

The Relative Clause in Narrative Discourse

Shin Ja Joo Hwang

This paper describes the relative clause structure of Korean in comparison with that of English and explores functions of the relative clause in narrative discourse. While English (an SVO language) has a postnominal relative clause with the relative pronoun strategy, Korean (an SOV language) has a prenominal relative clause with the deletion strategy. In both languages, the relative clause is found to provide background information about participants and props, cohesion in discourse, and minor or displaced events. However, there are also differences in function of the relative clause between the two languages, e.g. the use of the relative clause in English in introducing additional participants related to the one introduced as the head noun and that in Korean in encoding didactic material.

1. Introduction

There are, broadly speaking, three approaches to the study of relative clauses in the world's languages: (1) a description of their structures within a language or in comparison with other languages from universal and typological perspectives (e.g. Comrie 1981, Downing 1977, Keenan 1985, Lehmann 1986, Mallinson and Blake 1981, Maxwell 1979, Nichols 1984); (2) an explanation of their functions in discourse (e.g. Beavon n.d., Fox 1987, Givón 1979, Hopper and Thompson 1980 & 1984); and (3) the psycholinguistic considerations regarding the processing of relative clauses (e.g. Clancy, et al. 1986, Prideaux 1982 & 1985, Prideaux and Baker 1986, and Rosenbaum and Kim 1976). These approaches, of course, overlap to a large extent, such that any given type of study may involve describing the

* I am grateful to Donald Burquest, Vurnell Cobbey, David Coward, Desmond Derbyshire, Robert Dooley, Jerry Edmondson, Lynne Fiore, and Marlin Leaders for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.

structures of relative clauses, the effects of their structures on processing, and their functions in discourse and context. The purpose of this paper is to explore the first two: to describe the relative clause structure of Korean in comparison with that of English and to explore functions of the relative clause in narrative discourse.

Relative clauses(RCs) are typically considered to be part of a noun phrase(NP), in which they modify the head noun. Thus, when we view a narrative text as an intricate interweaving of noun phrases (participants and props) and verb phrases (their conditions and actions) (cf. Longacre 1983 & 1989), relative clauses pose an interesting question: Are RCs more like NPs since they are embedded in NPs, or are they more like verb phrases in that they are clauses with verbal elements? To put the question differently, do RCs give information about participants or information about happenings and plot structure? Admittedly, of course, the two parts are so intricately intertwined that it is very difficult to separate participants from actions or vice versa.

To answer this, we will look at the types of information that are reported in RCs, rather than in main clauses or subordinate clauses (those dependent clauses that do not modify head nouns). Labov(1972) and Tomlin(1985) have pointed out that foreground information (cf. Hopper and Thompson 1980, Tomlin 1987) is generally encoded in main/independent clauses while background information is encoded in subordinate and relative clauses. Thus, a correlation or a coding relationship is posited between the "salience of information" and coordination versus subordination in grammar.

For this project, the RCs in six Korean stories (folktales) are studied, and they are compared in their structure and function with the RCs in three short English stories.

The following section(Section 2) describes the structure of Korean RCs in comparison with that of English RCs. Section 3 discusses the functions of RCs in narrative discourse. Concluding remarks are given in Section 4.

2. Structure of the Korean Relative Clause

2.1. External or Headed

The position of the RC in relation to its head noun (or domain noun, cf. Keenan 1985) is one of the basic characteristics of RCs described in a

given language. Both English and Korean are examples of languages having external or headed relatives, in which the head is located outside the RC. There are some languages, like Navajo, with internal relatives, where the head occurs inside the RC.

2.2. Prenominal

While an RC in English follows the head noun (postnominal RC: Head noun+RC), in Korean an RC precedes the head noun (prenominal RC: RC+Head noun), acting much like any modifier before the noun. Thus, in English discourse the head noun (with any preposed modifiers such as an article and an adjective) is the first piece of information occurring in the NP, while in Korean the information in the RC comes first (together with any other modifiers) before the head noun, which occurs finally in the NP. As Keenan(1985) notes, in verb-final languages, such as Korean (basic word order: SOV), the prenominal position of the RC and other modifiers is more dominant than the postnominal position.

Some examples of the RC in Korean follow:¹

¹ Fred Lukoff's(1945~47) romanization system is adopted in the transcription of the Korean language data. The following abbreviations are used in the glosses:

Activ	Activitive mode
Decl	Declarative ending
foDecl	Formal declarative ending
fuM	Future modifying ending
Honor	Honorific suffix .
OP	Object particle
Pass	Passive
pM	Past modifying ending
Poss	Possessive
prM	Present modifying ending
Prog	Progressive
rM	Retrospective modifying ending
SP	Subject particle
TP	Topic particle
Voc	Vocative

The following abbreviations refer to the texts. For the complete Korean texts in transcription and English translation, see Appendix A of Hwang (1987). The numbers after the text refer to the sentence numbers, e.g.

BM11= Sentence 11 of "The Beauty and the Monk."

Korean Texts: BM The Beauty and the Monk

GM The Grateful Magpies

- (1) BM11 [ϕ mok-esø ppänä-n] kət
 throat-from pull.out-pM thing
 'the object that (he) pulled out of the throat'
- (2) SC52 [je-ke ϕ mot-ha-l] malssum
 I(Humble)-to unable-do-fuM word
 'words that (you) cannot tell me'
- (3) HS7 [ϕ ja-nun] moja jangsa
 sleep-prM hat seller
 'the hat seller who is sleeping'

2.3. Deletion of Coreferential Nouns

Instead of being replaced by a relative pronoun, the coreferential noun is omitted in the Korean RC and is marked by ϕ in the above examples. This deletion (or gap, cf. Comrie 1981) strategy of the Korean RC contrasts with the English strategy of using relative pronouns (such as *who* and *whom*) or the relativizer (*that*), which occur initially in the RC and immediately following the head noun (but prepositions such as *with* may occur before the relative pronoun as in: *the man with whom I played tennis*). There are also cases in English where there is no relative pronoun in the RC: e.g. *the man I saw yesterday*. The English RC has two characteristics: instead of a noun there is a relative pronoun, and it is found in initial position in the RC. The Korean RC involves two things: deleting the coreferential noun and its postpositional particle from the RC, and changing the finite form of the verb to a nonfinite form, which consists of a verb and a modifying ending.

