

ARTICLES

STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC LIMITS OF COORDINATION IN KOREAN

Ladislav DROZDÍK

Institute of Oriental Studies, Slovak Academy of Sciences,
Klemensova 19, 813 64 Bratislava, Slovakia

It is widely known that the rigid two-term system of clause classes, coordinate and subordinate, though in many respects of fundamental importance, does not provide a reliable basis for examining all aspects of clause clustering in multi-clause (compound or complex) sentences and prevents the formulation of cross-linguistically valid statements in this syntactic domain. Notably, it fails to answer the cardinal question of what exactly belongs to any of these two classes with exclusion of the other. This failure is seemingly due to the lack of unambiguous formal criteria that would be able to account for the semantic (functional) side of this basic bipartition. The paper aims at drawing attention to some of the most outstanding problems obscuring the coordinate-subordinate distinction and to point out structural and semantic limits of what might be classified as sentential and phrasal coordination in Korean.

1. The variety of ways the clauses cluster into hierarchically higher units, sentences, calls for concepts and criteria general enough for a cross-linguistic analysis. The syntactic relationship examined in this inquiry, currently classified as coordination, is certainly one of those that might illustrate major structural and conceptual problems derived from various types of asymmetry between the semantic (functional) side of multi-clause sentences, and their structural representation. Let us consider the following examples:

English:

You drink another can of beer and I'm leaving (= If you drink another can of beer, I'm leaving (Culicover & Jackendoff 1997)).

Much the same semantic reinterpretation of coordination may result from an imperative-declarative clausal complex:

Make one little remark and they jump all over you (= If you make . . .), or from a declarative-interrogative complex:

I don't even have shoes to wear and do you hear me complain? (= Though I don't even have shoes to wear, you don't hear me complain), etc (modified from Language Log, March 12, 2004.htm).

Korean:

Nami-nun milkhu-lul masi-ko(se) hakkyo-ey ka-ss-ta

Nami-TOP milk-ACC drink-and school-to go-PST-DEC

'Nami drank milk and went to school'.

The first conjunct is tentatively classified as a temporally featured adverbial clause possibly signalling temporal sequence or simultaneity (Ho-min Sohn 1994: 70-1). In a subsequent treatment of 'and'-coordination, however, the conjunctive suffixes *-ko(se)* and *-e(se)* 'and, and then', indicating temporal sequences, are presented as displaying a borderline function between subordination and coordination (ibid. 119). Apart from the latter application, the conjunctive *-e(se)* may further be used to signal causality, as in *ilehkey nuc-ese mianha-pnita* 'I am sorry to be so late' (ibid. 74).

The lexical connective of the English example *and* contrasts with the affixal connective *-ko(se)* used in the Korean example. Affixal connectives in Korean highly outnumber lexical ones in all types of multi-clause¹ sentences and the present analysis will primarily be concerned with them. Interclausal relationships signalled by lexical connectives will mostly be used to provide contrastive background to constructions supported by affixal strategies and to round up the overall classificatory picture.

2. The Korean multi-clause sentence quoted in the previous paragraph may be interpreted in two different ways: as a sentence with two conceptually autonomous clauses, classifiable as sentences (hence 'compound sentence'), though the structural qualification for the sentence status does not cover all constituents involved:

- a) 'Nami drank milk and (Nami) went to school', both clauses convey the idea of co-occurrence of two autonomous events with no temporary or any other conceptual dependence between them:
- b) 'Nami drank milk and then went to school'/'Having drunk milk, Nami went to school'/'After drinking milk, Nami went to school', and similar paraphrases. The idea of temporal sequence results from anteriority, interpretationally at-

¹ The terminological distinction between *compound* sentences (consisting of two or more independent clauses) and *complex* sentences (including at least one dependent clause) is sometimes rejected in favour of a unified reference: Payne's treatment of coordination under the general heading of 'complex phrases and complex sentences' (in: Shopen, ed. 1985: 3-41), likewise Longacre's 'complex sentences' (ibid. 235-286 /237/). To simplify the reference, a similar terminological reduction has been adopted also in this paper: both fundamental types of multi-clause sentences will simply be referred to as functionally neutral 'multi-clause' or 'complex' sentences.

