

Jae Jung Song

Resumptive Genitive Pronouns in Korean Relative Clauses: Distribution and Explanation

Abstract

This paper provides an explanatory account of the distribution of resumptive genitive pronouns in Korean relative clauses. The use of resumptive genitive pronouns depends crucially on the bondedness of the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause. When these two expressions exhibit syntactic and semantic bondedness, the use of resumptive genitive pronouns is prohibited. If they are neither syntactically nor semantically bonded to each other, a resumptive genitive pronoun must be utilized. If they are syntactically, not semantically, bonded to each other, there is a choice between the use and non-use of resumptive genitive pronouns. Moreover, the notion of syntactic and semantic bondedness is compared with Kumashiro's (2000) notion of partially or highly autonomous layered interrelation with the conclusion that the latter must be redefined or reconceptualized in terms of the two different kinds of bondedness, syntactic and semantic. The paper closes with a brief discussion of general implications of these findings.

1. Introduction

In Korean, the primary relative clause (RC) forming strategy is the gap strategy whereby the NP coreferential with the head NP is "deleted" from the relative clause along with its case marker or postposition (Tagashira 1972, and Song 1991; for crosslinguistic discussion, see Keenan and Comrie 1977, Comrie 1989: chapter 7, and Song 2001: chapter 4).¹ In (1), thus, the head NP *kay* 'dog' is not expressed at all inside the relative clause. (Hereafter, relative clauses are enclosed in square brackets.)

¹ The abbreviations used in this paper are: ACC = Accusative, CONJ = Conjunctive, DAT = Dative, GEN = Genitive, HON = Honorific, HT = Honorific Title, IND = Indicative, INST = Instrumental, LOC = Locative, NOM = Nominative, PERF = Perfective, PL = Plural, PST = Past, REL = Relative, and TOP = Topic.

- (1) *ai-ka* [*koyangi-lul mu-n*] *kay-lul* *ttayli-ess-ta*
 child-NOM cat-ACC bite-REL dog-ACC hit-PST-IND
 'The child hit the dog that bit the cat.'

The sentence in (1) is related to those in (2); (2a) may be said to be "embedded" in (2b) by means of the common NP *kay*. In (1), the subject NP in (2.a) is relativized upon: the NP *kay*, along with its subject marker *-ka*, is absent from the corresponding relative clause in (1).

- (2) a. *kay-ka* *koyangi-lul* *mul-ess-ta*
 dog-NOM cat-ACC bite-PST-IND
 'The dog bit the cat.'
- b. *ai-ka* *kay-lul* *ttayli-ess-ta*
 child-NOM dog-ACC hit-PST-IND
 'The child hit the dog.'

The gap strategy applies also to direct object, indirect object and oblique NPs (cf. Keenan and Comrie's (1977) Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy). However, it is not always the case that oblique NPs can be directly relativized on by means of the gap strategy. There are at least three additional grammatical devices that are drawn upon in order to relativize on oblique NPs that cannot be directly relativized on by means of the gap strategy: promotion, conjunction and use of adverbs (for detailed discussion of these devices, see Song 1991).

When it comes to genitives, a different (i.e. non-primary) RC forming strategy may be called for. The relative clause in (3), related to the sentence in (4), must contain the pronominal form of the head NP, i.e. a so-called resumptive pronoun. It makes use of the reflexive pronoun *caki*, which refers to the head NP *haksayng*. The reflexive pronoun in turn is followed by the genitive case marker *-uy*.

- (3) *s[caki-uy/*Ø sensayng-nim-i* *chongkak-i-si-n]* *haksayng*
 self-GEN/*Ø teacher-HT-NOM bachelor-is-HON-REL student
 'The student whose teacher is a bachelor'

- (4) *haksayng-uy sensayng-nim-i chongkak-i-si-ta*
 student-GEN teacher-HT-NOM bachelor-is-HON-IND
 ‘The student’s teacher is a bachelor.’

For this reason, the RC forming strategy, exemplified in (3), is known as the pronoun retention strategy.

However, there are relative clauses the head NP of which seemingly or arguably bears the genitive relation, but which do not at all tolerate the presence of a resumptive genitive pronoun, as in (5). This is based on the assumption that the relative clause in (5) is related to or based on the sentence in (6), in which the “head” NP *haksayng* is marked by the genitive case marker *-uy*.

- (5) [\emptyset /**caki-uy caynung-i ttwuyena-n*] *haksayng*
 [\emptyset /*self-GEN talent-NOM outstanding-REL] student
 ‘The student whose talent is outstanding’

- (6) *haksayng-uy caynung-i ttwuyena-ta*
 student-GEN talent-NOM outstanding-IND
 ‘The student’s talent is outstanding.’

To make things more complicated, the resumptive genitive pronoun seems to be optional in relative clauses such as (7), which may be related to (8).

- (7) [*caki-uy*/ \emptyset *cha-ka kocangna-n*] *pangmwunkayk*²
 self-GEN/ \emptyset car-NOM break.down-REL visitor
 ‘The visitor whose car was in a state of a break-down’

- (8) *pangmwunkayk-uy cha-ka kocangna-ess-ta*
 visitor-GEN car-NOM break.down-PST-IND
 ‘The visitor’s car was in a state of a break-down.’