2.4. Deletion of Postpositional Particles

In Korean, any postpositions that are attached to nouns are deleted along with the noun whether the postpositional particle refers to case (subject,

-
- HS The Hat Seller
 SC The Story of Shim Chung
 SM The Brother and the Sister Who Became the Sun and the Moon
 UT The Ungrateful Tiger
 English Texts: C Cinderella
 H Hans
 P The Three Little Pigs

object) or other functions like location, time, goal, or source. Unlike the English RC, where some relative pronouns (and prepositions left in the RC) show—if only minimally—the grammatical function of the head, the function of the coreferential noun in the Korean RC is not marked on the surface structure at all. The function, however, is usually not difficult to discern from the context, the kind of verb, and the noun case that is missing in the RC. This strategy is related to the other syntactic characteristic of Korean that words (constituents) functioning as subject or object may be freely omitted when they are assumed to be known to the hearer or reader. Thus, when a subject does not occur in an RC, it may be simply omitted as known information, or it may be coreferential with the head noun which the RC modifies. Nevertheless, the task of finding out the function of the deleted noun is not really difficult since the context and communication situation provide enough clues.

The following English examples of RCs in (4) and (5) have the preposition *to*, which signals the grammatical function of the relative pronouns in the RC. Example (6), however, shows that in the Korean RC the phrase *through the way* (*through which*) is deleted.

- (4) C7 a grand ball [*to* which he invited all the lords and ladies in the country]
- (5) C45 the beautiful and graceful lady [*to* whom the Prince paid so much attention]
- (6) UT2 [holangi-ka ϕ jal tani-nun] kilmok
 tiger-SP often pass-prM way
 'the way *through which* the tiger frequently passes'

The deletion of postpositions in some cases may result in ambiguity (Yang 1972, Salleh 1983). One case involves the choice of interpretation of the noun as source or goal. This is usually disambiguated by using the lexical meaning of the verb, or the interpretation factually most plausible in the speech situation.

- (7) [uli-ka ϕ isa o-n] tongne
 we-SP move come-prM neighborhood
 'the neighborhood we moved to' (Less likely but possible to interpret as: 'the neighborhood we moved from')

- (8) [uli-ka ϕ isa ka-n] tongne
 we-SP move go-pM neighborhood
 'the neighborhood we moved to'
- (9) [uli-ka ϕ ttøna.o-n] tongne
 we-SP leave-pM neighborhood
 'the neighborhood we left' (Possible interpretation: 'the neighborhood we came to')

2.5. Modifying Endings

The modifying endings of verbs are also referred to as 'relative markers' in RCs (Yang 1972) and 'complementizers' in complement clauses (CCs) (Park 1974). In other words, modifying endings in RCs and CCs are identical in form, signaling not only that the verb is nonfinite (and dependent) but also that a modified noun follows these endings.²

The modifying endings, which occur immediately preceding head nouns, vary, not according to the function/case of the head noun (*who* vs. *whom*) in the RC, but according to the tense of the verb within the RC. Generally speaking, $-(\#)n$ signals or accompanies past tense for verbs but present tense for adjectives and copula, $-nun$ present tense for verbs only, $-(\#)l$ future, and $-t\phi n$ retrospective (as well as past tense for adjectives), with some variations depending on aspectual considerations.³

2.6. Relativization of S, O, IO, O of Postposition, and Possessor

In Korean the subject, object, indirect object, and object of postposition (oblique) may be relativized, but the possessor and object of comparison are generally not relativized.⁴ The latter two types are readily promoted to other functions such as the subject and then relativized (Salleh 1983,

² The noun in complement clauses, according to Park (1974), may be complete or incomplete, the latter referring to such generic nouns as *k\phi t* 'thing, fact' or nominalizer type words like *jul*, *ji*, *ssu*.

³ A detailed discussion on these markers is beyond the scope of this paper and the readers are referred to Yang (1972).

⁴ The possessor and object of comparison relativization would produce ungrammatical noun phrases as shown below:

*n\~a-ka jh\~ak-ul ilk-ko.in-n\~un salam
 I-SP book-OP read-Prog-prM person
 'the person whose book I am reading'

*n\~a-ka t\~ø ppal\~u-n y\~øja
 I-SP more fast-prM woman
 'the woman I am faster than'

Givón 1979). However, Tagashira (1972:219; repeated in Keenan 1985) presents the following example of a Korean relative that has the coreferential noun functioning as a possessor in the pronominal (or reflexive) form of *jaki* 'self':

- (10) [jaki-uy kä-ka jhyongmyong.ha-n] kü salam
 self-Poss dog-SP be.smart-prM the person
 'the man whose dog is smart'

Also, as in the Malay example cited in Comrie (1981:154), the Korean possessor may also be relativized with a pronominal trace *ku* 'he' (from *ku-uy* 'he-Possessive') in the RC:

- (11) [kü ø hyong-i na-lul ttäli-n] salam
 he elder.brother-SP I-OP hit-pM person
 'the person whose elder brother hit me'

When there are two nouns with a strongly implied possessive relationship, such as body parts and kinship, the possessor may be relativized without any overt pronoun in the RC. One example occurs in the text "The Grateful Magpies":

- (12) GM43 [ø möli-ka kkä-ji-n] kkajhi tu mali
 head-SP break-Pass-pM magpie two Counter for animals
 'the two magpies whose heads were broken'

In terms of the Keenan and Comrie(1977; Comrie and Keenan 1979) NP Accessibility Hierarchy,

Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Object of Pre-or
 Postposition > Possessor > Object of Comparison,

Korean examples show that the more accessible NPs on the left/high side of the hierarchy (i.e. first, Subject; second, Direct Object; etc.) have more instances of relativization, and that frequency and plausibility decrease toward the right.⁵ As predicted by Keenan(1985), while NPs high on the hierarchy are regularly deleted in RCs, the possessor in Korean, which is low on the hierarchy, either has an overt pronominal trace in the RC or

⁵ Fox(1987) correctly, I think, proposes that the NP accessibility hierarchy be revised to reflect the absolutive hypothesis rather than subject primacy, i.e. both subject (intransitive subject) and patient (object) be placed as the left-most elements and agent (transitive subject) as the next element in the hierarchy.

is not relativized. When the possessive relationship is especially obvious, however, the regular deletion strategy is used.

