

UC Berkeley

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society

Title

Discourse Coherence and Relativization in Korean

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4rs0v111>

Journal

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 41(41)

ISSN

2377-1666

Author

Park, Sang-Hee

Publication Date

2015

DOI

10.20354/B4414110004

Peer reviewed

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FORTY-FIRST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
BERKELEY LINGUISTICS SOCIETY

February 7-8, 2015

General Session

Special Session
Fieldwork Methodology

Editors

Anna E. Jurgensen
Hannah Sande
Spencer Lamoureux
Kenny Baclawski
Alison Zerbe

Berkeley Linguistics Society
Berkeley, CA, USA

Berkeley Linguistics Society
University of California, Berkeley
Department of Linguistics
1203 Dwinelle Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-2650
USA

All papers copyright © 2015 by the Berkeley Linguistics Society, Inc.

All rights reserved.

ISSN: 0363-2946

LCCN: 76-640143

Contents

Acknowledgments	v
Foreword	vii
<i>The No Blur Principle Effects as an Emergent Property of Language Systems</i>	
Farrell Ackerman, Robert Malouf.	1
<i>Intensification and sociolinguistic variation: a corpus study</i>	
Andrea Beltrama	15
<i>Tagalog Sluicing Revisited</i>	
Lena Borise	31
<i>Phonological Opacity in Pendau: a Local Constraint Conjunction Analysis</i>	
Yan Chen	49
<i>Proximal Demonstratives in Predicate NPs</i>	
Ryan B. Doran, Gregory Ward	61
<i>Syntax of generic null objects revisited</i>	
Vera Dvořák	71
<i>Non-canonical Noun Incorporation in Bzhedug Adyghe</i>	
Ksenia Ershova	99
<i>Perceptual distribution of merging phonemes</i>	
Valerie Freeman	121
<i>Second Position and “Floating” Clitics in Wakhi</i>	
Zuzanna Fuchs.	133
<i>Some causative alternations in K’iche’, and a unified syntactic derivation</i>	
John Gluckman	155
<i>The ‘Whole’ Story of Partitive Quantification</i>	
Kristen A. Greer	175
<i>A Field Method to Describe Spontaneous Motion Events in Japanese</i>	
Miyuki Ishibashi	197

<i>On the Derivation of Relative Clauses in Teotitlán del Valle Zapotec</i> Nick Kalivoda, Erik Zyman	219
<i>Gradability and Mimetic Verbs in Japanese: A Frame-Semantic Account</i> Naoki Kiyama, Kimi Akita.	245
<i>Exhaustivity, Predication and the Semantics of Movement</i> Peter Klecha, Martina Martinović.	267
<i>Reevaluating the Diphthong Mergers in Japono-Ryukyuan</i> Tyler Lau	287
<i>Pluractionality and the stative vs. eventive contrast in Ranmo</i> Jenny Lee	307
<i>Labial Harmonic Shift in Kazakh: Mapping the Pathways and Motivations for Decay</i> Adam G. McCollum	329
<i>Reference to situation content in Uyghur auxiliary ‘bolmaq’</i> Andrew McKenzie, Gülnar Eziz, Travis Major	353
<i>Case-Marking in Estonian Pseudopartitives</i> Mark Norris	371
<i>Discourse Coherence and Relativization in Korean</i> Sang-Hee Park.	397
<i>Negotiating Lexical Uncertainty and Speaker Expertise with Disjunction</i> Christopher Potts, Roger Levy	417
<i>Patterns of Misperception of Arabic Consonants</i> Chelsea Sanker.	447
<i>The Imperative Split and the Origin of Switch-Reference Markers in Nungon</i> Hannah Sarvasy	473
<i>Asymmetries in Long-Distance QR</i> Misako Tanaka.	493
<i>The cross-linguistic distribution of sign language parameters</i> Rachael Tatman	503

<i>Homophony and contrast neutralization in Southern Min tone sandhi circle</i>	
Tsz-Him Tsui 515
<i>Cultural Transmission of Self-Concept from Parent to Child in Chinese American Families</i>	
Aya Williams, Stephen Chen, Qing Zhou 533
<i>Fruits for Animals: Hunting Avoidance Speech Style in Murui</i>	
Katarzyna Izabela Wojtylak 545
<i>A Quest for Linguistic Authenticity: Cantonese and Putonghua in Postcolonial Hong Kong</i>	
Andrew D. Wong. 563

Acknowledgments

As the Executive Committee of the 41st Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, we would like to express our gratitude to the conference participants, volunteers, session chairs, faculty, and staff members for their participation. It was your contributions that made the conference a success. We are especially grateful for the patience, hard work, and support of Paula Floro and Belén Flores, without whom BLS 41 would not have been possible. We would also like to thank the following departments and organizations of the University of California, Berkeley for their generous financial support:

Department of Linguistics
Student Opportunity Fund
Graduate Assembly
Department of Philosophy
Department of Psychology
Department of Ethnic Studies
French Department
Department of Spanish and Portuguese
Berkeley Language Center
Office of Academic Affairs Vice President

Foreword

This monograph contains a number of the talks given at the 41st Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, held in Berkeley, California, February 7-8, 2015. The conference included a General Session and the Special Session *Fieldwork Methodology*. The 41st Annual Meeting was planned and run by the second-year graduate students of the Department of Linguistics at the University of California, Berkeley: Kenny Baclawski, Anna Jurgensen, Spencer Lamoureux, Hannah Sande, and Alison Zerbe.

The original submissions of the papers in this volume were reviewed for style by Anna Jurgensen and Hannah Sande. Resubmitted papers were edited as necessary by Anna Jurgensen and Kenny Baclawski, and then compiled into the final monograph by Anna Jurgensen. The final monograph was reviewed by Spencer Lamoureux. The endeavor was supported by Alison Zerbe's management of the Berkeley Linguistic Society's funds for publications.

The BLS 41 Executive Committee
July 2015

Discourse Coherence and Relativization in Korean

SANG-HEE PARK

*University at Buffalo, State University of New York**

1 Introduction

It is widely accepted that the split between restrictive and nonrestrictive relatives generally coincides with their asymmetric contribution to discourse: restrictive relatives contribute content that is part of the main assertion of the sentence, while nonrestrictive relatives contribute content that is backgrounded or supplementary to the content of the main clause.¹ Recent studies (Huddleston & Pullum 2002:1033-1065; Potts 2005:93-94), however, have argued that this traditional dichotomy along model-theoretic lines is not successful, offering evidence that some cases of nonrestrictive relative clauses do have equality of informational status with their main clauses (see, for example, Huddleston & Pullum (2002:1064)). In line with these studies, the present work argues that the model-theoretic properties of a relative clause (restrictive vs. nonrestrictive) and the kind of content it contributes (at-issue vs. supplementary) do not always go hand in hand.

In Korean, two different types of relative clauses can be identified on the basis of whether the nominal that functions as an argument in both the relative and the main clause (henceforth, *anchor*) is outside the relative or not. In Externally-Headed Relative Clauses (EHRCs) like (1) the anchor *sakwa* ‘apple’ occurs immediately after the relative clause and there is a missing element within the relative that is coreferential with the anchor. In Internally-Headed Relative Clauses (IHRCs) like (2), by contrast, the anchor is within the relative clause, while the “external head” position is occupied by a defective noun *kes* that obligatorily takes a verbal complement. (1) and (2) are adapted from M. Kim (2004:101).²

- (1) Minaka cepsiey issnun sakwalul mekessta. (EHRC)

Mina -ka [____i cepsi -ey iss -nun] sakwa_i -lul mek -ess -ta
Mina -NOM [____i plate -LOC exist -ADN.IPFV] apple_i -ACC eat -PST -DECL

Restrictive: ‘Mina ate the apples that were on the plate.’