In relative clauses such as (3), a resumptive genitive pronoun must be utilized to express the role of the head NP (i.e. the pronoun retention strategy). In relative clauses such as (5), the use of resumptive genitive pronouns is prohibited (i.e. the gap strategy). Yet relative clauses such as (7) may optionally call for the use of resumptive genitive pronouns (i.e. the pronoun retention or gap strategy). Needless to say, this situation seems to

² The predicate *kocangna-* in (8) can also encode a temporally bound or non-stative event; (8) can also be translated as ‘the visitor’s car broke down’.

be random or even chaotic. The objective of the present paper is to take account of the distribution of the resumptive genitive pronoun *caki-uy* in Korean relative clauses with predicative complements (or, to be more precise, relative clauses containing intransitive-predicative complements). In common with Tagashira (1972) and Song (1991), therefore, it will not deal with the distribution of resumptive genitive pronouns in other subject, direct object, indirect object, or oblique relative clauses.³

³ Examples of such relative clauses are as follows:

- (i) [*caki-uy chinkwu-ka kay-lul ttayli-n*] *ai*_i
 self-GEN friend-NOM dog-ACC hit-REL child
 'The child whose friend hit the dog'
 [GEN-SUBJECT]
- (ii) **[ku salam-i caki-uy cha-lul phala-peli-n]* *haksayng*_i
 the man-NOM self-GEN car-ACC sell-PERF-REL] student
 'The student whose car the man sold'
 [GEN-DIRECT OBJECT]
- (iii) **[ku salam-i caki-uy ai-eykey ton-ul cwu-n]* *yeca*_i
 the man-NOM self-GEN child-DAT money-ACC give-REL woman
 'The woman whose son the man gave the money to'
 [GEN-INDIRECT OBJECT]
- (iv) **[ku salam-i ai-tul-ul caki-uy cha-lo telyi-ko ka-n]*
 the man-NOM child-PL-ACC self-GEN car-INST take-CONJ go-REL
*yeca*_i
 woman
 'The woman whose car the man took the children in'
 [GEN-OBLIQUE]
- (v) [*caki-uy cip-eyse salin saken-i ilena-n*] *yeca*_i
 self-GEN house-LOC murder case-NOM occur-REL woman
 'The woman whose house the murder took place in'
 [GEN-OBLIQUE]

Note that the ungrammaticality of (ii), (iii), and (iv) seems to be caused by the fact that the resumptive genitive pronoun must refer to the subject NP of the relative clause, not to the head NP. This suggests that the anaphoric nature of the genitive pronoun may also have a bearing upon the distribution of resumptive genitive pronouns in relative clauses. This awaits further research. Incidentally, Korean and Mandarin Chinese are the only known languages that use resumptive pronouns in the context of prenominal external-headed relative clauses (Song 2001: 218; cf. Lehmann 1986).

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In section 2, two potential explanations will be assessed: (i) the distinction between “property possessive” and “instance possessive,” based on Tagashira (1972); and (ii) the distinction between inalienable and alienable possession, which has been shown on a cross-linguistic basis to be highly relevant to possession. It will be demonstrated that neither of these explanations seems to account for the presence or absence of resumptive genitive pronouns in Korean relative clauses. In section 3, an alternative explanation based on the notion of bondedness (cf. Keenan 1984) is put forward and argued for. Moreover, this notion will be compared with what has been proposed by Kumashiro (2000) and Kumashiro and Langacker (in press) for the so-called double-nominative construction in Japanese, because certain relative clauses are based on double-nominative sentences in Korean. In section 4, the alternative explanation is further put to the test in order to see whether it makes correct predictions about the use of resumptive genitive pronouns in Korean relative clauses. Finally, in the guise of a conclusion the main points of the paper will be recapitulated in section 5 with a view to drawing general implications.

2. The use of resumptive genitive pronouns in Korean relative clauses

Data such as presented in section 1 lead Song (1991: 200) to conclude that in Korean the genitive relation may be relativized on either by means of the pronoun retention strategy (e.g. (3)) or by means of the gap strategy (e.g. (5)). Tagashira (1972: 219–221) also thinks that the relative clause in (3), based on the sentence in (4), is produced by means of the pronoun retention strategy, and the relative clause in (5) by means of the gap strategy. But she argues that the relative clause in (5) is not a genitive relative clause at all. (For the sake of convenience, relative clauses in which the head NP bears the genitive relation are referred to in this paper as genitive relative clauses.) Thus, (5) should instead be related to the sentence in (9) (i.e. so-called double-nominative (or double-subject) construction or a topicalized version thereof), in which the “head” NP bears the subject relation, not to that in (6), in which the “head” NP bears the genitive relation (for discussion of the double-nominative construction in Korean, see Yim 1985, J. H.-S. Yoon 1987, Kang 1987, Kang 1989, J.-M. Yoon 1989, and J.-Y. Yoon 1989 *inter alia*). To put it differently, the relative clause in (5) arises

from the subject NP *haksayng-i* or its topicalized counterpart *haksayng-un* in (9) relativized on by means of the gap strategy.

- (9) *haksayng-i/-un* *caynung-i* *ttwuyena-ta*
 student-NOM/-TOP talent-NOM outstanding-IND
 'It is the student who is such that his/her talent is outstanding.'

Indeed, there is evidence, as will be discussed below, that the relative clause in (5) must be related to the double-nominative sentence in (9), not to the single-nominative sentence in (6). This suggests that Song's (1991) conclusion that genitive relative clauses are produced either by means of the pronoun retention strategy or by means of the gap strategy is misguided. Rather, the genitive relation is relativized on by means of the pronoun retention strategy alone (e.g. Keenan and Comrie 1972: 78).