The interpretational liberality of typically coordinate constructions will be illustrated on multi-clause sentences with clauses connected by the affixal coordinator *-ko*. The basic idea of contiguity and coextensiveness of events will alternate with that of temporal sequence or be substituted by it. The two cases will shortly be labelled as *coextensive*, for the former case, and *sequential*, for the latter. The labelling (Keedong Lee 1993) reflects native speaker's feeling about the messages reported:

or:

or:

or:

2 The past tense marker (PST) *-ass* in *nol*- 'play': *nol-ass-ta* '(we) played', is a simplified glossing adopted for more economy; the affixal complex *-ass* should properly be presented as *-a-*, stem-forming suffix (henceforth glossed as SF) and *-ss-*, past tense marker (henceforward PST); SF is attached to the root, represented by the verbal basis *nol*, hence *nol-a* (*Konverbalform*-formative, Lewin-Kim 1974: 48 f; *concatenating ending* /type i/, Hansol H.B. Lee 1989: 111; some of the terms proposed are utterly misleading and inappropriate, e.g. Kang's *infinitive suffix*, apparently motivated by the non-finite nature of the verbal stem *nol-a*, *mek-e*, etc. in contrast to the finite verb *nol-ta*, *nol-a-ss-ta*; *mek-ta*, *mek-e-ss-ta* (1997: 6)); the SF (*-a-*, *-e*), used to form past tense and compound verbs, combines with the past tense marker (PST) *-ss-* and the affixal complex *-ass-/ess-* ends in the combined sentence mood/speech level marker, here *-ta* (declarative sentence mood/high formal level); the latter, as a closing morpheme in a SOV language like Korean, operates as a sentence ender (SE); unless indispensable for explanatory purposes, the SF-PST affixal complex, will be presented as an unsegmented whole; neither the etymological background of the SF will be taken into account, as in *ka* 'to go' – **ka-a-ss-ta* > *ka-ss-ta* '(he) went', or *ssu-* 'to write; to wear, put on / e.g. hat/' – **ssu-e-ss-ta* > *sse-ss-ta*, etc. The tense marking in non-final *ko*-coordinated clauses is generally presented as optional, some authors, however, seem to disagree with it (for restrictions imposed on the feature of optimality in *ko*-coordination, see the (ii-i)- (ii-ii) distinction in §5 /Keedong Lee 480-1/).

or:

ku-nun moca-lul ssu-ko naka-ss-ta
he-TOP hat-ACC put on-and leave-PST-DEC

'he put on his hat and left (with the hat on)' (coextensive/sequential); this double labelling, however, is incompatible with the author's analysis of a number of semantically similar examples (cf., Keedong Lee's distinction between (ii-i) and (ii-ii) types of multi-clause sentences in § 5 (ii)).

or:

ku-nun moca-lul ssepo-ko naka-ss-ta
try-and

'he tried a hat on and left (without the hat on)' (sequential) (Keedong Lee 1993: 469-471).

As there is no specific formal guide, the interpretation is ultimately determined by the semantic aspects of the lexical units involved and by the evaluation of the respective situational context (or, as Keedong Lee put it, 'by the nature of the verbs and by our knowledge of the world' /ibid. 470/).

2.1. The connective *-ko* is frequently used to link clauses with unequal semantic import that may efface the coordinate structure of *and*-sentences:

koyangi-ka kong-ul kaji-ko nol-ko-iss-ta
kitten-NOM ball-ACC catch-and play PM DEC
(lit. the kitten is catching the ball and playing /with it/) >
'the kitten is playing with the ball' (*Essence: nolta*).

(*-ko-iss-*: affixal simplex signalling continuative or durative aspect, *aktionsart*, possibly glossed as progressive mood (PM))

Some coordinate sequences of the latter type are idiomatized, as in:

nol-ko mek-ta
play-and eat-DEC
lead a lazy life (ibid.) (see also §7: verbal compounds).

3. From a semantic point of view, two basic types of interclausal relationship may be presented in terms of the conceptual equivalence between conjuncts of a multi-clause sentence: (1) multi-clause sentences with conceptually equivalent clauses, classifiable as autonomous sentences (coordination) and (2) those consisting of conceptually non-equivalent clauses, i.e. sentences containing among their constituents at least one dependent clause (subordination). In contrast to coordination, described as 'a structure in which two or more elements are joined in such a way that each of them can possibly be the head of that structure', subordination is presented as 'a structure in which two elements are joined in such a way that one of them is dominated by the other (forms a constituent of the other element)' (Kwon 2004, 1-2). As against both of them, cosubordination (or pseudo-coordination) may be defined as a reinterpretation of the conceptual content of formally coordinate structures in terms of a semantic (functional) dependence or, in Kwon's terms, as 'a syntax/semantics mismatch that show some properties of adjunction and some properties of coordination' (ibid.).