In the case of (non-standard) English, the pronoun retention strategy is also used in addition to the usual relative pronoun strategy for those low on the hierarchy. Thus, a pronoun is left in the original position in the following example from Comrie(1981:133): *this is the road which I don't know where it leads*. He(1981:156) describes this pronoun retention strategy as marginal in English, and it is used 'for one of the least accessible positions, namely subject of a subordinate clause with an overt conjunction'.

2.7. No Distinction between Restrictive and Nonrestrictive

Most literature dealing with RCs, especially English RCs, mentions restrictive versus nonrestrictive (or appositive) relatives, i.e. those RCs providing identifying and restricting information versus those giving additional information. The nonrestrictives are said to be marked off by commas and pause (Comrie 1981, Keenan 1985, Quirk, et al. 1972).

The following examples from Cinderella illustrate restrictive and non-restrictive RCs respectively, although orthographically there is no comma in (14).⁶

(13) C55 any lady in the land [who could fit the slipper upon her foot]

(14) C60 the lovely Princess [who was to be the Prince's bride]

Another pair of examples comes from a paragraph of the "Hans" text:

(15) H26 It seemed to Hans as if all eyes were fixed on him when, in an agony of fear, he timidly placed the red apple on the plate.

H27 He held his breath, but no one spoke, and *the man who took the apple* did not frown.

H28 He allowed it to remain on the plate with the silver coins.

H29 Slowly he walked along the aisle and up the steps to the choir, where he handed the plate to *the priest, who blessed the gifts and then reverently placed them on the altar*.

⁶ Further discourse context is needed to establish the status of this example as either restrictive or nonrestrictive. From the context, it is clear that there is only one lovely princess and that the RC provides additional, not restrictive, information. Perhaps the capitalization used for the characters (Princess and Prince) also helps to determine the RC as nonrestrictive.

In the passage, *who took the apple* is a restrictive RC, and *who blessed the gifts and then reverently placed them on the altar* is clearly a nonrestrictive RC (with two clauses in coordination embedded in it), which reports sequential time line events.

In Korean, the distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive RCs is made neither in syntax nor in phonology.⁷ The distinction is possible only on semantic grounds, as in a nonrestrictive RC with a proper noun head, which cannot be further restricted by an RC.

RESTRICTIVE:

- (16) SC47 [na-lul kuhä-ju-n] sunim
I-OP save-give-pM monk
'the monk who saved me'
- (17) SC87 [nala an-e sa-nun] motun sokyong-tul
country inside-at live-prM all blindman-Plural
'all the blind men who live in the country'

NONRESTRICTIVE:

- (18) SC84 [mul-e ttwiotul-öt-tön] Sim Jhong-i
water-at jump.into-Past-rM Shim Chung-Voc
'Shim Chung, who had jumped into the water'
- (19) SC86 [hyosong-i jikuk.ha-n] Sim Jhong-i
filial.piety-SP be.abundant-prM Shim Chung-Voc
'Shim Chung, who is filled with filial piety'

Yang(1972:226) limits his discussion of Korean relativization only to restrictive RCs and claims that nonrestrictive is not used as a type of relativization but as a type of conjunction in Korean, citing the following example:

- (20) nä-ka jinkong-sojeki-lul sa-n-nunte
I-SP vacuum-cleaner-OP buy-Past-and
ka jinkong-sojeki-ka kojang.na-t-ta.
the vacuum-cleaner-SP be.out.of.order-Past-Decl
'I bought a vacuum cleaner, and the vacuum cleaner is out of order.'

⁷ Japanese relative clauses share this characteristic with Korean RCs, together with some other characteristics like prenominal position of the RC and the deletion strategy (cf. Kuno 1973 and McCawley 1972). However, unlike Korean, Japanese RCs do not have nonfinite verbs with modifying endings.

For the sentence 'I bought a vacuum cleaner, which is (now) out of order', Korean would use two clauses in a coordinate sentence structure as given in (20). In fact, it is also possible in Korean not to repeat the noun phrase 'the vacuum cleaner' in the second clause ('I bought a vacuum cleaner and (\emptyset =it) is out of order'), since the subject of the second clause is readily deducible from the first clause object. If we were to use the English-type RC, a different sentence results: 'I bought a vacuum cleaner that was out of order'. Since what is in the RC needs to precede the head noun in Korean, the order of events is reversed: being "out of order" before being purchased.

In the same way, the nonrestrictive RC in (15) may not be translated as an RC in Korean. The sentence may best be translated as two coordinate sentences: 'Slowly he walked along the aisle and up the steps to the choir and handed the plate to the priest. Then the priest blessed the gifts and reverently placed them on the altar.' If we were to translate the sentence literally with the RC structure, the order of events is reversed, resulting in a nonsensical sentence.

Thus, I agree with Yang in saying that many nonrestrictive RCs in English would best be expressed in Korean by a compound sentence structure rather than a complex clause structure (where one clause is embedded). However, Korean texts also provide many examples of RC-like modifying clauses that are nonrestrictive semantically by giving additional, rather than further restricting, information.

I propose that we define a relative clause in Korean formally as all structures with [Clause+Modifying Ending] that precede the Head Noun when the head noun is coreferential with a deleted noun in the modifying clause. Complement clauses differ from RCs basically by not having a deleted coreferential noun in modifying clauses.⁸ This formal definition of

⁸ According to this definition, complement clauses would include those problematic RCs Tagashira(1972:224-5) discussed, e.g.

[sikmo-ka mun-ul tat-nun] soli
 servant-SP gate-OP close-prM sound
 'the sound of servants closing the gate'

He (p.225) describes his dilemma in this way: 'we cannot simply say that these are special relative clause constructions and therefore do not have to have the NP's corresponding to head nouns. Neither can we say that they are not relative

the RC would effectively abolish the distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses, and add attributive adjectives to the class of RCs in Korean (see Sec. 2.8 below).

Even in English, I am not sure that the distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive RCs is always maintained. The sheer confusion of whether to use *that* or *which* perhaps illustrates the fact that the distinction may be disappearing. Furthermore, there are examples in texts whose function (restrictive or nonrestrictive) is vague.