Tagashira's (1972: 220) explanation of the difference between (3) (i.e. the presence of a resumptive genitive pronoun) and (5) (i.e. the absence of a resumptive genitive pronoun) is related directly to her distinction between "property possessive" and "instance possessive." Property possessive is said to be a type of possessive that involves the notion of "belonging to" or "property of." Instance possessive, on the other hand, has to do with what is being talked about "in relation to a certain individual [or entity]" (Tagashira 1972: 220). Then, property possessive is claimed to call for the pronoun retention strategy, and instance possessive the gap strategy. However, Tagashira's (1972) distinction is so vague or in so much need of explanation that it is difficult to apply without problems. For instance, it is extremely difficult to imagine in the context of relative clauses—even in the case of property possessive—that there is anything that is not being talked about in relation to a certain individual or entity. Indeed, to provide information about individuals or entities is precisely one of the functions of relative clauses (cf. Fox 1987).

Moreover, as Song (1991: 200) observes, some clear examples of property possessive—in fact far better examples than (3)—may optionally do without resumptive genitive pronouns, as demonstrated below.

- (10) [*caki-uy* *sin-i* *ta* *talh-un*] *ai*
 self-GEN shoe-NOM all worn.out-REL child
 'The child whose shoes are all worn out'

- (11) [*caki-uy cha-ka kocangna-n*] *pangmwunkayk*
 self-GEN car-NOM break.down-REL visitor
 'The visitor whose car was in a state of a break-down'
- (12) [*sin-i ta talh-un*] *ai*
 shoe-NOM all worn.out-REL child
 'The child whose shoes are all worn out'
- (13) [*cha-ka kocangna-n*] *pangmwunkayk*
 car-NOM break.down-REL visitor
 'The visitor whose car was in a state of a break-down'

Thus, while Song's (1991) conclusion is incorrect, Tagashira's (1972) distinction between property and instance possessive also fails to take adequate account of the distribution of the resumptive genitive pronoun *caki-uy* in Korean relative clauses. For one thing, some relative clauses of Tagashira's property possessive type may not draw upon the pronoun retention strategy, albeit optionally.

One of the most prominent semantic parameters relating to possession in the languages of the world is the distinction between inalienable and alienable possession (e.g. Chappell and McGregor 1996). This, however, does not seem to account for the distribution of the resumptive genitive pronoun *caki-uy* in Korean relative clauses (cf. Tagashira 1972: 229). For instance, consider (14) and (15), where the noun *cip* 'house' appears with the NOM case marker inside the relative clause.

- (14) [*caki-uy/*Ø cip-i cak-un*] *ai*
 self-GEN/*Ø house-NOM small-REL child
 'The child whose house is small'
- (15) [*Ø/*caki-uy cip-i kananha-n*] *ai*
 Ø/*self-GEN house-NOM poor-REL child
 'The child whose house is poor'

Though it refers to the child's place of dwelling in (14) and the household of which the child is a member in (15), the noun *cip* in these relative clauses must be taken to be an example of inalienable possession. Based on syntactic evidence, Sohn (1994: 176–177) indeed demonstrates that in Korean culture not only body parts and personal belongings but also "items essential to maintain one's living," e.g. *cip* 'house' or 'home', *cikcang* 'workplace' or 'employment', *sin* 'shoes', *cha* 'car', etc., are considered as

“inalienable parts of the possessor.”⁴ Nonetheless, the noun *cip* co-occurs with a resumptive genitive pronoun in (14), whereas in (15) it cannot. On the other hand, some other examples of inalienable possession, as in (10)–(13), call for the optional use of resumptive genitive pronouns within the same relative clauses. Thus, inalienable, as opposed to alienable, possession does not seem to provide a sound basis for explaining the distribution of the resumptive genitive pronoun *caki-uy* in Korean relative clauses.

3. Bondedness of the NOM-marked NP and the predicate: an alternative explanation

The alternative explanation to be put forward in the present paper is based crucially on bondedness between the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause (e.g. *caynung-i* and *ttwuyena-*, respectively, in (5)). Bondedness here refers to the situation in which the NOM-marked NP and the predicate constitute a close unit (cf. Keenan 1984: 200). These two

⁴ Inalienable, as opposed to alienable, nouns trigger the appearance in the predicate of the so-called honorific suffix *-(u)si*. For instance, *phal* in (i) is an example of inalienable possession, whereas *kay* in (ii) is an example of alienable possession. The inalienable noun *phal* in (i) calls for the honorific suffix *-(u)si*, whereas the alienable noun *kay* in (ii) does not tolerate the presence of the suffix.

- (i) *sensayng-nim-kkeyse phal-i khu-si-ta*
 teacher-HT-HON.NOM arm-NOM big-HON-IND
 ‘It is the teacher who is such that his/her arms are big.’
- (ii) *sensayng-nim-kkeyse kay-ka khu-(*si)-ta*
 teacher-HT-HON.NOM dog-NOM big-(HON)-IND
 ‘It is the teacher who is such that his/her dog is big.’

Indeed, the noun *cip* ‘house’ or ‘home’, being an example of inalienable possession, also triggers the appearance in the predicate of the honorific suffix, as can be seen in (iii) and (iv).