3.1. Coordination is presented here as inclusive of two basic types: (i) conjunction (in short, *and*-coordination) with its adversative subtype when the conjuncts are to be contrasted (*but*-coordination), and (ii) disjunction (*or*-coordination). The cooccurrence of temporal, causal or any other adverbial connotations, typical of subordination, in structurally coordinate structures, will be classified as cosubordination.

Difficulties in defining coordination as distinct from subordination are notorious. Syntactic constructions that appear to be coordinate frequently express semantic relationships involving conceptual dependency. The lack of reliable formal criteria that would allow us to unambiguously distinguish one of these relationships from the other, and the over-all chaotic typological picture, support fully justified assumptions of a *continuum nature* of the coordination-subordination relationship (Croft's coordination/subordination continuum, 1991).

The exclusion of subordination out of scope of the present paper and its restriction to coordination and cosubordination is, of course, an intentional simplification motivated by the goal of the inquiry. As it is primarily centred on structural aspects of coordination and, semantically, on interpretative deviations from true coordinative functions due to the loss of conceptual autonomy of the conjuncts involved, the impact of subordination on coordinative functions was simply reduced to a unique significant point: invalidation of conceptual equivalence (autonomy) in coordinate structures, with no closer semantic or structural specification.

Unless prevented by the semantic content of the lexical units involved, the non-final clause (NFC) of any cosubordinate (pseudo-coordinate) construction may alternatively be interpreted as conjoined (coordinate) or embedded (subordinate).³

3.2. Structurally, two levels of coordination are taken into account (presented in S(O)V symbols); the (O), signalling argument- and/or adjunct-type V-related expansions, is classificatorily irrelevant to the present purpose; the (c) stands for any affixal or lexical connective operating in the semantic space of coordination: conjunctive (*and*-type), adversative (*but*-type), disjunctive (*or*-type):

³ That is why we cannot agree with Kwon's definition of 'associated meanings of *ko*-pseudo-coordination' in terms of *causality* or *concurrence*. The semantic notion of causality is too narrowly set, being only one of the wide range of adverbial values, like temporality, concessiveness, finality etc. that had to be taken into account. Kwon's concurrence, apparently signalling simultaneity, is a regular counterpart of sequentiality that cannot be excluded from the scope of pseudo-coordination, either: *John-i moca-lul ssu-ko hakkyo-ey ka-ss-ta* 'John put on a hat and went to school' may freely be interpreted as either 'concurrent': 'John went to school wearing a hat', i.e. 'when John went to school, he was wearing a hat' (as presented by Kwon 3), or as 'sequential': 'John put on a hat and then went to school' or 'having put on a hat, John went to school', etc. Though *ko*-conjunct is able to mark both temporal connotations, the notion of sequentiality may be less ambiguously expressed by *-kose*: *Johni mocalul ssukose hakkyoey kassta*. Even in this particular case, Kwon's concurrence might be, more specifically, glossed as temporalness or some other tense-related term.

(i) sentential coordination:

SV (c) SV:

kay-nun koyangi-lul ccoch-ko koyangi-nun cwi-lul ccoch-nun⁴-ta
dog-TOP cat-ACC chase-and cat-TOP rat-ACC chase-IND-DEC
'a dog chases a cat and a cat chases a rat' (Ho-min Sohn 129);

or:

inkan-un cwuk-nun-ta kulena sin-un an cwuk-nun-ta
human-TOP die-IND-DEC but God-TOP not die-IND-DEC
'man is mortal, but God is not' (ibid. 121);

(ii) phrasal coordination (only V-related phrases will be found relevant to the matter):

SV (c) V:

Payksel kongcwu-ka sakwa-lul mek-ko cwuk-ess-ta
white-snow princess-NOM apple-ACC eat-and die-PST-DEC
'Princess Snow White ate an apple and died' (Kwon 3);

or:

ku-nun hamonikha-lul pwul-ko nolay-lul pwull-ess-ta
he-TOP harmonica-ACC play-and song-ACC sing-PST-DEC
'he played the harmonica and sang songs' (Keedong Lee 483, modified);

or:

pwusan-ey ka-ss-ta kuliko Minca-wa swuyenghay-ss-tta
(he) Pusan-to go-PST-DEC and Minca-with swim-PST-DEC
'(He) went to Pusan and swam with Minca' (Keedong Lee 118, modified).