(21) P36 the house of straw [which the first little pig had built]

In the context there is no other house of straw but the one built by the first little pig, yet the RC is not set off with a comma. Is this a restrictive or a nonrestrictive RC? It seems more likely that it provides cohesion, the connective tissue, on the discourse level rather than further identifying or delimiting information about the house. The relative clause refers to the earlier event of housebuilding by the first little pig and in a way foreshadows the upcoming conflict.

In the example (14) cited above, *the lovely Princess who was to be the Prince's bride*, also occurs without a comma, and the RC functions as a cohesive device foreshadowing a future event.

2.8. Attributive Adjectives

Most Korean adjectives are inflected predicates;⁹ they do not need a copula to be predicates as in English (Bolinger 1967). Adjectives in most

clause constructions because the head noun does not correspond to any NP in the preceding clause: this is totally circular. Unless we find some independent evidence which distinguishes these phrases, we must try to find an analysis which accounts for both constructions.'

Regarding similar clauses in Japanese, Kitagawa(1982:201-2) refers to them as "additive" clauses:

[meizin-ga ryoori-si-ta] azi
 expert-nom cooking-do-past flavor
 'flavor [that results when] an expert cooked'

As 'the complement contains no item that may be linked to the head,' Kitagawa distinguishes them from relative clauses. I agree with him and consider these clauses to be a type of complement clause.

⁹ The copula *i*, which is used in equative clauses to link a set and its member, behaves like an adjective syntactically.

languages are distinguished from verbs (or nouns) first of all on semantic grounds. As Dixon(1977) discusses, they express dimension (big, little), physical property (hard, hot), color (black, red), human propensity (kind, clever), age (young, old), value (good, proper), and speed (fast, slow). In addition, adjectives can be used in comparative constructions while verbs cannot.

There are additional syntactic characteristics in Korean that separate adjectives from verbs: (1) Adjectives do not take the $-(nu)n$ suffix (which is commonly referred to as the present tense marker for verbs—in contrast to zero for adjectives—or the activitive mode marker) in the declarative sentence of plain or familiar speech style, e.g. *ka-n-ta* 'go-Present/Activ-Decl', but *yeppu-ta* 'be pretty-Decl' not **yeppu-n-ta*.¹⁰ (2) Adjectives take different modifying endings than verbs for present and past tenses as mentioned in Sec. 2.5. An identical suffix $-(u)n$ represents past for verbs but present for adjectives; $-nun$ is used for present for verbs only; for the past tense of adjectives the retrospective ending $-t\phi n$ is used with the added meaning of retrospection (Sohn 1974).¹¹

Korean adjectives are like verbs in predicate function, i.e. an adjective stem like *yeppu* is equivalent to 'be pretty' in English. When they are used in attributive function, therefore, these adjectival predicates take modifying endings just as verbs do in that position: *yeppu-n sony\phi* (be.pretty-prM girl) 'pretty girl'. This observation leads me to say that adjectives, when they modify a following noun, are relative clauses in Korean, just as verbs are. That is, both verbs and adjectives (and copula)

¹⁰ There are some stems that can be either verb or adjective depending on the context. For example, *khu* means either the verb 'to grow' or the adjective 'be big': *khu-n-ta* 'grow-Activ-Decl' and *khu-ta* 'be big-Decl'.

¹¹ For example, for the verb *ka* 'go', the suffix $-n$ marks past tense modifying ending:

<i>ka-n</i> salam	<i>ka-nun</i> salam
go-pM person	go-prM person
'the person who went'	'the person who is going'

But the adjective *yeppu* 'be pretty' takes the same $-n$ suffix for the present tense, while $-t\phi n$ marks past:

<i>yeppu-n</i>	<i>y\phi nkkot</i>	<i>yeppu-t\phi n</i>	<i>y\phi nkkot</i>
be.pretty-prM	lotus	be.pretty-rM	lotus
'lotus which is pretty'		'lotus which was pretty (I recall)'	

are relativized when they modify following head nouns.

There is a small set of adjectives that is used only in the attributive, modifying function, such as *sä* 'new', *hol* 'lone', *on* 'whole', and *motun* 'all'. Since these adjectives do not have corresponding predicate forms, they may not be called relative clauses, which by definition have modifying endings of the predicate.

This view of adjectives as RCs (most adjectives in Korean) may not be so farfetched even though very different from the English case. In fact, Comrie(1981:136) asserts that his 'functional (semantic, cognitive) definition' of RCs as restricting clauses includes attributive adjectives as well, but excludes nonrestrictive clauses from the category of prototypical RCs.

2.9. Summary

The following are the similarities in structure between English and Korean RCs: (1) External or headed relatives; (2) May embed one or more conjoined clauses (e.g. *the man [who arrived here last night and showed us his new invention]*); (3) May modify an NP in the main or subordinate clause (e.g. *I saw the man [who arrived here last night and showed us his new invention]*, or *When I saw the man [who arrived here last night], I recognized him immediately*); (4) As part of the definition of the RC, semantically there is a noun in the RC which is coreferential with the head noun.

The contrastive characteristics are given in following table.

English Relative Clause	Korean Relative Clause
1. Postnominal	1. Prenominal
2. Relative pronoun or relativizer in RC initial position	2. Deletion of coreferential noun
3. Preposition is left with relative pronoun	3. Postposition is deleted along with coreferential noun
4. Finite form of verb in RC; less nominalization	4. Nonfinite form of verb in RC with modifying ending; more nominalization
5. Positional contrast with adjective, which is prenominal	5. Adjective in attributive function is an RC
6. Distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive	6. No syntactic or phonological distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive

- | | |
|--|--|
| 7. Clearer distinction from complement clause; head noun is not required in CC | 7. Similar to complement clause; both RC and CC have modifying endings, followed by head nouns |
| 8. Possessor and Object of Comparison may be relativized | 8. Possessor may be relativized with some constraints; Object of Comparison may not |

3. Functions of the Relative Clause in Narrative Discourse

In Section 2 we discussed the internal structure of the relative clause itself, largely concentrating on its syntactic characteristics. In this section we will see how RCs are used in narrative texts. What kind of functions do they have on the level of discourse, especially in narrative discourse? For an adequate description and explanation of language, it is not enough to describe how a given structure is formed; we have to show how it is used in relation to other structures in discourse.