Nonrestrictive: ‘Mina ate the apples, which were on the plate.’

*I thank Rui Chaves, Matthew Dryer, Jean-Pierre Koenig, Eunhee Lee and members of Syntax-Semantics Reading Group at University at Buffalo for comments and discussions that contributed to this work. I also thank the audience at BLS 41 for feedback and discussion. Any remaining errors are my own.

¹Abbreviations: ACC (accusative); ADN (adnominal); CLF (classifier); COMP (complementizer); CONJ (conjunction); DECL (declarative); EXCLAM (exclamative); HON (honorific); IPFV (imperfective); LOC (locative); NEG (negation); NMLZ (nominalizer); NOM (nominative); PRS (present); PST (past); PRF (perfect); Q (question); RETR (retrospective); TOP (topic)

²Unless stated otherwise, the data in this study are my own and have been judged by nine native speakers of Korean (two male and seven female; average age 30.9).

- (2) Minaka sakwaka cepsiey issnun kesul mekessta. (IHRC)

Mina -ka [sakwa_i -ka cepsi -ey iss -nun] kes_i -ul mek -ess -ta
 Mina -NOM [apple_i -NOM plate -LOC exist -ADN.IPFV] entity_i -ACC eat -PST -DECL

Nonrestrictive: ‘Some apples were on the plate and Mina ate them (= the apples).’

EHRCs and IHRCs differ in their meaning. While IHRCs are always interpreted non-restrictively, EHRCs are ambiguous between restrictive and nonrestrictive relatives when taken out of context. For example, the EHRC in (1) has a nonrestrictive interpretation if the contextual set of objects denoted by the anchor equals the set of objects that satisfy the description provided by the relative: that is, the apples Mina ate are all and exactly those apples that were on the plate. On the other hand, the relative has a restrictive interpretation if it describes a situation where there are more apples on the plate than those eaten by Mina.

This paper attempts to solve a long-standing puzzle that arises from an asymmetry in acceptability between EHRCs and IHRCs, namely that IHRCs are often less acceptable than their EHRC counterparts (Kuroda 1976; Fuji 1996; Shimoyama 1999, 2001; Y. Kim 1996, 2002; M. Kim 2004, 2007, 2008). There is agreement that this asymmetry stems from a requirement that an IHRC must enter a semantic or pragmatic relation with the main clause in order for it to be acceptable, but there is disagreement on what exactly this relation is. In the present work, I argue that the EHRC-IHRC asymmetry arises from the fact that IHRCs are acceptable if and only if a *coherence relation* (Hobbs 1985; Mann & Thompson 1988; Kehler 2002; Asher & Lascarides 2003) holds between the relative and the main clause.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, I present data that illustrate acceptability contrast between EHRCs and their IHRC counterparts. I point out that, contra M. Kim (2004, 2007, 2008), the various relations that can hold between the eventuality described by an IHRC and the eventuality described by its main clause cannot be subsumed under the notion of simultaneity. In Section 3, I show that this seemingly disparate class of relations correspond in fact to independently motivated coherence relations, but that there is a restriction on the range of coherence relations that are possible between IHRCs and their main clauses. In Section 4, I take up the issue of why failure to enter into a coherence relation gives rise to unacceptability in the case of IHRCs but not in the case of EHRCs. My answer is that IHRCs are associated with an inherent discourse goal that is tied to their meaning, and that this goal can only be achieved through the establishment of a coherence relation between the relative and the main clause. In Section 5, I summarize the major findings of this study.

2 Asymmetry between EHRCs and IHRCs

Since Kuroda (1976), studies on IHRCs in Japanese and Korean have agreed that IHRCs are subject to a condition whereby the relative clause is interpreted in relation to the content of the main clause. Kuroda distinguishes among several different relations that can license IHRCs (*co-temporal*, *co-locational*, *purposive*, *causal*), but many other studies (Fuji 1996; M. Kim 2007, 2008) assume that it is the co-temporal relation that is responsible for the licensing of IHRCs. The latter theory is encapsulated by the Simultaneity Condition in (3).

- (3) THE SIMULTANEITY CONDITION: In order for an IHRC to be acceptable, it must be interpreted in such a way that the eventuality described by the relative temporally overlaps with the eventuality described by the main clause.

In the present study, I consider the following two hypotheses.

- HYPOTHESIS 1. The Simultaneity Condition is the necessary and sufficient condition for the licensing of IHRCs.
- HYPOTHESIS 2. The Simultaneity Condition is only a sufficient condition for the licensing of IHRCs.

Hypothesis 1 is proposed by Fuji (1996) and M. Kim (2007, 2008), among others. These studies essentially view licensing IHRCs as a problem of characterizing the notion of simultaneity in semantic terms. Hypothesis 2 is put forward by Kuroda (1976) and Y. Kim (1996), who argue that there are various pragmatic relations that can license IHRCs. In the remainder of this section, I provide a discussion on Hypothesis 1, focusing on M. Kim's (2007; 2008) rendition of the Simultaneity Condition, and give arguments against it.³

Assuming Hypothesis 1, the acceptability of (2) above is dependent on the availability of a simultaneous reading, where the event of Mina's eating apples is directly related to the state of these apples being on the plate 'at the moment of the eating event'. While the EHRC counterpart in (1) also entails that there is a temporal overlap between the eventualities described by the relative and the main clause, due to the imperfective aspect of the relative clause's predicate, the underlying assumption is that such temporal entailment is orthogonal to the licensing of EHRCs.

Typical examples used to support Hypothesis 1 are provided in (4)-(5).⁴ Note that these sentences are string identical to (1) and (2) except for the grammatical aspect of the relative clauses' predicates and the temporal adverbs *ecey* 'yesterday' and *onul* 'today'.

- (4) Minaka ecey cepsiey issten sakwalul onul mekessta. (EHRC)

Mina -ka [____i ecey cepsi -ey iss -ten] sakwa_i -lul onul mek
 Mina -NOM [____i yesterday plate -LOC exist -ADN.RETR] apple_i -ACC today eat
 -ess -ta
 -PST -DECL

Restrictive: 'Mina ate the apples today that had been on the plate yesterday.'

Nonrestrictive: 'Mina ate the apples today, which had been on the plate yesterday.'

³M. Kim (2008) additionally assumes an optional pragmatic constraint that licenses additional readings (*circumstantial, cause-effect, concessive*) on top of the simultaneous reading licensed by an obligatory grammatical condition. Since the acceptability of IHRCs is explained solely by the grammatical condition, M. Kim's (2008) proposal is essentially the same as M. Kim's (2007).

⁴Embedded stative verbs in Korean take the retrospective marker (*-ten*) to refer to eventualities that are perceived to have taken place prior to speech time (Sohn 1995:41).

- (5) ?Minaka sakwaka ecey cepsiey issten kesul onul mekessta. (IHRC)

Mina -ka [sakwa_i -ka ecey cepsi -ey iss -ten] kes_i -ul
 Mina -NOM [apple_i -NOM yesterday plate -LOC exist -ADN.RETR] entity_i -ACC
 onul mek -ess -ta
 today eat -PST -DECL

‘Some apples were on the plate yesterday and Mina ate them (= the apples) today.’