4. As might be inferred from the few hitherto quoted examples, the use of semantic criteria does not lead to satisfactory results in the syntactic domain examined. Notably, when applied cross-linguistically as a unique criterion, it does not allow us to create a consistent sentence hierarchy unambiguously distinguishing between both counterparts of the coordinate-subordinate relationship in a considerable number of world languages. The strict structural approach, adopted by Longacre (in Shopen, ed. 1985:235-286), is much more promising in this respect, since it allows us to speak of coordinate sentences involving structurally dependent clauses, which is exactly the case of Korean and many other typologically akin languages.

⁴ The suffix *-nun-*, or what equals it at particular speech levels, is glossed by Ho-min Sohn as IND(icative) to distinguish it from volitive and retrospective sentence mood markers within the declarative sentence type (see also Hansol Lee 98, with respect to the high formal speech level marker of the declarative sentence type *-pnita* > *-p* (high formal style suffix) *-ni* (indicative mood suffix) *-ta* (declarative or propositive mood suffix) alternatively classified as one of the set of sentence enders (SE). The indicative mood marker *-ni-*, contrasts with the volitive *-si-* and retrospective *-ti-*. Nevertheless, the morphemic segmentation of *-nta/-nunta*, *-pnita/-supnita* and relatively numerous other affixal complexes of this functional orientation is of no direct relevance to the subject of the present inquiry.

Cross-linguistically, Longacre divides sentence structures into two types: *co-ranking* and *chaining* structures (ib. 238). Co-ranking structures, typical of Indo-European languages, consist of several verbs of the same rank (independent verbs). At the sentence level, co-ranking structures produce sentences with coordinated independent clauses (in English connected by *and*, *but*, *or* and a few others). A sentence, supported by chaining structures, cannot combine verbs of the same rank: the dominating verb, typically the final verb of the sentence, is structurally more elaborate than any of the preceding verbs of that sentence. The structural contrast between the two types is illustrated by comparing English, as a co-ranking language, with Selepet, a Papua New Guinea language, for the chaining type. A more detailed presentation of the Korean variant of what Longacre terms chaining structure will be given thereafter.

The difference in the structural featuring of the verb in final and non-final position will be obvious from comparing the following simple and complex sentences:

(1) Simple sentence:

Kawa ari-op

Kawa leave-3P singular, remote past tense

'Kawa left';

Kiap ya taka-op

patrol officer that arrive-3P singular, remote past tense

'The patrol officer arrived';

(2) Complex sentence (see note 1):

Kawa ari-mu kiap ya taka-op

'Kawa left and that patrol officer arrived',

where *-mu* (3P singular, subject switch), with the non-final verb, has replaced *-op* as glossed above. As evident, the crucial tense marking is missing in the non-final clause.

Although differing in details, substantially the same structural dependence of coordinate sentence structures may be observed in Korean (as illustrated with *ko*-constructions). Korean, possibly classified as a typically 'chaining' language, in Longacre's terms, does not exclude, however, 'co-ranking' sentence structures supported by a relatively small number of lexical coordinators (see further on). This paper is primarily concerned with Korean 'chaining' structures of what might be classified as sentential and phrasal coordination.

Let us consider the following sentences: (the underlying NFC-FC multi-clause structures are transformed into two independent FC-FC structures):

(with processive verbs)

so-kathi ilha-ko cwi-kathi mek-nun-ta

ox-like work-and mouse-like eat-IND-DEC

'(he) works like an ox and eats like a mouse' (coordination with a possible conjunctive or adversative reading; Korean proverb: way to prosperity) (Lewin-Kim 93).

The multi-clause sentence quoted is made up of two conceptually autonomous clauses (classifiable as sentences) that are nevertheless unequal in their structural featuring: only the final clause (FC), ending in a closing morpheme (in this case *-ta*), currently termed sentence ender (SE), can be structurally qualified as a sentence in contrast to the non-final clause (NFC) where the connective *-ko* is substituted for the SE *-ta*. Structural model of the sentence quoted in symbolic terms: NFC – FC, where NFC stands for conceptual autonomy combined with structural dependence as opposed to FC, symbolizing both conceptual and structural autonomy.