- (iii) *sensayng-nim-kkeyse cip-i cak-usi-ta*
 teacher-HT-HON.NOM house-NOM small-HON-IND
 ‘It is the teacher who is such that his/her house is small.’
- (iv) *sensayng-nim-kkeyse cip-i kananha-si-ta*
 teacher-HT-HON.NOM house-NOM poor-HON-IND
 ‘It is the teacher who is such that his/her house is poor.’

expressions, when bonded to each other, may thus function as a single, albeit complex, predicate. Depending on whether or not they are bonded to each other, the use of resumptive genitive pronouns may or may not be required. Moreover, this bondedness cannot be only syntactic but also semantic. If the two expressions in question are both syntactically and semantically bonded to each other, the use of resumptive genitive pronouns is prohibited. If they are syntactically, not semantically, bonded to each other, there is a choice between the use and non-use of resumptive genitive pronouns. Finally, if they are neither syntactically nor semantically bonded to each other, a resumptive genitive pronoun must be utilized inside the relative clause.

The NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause in (5), for instance, exhibit syntactic bondedness. This is manifested by the fact that the NOM case marker can be omitted optionally from the NOM-marked NP. Compare (5) with (16):

- (16) [*caynung ttwuyena-n*] *haksayng*
 [talent outstanding-REL] student
 'The student whose talent is outstanding'

In (16), the NP *caynung*, without its NOM case marker, can be more clearly seen to form a complex predicate together with the predicate *ttwuyena-* than in (5).

Further evidence in support of this syntactic bondedness comes from the fact that intensifiers such as *acwu* 'very', which can appear either before the NOM-marked NP or before the predicate in (5), must appear before the erstwhile NOM-marked NP, and not before the predicate in (16). This is illustrated by (17) and (18).

- (17) [(*acwu caynung-i* (*acwu ttwuyena-n*) *haksayng*
 [(very) talent-NOM (very) outstanding-REL] student
 'The student whose talent is very outstanding'

- (18) [(*acwu caynung* (**acwu ttwuyena-n*) *haksayng*
 [(very) talent (**very*) outstanding-REL] student
 'The student whose talent is very outstanding'

This positional restriction on *acwu* in (18) can be explained by the syntactic bondedness that holds between the two expressions *caynung* and *ttwuyena-* in (16); the intensifier is no longer allowed to interfere with their

bondedness once the NOM case marker has been removed from the NOM-marked NP.

The bondedness between the NOM-marked NP and the predicate can also be semantic; they can also function as a semantically complex predicate. What this means is that the NOM-marked NP and the predicate **together** impute a quality or attribute to the referent of the head NP. Indeed, what the NOM-marked NP does in the relative clause in (5), for instance, is merely to specify the area in which the referent of the head NP is outstanding. If the student's talent is outstanding, it then follows that the student is outstanding in at least one respect. In other words, what is true of the student's talent can be thought to be true of the student also.

The NOM-marked NP in (5) (or the erstwhile NOM-marked NP in (16) for that matter), when part of the complex predicate, does not retain its full nominal status. This 'reduced' nominal status may explain why it cannot be modified by the genitive phrase, i.e. *caki-uy*, as in (5). The NOM-marked NP *caynung-i* in (6), on the other hand, is very much of a nominal (that is, it does not form a complex predicate with *ttwuyena-*), as evinced by the fact that it is already preceded by the modifying genitive phrase *haksayng-uy*. In other words, *haksayng-uy caynung-i* is the subject NP of the relative clause with *ttwuyena-* as its own predicate. This in turn may suggest that the relative clause in (5) be related to (9), not to (6), all repeated below.

- (5) [\emptyset /**caki-uy* *caynung-i* *ttwuyena-n*] *haksayng*
 [\emptyset /*self-GEN talent-NOM outstanding-REL] student
 'The student whose talent is outstanding'
- (6) *haksayng-uy caynung-i ttwuyena-ta*
 student-GEN talent-NOM outstanding-IND
 'The student's talent is outstanding.'
- (9) *haksayng-i/-un caynung-i ttwuyena-ta*
 student-NOM/-TOP talent-NOM outstanding-IND
 'It is the student who is such that his/her talent is outstanding.'

This view, based on bondedness, is further supported by evidence arising from the fact that certain sequences of the NOM-marked NP and the predicate have idiomatic as well as literal readings (e.g. Kang 1987, Yoon 1987). For instance, (19) illustrates one such sequence.

- (19) *ku chinkwu-ka/-nun pal(-i) nelp-ta*
 the fellow-NOM/-TOP foot(-NOM) wide-IND
 'The fellow has big feet.' [literal] *or*
 'The fellow has a lot of contacts.' [idiomatic]

Note that the NOM case marker can optionally be deleted from *pal-i*, suggesting that it is a syntactically complex predicate. Moreover, if someone is big in his/her feet, he/she can be thought to be physically big at least in that part of the body, i.e. semantic bondedness. The fact that the sequence in question can have the idiomatic in addition to the literal meaning further indicates unequivocally that it constitutes a lexicalized complex predicate.

Moreover, the NOM-/TOP-marked NP in (19), i.e. *ku chinkwu-ka/-nun*, can be expressed also as a genitive phrase, as in (20).⁵

- (20) *ku chinkwu-uy pal-i nelp-ta*
 the fellow-GEN foot-NOM wide-IND
 'The fellow has big feet.'

But (20) does not have the idiomatic reading at all; only the literal reading is allowed.

When the sequence *pal(-i) nelp-* is utilized in a relative clause, no resumptive genitive pronoun is permitted, as in (21).