Despite the fact that (4) and (5) are parallel in content, (5) is less acceptable than (4). This observation fits well with Hypothesis 1, which attributes the oddness of (5) to the violation of the Simultaneity Condition.

Another example that lends support to Hypothesis 1 is given in (6) (Y. Kim 2002:551), which differs from (5) in the telicity of the predicate within the relative (*iss* ‘to exist’ vs. *tteleci* ‘to fall’). Under the standard assumption that telic events have a natural endpoint that holds forever after the culmination of the event (Kratzer 1994), the Simultaneity Condition is met in (6) but not in (5).

- (6) Mary-nun sakwaka ecey ttelecin kesul onul achimey cipe tulessta. (IHRC)

Mary -nun [sakwa -ka ecey tteleci -n] kes -ul onul achimey
 Mary -TOP [apple -NOM yesterday fall -ADN.PRF] entity -ACC today morning
 cipetul -ess -ta
 pick.up -PST -DECL

‘Some apples fell (from the tree) yesterday and Mary picked them (= the fallen apples) up today.’

M. Kim (2007, 2008) offers one of the most sophisticated semantic justification of Hypothesis 1. She explains the apparent effect of telicity and grammatical aspect on the acceptability of IHRCs on the basis of Parsons (1990)-style theory of aspect. The following assumptions are crucial in her analysis: (i) IHRCs introduce a temporary state, (ii) the temporary state must overlap with the eventuality described by the main clause, and (iii) the anchor must bear a thematic role in that temporary state. This way of characterizing the notion of simultaneity preserves the essence of the Simultaneity Condition but it also enables making precise predictions about the acceptability of different IHRCs that vary in telicity and aspect. M. Kim defines the notion of temporary state as in (7).

- (7) Kinds of temporary state (M. Kim 2007:303-304):

- a. An *in-progress* state is introduced by a progressive or imperfective predicate. It holds true of every individual that bears a thematic role during the runtime of the event.
- b. A *resultant* state is introduced by a perfect predicate and it holds permanently after the culmination of the event. A perfect aspect on a telic predicate describes a *target* state in addition to a resultant state. While a resultant state holds true of the agent argument, a target state holds true of the theme argument.

Assuming M. Kim's account, the contrast between (5) and (6) is explained as follows. In (5) the relative clause has an imperfective predicate (M. Kim 2004:101) describing an in-progress state. This in-progress state does not overlap with the eventuality described by the main clause, and therefore the sentence is predicted to be unacceptable. In (6) the relative clause involves a perfect, telic predicate, in which case the relative introduces a target state as well as a resultant state. These states overlap with the eventuality described by the relative clause, and the anchor *sakwa* 'apple' bears a thematic role in both of these states; therefore, the acceptability of the sentence is correctly predicted.

However, M. Kim's analysis is unsatisfactory in a number of respects. The first problem is that it cannot exclude IHRCs that are temporally coincident with their main clauses but describe an irrelevant eventuality. For example, M. Kim would predict (8) to be acceptable, because the relative clause introduces a target state as well as a resultant state, and the anchor *Jina* is an agent that a resultant state holds true of. However, (8) is odd, as will be discussed in Section 3, there is no obvious connection between *Jina*'s having finished a marathon yesterday and *Swumi*'s meeting her today.⁵

(8) ?*Swumika Jinaka ecey malathonul wancuhan kesul onul mannassta.* (IHRC)

Swumi -ka [*Jina_i* -ka ecey malathon -ul wancuha -n] kes_i
Swumi -NOM [*Jina_i* -NOM yesterday marathon -ACC finish -ADN.PRF] entity_i
 -ul onul manna -ass -ta
 -ACC today meet -PST -DECL

'*Jina* finished a marathon yesterday and *Swumi* met her (= *Jina*) today.'

The second problem has to do with the fact that there are acceptable examples of IHRCs that do not satisfy the Simultaneity Condition. Under M. Kim's analysis, examples like (9), taken from (M. Kim 2008:97), would be incorrectly predicted to be unacceptable since a resultant state is true of the agent, but not the theme, argument.⁶

(9) *Johnun Maryka ecey inhyengul halwu congil kaciko non kesul onul nayta peliessta.* (IHRC)

John -un [*Mary* -ka ecey inhyeng_i -ul halwu congil kaci -ko no
John -TOP [*Mary* -NOM yesterday doll_i -ACC day long have -COMP play
 -n] kes_i -ul onul nayta peli -ess -ta
 -ADN.PRF] entity_i -ACC today take throw.away -PST -DECL

'*Mary* played with a doll all day yesterday and *John* threw it (= the doll) away today.'

Likewise, in (10) the relative clause describes an in-progress state which does not overlap with the eventuality described by the main clause, and yet the sentence is acceptable: the state of *Minswu* lying does not hold at the time his mother scolds him.

⁵Again, a proper contextualization can enhance the acceptability of (8). See Section 3.

⁶In fact, (M. Kim 2008:97) judges (9) to be unacceptable but the native speakers I consulted invariably judged it acceptable, and commented that the sentence is very natural under a causal or purposive reading: e.g. *John* discovered a reason to throw the doll away today.

- (10) Emenikkeyse Minswuka ecey halwu congil nuwuemanissten kesul onul achim honnaysiessta. (IHRC)

Emeni -kkeyse [Minswu_i -ka ecey halwu congil nuwue -man -iss
 Mother -HON.NOM [Minswu_i -NOM yesterday day long lie -only -prog
 -ten] kes_i -ul onul achim honnay -si -ess -ta
 -ADN.RETR] entity_i -ACC today morning scold -HON -PST -DECL

‘Minswu was lying (on his bed) all day yesterday and his mother scolded him (= Minswu) this morning.’

Data such as (9) and (10) show that the relation between IHRCs and their main clauses cannot always be merely temporal: there are other readings that cannot be covered if simultaneity is the only relation that is possible between IHRCs and their main clauses. Crucially, (9) is acceptable under a cause-effect interpretation where John’s throwing Mary’s doll away is possibly motivated by the fact that the doll was so dirty that John could not simply bear to see Mary play with it. Likewise, in (10) Minswu’s lying all day yesterday doing nothing provides a natural reason for his mother scolding him.

3 A Pragmatic Account of Korean IHRCs

I have shown that previous attempts at offering a semantic, simultaneity-based analysis of the relation between IHRCs and their main clauses have been unsuccessful. In this section, I propose a PRAGMATIC account of the relation between IHRCs and their main clauses that defends Hypothesis 2 mentioned at the beginning of Section 2. In doing so, I attempt to provide a principled characterization of the various relations between IHRCs and their main clauses within the context of theories of discourse coherence (Hobbs 1985; Mann & Thompson 1988; Kehler 2002; Asher & Lascarides 2003), while taking into account the semantics of IHRCs that imposes restrictions on the range of possible relations.

