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0. Introduction

I have found that, besides the regular relative clauses, another type must be recognized in Korean. The regular type displays the head outside of the clause which modifies it. This type involves movement of the head NP. Another type keeps the head in the base position inside the relative clause, and the outside otherwise head position (i.e., the antecedent position in the regular type) is occupied by a non-human bound pronominal kws 'thing'. The former type is typologically classified as the 'externally headed' relative clause (EXR), and the latter type belongs to the 'internally headed' relative clause (INR). Korean is an SOV, head-last language, and thus the two relative clause types display the following structures:

1a Soul-esο o-n phyancι-ka issαyo
   Seoul-from come-Rel letter-Subj exist
   'There is a letter which has come from Seoul'

1b [[[Soul-esο tι o [p]-n Cι] Οι CP] phyancι-ka issαyo

2a Soul-esο phyancι(-ka) o-n kws-t issαyo
   Seoul-from letterι(-Subj) come-Rel thingι-Subj exist
   'There is a letter which has come from Seoul'

2b [[[Soul-esο phyancι(-ka) o [p]-n Cι] CP] kws-t issαyo

The EXR in (1) represents typical relative clauses in Korean. The INR clause in (2) represents the relative clauses which will be attested in this paper. To my knowledge, the Korean INR has not been quoted in the literature on typology of relative clauses (cf. Keenan

1 The word kws is one of the so-called defective nouns. It must always be bound to a real pronominal form such as i 'this' and ki 'that'. Justification will be made for calling the resumptive head a pronominal in Section 2.

2 The abbreviations EXR and INR will be used in this paper to refer to either clause types or types of relativization (i.e., external relative clause formation and internal or resumptive relative clause formation).
and Comrie 1977, Comrie 1981, Keenan 1985, Lehman 1986) It has not been attested even among Korean linguists For instance, the INR is not listed in Sohn (1994), which is the most comprehensive and up-to-date descriptive grammar of Korean currently available. The necessity for the INR to be recognized as a separate construction will be justified by its syntactic behavior which systematically differs from that of the EXR.

Another goal of this paper is to apply Optimality Theory (OT) to analyze the Korean relativization phenomena. Specifically, I will apply the optimality theoretical constraint system for relative clauses advanced by Pesetsky (1994) and Brothier (1995) to the two types of Korean relative clauses. I will argue that their constraint set must be revised and expanded. The Pesetskian system has been irrelevant to the head or antecedent position which is outside of the relative clause (i.e., CP), but the revised constraint set will require extending its scope of application from CP to the head position to cover the Korean resumptive relative clause.

1. The Pesetskian OT Approach to Relative Clauses

In this section, I will only give the constraint set built in the Pesetskian theory of relative clauses, without showing their actual applications to real data they collected (see Pesetsky and Brothier for details).

The constraint set directly relevant to the evaluation of relative clauses consists of the following four constraints:

1. **RCV** Deleted (i.e., +silent) material must be recoverable (Recoverability)

2. **LE(C)** A complementizer must be pronounced at the left edge of CP (Left Edge (Comp))

---

3. Sohn (1994:62) implies that the INR belongs to the so-called 'appositive adjectival clause', in which the head kas may render such interpretation as 'fact', 'sight', etc., as in

(i) nae-ka namse-lil math-in sasil/kas
   1-Subj smell-Obj smell-Rel fact/thing
   'the fact that I smelled the smell'

4. The discussions about the Pesetskian theory in this paper are largely based on Brothier (1995). A copy of Pesetsky's Fall 1994 lecture handouts has been accessible, but it is skeletal, as handouts usually are, and no details are available, although it is worth looking at. The reference to Pesetsky will be to Pesetsky's Fall 1994 lecture handouts, the reference to Brothier is Brothier (1995). The reference to 'Pesetsky and Brothier' will be to the two, respectively.
3 TEL  A function (or telegraphable) morpheme must be unpronounced (Telegraph)

4 MnT Provide traces with minimal pronunciation — [+silent] where possible, [+pronominal] elsewhere (Minimize Trace)

Recoverability is defined as a property of chains 'either [reduced] or [-silent] pronunciation of any link in the chain is enough to ensure that RCV is satisfied by every link in the chain' (Brothers 15) This constraint will be slightly revised to handle the recoverability of the resumptive head in Korean

LEC is actually a combination of two constraints 'A complementizer must be pronounced, and must be pronounced at the left edge of CP' (Pesetsky 9) Thus, LEC is violated both when the complementizer is not pronounced and when it does not occur in the left edge position This constraint will be incorporated into the constraint Edge Most Complementizer (EMC) by adapting Anderson (1994)