- (21) [\emptyset /**caki-uy pal(-i) nelp-un*] *ku chinkwu*
 \emptyset /*self-GEN foot(-NOM) wide-REL the fellow
 'The fellow who has big feet' [literal] *or*
 'The fellow whose has a lot of contacts' [idiomatic]

Note that (21), like (19), has both the literal and idiomatic readings, whereas (20), unlike (19), has the literal reading only. This suggests strongly that the relative clause in (21) should be related to the double-nominative sentence in (19), not to the single-nominative sentence in (20). The NOM-marked NP *pal-i*, when serving as part of the complex predicate (and thus having lost its nominal status), cannot be preceded or modified by the genitive phrase, as in (21). In (20), on the other hand, the genitive phrase modifying the NP *pal-i* prevents the latter and the predicate *nelp-* from constituting a complex predicate, whereby the idiomatic reading is disallowed.

⁵ In (20), the NOM case marker, *-i*, cannot be deleted from the NP, *pal-i*.

Recall that in (14) and (15) the same inalienable noun *cip* may or may not be modified by a genitive phrase, depending upon the predicate with which it co-occurs. This interesting contrast can be similarly explained.

In the relative clause in (14), the NOM-marked NP *cip-i* and the predicate *cak-* do not form a complex predicate. Rather, the NOM-marked NP is the subject NP of the relative clause with *cak-* as its own predicate.

- (14) [*caki-uy*/* \emptyset *cip-i* *cak-un*] *ai*
 self-GEN/* \emptyset house-NOM small-REL child
 'The child whose house is small'

First, the NOM case marker cannot be eliminated from the NOM-marked NP.

- (22) **[caki-uy cip cak-un]* *ai*
 self-GEN house small-REL child
 'The child whose house is small'

Moreover, the NOM-marked NP and its predicate do not impute an attribute or quality to the referent of the head NP. The predicate *cak-* does instead impute smallness only to the referent of the NOM-marked NP *cip-i* inside the relative clause. In other words, what is true of the NOM-marked NP (i.e. the house) is not necessarily true of the head NP (i.e. the child). In (14), the house may be small, but that does not necessarily mean that the child also is small. Unlike in (5), the NOM-marked NP does not specify the area in which the child is small, as it were. Thus, the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause in (14) exhibit neither syntactic nor semantic bondedness. Because the primary function of the relative clause is to modify the head NP, there is a connection between the two. This is expressed by the resumptive genitive pronoun, which specifies a possessive relationship between the head NP *ai* and the NOM-marked NP *cip-i* in (14) (cf. Comrie 1989: 163, Song 2001: 226–227).

In (15), on the other hand, the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause form a syntactically complex predicate, as the NOM case marker can be optionally deleted, as in (23).

- (15) [\emptyset /* *caki-uy* *cip-i* *kananha-n*] *ai*
 \emptyset /* self-GEN house-NOM poor-REL child
 'The child whose house is poor'

- (23) [*cip kananha-n] ai*
 house poor-REL child
 'The child whose house is poor'

In addition, the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause in (15) impute the state of being poor to the head NP *ai*; more accurately speaking, the state of his/her family's poverty is attributed to the child. If the child's family is poor, it can be concluded without much difficulty that the child also is poor (*Because his/her family is poor, the child is poor, too* vs *Because his/her house is small, the child is small, too*(?!)). Thus, the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause in (15) exhibit not only syntactic but also semantic bondedness. This explains why a resumptive genitive pronoun cannot be used in (15), as opposed to (14).

Relative clauses such as (11) and (13), repeated here, can either have a resumptive pronoun or do without it, respectively.

- (11) [*caki-uy cha-ka kocangna-n] pangmwunkayk*
 self-GEN car-NOM break.down-REL visitor
 'The visitor whose car was in a state of a break-down'
- (13) [*cha-ka kocangna-n] pangmwunkayk*
 car-NOM break.down-REL visitor
 'The visitor whose car was in a state of a break-down'

The relative clause in (11) is related to the single-nominative sentence in (24), and the relative clause in (13) to the double-nominative sentence in (25).

- (24) *pangmwunkayk-uy cha-ka kocangna-ess-ta*
 visitor-GEN car-NOM break.down-PST-IND
 'The visitor's car was in a state of a break-down.'
- (25) *pangmwunkayk-i cha-ka kocangna-ess-ta*
 visitor-NOM car-NOM break.down-PST-IND
 'It was the visitor who was such that his/her car was in a state of a break-down.'

There is evidence for postulating the relationship between (11) and (24) on the one hand, and between (13) and (25) on the other. In (13), the NOM case marker can be deleted optionally from the NOM-marked NP, giving rise to (26).

- (26) [*cha kocangna-n*] *pangmwunkayk*
 car break.down-REL visitor
 'The visitor whose car was in a state of a break-down'

Indeed, the second NOM-marked NP in (25), to which (13) is related, can also optionally appear without the NOM case marker, as in (27).

- (27) *pangmwunkayk-i cha kocangna-ess-ta*
 visitor-NOM car break.down-PST-IND
 'It was the visitor who was such that his/her car was in a state of a break-down.'

This suggests that the NOM-marked NP *cha-ka* and the predicate *kocangna-* in (25) form a syntactically complex predicate (i.e. syntactic bondedness).

But omission of the NOM case marker from (11), on the other hand, results in an ungrammatical relative clause, as in (28).

- (28) **[caki-uy cha kocangna-n] pangmwunkayk*
 self-GEN car-NOM break.down-REL visitor
 'The visitor whose car was in a state of a break-down'

This is because the NOM-marked NP *caki-uy cha-ka* is the subject NP of the predicate *kocangna-*. Indeed, the sentence in (24), to which the relative clause in (11) is related, cannot have the NOM-case marker eliminated from the NOM-marked NP.

