I. Introduction

Unlike English, which has only head-external (or externally headed) relative clauses, Korean shows two types of relative clauses: namely, head-external relative clauses and head-internal relative clauses, as given in (2a) and (2b) respectively:

\(\text{(1) English} \)
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{I caught the cat that was stealing the fish.} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{I snatched the fish that the cat was stealing.}
\end{align*}\]

\(\text{(2) Korean} \)
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{na-nun [I e saynsen-uhl hwunchi-nun] cayangki-hul cap-ass-ta} \\
& \quad \text{I-Top fish-Acc steal-Rel cat-Acc catch-Pst-Dec} \\
& \quad \text{'I caught the cat that was stealing the fish.'} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{na-nun [I cayangki-ka saynsen-uhl hwunchi-nun] ul cap-ass-ta} \\
& \quad \text{I-Top cat-Nom fish-Acc steal-Rel kesu-uhl cap-ass-ta} \\
& \quad \text{KES-Acc catch-Pst-Dec} \\
& \quad \text{(i) 'I caught the cat while it was stealing the fish.'} \\
& \quad \text{(ii) 'I snatched the fish when the cat was stealing it.'}
\end{align*}\]

Traditionally, (2a) is regarded as a head-external relative clause since the
head noun of the relative clause (i.e. koyangi 'cat') is externally placed, and this type of relative clause is almost syntactically identical with the English ones, shown in (1a) and (1b). On the other hand, the kes construction in (2b) seems to be different from the typical relative clause construction in (1a) in certain grammatical aspects. In particular, kes in (2b) appears to occur in the same position where the external head of the relative clause is placed. However, even though kes in (2b) is placed in the external head position of the relative clause, it cannot be counted as the “internal (or semantic) head” of the relative clause. For example, in the first reading of (2b), the internal head of the relative clause is either the embedded subject koyangi 'cat' or the embedded object sayngsen 'fish' depending on the context, and it occurs within the clause. Kes in (2b) seems to be semantically associated with the semantic head occurring in the preceding relative clause. That is, kes plays the role of the expletive head of the preceding relative clause. In (2b), kes is anaphoric in the sense that it can be semantically associated with one of the arguments in the preceding embedded clause. The kes construction in (2b) conforms to the cross-linguistic definitions for HiRC suggested in July (1990). I call this type of kes construction a head-internal relative clause (HiRC) construction.

The main purpose of this paper is to address certain island effects of the scrambling from Korean head-internal relative clauses (HiRCs). More specifically, I suggest that scrambling from the HiRC construction is possible if and only if a scrambled element meets what I call the HiRC Extraction Conditions. That is, scrambling from the HiRC construction is possible if and only if i) a scrambled element is the internal (or semantic) head of the HiRC; and ii) a scrambled element is the argument, not the adjunct, of the verb in the HiRC. Otherwise, the HiRC construction is an island for scrambling. In addition, I show in a later section that in terms of the island effects of scrambling, the HiRC construction is different from another type of Korean kes construction: namely, what I call a nominal complement clause (NCC) construction. More specifically, scrambling from this type of kes construction is relatively free from the island effects expected in the HiRC construction.