A case in point is the function of the RC in English narrative to introduce participants¹² as in:

(22) P1 there was a mother pig [who had three little pigs]

(23) C1 there was a little girl [who lived alone with her father]

Each example occurs in the very first sentence of an English story, introducing not only the participant in the existential clause but other participant(s) as well in the RC.

In the Korean texts under study, no example of this kind is found. There are plenty of RCs identifying and describing participants in the head noun position, but no RC introducing participants related to the participant expressed as the head noun. It is perfectly grammatical in terms of the internal structure of the RC to have a sentence like

(24) [säkki twäji se mali-lul kaji-n]
 baby pig three Counter-OP have-prM
 ømma twäji-ka iss-øss-umnita.
 mommy pig-SP exist-Past-foDecl

¹² Fox(1987:862) similarly observes that relative clauses 'situate a referent in the on-going discourse': '(a) The relative clause provides a stative description of some aspects of the referent that situates it, and justifies its introduction. (b) The relative clause provides a link via a referent that has already been introduced into the discourse.'

‘There was a mother pig who had three little pigs.’

However, Korean narrative seems to prefer a sentence with a coordinate NP to introduce participants who are related, as found in one of the six texts:

- (25) SM₁ hol ømøni-wa atəl ttal iløkhe se
 lone mother-and son daughter like.this three
 sikku-ka sal-ko, iss-øss-umnita.
 family.member-SP live-Prog-Past-foDecl
 ‘There lived a family of three, a widowed mother, a son, and
 a daughter.’

The first sentence of “The Three Little Pigs” would find a corresponding structure in Korean as follows:

- (26) ømma twäji-wa säkki twäji se mali-ka
 mommy pig-and baby pig three Counter-SP
 sal-ko, iss-øss-umnita.
 live-Prog-Past-foDecl
 ‘There lived a mother pig and three little pigs.’

The structure with a coordinate NP rather than an RC is more natural in Korean for the introduction of the mother pig first, i.e. before the little pigs. In both languages the mother pig is introduced first and the little pigs next as in relation to their mother. If the RC structure were to be used in Korean, due to the characteristic of RCs being in prenominal position, this natural flow of information would not be maintained. Thus, the introduction of participants by way of the RC is not used in Korean (so far as the six sample texts are concerned).

A similar distinction is found in comparing the introduction of the Cinderella story to that of the Korean story Shim Chung. Here again, in Korean the use of an RC is avoided when introducing the father; rather, a separate sentence is used as shown below:

- (27) SC₁ ...[hyosøng, sulø-n] sonyø Sim Jhøng-i-ka
 be, dutiful-prM girl Shim Chung-Voc-SP
 sal-ko, iss-øss-umnita.
 live-Prog-Past-foDecl
 ‘There lived a dutiful girl, Shim Chung.’

- SC2 Hol apøji son-esø...
 lone father hand-at
 'In the hands of (her) widowed father...'
- SC3 Sim Jhøng-i-uy ømøni-nan...
 Shim Chung-Voc-Poss mother-TP
 'Shim Chung's mother...'

In contrast, there is a heavy use of RCs in the first three sentences of the English text *Cinderella*.

- (28) C1 Once upon a time there was a little girl [who lived alone with her father].
- C2 Her own kind mother was dead, and her father, [who loved her very dearly], was afraid his beloved child was sometimes lonely.
- C3 So he married a grand lady [[who had two daughters of her own], and [who, he thought, would be kind and good to his little one]].

After that, only five more RCs occur in the rest of the text, which has a total of 64 sentences.

Similarly, no RC is found in the Korean texts to introduce a new prop, as is found in English: *a man [who was carrying some straw]* (P8). In this case, however, it is quite acceptable to have such an RC in the Korean version of the same story. This would have the effect of introducing the straw before the man in the linear presentation of the text, yet this is acceptable, I think, due to the prominence of the straw over the man in the plot structure of the story; i.e. the man is there only to bring the straw for the first little pig's housebuilding. There are NPs in the Korean texts with props as head nouns and RCs providing some descriptions for them: e.g. 'a pretty lotus flower' (SC83), 'high belfry' (GM31, 40), and 'deep trap' (UT2). The trap is referred to four times with adjectives in an RC form in the text. This is an important prop, as it is what the tiger has fallen into.

If it is the case in Korean narrative that the RC does not introduce additional participants related to the head noun participant as English does, what are the functions of the Korean RC? The following functions are observed and are discussed below: (1) background information about participants and props, (2) abstract theme or teaching of the story, (3) cohesion

in discourse, and (4) minor or displaced events. Also we need to see if any of these functions are shared by the English RC in narrative texts. In the discussion of the functions of RCs in both English and Korean, we do not include the head noun as part of the information in the RC, since the head noun is already a part of the embedding clause. An RC is called for (in any language) because of the information it contains, not because of the head, even though it is the information about the head.

3.1. Background Information about Participants and Props

All relative clauses with adjectives describe characteristics of the head noun, which is often a participant or prop.

- (29) SC2 [øli-n] Jhøng-i
 be, young-prM Chung-Voc
 ‘Chung, who is little’
- (30) SC3 [maum jhak, ha-ko øyøppu-n] pun
 mind be, good-and be, pretty-prM person
 ‘a person who is good and pretty’

There are RCs with verbs that function to describe and identify participants and props.

- (31) SC19 [ap mot-po-nun] pun
 front unable-see-prM person
 ‘the person who cannot see (i.e. a blind person)’
- (32) SC47 [na-lul kuhä-ju-n] sunim
 I-OP save-give-pM monk
 ‘the monk who saved me’
- (33) SC85 [yongkung-esø ponä-o-n] [alumtau-n] jhønyø
 sea, palace-from send-come-pM be.beautiful-prM girl
 ‘a beautiful girl who was sent from the sea palace’

In English texts we find several examples of RCs in this function: *the man [who took the apple]* (H27, Example (15)) and *the man [who was carrying some straw]* (P8). Sometimes the information in the RC may be more crucial than the one given as the head noun itself, as the following examples from Cinderella illustrate: *a velvet cushion, [upon which rested a little glass slipper]* (C55) and *any lady in the land [who could fit the*

slipper upon her foot] (C56, Example (13)).