- (29) **pangmwunkayk-uy cha kocangna-ess-ta*
 visitor-GEN car break.down-PST-IND
 'The visitor's car was in a state of a break-down.'

This, however, raises the question as to why there is a choice between the relative clause in (11) and that in (13), as opposed to (5) or (14). It seems that, although the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause in (13) are a syntactically complex predicate, they do not also constitute a semantically complex predicate. Thus, they do not impute an attribute or quality directly to the referent of the head NP, *pangmwunkayk*. In other words, what is true of the car is not true of its owner. It is only the car, not the owner, that was in a state of a break-down. (In fact, people do not break down at least in Korean; only machines break down.) This suggests that the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause in (13) (i.e. only syntactic bondedness) may be less bonded than

those in (5) (i.e. both syntactic and semantic bondedness), but more bonded than those in (14) (i.e. neither syntactic nor semantic bondedness). This may explain why the resumptive genitive pronoun appears in the relative clause in (11), as opposed to (13), by way of (24).

To summarize, the NOM-marked NP and the predicate in (5) display not only syntactic but also semantic bondedness, whereby the use of a resumptive genitive pronoun is prohibited. The relative clause in (5) is based on the double-nominative sentence in (9), not the single-nominative sentence in (6), in which the NOM-marked NP contains a modifying genitive phrase. The NOM-marked NP and the predicate in (14) are neither syntactically nor semantically bonded to each other, thereby requiring a resumptive genitive pronoun to make explicit the connection between the head NP and the relative clause. The relative clause in (14), unlike that in (5), is based on a single-nominative sentence, in which the NOM-marked NP contains a modifying genitive phrase. The NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause in (13), displaying only syntactic bondedness, are somewhere in between the corresponding expressions in (5) and in (14), as it were. This accounts for the optional use of a resumptive pronoun inside the relative clause, as exemplified in (11); (11) is based on the single-nominative sentence in (24), and (13) on the double-nominative sentence in (25).

The notion of bondedness invoked in the present paper may seem similar to what has recently been proposed by Kumashiro (2000) for the double-nominative construction in Japanese (also see Kumashiro and Langacker in press). Recall that relative clauses such as (5) are based on double-nominative sentences such as (9). Thus, a few words are in order as to whether Kumashiro's proposal can be extended to the distribution of resumptive genitive pronouns in Korean relative clauses, although he does not deal with (Japanese) relative clauses at all.

Kumashiro (2000: chapters 5 and 6) argues that the double-nominative construction in Japanese, as in (30), encodes what he refers to as a "layered interrelation," whereby one entity, e.g. *kateikyoooshi-ga* in (30a), is construed as standing in a relation, forming a higher-order entity, e.g. *kateikyoooshi-ga gaikokujin-da* in (30a), and another entity, e.g. *Taroo-ga* in (30.a), as standing in another relation with that higher-order entity.

- (30) a. *Taroo-ga kateikyoooshi-ga gaikokujin-da*
 Taro-NOM tutor-NOM foreigner-be
 'It is Taro who is such that his tutor is a foreigner.'

- b. *zoo-ga* *hana-ga* *nagai*
 elephant-NOM trunk-NOM long
 ‘It is the elephant that has its trunk long’

He further claims that the second NOM-marked NP, *kateikyooshi-ga*, and the predicate, *gaikokujin-da*, in (30.a) encode what he (2000: 156) calls a “highly-autonomous layered interrelation” with the effect that the two expressions in question can potentially form a sentence by themselves to the exclusion of the first NOM-marked NP, *Taroo-ga*. Thus, *kateikyooshi-ga gaikokujin-da* ‘the tutor is a foreigner’ is a perfect, full sentence in Japanese. The first NOM-marked NP is then taken to hold a “predication relation” with the rest of the sentence to the effect that “the latter is interpreted as expressing a characteristic predicated of the former” (Kumashiro 2000: 159); in (30.a), the tutor being a foreigner is construed as a characteristic predicated of Taro.

In (30.b), on the other hand, the second NOM-marked NP, *hana-ga*, and the predicate, *nagai*, encode what Kumashiro (2000: 202) refers to as a “partially-autonomous layered interrelation” with the effect that these two expressions form a “complex predicate” (which seems similar to the complex predicate invoked in this paper, but see below). The first NOM-marked NP, *zoo-ga*, in turn functions as the subject of this complex predicate (and hence as the subject of the sentence as a whole). In (30.b), therefore, the second NOM-marked NP and the predicate alone, i.e. *hana-ga nagai* ‘the trunk is long’, hardly form a complete sentence, because the second NOM-marked NP, *hana-ga*, “is conceptually dependent on” the first NOM-marked NP, *zoo-ga* (Kumashiro 2000: 209).

Thus, the partially-autonomous layered interrelation bears a strong resemblance to the presence of bondedness and the highly-autonomous layered interrelation to the absence of bondedness. When, however, extended to Korean relative clauses, this resemblance is more apparent than real. Double-nominative sentences with highly-autonomous layered interrelations such as (31) can never be associated with relative clauses such as (3). Rather, (3) is related to (4), in which the only NOM-marked NP contains a modifying genitive phrase.