As far as (finite) relative clauses are concerned, a function morpheme can in practice be equated with a complementizer TEL, therefore, severely conflicts with LEC, because, as pointed out just above, LEC requires a complementizer to be pronounced Different orderings of LEC and TEL will result in typologically different languages

The constraint MnT ensures that there are languages in which traces are obligatorily or optionally realized as a resumptive pronoun To state deductively, to posit this constraint means to assume that the resumptive relative clauses in languages like Arabic, Polish, Hebrew, etc., are viewed as involving movement of an NP (see Demirdache 1991 for a non-movement theory of resumptive pronouns, see also Martohardjono 1993 for a non-movement view of Indonesian relative clauses) As in the Principles and Parameters framework, movement is taken as a last resort, which takes place in order not to violate Island Conditions (cf Shlonsky 1992) MnT entails a distinction of three levels of pronunciation [+silent], [-silent], and [reduced] (= [+pronominal]), and thus also entails that the input to GEN consists of forms not at S-structure but at LF A [reduced] or [+pronominal] pronunciation is understood as the pronunciation of the minimal 4-features of the antecedent, and a trace assigned a [reduced] pronunciation will be phonetically realized as a resumptive pronoun

As seen from the Korean data above and will be shown in more detail below, a resumptive pronoun does not always originate from a trace left by a certain movement It also can come

---

As a matter of fact, the notion of reduced pronunciation is a reconciliation of the Shadow Pronoun Hypothesis advanced by Perlmutter (date not given in Pesetsky) with the copy theory of movement in the Minimalist Program In the Shadow Pronoun Hypothesis, movement leaves behind a shadow 'pronoun', whereas it leaves a copy (of a full NP) in the copy theory The two theories, therefore, conflict with each other Pesetsky suggests that a pronoun is a 'pronunciation of some (but not all) of the 4-features of a DP', and then resumptive pronouns can be viewed as 'the copy in the base position pronounced minimally', maintaining the copy theory of movement (Pesetsky 22)
from a base-generated empty position without movement involved. Thus, we need another mechanism or constraint that will ensure this way of producing a resumptive pronoun. This constraint will roughly read 'Provide a base-generated empty position, with [+pronominal]', which will be elaborated upon in Section 3.

2. Characteristics of the Korean Relative Clause

In both EXRs and INRs, neither Postposition Stranding nor Pied-Piping is allowed, the relevant postposition must be deleted. But they differ in their distribution in several ways.

First, the EXR allows a wide range of grammatical functions to be relativized. In fact, the EXR relativization can be performed virtually on any grammatical function.

3. Subject

   a. John-in Seoul-lo ka-t-ta
      John-Subj Seoul-to go-Pst-Decl
      'John went to Seoul'

   b. Seoul-lo ka-n John
      Seoul-to go-Rel John
      'John who went to Seoul'

4. Direct Object

   a. John-in yulichang-li k'ae-t-ta
      John-Subj window-Obj break-Pst-Decl
      'John broke the window'

   b. John-t k'ae-n yulichang
      John-Subj break-Rel window
      'the window which John broke'

5. Indirect Object

   a. John-in Bill-eke chzk-tli cu-Qt-ta
      John-Subj Bill-to book-Obj give-Pst-Decl
      'John gave a book to Bill'

   b. John-t chzk-tli cu-n Bill
      John-Subj book-Obj give-Rel Bill
      'Bill whom John gave a book to'

6. Genitive

   a. John-ty os-t talap-ta
      John-Gen clothe-Subj dirty-Decl
      'John's clothes are dirty'
In all cases, the trace left by the movement of the head is recoverable, although Postposition Stranding and Pied-Piping are not allowed, as mentioned above.\(^6\)

\(^6\)In languages like Arabic, a resumptive pronoun is obligatorily employed when relativizing oblique NPs, because they are not recoverable in the languages (Shlonsky 1992)
INR formation is only allowed on the subject and direct object, not on any other grammatical functions

11 Subject
phyonci(-ka) o-n kǝs(-n) ǝni-e chırwaỏyo?
letter(-Subj) come-Rel thing(-Obj) where-Loc put away
'Where did you put the letter which came?'

12 Direct Object
phyonci(-lal) s'-n kǝs(-n) ilka pəassǝyo?
letter(-Obj) write-Rel thing(-Obj) read see
'Have you read the letter which (he) wrote?'

