such an assumption. The fact that in a double nominative construction, a pronoun in an island can be coindexed with the first nominative NP is part of a larger pattern having to do with how the relation between pronouns and their antecedents is established. In general, a pronoun in an island can be coindexed with a preceding NP, as in (iiia). And as in (iiib), a pronoun inside an island can have the gap of a relative clause as an antecedent, and in this case, the head noun and the pronoun are coindexed indirectly.

(iii) a. John-un, \[i\text{sland Sue-ka ku-lul}_i \text{ cohaha-n-tanun sasil-ul] molu-n-ta. John-Top_i Sue-Nom he-Acc_i like-Pres-Adn fact-Acc not-know-Pres-Decl\] ‘John does not know that Sue likes him.’
    b. \[RC t_i [i\text{sland Sue-ka ku-lul}_i \text{ cohaha-n-tanun sasil-ul} ] molu-nun] namca_i t_i Sue-Nom he-Acc_i like-Pres-Adn fact-Acc not-know-Adn man_i\] ‘the man who does not know that Sue likes him’

So, in principle, a head noun of a relative clause can be coindexed with a pronoun contained in an island, and the schema in (ib) is a possible derivation as long as there is no extraction from within the island. To us, the reason why the examples in (5) are out is orthogonal to co-reference constraints on pronouns: they are degraded because an extraction has occurred out of an island.

In defense of the resumptive pronoun analysis on ‘double relative clauses,’ an anonymous reviewer observes that the example in (31) should not be judged as ungrammatical, but merely as
difficult to process because *wuli pan haksayng-i* (‘our class student-Nom’) which is the subject of the higher clause can be misinterpreted as the subject of the lower clause. However, we saw that a relative clause such as (iia) in footnote 3 is perfectly acceptable even though misinterpreting the subject is also in principle possible. Further, even if we rule out the possibility of misinterpreting the subject, by placing an adjunct that can only modify the higher verb in between the subject and the lower relative clause, the acceptability does not improve. This is illustrated in (i) below.

(i) */?? [RC1 wuli pan haksayng-isochangmwun-ulo eip-un] yangpok-ulj
    our class student-Nom window-through e; i; j wear-Adn suit-Accj
    po-n]
    see-Adn gentlemani
    ‘the gentleman [RC1 who; i the student from our class saw the suit [RC2 whichj; e; i wore
    e; j]]’
    ‘the gentleman who the student from our class saw through the window the suit which
    [he] wore’

Out of the 10 native speakers we consulted, 8 speakers judged (i) ungrammatical, and 2 speakers judged it marginal. And both the speakers that judged it marginal judged (3)-(4) acceptable confirming the sharp contrast in the acceptability between the two types of configurations. We think that this contrast deserves a grammatical analysis.

An anonymous reviewer points out that the IP-adjoined nominative NP tends to be definite, but the head noun in ‘double relative clauses’ does not necessarily have this tendency. We note that in relative clauses, it is not the head noun that is extracted, but an empty operator. This extraction has the semantic effect of turning the relative clause into a predicate type. It has nothing to do with definiteness and hence the question of the head noun inheriting the definiteness of the source position of the empty operator does not arise. Rather, the definiteness of the head noun will depend on the context in which the noun phrase (with the relative clause) occurs within the sentence or the discourse.
References


Han, Jong-Im. 1992. Syntactic Movement Analysis of Korean Relativization. Language Research 28:2, 335–357


Chung-hye Han
Dept. of Linguistics
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Dr.
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6, Canada
chunghye@sfu.ca

Jong-Bok Kim
School of English
Kyung Hee University
1 Hoegi-dong, Dongdaemoon-gu
Seoul, 130-702, Korea
jongbok@khu.ac.kr