- (31) *haksayng-i sensayng-nim-i chongkak-i-si-ta*
 student-NOM teacher-HT-NOM bachelor-is-HON-IND
 'It is the student who is such that his/her teacher is a bachelor.'
- (3) [*caki-uy/*Ø sensayng-nim-i chongkak-i-si-n] haksayng*
 self-GEN/*Ø teacher-HT-NOM bachelor-is-HON-REL student
 'The student whose teacher is a bachelor'
- (4) *haksayng-uy sensayng-nim-i chongkak-i-si-ta*
 student-GEN teacher-HT-NOM bachelor-is-HON-IND
 'The student's teacher is a bachelor.'

Therefore, double-nominative sentences imbued with highly-autonomous layered interrelations are not conducive or relevant to relativization in Korean. Nonetheless, the presence of Kumashiro's highly-autonomous layered interrelation could perhaps be **indirectly** used to predict the appearance in relative clauses of resumptive genitive pronouns, since the relative clause in (3) is not based on the double-nominative sentence in (31), but on the single-nominative sentence in (4).

Be that as it may, one prime example of Kumashiro's (2000: 218–221) partially-autonomous layered interrelation is none other than inalienable possession (e.g. (30.b)), and, as has already been demonstrated by means of (14) and (15) in particular, inalienable possession in Korean may call for either the use or the non-use of resumptive genitive pronouns, depending on whether or not the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause are bonded to each other. Inalienable possession in itself has no bearing on the use of resumptive genitive pronouns. In other words, the notion of partially-autonomous layered interrelations cannot be equated with the notion of complex predicates as developed in this paper. Moreover, some examples of inalienable possession can optionally do with or without resumptive genitive pronouns, e.g. (11) vs (13), if bondedness is merely of syntactic nature, not both syntactic and semantic. Thus, insofar as the use of resumptive genitive pronouns in Korean relative clauses is concerned, the notion of complex predicates (and the associated notion of partially-autonomous layered interrelations), used in the context of Kumashiro's work, must be redefined or reconceptualized in terms of the two different kinds of bondedness, syntactic and semantic.

4. Testing the predictions

In this section, three more examples will be tested in view of the preceding discussion. This is intended to strengthen the validity of the explanation proposed in section 3. Consider the following relative clauses.

- (32) [*caki-uy/∅ caysan-i manh-un*] *namca*
 self-GEN/∅ assets-NOM enormous-REL man
 ‘The man who has a lot of assets’

- (33) [*caki-uy/*∅ kay-ka chongmyengha-n*] *ai*
 self-GEN/*∅ dog-NOM smart-REL child
 ‘The child whose dog is smart’

- (34) [*∅/*caki-uy meli-ka aphu-n*] *ai*
 ∅/*self-GEN head-NOM sick-REL child
 ‘The child whose head aches’ or
 ‘The child who has a headache’

The NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause in (32) can form a syntactically complex predicate as evidenced by the fact that the NOM case marker can be deleted optionally from the NOM-marked NP *caysan-i*, as in (35).

- (35) a. [*caysan manh-un*] *namca*
 assets enormous-REL man
 ‘The man who has a lot of assets’

- b. *namca-ka caysan(-i) manh-ta*
 man-NOM assets(-NOM) enormous-IND
 ‘The man has a lot of assets.’

The NOM-marked NP *caysan-i* and the predicate *manh-* in (32), however, do not impute any property or attribute to the referent of the head NP. Rather, they merely denote a certain situation associated with the referent of the head NP (i.e. the man’s material possession). In other words, what is true of the NOM-marked NP is not true of the head NP; although his assets are enormous (or literally ‘many’ in Korean), the man himself cannot be said to be enormous (or ‘many’). Thus, the NOM-marked NP and the predicate in (32) are characterized by syntactic, but not semantic,

bondedness. This predicts that a resumptive genitive pronoun may be optionally used in (31), which is indeed the case.

The relative clause in (33) contains one NOM-marked NP and one predicate, which do not form a syntactically complex predicate. For instance, the NOM case marker cannot be omitted from the NOM-marked NP, as in (36).

- (36) **[caki-uy kay chongmyengha-n] ai*
 self-GEN dog smart-REL child
 'The child whose dog is smart'

Moreover, what is true of the NOM-marked NP is not necessarily true of the head NP. In other words, the dog may be smart, but its owner is not necessarily so. In other words, the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause in (33) display neither syntactic nor semantic bondedness. This explains why a resumptive genitive pronoun must be utilized in (33).

Finally, there is evidence that the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause in (34) constitute a complex predicate, not only syntactically but also semantically. For instance, the NOM case marker can be easily eliminated from the NOM-marked NP, as in (37) (i.e. syntactic bondedness).

- (37) *[meli aphu-n] ai*
 head ache-REL child
 'The child who has a headache'

Moreover, the NOM-marked NP in (34) specifies where the child aches. If the child's head aches, he/she aches in at least one part of his/her body. Thus, what is true of the child's head is also true of the child (i.e. semantic bondedness). This explains why no resumptive genitive pronoun is used in (34), because (34) is related to (38), not to (39).

- (38) *ai-ka-nun meli-ka aphu-ta*
 child-NOM/-TOP head-NOM sick-IND
 'The child has a headache.'

- (39) *ai-uy meli-ka aphu-ta*
 child-GEN head-NOM sick-IND
 'The child has a headache.' *or*
 literally 'The child's head aches.'

Indeed, the NOM case marker in (38), not in (39), can be deleted optionally from the NOM-marked NP *meli-ka*, as is shown by (40) and (41).