13 Indirect Object
*ǝnǝ-ka namu-e mul-n kǝs
I-Subj tree,-to water-Obj give-Rel thing,
'the tree which I gave water to'

14 Topic
*namǝ-ka khǝ-ka ki-n kǝs
tree,-Top height-Subj bag-Rel thing,
'the tree which is tall'

15 Oblique
*nǝ-ka həkkə-yo-e ka-n kǝs
I-Subj school,-to go-Rel thing,
'the school which I went to'

Second, while EXR is not sensitive to the animacy of the NP to be relativized, INR is sensitive to it. Human NPs are not allowed to undergo INR formation. The resumptive heads pun 'person (Honorific)' and j 'person (Non-honorific)' below are human counterparts of the non-human resumptive head kǝs

16 *sonnum(-t) chǝcao-ǝ-n pun
guest,(-Subj) visit-Hon-Rel person,
'guest who has visited'

17 *chinku-ǝ-n manna-n j
friend,(-Obj) meet-Rel person,
'friend who (he) met'

Third, while definiteness of the NP is irrelevant to EXR, it binds INR formation. In other words, definite NPs do not undergo INR
Finally, the morphological status of the external head is different from the resumptive head. The former is a pronominal which has an N' status, while the latter is a pronominal at N' level. The heads in EXRs can take a specifier (and/or an adjective) either before the relative clause or between the clause and the head, whether the head is an R-expression or a pronominal kas which is the same in form as the resumptive head in the INR.

The resumptive head in the INR, however, cannot felicitously take a specifier in either position.

Of the following figures, Figure 1 represents EXRs in which a specifier occurs before the relative clause, Figure 2 those in which it occurs between the relative clause and the head, and Figure 3 represents INRs.

Furthermore, the resumptive head kas is an indefinite pronominal which has a sister relation with the relative clause. The INR + kas as a constituent, therefore, is an indefinite pronominal phrase. This can be seen in the following comparison.
The differences between EXR and INR described so far are summarized in Table 1 below. Of the characteristics, those in (1) and (2) are relevant to the recoverability constraint, RCV, those in (3), (4) and (5) are Related to GEN. Especially, the indefiniteness of the resumptive head will explicitly explain why relativization of definite NPs is prohibited in INR.

Table 1 Differences between the externally headed and internally headed relative clause in Korean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Externally Headed Relative Clause</th>
<th>Internally Headed Relative Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> A wide range of grammatical functions can be relativized</td>
<td>Only the subject and direct object can be relativized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> The trace is recoverable in all cases</td>
<td>The resumptive head is recoverable only in subject and DO relativization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Animacy of the NP is irrelevant to relativization</td>
<td>Human NPs cannot be relativized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Definiteness of the NP is irrelevant to relativization</td>
<td>Definite NPs cannot be relativized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> The head is a nominal at N' level</td>
<td>The resumptive head is an indefinite pronounal at N' level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. An OT Approach to the Korean Relative Clauses

The constraints which are involved in the evaluation of Korean relative clause candidates are the following five:

1. **RCV** = [+silent] material (traces and base-generated empty positions which are bound) must be recoverable

2. **EMC** = A complementizer must be pronounced in the edge-most position of CP

3. **TEL** = A function morpheme must be unpronounced

4. **MinT** = Provide traces with minimal pronunciation -- [+silent] where possible, [+pronominal] elsewhere

5. **STUFF** = Provide base-generated non-operator empty positions with [+pronominal]

Here, we have a new constraint, **STUFF**. We need this to prevent the base-generated empty head position in the main clause of an INR from being left unfilled. At a glance, this might look like a restatement of the second conjunct of the Pesetskian Minimize Trace...
Provide traces with [+silent] where possible, '[+pronominal] elsewhere'. Presumably, the reason why Brohra included this statement in the constraint, taking the risk of the constraint's being fuzzy by doing that, is to ensure the existence of resumptive pronouns in some natural languages. The constraint Minimize Trace, however, cannot apply to the resumptive head in the Korean relative clause, because it is clearly not a trace position involving movement, but a base-generated empty position which is later filled with a pronominal. This is the reason why the constraint STUFF is necessary. Posting the constraint is empirically supported by languages like Navajo which have internally headed relative clauses whose external head position is never filled.

22 (shi) leechaq'í b-á hashtal-igii hahat'in
[I dog 3-for Impf 1 sing-NR] Impf bark (NR = Nominalizer)
'The dog I am singing for is barking.'