This is the most basic and general function of the RC both in Korean and English; that is, as a clause modifying a noun (which is a participant or prop in most cases), the RC provides background information about the noun. In this broad sense, other functions discussed below (such as “theme marking” and cohesion) may be considered subtypes of this category. I have chosen to group them separately, however, since they are more specific to either theme marking or cohesion than to participant identification. Certainly, a given RC may have overlapping functions. Example (32), for instance, identifies the monk, expresses the theme of gratitude or indebtedness, and provides cohesion in discourse by referring back to an earlier event.

3.2. Abstract Theme or Teaching of the Story

Relative clauses in Korean narrative often express the abstract theme or point of a story explicitly. This function of the RC is very prominent in Korean narrative. In the story of Shim Chung, she is modified three times by an RC expressing her devotion to her father in Sentences 1, 62, and 86. Sentences 1 and 86 are illustrated above as Examples (27) and (19). In all three cases she is described as dutiful and filled with devotion to her father. There is another RC early in the text (S5 out of 93 sentences) expressing the theme or point of the story that one should be devoted to one’s parents. The following NP with an RC occurs in the sentence, which says: ‘As Shim Chung grew up, (she) was filled with devotion to (her) father, and she supported him, working at the Minister (of State) Chang’s house’.

- (34) SC5 [apøji-lul wiha-nun] hyosøng
 father-OP be, for-prM filial, piety
 ‘devotion to (her) father’

The RC in Sentence 84 (‘Shim Chung, who jumped into the water’) also reinforces this theme in that she jumped into the sea as an ultimate expression of her devotion to her father.

In “The Grateful Magpies” the revenge theme is expressed three times in the RC: ‘an enemy who killed my husband’ (GM14), ‘you, who shot

and killed my husband' (GM19), and 'the mindset with which (you) try to avenge (your) husband' (GM20). The main theme of gratitude is also explicitly expressed twice in an RC structure:

- (35) GM43 [jong-ul jhi-nulako mæli-ka kkä-ji-n] kkajhi
 bell-OP ring-to head-SP break-Pass-pM magpie
 'the magpie whose head broke in ringing the bell'
- GM44 [unhe-lul kapki-wihäsø [kwijung.ha-n] moksum-kkaji
 debt-OP repay-to be.precious-prM life-even
 pæli-n] ømma appa kkajhi
 cast.away-pM mommy daddy magpie
 'mommy and daddy magpies, who sacrificed even their
 precious lives to return (their) favor'

I believe that this overt statement of the theme of gratitude in the RC would in fact turn out to be the most abstract summary of the story, or the macrostructure of the highest level of abstraction (van Dijk 1980). In fact, in a summary experiment (Hwang 1984) the following information reported in an RC in "The Beauty and the Monk" had a high rate of inclusion in summaries by the Korean subjects.

- (36) BM24 [jaki-uy sängmyøng-ul kuhä-ju-si-n] sunim
 self-Poss life-OP save-give-Honor-pM monk
 'the monk who saved (her) life'

This is the only occurrence of the theme overtly expressed in the text, despite its being grammatically subordinated on the RC level.

"The Ungrateful Tiger" also has two RCs relating to the theme: UT14 'the person who saved you' and 'an animal who does not know gratitude.'

Three of the four texts with strong didactic themes have titles reflecting those themes, which are very important in the culture: "The dutiful girl Shim Chung," "The magpies who repay gratitude," and "The tiger who does not know gratitude." The last two stories have RCs right in their titles.

The two other texts do not have didactic themes: the story of a clever hat seller who uses monkeys' imitative behavior to retrieve his hats, and the story of a brother and a sister who become the sun and the moon. These stories do not state themes explicitly, but the monkey's imitative behavior is reported in an RC in the first story, and the second story has

the RC in the title summarizing the theme.

Keith Beavon(1985 & n.d.) reports that the primary function of the RC in Koozime (a Bantu language spoken in southeast Cameroon) narrative is marking themes.¹³ While he notes that the RCs having this function occur mostly in the setting of a discourse or sometimes in the inciting moment of the story, I do not find this to be the case in Korean. The RCs marking the theme occur scattered throughout the story: at stage setting, prepeak episode (inciting moment), peak (climax), and in closure. For example, in "The Beauty and the Monk" the RC marking the theme occurs at peak, right before the closure; in "The Story of Shim Chung," two theme-marking RCs occur at stage setting and several more scattered elsewhere; in "The Grateful Magpies," one occurs near the end of the story.

I do not know how prevalent this theme-marking function of the RC is in other languages, but it seems significant in both Korean and Koozime. The three English stories do not have an explicit theme or teaching to provide a comparison on this point. If "The Three Little Pigs" is about the cleverness of the third little pig, he is referred to as such three times in the story by means of an adjective. In each case, 'cleverness' is asserted by occurring in the predicate rather than as a modifier of the subject.

(37) P63 "This is a clever little pig."

P68 But the third little pig was a clever little pig.

P123 The third little pig was too clever for him.

The first two occurrences of 'clever' as a modifying adjective would be equivalent to Korean RCs with adjectives.

Notice also that I used RCs to describe the Korean stories in English above, e.g. 'a clever hat seller who uses monkeys' imitative behavior to retrieve his hats' and 'a brother and a sister who become the sun and the moon.' These observations suggest that RCs in English may be used to express the main theme or thrust of the narrative as well, but we do not have in our three texts under study a clear example of a didactic, teaching

¹³ Other functions of the relative clause in Koozime are: introducing participants and major props, referring to major props, and marking peak (Beavon n.d.).

theme expressed in an RC.

3.3. Cohesion in Discourse

Relative clauses provide cohesion in Korean and English narratives by (1) referring back to a participant/prop or to an earlier event, (2) summarizing an earlier event, and (3) foreshadowing what is to come.

3.3.1. Backreferencing

There are many examples of the RC in this function: Examples (1) and (3) above illustrate this function. The RC in ‘the object that he pulled out of the throat’ (BM11) refers to the earlier event reported in BM9. ‘Sleeping’ in HS7 refers to the event of the hat seller falling asleep given in HS4. The last sentence (HS18) of “The Hat Seller” has as its subject ‘the monkeys, who were watching from the tree top,’ whose RC refers back to HS7. The RCs from “The Hat Seller” illustrate that the same RC, in addition to backreferencing, may also have a function of setting up conditions which are important for a subsequent event.