3.1 The pragmatic nature of the relation between IHRCs and their main clauses

I propose that the relation between IHRCs and their main clauses is only partially expressed. More specifically, I argue that, semantically, IHRCs and their main clauses are connected by a propositional connective and that the various interpretations of sentences instantiating an IHRC arise as a result of pragmatic enrichment. In this respect, my analysis is similar in spirit to Kay & Zimmer’s (1978) treatment of nominal compounds and genitive constructions, and Nishiyama & Koenig’s (2010) analysis of the English perfect. In Nishiyama & Koenig (2010:619) it is argued that the English perfect introduces a perfect state whose category is semantically a free variable, and the value of this variable is filled by pragmatic inferences. In a similar vein, I propose that the interpretation of sentences instantiating an IHRC arises as a result of inferences drawn by addressees on the interpretation of the propositional connective introduced by IHRCs. The fact that the nature of the constraint is pragmatic properly allows the particular relation or relations established between an IHRC and its main clause to be contingent on the knowledge of the addressee.

I start by presenting data in (8) (repeated in (11) below) and (12) that show that the relation between IHRCs and their main clauses is pragmatic in nature. As noted above, (11) is odd because there seems to be no natural connection between Swumi's completing a marathon yesterday and Jina's meeting her today. This is because, out of context, it is hard to think of why the meeting happened today, not yesterday, if the meeting had anything to do with the marathon; conversely, if the meeting had nothing to do with Jina's marathon, why would the speaker bother to mention it? (12), on the other hand, provides information that can be used by addressees for drawing causal or circumstantial inferences by which the two described events can naturally be connected: the information that the interviewer was a journalist indicates that Lee's completion of a marathon might be still newsworthy the day after the marathon took place. A purely semantic account cannot explain the contrast between (11) and (12), as these sentences are semantically parallel.

- (11) ?Swumika Jinaka ecey malathonul wancwuhan kesul onul mannassta. (IHRC)

Swumi -ka [Jina_i -ka ecey malathon -ul wancuha -n] kes_i
 Swumi -NOM [Jina_i -NOM yesterday marathon -ACC finish -ADN.PRF] entity_i
 -ul onul manna -ass -ta
 -ACC today meet -PST -DECL

‘Jina finished a marathon yesterday and Swumi met her (= Jina) today.’

- (12) Kim kicaka Lee ssika ecey malathonul wancwuhan kesul onul mannase inthepyuhayssta. (IHRC)

Kim kica -ka [Lee_i ssi -ka ecey malathon -ul wancuha
 Kim journalist -NOM [Lee_i Mr. -NOM yesterday marathon -ACC finish
 -n] kes_i -ul onul manna -se inthepyuhay -ss -ta
 -ADN.PRF] entity_i -ACC today meet -CONJ interview -PST -DECL

‘Mr. Lee finished a marathon yesterday, and journalist Kim met and interviewed him (= Mr. Lee) today.’

Similarly, the marginal status of (5) (repeated in (13) below) is due to the lack of sufficient information addressees can make use of when drawing inferences about the relation between the eventualities described by the relative and the main clause. If the context provides that one of the daily rituals of Mina is to put some apples on an empty plate and eat all of them, but she somehow forgot to eat the apples yesterday, (13) becomes acceptable.⁷

- (13) ?Minaka sakwaka ecey cepsiey issten kesul onul mekessta. (IHRC)

Mina -ka [sakwa_i -ka ecey cepsi -ey iss -ten] kes_i -ul
 Mina -NOM [apple_i -NOM yesterday plate -LOC exist -ADN.RETR] entity_i -ACC
 onul mek -ess -ta
 today eat -PST -DECL

‘Some apples were on the plate yesterday and Mina ate them (= the apples) today.’

⁷The same occurs in Japanese, as originally observed by Kuroda (1976:272).

Although the relation between IHRCs and their main clauses is semantically underspecified, a temporal relation is generally *preferred*, as indicated by the fact that the majority of acceptable examples of IHRCs from previous studies are natural under a temporal reading. I argue that this bias toward a temporal interpretation is due in part to the semantic contribution of the adnominal markers such as *-nun* (imperfective) and *-(u)n* (perfect) which specify a temporal relation between the eventuality described by the relative and the eventuality described by the main clause. In this sense, a temporal relation, be it co-temporal or temporal precedence, always arises by default between an IHRC and its main clause.

I assume that the imperfective marker *-nun* indicates that two events are co-occurring, while the perfect marker *-(u)n* signals that there is a temporal progression. In other words, the imperfective adnominal marker *-nun* encodes that, for the temporal trajectories of the eventualities t_1 (described by the relative clause) and t_2 (described by the main clause), there exists a subpart t such that $t \subset t_1$ and $t \subset t_2$. I follow Nishiyama & Koenig's (2010:619) analysis of the perfect in making the following assumptions on the perfect adnominal marker *-(u)n*; (i) the perfect on a relative clause specifies that for t_1 and t_2 , there exists a subpart t_0 of t_1 that precedes t_2 ($t_0 \prec t_2$) and (ii) the eventuality described by the relative clause introduces a perfect state s that overlaps t_2 ($s \circ t_2$), and the category of this perfect state is determined via pragmatic inferences.

The proposed account of the semantic contribution of Korean adnominal markers explains a possible source of a common misunderstanding among previous studies, namely that only a temporal relation is possible between IHRCs and their main clauses: unlike a temporal relation inferred largely based on the semantic encoding of the imperfective and the perfect, other relations such as cause-effect have a less direct source than the grammatical aspect markers and therefore are less immediately inferable out of context.

3.2 A Coherence-Based Account of the various relations between IHRCs and their main clauses

I argue that the various relations that hold between IHRCs and their main clauses correspond to *coherence relations* (Hobbs 1985; Mann & Thompson 1988; Kehler 2002; Asher & Lascarides 2003), which are relations between described eventualities that must be established for a discourse to appear coherent. My analysis builds upon the classification of coherence relations proposed by Hobbs (1985) and Kehler (2002). With these and others (e.g. Mann & Thompson (1988); Asher & Lascarides (2003)), I assume that discourse coherence arises in part by means of computing coherence relations (e.g. OCCASION, RESULT, PARALLEL, CONTRAST). I note that, although similar in spirit, my analysis differs from Kuroda's (1976) in the following respects: on my account, the coherence relations between IHRCs and main clauses fall out of a general condition on successive propositions in a discourse, but they are IHRC-specific in Kuroda's analysis; second, Kuroda's analysis does not explain why it seems that IHRCs but not EHRCs must enter into a coherence relation with their main clauses, whereas my analysis does (see Section 4).

I begin by introducing the OCCASION relation, with the definition and examples in (14)-(16). OCCASION arises between eventualities described by two successive utterances S_1 and S_2 iff a change-of-state event has been inferred from S_1 and the final state of that event is inferred from S_2 . In (15), for example, an inference arises such that the speaker took

his mother *from the airport when she arrived there* (the final state of the relative clause's event). The establishment of OCCASION promotes coherence by helping addressees construct a representation of eventualities that occur in temporal sequence.

(14) OCCASION:

Infer a change-of-state for a system of entities from S_1 , inferring the final state for this system from S_2 .

(Here and in all the definitions below, S_1 and S_2 refer to the relative clause and the main clause, respectively.)

(15) Nanun emenika konghangey tochakhan kesul cipulo mosiessta. Chung (1999:9)

Na -nun [emeni_i -ka konghang -ey tochakha -n] kes_i -ul cip -ulo
 I -TOP [mother_i -NOM airport -at arrive -ADN.PRF] entity_i -ACC home -to
 mosi -ess -ta
 take.HON -PST -DECL

'My mother arrived at the airport and I took her (= my mother) home.'