- (40) *ai-ka/-nun meli aphu-ta*
 child-NOM/-TOP head sick-IND
 'The child has a headache.'
- (41) **ai-uy meli aphu-ta*
 child-GEN head sick-IND
 'The child has a headache.'

5. Conclusion

In this paper, the distribution of resumptive genitive pronouns in Korean relative clauses has been investigated. It has been argued that the use of resumptive genitive pronouns depends crucially on the bondedness of the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause. If these two expressions are syntactically and semantically bonded to each other, the use of resumptive genitive pronouns is prohibited. In this case, the relative clause is formed on the subject relation by means of the gap strategy. If they are syntactically, not semantically, bonded to each other, there is a choice between the use and non-use of resumptive genitive pronouns. Lastly, if they are not at all bonded to each other, a resumptive genitive pronoun must be utilized in order to explicitly express the connection between the head NP and the relative clause. In this case, the relative clause is formed on the genitive relation by means of the pronoun-retention strategy.

There are two general comments to be drawn from these findings. First, the degrees of bondedness between the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause correlate well with the use or non-use of a resumptive genitive pronoun inside the relative clause. Resumptive genitive pronouns are prohibited when there is the highest degree of bondedness (i.e. both syntactic and semantic), because the NOM-marked NP, being part of a complex (or bonded) predicate, can no longer be modified by a genitive pronoun. It is only when there is no bondedness

(that is, the NOM-marked NP retaining its nominal status) that such modification is possible. This indeed makes sense, because nominal status sanctions, but predicate status inhibits, pronominal modification.

Second, when the NOM-marked NP and the predicate inside the relative clause function as a syntactically and semantically complex predicate (i.e. the head NP bearing the subject relation inside the relative clause), the gap strategy must be selected for relativization. When there is no such bondedness at all, the NOM-marked NP itself is the subject NP of the predicate inside the relative clause (i.e. with the head NP bearing the genitive relation inside the relative clause). In this case, the pronoun-retention strategy is called for. This ties in perfectly with the well-known cross-linguistic observation that the lower down the Accessibility Hierarchy (Keenan and Comrie 1977) relativization takes place, the more explicit relativization strategy is used.

References

- Chappell, Hilary and McGregor, William (eds) (1996) *The Grammar of inalienability: a typological perspective on body part terms and the part-whole relation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Comrie, Bernard (1989) *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fox, Barbara A. (1987) The Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy reinterpreted: subject primacy or the absolutive hypothesis? *Language* 63: 856–870.
- Kang, Myung-Yoon (1987) ‘Possessor Raising’ in Korean. In: Susumu Kuno, Ik-Hwan Lee, John Whitman, Sung-Yun Bak and Young-Se Kang (eds). *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics II*, pp. 80–88. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Kang, Young-Se (1989) On base-generating multiple nominative constructions. In: Susumu Kuno, Ik-Hwan Lee, John Whitman, Sung-Yun Bak, Young-Se Kang and Young-joo Kim (eds). *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics III*, pp. 259–266. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Keenan, Edward L (1984) Semantic correlates of the ergative/absolutive distinction. *Linguistics* 22: 197–223.
- Keenan, Edward L. and Comrie, Bernard (1977) Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 63–99.
- Kumashiro, Toshiyuki (2000) The conceptual basis of grammar: A cognitive approach to Japanese clause structure. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, San Diego.

- Kumashiro, Toshiyuki and Langacker, Ronald W. (in press). Double-subject and complex-predicate constructions. *Cognitive Linguistics* 14.
- Lehmann, Christian (1986) On the typology of relative clauses. *Linguistics* 24: 663–680.
- Sohn, Ho-Min (1994) *Korean*. London: Routledge.
- Song, Jae Jung (1991) Korean relative clause constructions: conspiracy and pragmatics. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 11: 195–220.
- Song, Jae Jung (2001) *Linguistic typology: Morphology and syntax*. Harlow and London: Pearson Education.
- Tagashira, Yoshiko (1972) Relative clauses in Korean. In: Paul M. Peranteau, Judith N. Levi and Gloria C. Phares (eds). *The Chicago Which Hunt: Papers from the Relative Clause Festival*, pp. 215–229. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Yim, Young-Jae (1985) Multiple subject construction. In: Susumu Kuno, John Whitman, Ik-Hwan Lee and Young-Se Kang (eds). *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics*, pp. 101–109. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Yoon, James Hye-Suk (1987) Some queries concerning the syntax of multiple subject constructions in Korean. In: Susumu Kuno, Ik-Hwan Lee, John Whitman, Sung-Yun Bak and Young-Se Kang (eds). *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics II*, pp. 138–162. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Yoon, Jeong-Me (1989) ECM and multiple subject constructions in Korean. In: Susumu Kuno, Ik-Hwan Lee, John Whitman, Sung-Yun Bak, Young-Se Kang and Young-joo Kim (eds). *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics III*, pp. 369–381. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Yoon, Jong-Yurl (1989) On the multiple 'ka' and 'lul' constructions in Korean. In: Susumu Kuno, Ik-Hwan Lee, John Whitman, Sung-Yun Bak, Young-Se Kang and Young-joo Kim (eds). *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics III*, pp. 383–394. Seoul: Hanshin.

Contact information:

Linguistics Section
School of Language, Literature and Performing Arts
University of Otago
P.O. Box 56
Dunedin
New Zealand
E-Mail: jaejung.song@stonebow.otago.ac.nz