While the above examples of the RC refer to some incident mentioned not in the immediately preceding sentence but in some earlier part of the text, there are several examples of RCs referring back to the information given in the immediately preceding sentence. Sentences 7 and 8 in “The Story of Shim Chung” illustrate this:

(38) SC7 ‘Shim Chung’s father Shim Bongsa was waiting for (his) daughter to come back.’

SC8 ‘Shim Bongsa, who was tired of waiting, went outside...’

An example from English follows: *the house of straw which the first little pig had built* (P36, Example (21)).

3.3.2. Summarizing Earlier Events

Examples (32) and (33), which provide background information about participants, also illustrate this function: ‘the monk who saved me’ (SC47) summarizes the earlier event, as well as identifying the monk and marking one of the themes of the story. The RC in ‘a beautiful girl who was sent from the sea palace’ (SC85) also reports an earlier event in summary form.

The same is true of BM24 ('the monk who saved (her) life'), which is given above as Example (36).

An example from Cinderella illustrates this summarizing function of the RC in English: *the beautiful and graceful lady [to whom the Prince paid so much attention]* (C45), which summarizes the evening's main event.

3.3.3. Foreshadowing Future Events

I do not find any clear example of foreshadowing, but there are several RCs that are suggestive of this function. There are some from "The Grateful Magpies," such as 'the rope to pull (the bell)' (GM29), 'the way to ring the bell' (GM30), 'readiness to die (be ready to die)' (GM33), 'the mindset with which you try to avenge (your) husband' (GM20), 'the food to serve' (GM11), all of which are NPs with some form of RC in Korean. They would have had the cohesive function of foreshadowing, if they actually turned out to be future events. However, in this particular story, none of these actually occurred as part of the text.

In the English text of Cinderella there is an RC with this function: *the lovely Princess who was to be the Prince's bride* (C60, Example (14)). In this case the information in the RC actually turns out to be true.

3.4. Minor or Displaced Events

There are cases of RCs which encode events, most of which are either minor and incidental or displaced in time (even if crucial to the plot structure). An example of the former occurs in GM42: 'the young man, who was thinking like this and looking at the ground.' This is an example of an RC with an embedded sentence structure: the first clause has the cohesive function of linking this sentence to the thought content of the previous sentence, and the second clause reports a new piece of information, the young man's action of looking at the ground. This action, however, is incidental and minor but enables a subsequent event, i.e. leads to his discovery of what has happened, the discovery that the magpies have sacrificed themselves to repay their gratitude.

The second type, a crucial event but displaced in temporal sequence in the narrative, occurs in the next sentence of the same text: 'the two magpies whose heads were broken in order to ring the bell' (GM43). The

event occurred before, but the readers are told later as the young man finds it out.

Some RCs report minor events that are script-predictable, i.e. they report new information but the sequence of events is expected. GM12 illustrates this type: 'the room where the woman led (him)'. When someone invites you in to rest overnight, you would expect that person to lead you to a room. This type of RC is not that clearly distinguishable from those with a cohesive function, in that the happenings that are predicted by the given script greatly add to the textual coherence.

The English narrative of Cinderella provides an example of minor events reported in the RC: *a grand ball to which he invited all the lords and ladies in the country* (C7). In the Hans text, as we have already noted (Sec. 2.6), the nonrestrictive RC, *the priest, who blessed the gifts and then reverently placed them on the altar*, carries sequential events. The events in this case are minor and incidental but nonetheless foreground information on the narrative time line although they are grammatically reduced to the level of the RC. This unusual coding of foreground information in an RC rather than in an independent clause seems to be one of the characteristics of the peak, corresponding to the high tension point of the story (Longacre (1985), Hwang (1990)).

4. Concluding Remarks

We have viewed relative clauses in this paper from perspectives of both typological description and functional explanation. The syntactic structure of the Korean RC is compared with that of the English RC, and the functions of the RC in narrative discourse are investigated. By taking into consideration the perspective of explanation as well as that of description, we assume that in studying relative clauses it is not enough to describe the internal structure only, we need to find out why and how they are used in texts.

The structure of the RC in the two languages shows several contrastive characteristics. While English (an SVO language) has a postnominal RC and the relative pronoun strategy, Korean (an SOV language) has a prenominal RC and the deletion (gap) strategy (with a limited pronoun retention strategy, such as possessor). With finite forms of the verb in the

RC, the English RC displays less nominalization than the Korean RC, which requires a nonfinite form of the verb with an obligatory modifying ending followed by the head noun.

In the case of Korean, most adjectives in attributive function (i.e. those not in predicative function) are RCs in their structure and in their position relative to the head noun. English adjectives in attributive function, on the other hand, are distinct from RCs in their structure and occur mostly before the modified noun while RCs follow the noun. Thus, on the surface structure, English adjectives are different from RCs, although both adjectives and RCs describe, identify, and delimit the head noun. Another point of comparison is the distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive RCs in English (although this distinction may be disappearing). In Korean, there is not a formal difference between restrictive and nonrestrictive RCs, but only a semantic distinction between the types of information in the RC: restrictive or identifying information versus additional information.

This study of RCs in narrative discourse shows that the functions of RCs are not identical in English and Korean narratives, especially in the introduction of the participants. Whereas the English RC is frequently utilized at the beginning of a discourse or episode to introduce participants who are related to the one expressed as the head noun, the Korean RC is not. A coordinate NP is used for this purpose in Korean, probably due to the interrelationship between natural information flow in discourse and linear order of the constituents. Another difference is found in encoding didactic material in the RC. While Korean and Kozzime RCs serve this function, no example of an RC of this function is found in the English texts. Further research may prove whether the English RC does serve this type of function or not.

The information found in an RC of either language is primarily not reporting sequential events but providing background information which is descriptive and cohesive. Occasional occurrences of new events in an RC report minor or incidental events or displaced events on the time line.

