

Internally-Headed Relatives Instantiate Situation Subordination

The central question of this paper is why the Internally Headed Relative Clause construction in Korean (and Japanese) (henceforth IHRC), illustrated in (1), differs syntactically and semantically from the more familiar Externally Headed Relative Clause construction (henceforth EHRC), illustrated in (2).

The IHRC is found in languages with verb-final word order such as Korean, Japanese, Quechua, Lakota, and Yuman languages, which also have the EHRC (see, among others, Cole 1987, Williamson 1987, Culy 1990, Basilico 1996; cf. Hiraiwa 2003). The IHRC is labeled as such, because its semantic head, i.e., what it refers to, is contained inside the relative clause, whereas the head of the corresponding EHRC is outside the relative clause. Compare (1) and (2) (the semantic heads are italicized).

The IHRC in Korean differs from the EHRC in the following respects: first, whereas the material preceding the external head in the EHRC can be omitted, the material preceding *kes* in the IHRC cannot be. Second, only the IHRC is subject to semantico-pragmatic conditions such as the Relevancy Condition, which dictates that the content of the IHRC be “directly relevant to the pragmatic content of the matrix clause” (Kuroda 1977, 1992:147). Third, unlike the EHRC, the IHRC does not restrict the properties of individuals denoted by the head noun (Kuroda 1992, Jung 1995, Hoshi 1996, Shimoyama 1999, Y. Kim 2003). Fourth, the IHRC shows a dualistic behavior by functioning both as an argument of the matrix predicate and as a modifier of the matrix clause.

These differences between the IHRC and the EHRC have drawn considerable attention in the literature and various approaches have been taken to account for them (e.g., Jhang 1994, B. Park 1994, Jung 1995, H. Park 1998, D. Chung 1999, Y. Kim 2002, C. Chung and J. Kim 2003). But few studies have investigated the interpretive aspects of the IHRC within a formal semantic framework (cf. Hoshi 1996, Shimoyama 1999, Matsuda 2002, Y. Kim 2002).

In this study, I will develop a formal mechanism which accounts for the distinctive characteristics of the IHRC. I will propose that the IHRC connects two situations by subordinating one under the other. The basis for this proposal will be drawn from the parallels between the IHRC and other situation-subordinating constructions such as direct perception complements in Korean/Japanese, illustrated in (3), and free adjuncts in English, illustrated in (4). I will show that this semantic function of the IHRC accounts for why the IHRC is interpreted non-restrictively with respect to the semantic head noun; this is because it restricts the matrix situation, not the denotation of the semantic head. I will demonstrate that the semantic-pragmatic conditions on the IHRC such as the Relevancy Condition are natural consequences of the semantic function of this construction and hence can be dispensed with as independent conditions.

In order to account for the non-optionality of the material preceding *kes*, I will propose that the IHRC consists of a gapless clause (or the IHR-clause) and the pronominal head *kes*, which is a spell-out of a definite article preceded by an (elided) NP (cf. Elbourne 2002). I will argue that due to its intermediate categorial status, *kes* cannot stand alone and hence must form a syntactic unit with the IHR-clause.

On the other hand, I will explain the dualistic behavior of the IHRC by motivating both a syntactic and a semantic solution: The argument-like interpretation comes from the referent of *kes* serving as an argument of the matrix predicate; the adjunct-like interpretation of the IHRC comes from the LF raising of the IHR-clause to a higher position where adjuncts of the matrix clause normally occur. I will argue that the value of *kes* is assigned in a manner analogous to the interpretation of the so-called E-type pronouns in English (Evans 1977, 1980, Cooper 1979, Elbourne 2002): that is, the IHR-clause introduces a new discourse context which provides the descriptive content for the pronoun *kes* (cf. Hoshi 1996, Shimoyama 1999).

The present paper raises an important theoretical question as to why there is a correlation between relativization and situation subordination (cf. Larson 1983). It is hoped that the findings of this study will shed new light on the syntax and semantics of other instantiations of situation subordination such as participial small clauses in English (e.g., *John caught the thief running away*), whose syntactic form resembles that of a reduced relative clause (cf. Felser 1999).

Data:

(1) The Internally Headed Relative Clause Construction

John-un	[<i>totwuk-i</i>	<i>tomangka-nun</i>	<i>kes</i>]-ul	<i>cap-ess-ta</i>
J.-top	[<i>thief-nom</i>	<i>run.away-rel.imprf</i>	<i>kes</i>]-acc	<i>catch-pst-decl</i>

‘John caught the thief running away.’

(2) The Externally Headed Relative Clause Construction

John-un	[[_____	<i>tomangka</i>]-nun	<i>totwuk</i>]-ul	<i>cap-ess-ta</i>
J.-top	[[_____	<i>run.away</i>]-rel.imprf	<i>thief</i>]-acc	<i>catch-pst-decl</i>

‘John caught the thief who was running away.’

(3) Direct perception complement in Korean

John-un	[<i>totwuk-i</i>	<i>tomangka-nun</i>	<i>kes</i>]-ul	<i>po-ess-ta</i>
J.-top	[<i>thief-nom</i>	<i>run.away-rel.imprf</i>	<i>kes</i>]-acc	<i>see-pst-decl</i>

‘John saw the thief running away.’

(4) Free adjunct in English

Walking out of the house, John saw the thief running away.

Selected References:

- Basilico, David. 1996. Head position and internally headed relative clauses. *Language* 72:498-532.
- Chung, Chan and Jong-Bok Kim. 2003. Differences between externally and internally headed relative clause constructions. In *On-line Proceedings of HPSG 2002*.
- Chung, Dae-ho. 1999. A complement analysis of the head internal relative clauses. *Language and Information* 3:1-12.
- Cole, Peter. 1987. The structure of internally headed relative clauses. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5:277-302.
- Cooper, Robin. 1979. The interpretation of pronouns. In *Syntax and Semantics*, ed. F. Henry and H. Schnelle. New York: Academic Press.
- Culy, Christopher Douglas. 1990. The syntax and semantics of internally headed relative clauses, Stanford University: Doctoral Dissertation.
- Elbourne, Paul. 2002. E-type anaphora as NP-deletion. *Natural Language Semantics* 9:241-288.
- Evans, Gareth. 1980. Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11:337-362.
- Hoshi, Koji. 1996. Structural and interpretive aspects of head-internal and head-external relative clauses, University of Rochester: Doctoral dissertation.
- Jhang, Sea-eun. 1994. Headed nominalizations in Korean: relative clauses, clefts, and comparatives, Simon Fraser University: Doctoral dissertation.
- Kim, Yong-Beom. 2002b. Relevancy in internally headed relative clauses in Korean. *Lingua* 112:541-559.
- Kuroda, Shige-yuki. 1992. *Japanese Syntax and Semantics*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Larson, Richard K. 1983. Restrictive modification: Relative clauses and adverbs, University of Wisconsin-Madison: Doctoral dissertation.
- Matsuda, Yuki. 2002. Event sensitivity of head-internal relatives in Japanese. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 10:629-643.
- Park, Hyeson. 1998. Thetic/categorical judgment and relative clauses in Korean. In *Proceedings of the Western Conference on Linguistics '98*.
- Shimoyama, Junko. 1999. Wh-constructions in Japanese, University of Massachusetts at Amherst: Doctoral dissertation.
- Williamson, Janis. 1987. An indefiniteness restriction on relative clauses in Lakota. In *The Representation of (In)definites*, ed. E. Reuland and A.G.B.ter Meulen, 168-190. Cambridge, MA: The MIT press.