(16) Chelswuka khemphyutheka mangkacin kesul kochiessta. Yang (1999:his (5.1b))

Chelswu -ka [khemphyuthe_i -ka mangkaci -n] kes_i -ul kochi -ess
 Chelswu -NOM [computer_i -NOM break -ADN.PRF] entity_i -ACC fix -PST
 -ta
 -DECL

'A computer was broken and Chelswu fixed it (= the computer).'

OCCASION arises in sentences instantiating an IHRC that has a telic predicate since telic predicates give rise to a change-of-state entailment.⁸ By contrast, if the relative has an atelic predicate, a BACKGROUND relation is generally inferred.⁹ To illustrate, in (18) (repeated from (1)) the relative clause provides a description of the state of the apples, and this state acts as a background against which the event described by the main clause (Mina's eating these apples) takes place.

(17) BACKGROUND:

Infer a description of a system of entities from S_1 , inferring from S_2 that some entity is placed or moves against that system as a background.

(18) Minaka sakwaka cepsiey issnun kesul mekessta. (IHRC)

Mina -ka [sakwa_i -ka cepsi -ey iss -nun] kes_i -ul mek -ess -ta
 Mina -NOM [apple_i -NOM plate -LOC exist -ADN.IPFV] entity_i -ACC eat -PST -DECL

Nonrestrictive: 'Some apples were on the plate and Mina ate them (= the apples).'

⁸As Kehler (2002:23) points out, inferring a temporal progression by itself is insufficient for OCCASION; eventualities connected by OCCASION must cohere under a common scenario. This is why (8), for instance, is odd under an intended OCCASION reading.

⁹I follow Asher & Lascarides (2003) in assuming the relation BACKGROUND that establishes between eventualities that temporally overlap.

The next relation I discuss is **RESULT**. The definition in (19) states that **RESULT** arises when a causal link establishes between two propositions P and Q , such that Q holds as a consequence of the fact that P holds. In (20), for instance, a causal link can be established between the relative and the main clause because the fact that Sangho threw his fish away can naturally be understood as a direct consequence of the fact that the fish has gone bad and is therefore inedible.¹⁰

- (19) **RESULT**:
Infer P from the assertion of S_1 and Q from the assertion of S_2 , where normally $P \rightarrow Q$.

- (20) Sanghoka sayngseni sanghan kesul peliessta.

Sangho -ka [sayngsen_i -i sangha -n] kes_i -ul peli -ess
Sangho -NOM [fish_i -NOM go.bad -ADN.PRF] entity_i -ACC throw.away -PST
-ta
-DECL

‘(The) fish went bad and Sangho threw it (= the fish) away.’

Many existing accounts of IHRCs cover the data that I analyze as coherent under an **OCCASION**, **BACKGROUND**, or **RESULT** reading (Kuroda 1976; Fuji 1996; Y. Kim 2002; M. Kim 2007, 2008), and some argue that these readings all fall under a co-temporal reading (Fuji 1996; M. Kim 2007, 2008). However, there are other relations that are possible between IHRCs and their main clauses that cannot be subsumed under the notion of simultaneity. One such relation is **VIOLATED EXPECTATION**. In the **VIOLATED EXPECTATION** relation, a general assumption or expectation inferred from the first utterance is contradicted by the second. For example, the main clause’s content in (22) violates the expectation about a two year old baby, namely that she is too young to be smart.

- (21) **VIOLATED EXPECTATION**:
Infer P from the assertion of S_1 and Q from the assertion of S_2 , where normally $P \rightarrow \neg Q$.

- (22) Aika twu sal pakkey an toyn kesi ceypep yenglihata.

[Ai_i -ka twu sal pakkey an toy -n] kes_i -i ceypep
[Baby_i -NOM two year only not become -ADN.PRF] entity_i -NOM quite
yengliha -ta
be.smart.PRS -DECL

‘(This) baby is only two years old and (yet) she (= the baby) is very smart.’

¹⁰(20) can also be understood as an example of **OCCASION**. In fact, **OCCASION** generally holds if **RESULT** holds, as result temporally follows cause in normal circumstances. In my view, this ambiguity is not a problem for the present analysis; rather, I follow Asher & Lascarides (2003) and Nishiyama & Koenig (2010) in assuming that coherence is maximized if more than one relation is inferable between two given event descriptions.

(23) presents another example. The sentence is originally presented as unacceptable in Y. Kim (2002:550) under a causal reading, but in fact it is acceptable under a VIOLATED EXPECTATION reading: the police should have arrested the students for theft, not for a violation of traffic law. In fact, a subsequent utterance such as (24) can help infer the VIOLATED EXPECTATION relation in (23).

- (23) Kyengchal-i haksayngtuli totwukcilhanun kesul kyothongpep wuipanulo capassta.
(Adapted from Y. Kim (2002:550))

Kyengchal -i [haksayng_i -tul -i totwukcilha -nun] kes_i -ul
Police -NOM [student_i -PL -NOM steal -ADN.IPFV] entity_i -ACC
kyothongpep wuipan -ulo cap -ass -ta
traffic.law violation -for arrest -PST -DECL

‘Students were stealing (things) and (yet) the police arrested them (= the students) for a violation of traffic law.’

- (24) Keyngchali michiessapoa.

Keyngchal -i michi -ess -napoa
Police -NOM be.crazy -PST -EXCLAM

‘The police must be crazy.’

PARALLEL and CONTRAST are two other relations that are possible between IHRCs and their main clauses. These relations hold between propositions that involve similar (in the case of PARALLEL) or contrasting (in the case of CONTRAST) relations and entities. In (26) there are corresponding entities, Yuna and other kids, that are sufficiently similar (they share the property of being kids, presumably in the same class) and the same relation (missing the same problem in the exam) is predicated of these entities. (28) involves the same corresponding entities, but in this case two contrasting, rather than similar, relations are predicated of these entities (i.e. missing vs. getting a problem).

- (25) PARALLEL:

Infer $p(a_1, a_2, \dots)$ from the assertion of S_1 and $p(b_1, b_2, \dots)$ from the assertion of S_2 , where for all i , a_i and b_i are similar.

- (26) Yunaka munceylul thulin kesul talun aitulto thuliessta.

[Yuna -ka muncey_i -lul thuli -n] kes_i -ul talun ai -tul -to thuli
[Yuna -NOM problem_i -ACC miss -ADN.PRF] entity_i -ACC other kid -PL -also miss
-ess -ta
-PST -DECL

‘Yuna missed a problem (in the exam) and other kids missed it (= the problem) too.’

- (27) CONTRAST:

Infer $p(a_1, a_2, \dots)$ from the assertion of S_1 and $\neg p(b_1, b_2, \dots)$ from the assertion of S_2 , where for all i , a_i and b_i are similar.

(28) Yunaka munceylul thulin kesul talun aitulun motwu macchwessta.

[Yuna -ka muncey_i -lul thuli -n] kes_i -ul talun ai -tul -un
 [Yuna -NOM problem_i -ACC miss -ADN.PRF] entity_i -ACC other kid -PL -TOP
 motwu macchwu -ess -ta
 all get -PST -DECL

‘Yuna missed a problem (in the exam) but other kids all got it (= the problem).’