When transformed into two independent sentences, i.e. NFC-FC > FC-FC, the following picture will be obtained:

so-kathi ilha-n-ta (with final *-nta* indicative-declarative affixal complex inclusive of SE)

cwi-kathi mek-nun-ta (with *-nunta*, as above).⁵

(with qualitative verbs):

san-un noph-ko pada-nun kiph-ta

mountain-TOP high-(is)-and sea-TOP deep-(is)-DEC

'the mountain is high and the sea is deep' (Mazur 101);

san-un noph-ta 'the mountain is high'

pada-nun kiph-ta 'the sea is deep'.

5. As is evident from the examples hitherto quoted, Korean multi-clause sentence of whatever functional orientation may appear in two structural types identified in terms of structural equivalence or its lack (illustrated on coordinate structures). Structural equivalence is here understood as a structural identity of two fundamental clause types: final clause (FC), alternatively classifiable as a sentence, ending in a closing morpheme (joint sentence mood and speech level marker) referred to as sentence ender (SE):⁶

(i) multi-clause sentences consisting of structurally equivalent clauses (typically correlated with lexical coordinators (L)):

FC – L – FC:

[*pwusan-ey ka-ss-ta*] *kuliko* [*Minca-wa swuyenghay-ss-ta*]

FC

L

FC

⁵ It should be noted that *-nta/-nunta* (the former being a post-vocalic, the latter a post-consonantal variant) have nothing to do with the NFC > FC reconstruction.

⁶ The closing morpheme status of SE is invalidated in extremely limited instances only, most currently in quotative constructions:

yumyengha-ta-ko 'that /is/ famous' in *ku pyengwen-un yumyengha-ta-ko tul-ess-upni-ta* renowned (is)-DEC-QUOT

'I heard that this hospital is renowned' (modified from Lewin-Kim 1974: 97);

or: *na-nun i-kos-i coh-ta-ko malhay-ss-una cengmal kulen-ci molu-kess-ney*
I-TOP this thing-NOM good (is)-DEC-QUOT say-PST-but in fact like that-whether ignore-DUB-DEC
'I said that this is good, but in fact I do not know whether it is so' (Keedong Lee 501, modified).

pwusan-ey ka-ss-ta kuliko Minca-wa swuyenghay-ss-ta
 (he) Pusan-to go-PST-DEC and Minca-with swim-PST-DEC
 '(He) went to Pusan and swam with Minca' (Keedong Lee 118),

or:

innay-nun ssu-ta kuliko yelmay-nun tal-ta
 patience-TOP bitter-DEC and fruit-TOP sweet-DEC
 'patience (is) bitter but (its) fruit (is) sweet' (Korean proverb).

All constituents of multi-clause sentences (i) are fully qualified for an autonomous sentence status: marked for tense (in marked tenses) and SE. The tense- and SE-sharing makes the type (i) sentences ungrammatical (* NFC unmarked for tense and SE; FC marked for tense and SE).

(ii) Multi-clause sentences consisting of structurally non-equivalent clauses: final clause cooccurs with non-final clause(s) (correlated with affixal coordinators (A)):

NFC – A – FC:

[ku-nun hamonikha-lul pwul-(ess)]-ko [nolay-lul pwull-ess-ta]

NFC

A FC

ku-nun hamonikha-lul pwul-(ess)-ko nolay-lul pwull-ess-ta
 he-TOP harmonica-ACC play-(PST)-and song-ACC sing-PST-DEC

'he played the harmonica and sang songs' (Keedong Lee 483, modified)

Tense-sharing (NFC tensed or tenseless – FC tensed) in *ko*-coordination is optional (with a part of coordinating affixes the tense sharing is admitted, with another part it is prohibited); SE-sharing (NFC unmarked for SE; FC marked for SE) is obligatory.