Regarding RCV, Pesetsky and Brohra only refer to traces, while I also refer to base-generated empty positions which are bound, as well as traces. It requires, therefore, that the empty category in the resumptive head position which is bound by the internal head be recoverable by being linked to it. Due to this definition of the [+silent] position, RCV does not apply to the so-called quasi-NPs (which were called expletives until recently) such as it and there (but these NPs are subject to STUFF). On the other hand, which empty positions are recoverable and which are not is determined language-specifically. In Arabic, for example, oblique NPs are never recoverable when they are relativized, and thus resumptive pronouns must be employed in those positions, in Korean, all categories are recoverable in EXRs, while only the subject and direct object are recoverable in INRs,7 and only subject relativization is allowed in Indonesian. In this respect, the theory of parameterization cannot be absolutely excluded in the OT system, because the only grammatical category which is universally recoverable in the relative clause is the subject (cf. Keenan and Comrie 1977). And thus any constraint of recoverability which refers to a particular grammatical category (except for subject) will be too specific to be universal.

Next, as far as complementizers are concerned, it is more reasonable to generalize their occurrences in terms of edge-most position, since there is no evidence that their occurrence at the left-edge is universal but their occurrence at the right-edge is not universal. Pesetsky and Brohra have exclusively worked on Indo-European languages whose complementizers are all pronounced at the left edge of CP, and thus their constraint LEC is Euro-centric to that extent. The idea of EMC is as extension of Anderson's (1994) Edge-Most constraint.

7 In this respect, the motivation of the employment of a resumptive pronoun in Korean is the opposite from that in languages like Arabic: a resumptive pronoun is used when the trace is unrecoverable in Arabic, but the resumptive structure may be constructed only when the empty position is recoverable in Korean.
which is reasonable, given that most (of the relativizing) complementizers are affixes or clitics.

The relative marker in Korean goes against the constraint TEL and must always be pronounced. However, posting a constraint, say, UNTEL, which reads that 'A function morpheme must be pronounced', is problematic. Crucially, the scope and target of application of the two constraints will be absolutely the same, and thus only one of the two should be enough in the evaluation processes. Therefore, I have maintained the Pesetskian constraint TEL, even though it will be low ranked because of constant violation by all complementizers in Korean.

The constraint MinT is an adoption of the Pesetskian Minimize Trace as it is. Providing a trace with the feature [+pronominal] is considered as violating the constraint (weakly, though). In the actual evaluation processes, therefore, the presence or absence of the [+pronominal] part in the statement of the constraint results in nothing different.

Now, it is time to illustrate the application of the constraint set to data. The exact ranking of the constraints is indeterminable, except TEL, which is always lowest ranked. Actually, the ranking of other constraints than TEL does not matter because the optimal form or forms will not violate them. However, since RCV is supposed to be universally undominated, I placed it at the highest position. The ordering of STUFF, EMC, and MinT is more or less intuitive. The exact ranking will be determined in the evaluation processes of other grammatical phenomena.

Tableau 1A below represents relativization of the subject and direct object NPs as in (23a,b) and (24a,b), respectively. Tableau 1B exemplifies the subject NP relativization.

```
23 a  o-n phyanc1 (EXR,Subject) come-Rel letter
    'letter which came'
b  phyanc1(-ka) o-n kos (INR,Subject) come-Rel thunby

24 a  se-n phyanc1 (EXR,DO) write-Rel letter
    'letter which (he) wrote'
```
b) phyanci s't-n kas (INR, DO)

letter, write-Rel thing

**TABLEAU 1A** Relativization of Subject and DO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>RCV</th>
<th>STUFF</th>
<th>MinT</th>
<th>EMC</th>
<th>TEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) t C Np</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) NP C kas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) NP C Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) kas, C NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLEAU 1B** Relativization of the Subject NP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>RCV</th>
<th>STUFF</th>
<th>MinT</th>
<th>EMC</th>
<th>TEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) t o [p-n C] O C cp</td>
<td>phyanci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) phyanci o [p-n cp]</td>
<td>kas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) phyanci o [p-n C]</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) kas, o [p-n C] O C cp</td>
<td>phyanci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have here two optimal forms (a) and (b). Candidate (c) is out because it violates STUFF by leaving unfilled the antecedent position outside of the relative clause, which is fatal. Candidate (d) is also out because it violates MinT by pronouncing the trace, which is fatal.

Tableau 2A represents relativization of other grammatical functions including indirect object which is also prohibited from resumptive relativization. These functions are represented by PP (Postpositional Phrase). Tableau 2B shows how the EXR (25a) is found to be grammatical, but the INR (25b) ungrammatical in PP relativization.