So far, I have argued that the relations between IHRCs and their main clauses are independently motivated coherence relations. I have shown that IHRCs and their main clauses establish at least one of the following coherence relations: OCCASION, BACKGROUND, RESULT, VIOLATED EXPECTATION, PARALLEL, and CONTRAST. In fact, these six coherence relations are all and the only possible relations that can hold between IHRCs and their main clauses; other well-known relations such as EXPLANATION or ELABORATION are simply not possible in IHRC-instantiating sentences. In the remainder of this subsection, I offer an explanation for this restriction on the range of possible coherence relations between IHRCs and their main clauses.

Discourse theories often employ the notions of discourse coordination and subordination (Mann & Thompson 1988; Asher & Lascarides 2003; Polanyi *et al.* 2004; Asher & Vieu 2005). These notions inherently pertain to the structuring of discourse, but they can also motivate a classification of coherence relations into coordinating relations and subordinating relations.¹¹ One way to distinguish between coordinating and subordinating relations is to use *and* between the two clauses being related. According to Txurruka (2003), interclausal *and* has a semantic contribution that a simple logical conjunction does not have (see also Chaves (2012:488-490) for more discussion and related proposals): it specifies that a coordinating relation is established between its conjuncts. As such, *and* serves to restrict the range of coherence relations that are possible between its conjuncts. For example, (29a) admits a reading where the two propositions are connected by EXPLANATION: Max fell *because* John pushed him. But the sentence can also admit a less immediate, albeit possible, OCCASION reading: Max fell and *then* John pushed him. In the case of (29b), however, EXPLANATION does not arise because *and* does not allow a subordinating relation to be established between its conjuncts.

- (29) a. Max fell. John pushed him.
 b. Max fell and John pushed him.

Applying Txurruka’s test, we can divide coherence relations into the two groups in (30). Importantly, the distinction between coordinating and subordinating relations coincides with the distinction between those coherence relations that can obtain between IHRCs and their main clauses, and those that can not.

¹¹See Asher & Vieu (2005) for criteria distinguishing coordinating and subordinating relations.

- (30) A classification of Hobbs-Kehler coherence relations into coordinating and subordinating relations
- a. Coordinating relations: OCCASION, BACKGROUND, RESULT, VIOLATED EXPECTATION, PARALLEL, CONTRAST
 - b. Subordinating relations: EXEMPLIFICATION, GENERALIZATION, EXCEPTION, ELABORATION, EXPLANATION, DENIAL OF PREVENTER

I take the fact that the relation between IHRCs and their main clauses is limited to coordinating relations as indicating that IHRCs combine with their main clauses via coordination. More specifically, I argue that IHRCs specify in their semantics a propositional connective CRD that takes the propositions of the relative and the main clause. To implement this idea, I claim that sentences instantiating an IHRC are subject to a semantico-pragmatic constraint that requires that a coordinating relation must be established whenever there are two propositions that are arguments of CRD. I state the constraint in (31): for two propositions S_1 and S_2 , if they are arguments of CRD, there exists a pragmatic relation that is a member of the set of coordinating coherence relations (cf. Crnič 2010).

- (31) $\text{CRD}(S_1, S_2) \rightarrow$
 $\exists R \in \{\textit{Occasion}, \textit{Background}, \textit{Result}, \textit{Violated Expectation}, \textit{Parallel}, \textit{Contrast}\}: R(S_1, S_2)$

The proposed analysis makes the correct prediction that the various relations by which addressees can make sense of IHRCs and their main clauses correspond to the categories of readings compatible with the connective *and*. A mere temporal characterization of the relations between IHRCs and their main clauses such as the one proposed by M. Kim (2007, 2008) cannot capture the various interpretations available for sentences instantiating an IHRC, and it also misses the generalization that these are all and the only interpretations that are compatible with *and*.

Studies on the relation between syntactic and pragmatic structures (Schleppegrell 1992; Blühdorn 2008) have provided evidence that syntactic coordination and subordination does not always coincide with hierarchical structures in discourse. My proposal that IHRCs, despite their subordinate syntax, combine with their main clauses via coordination in semantics and pragmatics preserves the insights of these studies. However, the proposals of these works are largely based on the observation that subordinate connectives such as *because* and *while* do play the role of coordinate connectives in discourse. Given that IHRCs are often analyzed as periphrastic nominalized clauses in argument positions that do not appear to involve a clause connective, it is not obvious how the syntax-semantic-pragmatics interface of the IHRC and the main clause works. Here, I submit that the coordinate semantics of IHRCs (CRD) is encoded in the morpheme *kes*. *Kes* is a polyfunctional morpheme, frequently used as a subordinator, nominalizer, sentential ending, and in third person non-human pronouns (Rhee 2008). I assume that *kes* has gained its status as an adverbial connective in its grammaticalization path. In fact, Kikuta (2002) and Horie (2011) discuss the use of the Japanese counterpart *no* as an adverbial connective, and the examples they provide naturally translate into Korean (see, for example, Kikuta (2002:207-208)). I propose that *kes* in IHRCs has the following two roles: (i) as a pronoun, it picks out the entity or entities referred to by the anchor and (ii) as a clausal connective, it conjoins the relative and the main clause.

4 At-Issueness and the Function of Korean Relative Clauses

In the previous section I presented a coherence-based analysis of Korean IHRCs. But assuming the notion of coherence adopted in this paper, it may come as a surprise that, as discussed in Section 2, EHRCs do not seem to be required to enter into a coherence relation with their main clauses: *Why is it the case that an establishment of a coherence relation is important in the licensing of IHRCs but not in the licensing of EHRCs?* In this section I submit the following. First, in order for a discourse to be coherent, every part of that discourse must cohere with the context it occurs in. Second, different types of Korean relative clause (restrictive EHRCs, nonrestrictive EHRCs and IHRCs) cohere with their main clauses in different manner. The second part of my proposal is the corollary of the fact that each type of relative clause has a specially designated discourse function that is partially correlated with the kind of content (*at-issue* or not) it contributes to discourse.

The idea that there is a kind of meaning called conventional implicature (CIs, henceforth) independent of ‘what is said’ (Grice 1975) has long been maintained (Frege 1892/1994; Grice 1975; Karttunen & Peters 1979; Potts 2005). What is of particular interest for our purposes is Potts’ (2005) analysis of English relatives. Potts rejects the traditional restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction, and proposes an alternative classification that distinguishes between *integrated* relatives that contribute content that is at-issue and *supplementary* relatives that provide supplementary or CI content (*ibid.* p.94). Following Potts, I motivate a classification of Korean relative clauses along the at-issue/CI divide. Crucially, I argue that restrictive EHRCs and IHRCs contribute at-issue content, while the content of nonrestrictive EHRCs can be either at-issue or CI.

In what follows I present evidence supporting that IHRCs contribute at-issue content while nonrestrictive EHRCs have no such restriction. I leave out restrictive EHRCs from the discussion, as it is well established that the content of restrictive relatives are part of the at-issue content of their main clauses due to their inherent set-reducing function. The fact that a nonrestrictive EHRC does not necessarily provide supplementary content is illustrated by (32): the content of the nonrestrictive EHRC *keki sanun* ‘who lives there’ must be interpreted as at-issue no matter whether Speaker B has only one brother or not; interpreting the relative as supplementary would lead to an incoherent discourse.¹²

(32) A. Seoul-ey kaseyyo?

Seoul -ey ka -sey -yo
Seoul -to go -HON -Q

‘Are you going to Seoul?’