Grammatical subordination (such as RCs and subordinate clauses) is generally expected to correlate with background information, rather than with foreground information in the narrative. However, this division of information into two types does not necessarily correlate with the "impor-

tance" criterion of information in narrative, but rather with time line events, as shown by Thompson(1987) and Hwang(1990). The information in the RC in Korean narrative is seen to be highly important in terms of the theme of the story. It seems almost as if the theme is stated in grammaticalized nominals, so that the theme statement becomes a character or personality description of the participant.¹⁴

In the case of English, some nonrestrictive RCs may report time line events. The use of an RC, however, functions to shunt those events from being prominent foreground information to only minor, incidental events. Although it is possible to skew the regular coding relationship of foreground information in independent clauses and background information in grammatically subordinated clauses, this type of skewing is generally used to achieve a special effect, such as to mark the peak of the story, which is a zone of turbulence.

References

- Beavon, Keith H. (1985) 'Two Relativization Strategies in Koozime Discourse,' *Journal of West African Languages* 15. 1, 31-56.
- Beavon, Keith H. (n.d.) 'The Relative Clause in Koozime,' Ms.
- Bolinger, Dwight (1967) 'Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication,' *Lingua* 18, 1-34.
- Clancy, Patricia M., Hyeonjin Lee and Myeong-Han Zoh (1986) 'Processing Strategies in the Acquisition of Relative Clauses: Universal Principles and Language-specific Realizations,' *Cognition* 24, 225-262.
- Comrie, Bernard (1981) *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*, Oxford: B. Blackwell.
- Comrie, Bernard and Edward L. Keenan (1979) 'Noun Phrase Accessibility Revisited,' *Language* 55, 649-664.
- van Dijk, Teun A. (1980) *Macrostructures*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

¹⁴ Beavon(n.d.:28) makes a similar observation: 'The relative clause in Koozime is a vehicle for referring to props and participants of a high level of thematicity, especially in discourse constituents (such as Peak) which are inherently prominent. This conclusion should stand as a possible warning that formally dependent structures are not always extraneous to the development of the plot of a narrative.'

- Dixon, R.M.W. (1977) 'Where Have All the Adjectives Gone?,' *Studies in Language* 1, 19-80.
- Downing, Bruce T. (1978) 'Some Universals of Relative Clause Structure,' in J.H. Greenberg, ed., *Universals of Human Language*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, Vol. 4, 375-418.
- Fox, Barbara A. (1987) 'The Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy Reinterpreted,' *Language* 63, 856-870.
- Givón, Talmy (1979) *On Understanding Grammar*, New York: Academic Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson (1980) 'Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse,' *Language* 56, 251-299.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson (1984) 'The Discourse Basis for Lexical Categories in Universal Grammar,' *Language* 60, 703-752.
- Hwang, Shin Ja J. (1984) 'A Cognitive Basis for Discourse Grammar,' *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 7, 133-156.
- Hwang, Shin Ja J. (1987) *Discourse Features of Korean Narration*, Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.
- Hwang, Shin Ja J. (1990) 'Foreground Information in Narrative,' *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 9.2, 63-90.
- Keenan, Edward L. (1985) 'Relative Clauses,' in T. Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Cambridge: University Press, Vol. 2, 141-170.
- Keenan, Edward L. and Bernard Comrie (1977) 'Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar,' *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 63-99.
- Kitagawa, Chisato (1982) 'Topic Constructions in Japanese,' *Lingua* 57, 175-214.
- Kuno, Susumu (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Labov, William (1972) *Language in the Inner City*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lehmann, Christian (1986) 'On the typology of relative clauses,' *Linguistics* 24, 663-680.
- Longacre, Robert E. (1983) 'Discourse Analysis and Dejangonized Tagmemics,' Ms.
- Longacre, Robert E. (1985) 'Discourse Peak as Zone of Turbulence,' in

- J.R. Wirth, ed., *Beyond the Sentence*, Ann Arbor: Karoma, 81-98.
- Longacre, Robert E. (1989) 'Two Hypotheses Regarding Text Generation and Analysis,' *Discourse Processes* 12, 413-460.
- Lukoff, Fred (1945~47) *Spoken Korean*, 2 Vols, New York: Holt.
- Mallinson, Graham and Barry J. Blake (1981) *Language Typology*, Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- McCawley, James D. (1972) 'Japanese Relative Clauses,' in P.M. Peranteau, et al., eds., *The Chicago which Hunt*, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 205-214.
- Maxwell, Daniel N. (1979) 'Strategies of Relativization and NP Accessibility,' *Language* 55, 352-371.
- Nichols, Johanna (1984) 'Another Typology of Relatives,' *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 10, 524-541.
- Park, Byung-Soo (1974) 'Hankukø myøngsa pomun kujo-uy punsøk (Analysis of the Korean NP Complementation)', *Munpøp Yønku (Grammar Studies)* 1, 151-185, Seoul: Thap.
- Prideaux, Gary D. (1982) 'The Processing of Japanese Relative Clauses,' *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 27, 23-30.
- Prideaux, Gary D. (1985). 'Positional Tendencies of English Relative Clauses as Evidence for Processing Strategies,' in A. Makkai and A.K. Melby, eds., *Linguistics and Philosophy*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 305-314.
- Prideaux, Gary D. and William J. Baker (1986) *Strategies and Structures: The Processing of Relative Clauses*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1972) *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, London: Longman.
- Rosenbaum, Harbey and Kong-on Kim (1976) 'Factors Affecting Comprehension in Korean and English Self Embedded Structures,' *Working Papers on Language Universals* (Stanford University) 20, 43-57.
- Salleh, Ramli Md (1983) 'Korean Relativization' *Language Research* 19, 113-117.
- Sohn, Ho-min (1974) 'Retrospection in Korean,' *Language Research* 11, 87-103.
- Tagashira, Yoshiko (1972) 'Relative Clauses in Korean,' in P.M. Peranteau, et al., eds., *The Chicago which Hunt*, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic

Society, 215-229.

Thompson, Sandra A. (1987) "'Subordination' and Narrative Event Structure,' in Russell S. Tomlin, ed., *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 435-454.

Tomlin, Russell S. (1985) 'Foreground-background Information and the Syntax of Subordination,' *Text* 5, 85-122.

Tomlin, Russell S., ed. (1987) *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Yang, In-Seok (1972) *Korean Syntax*, Seoul: Paek Hap Sa.

SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS

7500 W. Camp Wisdom Rd.

Dallas, Tx. 75236

U.S.A