25 a) ka-n hakkyo (EXR, PP)
go-Rel school'school which (he) went to'
b) *hakkyo-e ka-n kas

**TABLEAU 2A** Relativization of grammatical functions other than Subject and DO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>RCV</th>
<th>STUFF</th>
<th>MinT</th>
<th>EMC</th>
<th>TEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) PPt C Np</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) PP C kas</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) PP C Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) kas, pos: C NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLEAU 2B Relativization of the Locative NP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>RCV</th>
<th>STUFF</th>
<th>MinT</th>
<th>EMC</th>
<th>TEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, PP trace (as in candidate (a)) can be recoverable in almost every case in spite of the prohibition against Stranding and Pied-Piping, but the resumptive head is unrecoverable in all PP relativization Candidates (b) and (c), therefore, violate RCV and are out (candidate (c) violates STUFF, too) Candidate (d) violates MinT and is also out Therefore, only non-resumptive clauses are optimal in PP relativization

4. The Definiteness and Humanness Problem

We saw above that definite and human NPs cannot undergo resumptive relative clause formation In fact, none of the constraint set given above have to do with definiteness and humanness Thus, the constraint ranking does not help explain why definite and human nouns resist INR formation

I showed in Section 2 that the resumptive head is an indefinite pronominal In addition, it can only refer to nonhuman beings That is, the resumptive head käs carries the features [-definite] and [-human] ⁹ If we assume that these two features in the resumptive head are actually agreement features, the resumptive head in the Korean INR will require that the internal head agree with the external head in definiteness and humanness The consequence of this assumption is that the ungrammaticality of the INRs with a definite and/or human internal head is supposed to be explained not in terms of constraint ranking, but in terms of GEN which does not generate candidates involving feature disagreement Thus, GEN does not generate INRs in which the internal head does not agree with the external resumptive head in definiteness and humanness This can be analogized to the English relative clause for

⁹ Historically, the resumptive head originates from the homophonous nominalizer via reanalysis into a pronominal The nominalizer originates, in turn, from the defective noun käs ‘thing’ Thus, the external head in the clause (ii) is ambiguous between a resumptive head and a nominalizer

(11) a  |  mak-nn käs  |  eat-Rel thing  |  ‘things to eat (=food)’
       |  b  |  po-nn käs  |  see-Rel thing  |  ‘seeing’
       |  c  |  ak'a pap  mak-nn käs  |  a while ago rice eat-Rel thing  |  ‘the rice (he) ate a while ago’, Or ‘the thing (=event) that (he) ate ’

441
which GEN generates the sequences the person who, the person that, the person 0, etc., but
does not generate sequences like *the person which

5. Conclusion

I have shown that, along with the externally headed relative clause, another type of
relative clause in Korean must be recognized. This peculiar construction is the internally
headed relative clause which fills the external head position with a resumptive pronoun. This
new type of resumptive relative clause has not been typologically attested, not even among
Korean linguists. One of the goals of this paper, therefore, has been to have the resumptively
headed relative clause in Korean attested publicly.

We have also seen that the Pesetskaian constraint system should be modified and expanded
so as to cover the Korean resumptive head relative clause. Two radical changes are (1) the
switch of the constraint on the occurrence of a complementizer at the left edge (LEC) into
the occurrence at an edge-most position (EMC), adapting Anderson (1994), and (2) the
introduction of the constraint STUFF to the effect that a base-generated non-operator empty
position must be provided with [+pronominal].

REFERENCES

Anderson, Stephen R. 1994 How to put your critics in their place or how the best account of
second-position phenomena may be a nearly optimal one. Ms Yale University
(Rutgers Optimality Archive ROA-21-0794)

Brohier, Keven. 1995 Optimality theoretic rankings with tied constraints. Slavic relatives,
resumptive pronouns and learnability. Ms MIT (Rutgers Optimality Archive)

Comrie, Bernard. 1981 Language universals and linguistic typology. Syntax and

Demirdache, Hamida. 1991 Resumptive chains in restrictive relatives, appositives and
dislocation structures. PhD dissertation. MIT

Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Keenan, Edward L. 1985 Relative clauses. In Timothy Shopen (ed.) Language typology and
syntactic description. Complex constructions. Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press

Keenan, Edward L. and Bernard Comrie. 1977 Noun phrase accessibility and universal
grammar. Linguistic Inquiry 8 63-99
1996 MALC

Sohn, Christian 1986 On the typology of relative clauses Linguistics 24 663-680

Martohardjono, Gita and James W Gair 1993 Apparent UG inaccessibility in second language acquisition In Fred R. Eckman (ed)

Pesetsky, David 1994 Optimality principles of sentence pronunciation Lecture handouts in Fall 1994 MIT

Platero, Paul R 1974 The Navajo relative clause International Journal of American Linguistics 40 202-246

Shlonsky, Ur 1992 Resumptive pronouns as a last resort Linguistic Inquiry 23 443-468

Sohn, Ho-Min 1994 Korean London Routledge