B. Ney, keki sanun tongsayngi hana isseseyo.

Ney [keki ____i sa -nun] tongsayng_i -i hana iss -ese
Yes [there ____i live -ADN.IPFV] younger.sibling_i -NOM one exist -because
-yo
-DECL

¹²The arguments and data here echo those in Huddleston & Pullum (2002:1065).

‘Yes, because I have a brother, who lives there.’

Unlike CI content that receives widest scope (Potts 2005; McCready 2010), at-issue content can be embedded under scopal operators that are higher in the structure. Thus, if an IHRC is embedded under a negation operator, as in (33), it can be interpreted as part of the denial.

(33) Sakwaka cepsiey issten kesul Minaka mekun kesun sasili anita.

[Sakwa_i -ka cepsi -ey iss -ten] kes_i -ul Mina -ka mek
 [Apple_i -NOM plate -LOC exist -ADN.RETR] entity_i -ACC Mina -NOM eat
 -n kes -un sasil -i ani -ta
 -ADN.PFV -NMLZ -TOP fact -NOM be.not -DECL

‘It is not true that there were some apples on the plate and Mina ate them (= the apples).’

Another test is provided in (34). The idea is that the truth of at-issue content can be subject to negotiation by other participants of the conversation, whereas CI content cannot (McCready 2010; AnderBois *et al.* 2015). In (34) B’s response to A calls into question the truth of the proposition that the apples were on the plate. The fact that the utterances of speaker B is acceptable suggests that IHRCs convey at-issue content.

(34) A: Sakwaka cepsiey issten kesul Minaka mekesse.

[Sakwa_i -ka cepsi -ey iss -ten] kes_i -ul Mina -ka mek -ess
 [Apple_i -NOM plate -LOC exist -ADN.RETR] entity_i -ACC Mina -NOM eat -PST
 -e
 -DECL

‘There were apples on the plate and Mina ate them (= the apples).’

B: Sasili aniya. Sakwaka cepsiey epsesse.

Sasil -i ani -ya. Sakwa -ka cepsi -ey eps -ess -e
 Fact -NOM be.not -DECL Sakwa -NOM plate -LOC not.exist -PST -DECL

‘That’s not true. The apples were not on the plate.’

So far I have argued that restrictive EHRCs and IHRCs provide at-issue content, while the content of nonrestrictive EHRCs can be at-issue or CI. I now propose an account of why IHRCs, but not restrictive and nonrestrictive EHRCs, are required to enter a coherence relation with their main clauses in order for sentences instantiating them to be acceptable. I assume that different types of relatives are tied to construction-specific discourse goals and that they contribute to discourse coherence by achieving these goals.¹³ First of all, the

¹³Alternatively, one may argue that the basic difference between different types of relatives lies in whether they constitute an independent information unit (cf. Depraetere (1996)), and that the lack of a coherence relation between EHRCs and their main clauses is due to the fact that they form a single information unit. However, the notion of information unit is not entirely clear, and I therefore pursue an alternative account here.

inherent function of restrictive EHRCs is to help identify discourse referents by narrowing down the referents of the anchor to exactly those that satisfy the description provided by the relative. Once the reference set has been identified, it is available for reference in later discourse, which further contributes to effective communication. That nonrestrictive EHRCs and IHRCs do not have this set-reducing function is shown by examples (35) and (36): in the context where there are twelve apples on the plate, (36) is odd while (35) is acceptable only under a restrictive reading.

- (35) Minaka cepsiey issnun sakwa yel kaylul mekessta. (EHRC)

Mina -ka [____i cepsi -ey iss -nun] sakwa_i yel kay -lul mek -ess
 Mina -NOM [____i plate -LOC exist -ADN.IPFV] apple_i ten CLF -ACC eat -PST
 -ta
 -DECL

Restrictive: ‘Mina ate ten apples that were on the table.’

Nonrestrictive: ‘Mina ate ten apples, which were on the table.’

- (36) Minaka sakwa yel kayka cepsiey issnun kesul mekessta. (IHRC)

Mina -ka [sakwa_i yel kay -ka cepsi -ey iss -nun] kes_i -ul mek
 Mina -NOM [apple_i ten CLF -NOM plate -LOC exist -ADN.IPFV] entity_i -ACC eat
 -ess -ta
 -PST -DECL

Nonrestrictive: ‘Ten apples were on the plate and Mina ate them (= the ten apples).’

Turning to IHRCs, I argue that the discourse function of IHRCs is tied to the clausal connective CRD, whose function is to construct tightly connected successive propositions that describe a single, overall situation. That is, an IHRC advances discourse in such a way that it contributes content that is part of a complex proposition that the main clause’s content is also part of. Importantly, this discourse-advancing function of IHRCs is essentially what successive propositions in narrative discourse have. Given this parallel between narratives and IHRC-involving discourse, it naturally follows that IHRCs are required to contribute to the construction of a coherent discourse in such a way that they enter into a coherence relation with their main clauses, just like successive sentences in narrative discourse are required to do so.

Lastly, I claim that the function of a nonrestrictive EHRC correlates with the kind of content it provides. If a nonrestrictive EHRC provides CI, it contributes to discourse coherence by helping addressees understand the importance or relevance of the at-issue content contributed by the main clause. But if a nonrestrictive EHRC provides at-issue content, it plays the same role that an IHRC does: the relative contributes part of a complex proposition.¹⁴ In the latter case, just as in the case of IHRCs, coherence is achieved if a coherence relation is established between the relative and the main clause. The proposed account

¹⁴Huddleston & Pullum (2002:1063) identify a similar class of relatives, which they call *continuative* relatives, that are not backgrounded relative to the information conveyed by the main clause unlike other supplementary relatives.

makes the correct prediction that pragmatically enriching nonrestrictive EHRCs by inferring a coherence relation is a possibility: doing so does not lead to unnatural interpretations.

To summarize, I have argued for a new classification of Korean relative clauses on the basis of the discourse function of the relative and the (non-)at-issueness of its content. My proposal has been that IHRCs can be interpreted coherently if and only if a coherence relation is inferred between the relative and the main clause, while restrictive and nonrestrictive EHRCs can be part of a coherent discourse without entering into a coherence relation with their main clauses. The analysis I have proposed sheds light on the often ignored distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive EHRCs in Korean, and offers a novel account of the three-way contrast between restrictive EHRCs, nonrestrictive EHRCs, and IHRCs. My account contrasts with the account suggested by M. Kim (2008), who argues that EHRCs have “restrictive” semantics (relating sets of individuals) whereas IHRCs’ semantics relates sets of eventualities. A typology of relatives along this line is problematic because it obscures the difference between *nonrestrictive* EHRCs and IHRCs, as nonrestrictive EHRCs’ semantics do involve relating sets of eventualities. Additionally, the results of the present study supports recent proposals that the traditional restrictive/nonrestrictive divide does not provide a satisfactory typology of relative clauses (Huddleston & Pullum 2002; Potts 2005) and echoes the observations in previous works on “strange” relative clauses that do not fit traditional distinctions (Carlson 1977; Grosu & Landman 1998; Koenig & Lambrecht 1999).

5 Conclusion

Scholars have long argued that Korean IHRCs are subject to an interpretability constraint that gives rise to an asymmetry in acceptability between IHRCs and their EHRC counterparts (Kuroda 1976; M. Kim 2007, 2008). In this paper, I have argued that a successful account of this asymmetry lies at the interface between the semantics of IHRCs and discourse-pragmatics. Building on previous works on discourse coherence (Hobbs 1985; Kehler 2002; Asher & Lascarides 2003), I have claimed that IHRCs semantically encode a clausal connective that is tied to coordinate coherence relations. The proposed analysis allows the various interpretations available for sentences instantiating an IHRC, while restricting these interpretations to those that are compatible with coordinating coherence relations.

I have also proposed a new classification of Korean relatives that distinguishes among different types of relatives on the basis of the at-issueness of the relative and the relative’s discourse function, and offered an explanation as to why the establishment of a coherence relation seems to be relevant only in the case of IHRCs. In principle, every part of a discourse must help achieve a coherent interpretation of the discourse, and relative clauses do so by achieving construction-specific discourse goals: (i) restrictive EHRCs serve to construct a coherent representation of discourse by helping addressees easily identify the referents denoted by the anchor; (ii) IHRCs contribute to discourse coherence by providing an at-issue proposition that is connected to the proposition of the main clause by means of a coherence relation, thereby giving rise to a more tightly connected representation of a complex situation; (iii) Nonrestrictive EHRCs may serve a supplementary role by providing information that helps addressees better understand the at-issue content of the main clause, or they may enter into a coherence relation with their main clauses in order to contribute a coherent representation of a complex situation, just as IHRCs do.

6 References

- ANDERBOIS, SCOTT, BRASOVEANU, ADRIAN, & HENDERSON, ROBERT. 2015. At-Issue Proposals and Appositive Impositions in Discourse. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, **32**, 93–138.
- ASHER, NICHOLAS, & LASCARIDES, ALEX. 2003. *Logics of Conversation*. Cambridge University Press.
- ASHER, NICHOLAS, & VIEU, LAURE. 2005. Subordinating and Coordinating Discourse Relations. *Lingua*, **115**(4), 591–610.
- BLÜHDORN, HARDARIK. 2008. Subordination and Coordination in Syntax, Semantics and Discourse. In: *'Subordination' versus 'Coordination' in Sentence and Text: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- CARLSON, GREG. 1977. Amount Relatives. *Language*, **53**, 520–542.
- CHAVES, RUI P. 2012. On the Grammar of Extraction and Coordination. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, **30**(2), 465–512.
- CHUNG, DAE-HO. 1999. A Complement Analysis of the Head Internal Relative Clauses. *Language and Information*, **3**, 1–12.
- CRNIČ, LUKA. 2010. Coordination and Additivity in Modal Discourses. *The Proceedings of the 46th Annual Meeting of Chicago Linguistics Society*.
- DEPRAETERE, ILSE. 1996. Foregrounding in English Relative Clauses. *Linguistics*, **34**(4), 699–731.
- FREGE, GOTTLIB. 1892/1994. On Sense and Reference. In: *Basic Topics in the Philosophy of Language*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- FUJI, MASAOKI. 1996. Temporal Interpretation of Internally Headed Relative Clauses in Japanese. *Formal Linguistics Society of Midamerica VIII*.
- GRICE, PAUL. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In: *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3. New York: Academic Press.
- GROSU, ALEXANDER, & LANDMAN, FRED. 1998. Strange Relatives of the Third Kind. *Natural Language Semantics*, **6**, 125–170.
- HOBBS, JERRY. 1985. On the Coherence and Structure of Discourse. CSLI-85-37.
- HORIE, KAORU. 2011. Versatility of Nominalizations: Where Japanese and Korean Contrast. In: *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Typological Studies in Language 96. New York: Academic Press.
- HUDDLESTON, RODNEY, & PULLUM, GEOFFREY K. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.

- KARTTUNEN, LAURI, & PETERS, STANLEY. 1979. Conventional Implicature. *In: Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 11. New York: Academic Press.
- KAY, PAUL, & ZIMMER, KARL. 1978. On the Semantics of Compounds and Genitives in English. *Proceedings of the 6th California Linguistics Association*, 29–35. San Diego: Campanile.
- KEHLER, ANDREW. 2002. *Coherence, Reference, and the Theory of Grammar*. CSLI.
- KIKUTA, CHIHARU U. 2002. Clausal Complement or Adverbial Clause?: Toward an Integral Account of the Japanese Internally-Headed Relative Clause. *The Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, 202–220. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- KIM, MIN-JOO. 2004. *Event-Structure and the Internally-Headed Relative Clause Construction in Korean and Japanese*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- KIM, MIN-JOO. 2007. Formal Linking in Internally Headed Relatives. *Natural Language Semantics*, **15**, 279–315.
- KIM, MIN-JOO. 2008. Relevance of Grammar and Pragmatics to the Relevancy Condition. *Language Research*, **44**.
- KIM, YONG-BUM. 1996. Internally Headed Relative Clause Constructions in Korean. *Proceedings of the Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information, and Computation*, **11**, 403–413.
- KIM, YONG-BUM. 2002. Relevancy in Internally Headed Relative Clauses in Korean. *Lingua*, **112**, 541–559.
- KOENIG, JEAN-PIERRE, & LAMBRECHT, KNUD. 1999. French Relative Clauses as Secondary Predicates. *Pages 191–214 of: Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 2. The Hague, The Netherlands.
- KRATZER, ANGELIKA. 1994. The Event Argument and the Semantics of Voice. Ms, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- KURODA, SHIGE-YUKI. 1976. Headless Relative Clauses in Modern Japanese and the Relevancy Condition. *Proceedings of the 2nd Meeting of Berkeley Linguistics Society*.
- MANN, WILLIAM C., & THOMPSON, SANDRA A. 1988. Rhetorical Structure Theory: Toward a Functional Theory of Text Organization. *Text*, **8**(3), 243–281.
- MCCREADY, ERIC. 2010. Varieties of Conventional Implicature. *Semantics & Pragmatics*, **3**, 1–57.
- NISHIYAMA, ATSUKO, & KOENIG, JEAN-PIERRE. 2010. What Is a Perfect State? *Language*, **86**(3), 611–646.

- PARSONS, TERENCE. 1990. *Events in the Semantics of English*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- POLANYI, LIVIA, CULY, CHRISTOPHER, VAN DEN BERG, MARTIN H., THIONE, GIAN LORENZO, & AHN, DAVID. 2004. Sentential Structure and Discourse Parsing. *Proceedings of the ACL2004 Workshop on Discourse Annotation*.
- POTTS, CHRISTOPHER. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicature*. Oxford University Press.
- RHEE, SEONGHA. 2008. On the Rise and Fall of Korean Nominalizers. *In: Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives*. Typological Studies in Linguistics 76. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- SCHLEPPEGRELL, MARY J. 1992. Subordination and Linguistic Complexity. *Discourse Processes*, **15**(2), 117–131.
- SHIMOYAMA, JUNKO. 1999. Internally Headed Relative Clauses in Japanese and E-Type Anaphora. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, **8**, 147–182.
- SHIMOYAMA, JUNKO. 2001. *Wh-Constructions in Japanese*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- SOHN, SUNG-OCK S. 1995. *Tense and Aspect in Korean*. University of Hawaii Press.
- TXURRUKA, ISABEL G. 2003. The Natural Language Conjunction *And*. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, **26**(3), 255–285.
- YANG, BYONG-SUN. 1999. Internally Headed Relative Clauses in Japanese and E-Type Anaphora. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, **8**, 147–182.

Park, Sang-Hee
Department of Linguistics
University at Buffalo
Buffalo, NY 14260-1030
sangheep@buffalo.edu