In *ko*-coordination, despite the current qualification of the tense-sharing in the NFC-FC context as optional, some authors nevertheless argue that there is an interpretational difference between a NFC with its own tense-marker and that with a shared one (Keedong Lee 480-481):

(ii-i) NFC marked by a shared tensor:

wuli-nun moca-lul ssu-ko pakkey naka-ss-ta
 we-TOP hat-ACC put on-and outside go out-PST-DEC
 'we put on a hat and went out (with the hat on)';

or:

ku-nun chayk-ul ilk-ko sephyeng-ul sse-ss-ta
 he-TOP book-ACC read-and review-ACC write-PST-DEC

'he read the book and wrote a review (of it)', i.e. the conceptual dependence is reflected in a temporal sequence 'he read the book and then wrote a review of it', as against:

(ii-ii) NFC marked by its own tensor:

wuli-nun moca-lul sse-ss-ko pakkay naka-ss-ta
 we-TOP hat-ACC put on-PST-and outside go out-PST-DEC
 'we put on a hat and went out';

or:

ku-nun chayk-ul ilk-ess-ko sephyeng-ul sse-ss-ta
he-TOP book-ACC read-PST-and review-ACC write-PST-DEC

'he read a book and wrote a review' (with no conceptual dependence between them; modified from Keedong Lee 480-481).

In terms of this distinction, the (ii-i) variant corresponds to what we classify as cosubordination (pseudo-coordination) in contrast to the (ii-ii) variant, identifiable with coordination.

Pseudo-coordination of the (ii-ii) sentences may be distinguished from true coordination by way of the permutation of conjuncts:

(ii-ii) *ku-nun chayk-ul ilk-ko sephyeng-ul sse-ss-ta*

'he read the book and wrote a review (of it)' or, more explicitly:

'he read the book and then wrote a review (of it)' >

* 'he wrote the review and then read the book' (Korean has no article distinction, when transferred into article languages, the articles are determined by extralinguistic factors).

It is worthwhile noting, however, that Keedong Lee's distinction between what he calls coextensive (our coordinate) and sequential (our cosubordinate) in terms of tense representation in the NFC is not generally accepted. Judging by the author's analysis of his own examples quoted in § 2 where a 'coextensive/sequential' qualification is indiscriminately applied to sentences with both tensed and tenseless NFCs, the argument advanced cannot be accepted as more than merely a tendency marker.

5. The notions of symmetry and asymmetry are widely used in describing and classifying the interclausal relationships of the structural and semantic types examined (for Korean, Yi 1998, Yoon 1997, Kwon 2004, and others). Their use, however, is not quite free from slight terminological and methodological differences. In our use, both concepts are derived from the structural and semantic basics typical of the relationships examined.

5.1. In the structural domain, the basic dichotomy reflects the structural equivalence, synonymous with structural autonomy, of all conjuncts of a multi-clause sentence (symmetry), or the lack of such an equivalence (asymmetry). Structural equivalence, in this context, is an equivalence of the two basic sentence types, criterial for setting sentence hierarchy of Korean: final clause (FC) and non-final clause (NFC). In symbolic terms: FC-FC, for symmetry, and NFC-FC, for asymmetry.

Structural model of coordination in terms of symmetry and asymmetry:

Multi-clause sentences involving:

(i) affixal coordinator (A): NFC-A-FC (structural asymmetry)

(ii) lexical coordinator (L): FC-L-FC (structural symmetry).

5.1.1. Multi-clause sentences with affixal coordinators (in view of the exuberant richness of all types of Korean connectives, only a very limited selection thereof will be given in the illustrative examples quoted):

(1) non-adversative conjunction (roughly glossed as *and*-coordination):

(11) *-ko*:

VW-nun kilum-to cekkey tul-ko kocang-to an-na-n-ta
 VW-TOP gasoline-also little, few need-and breakdown-also not-occur-IND-DEC
 'a VW takes little gasoline and seldom breaks down' (Keedong Lee 437, modified);

or:

kay-nun koyangi-lul ccoch-ko koyangi-nun cwi-lul ccoch-nun-ta
 dog-TOP cat-ACC chase-and cat-TOP rat-ACC chase-IND-DEC
 'a dog chases a cat and a cat chases a rat' (Ho-min Sohn 129);

(111) The *ko*-coordination may support the notion of reciprocity by linking together active and passive forms of the same verb in a coordinated sequence, as in:

pesu-eyse salam-tul-un mil-ko mil-li-ess-ta
 bus-in person-PL-TOP push-and push-PAS-PST-DEC
 'in the bus people pushed others and were pushed' (ibid. 128);

(13) *-ko(se)*, *-e(se)*, *-a(se)* 'and then' (see also §1): in longer coordinate sequences with a temporal connotation both connectives tend to alternate:

na-nun cokum ca-ko(se) ilena-(se) pap-ul mek-ko(se)
 I-TOP a little sleep-and get up-and meal-ACC eat-and
camkkan swi-ko(se) kongpwulul sicakhay-ss-ta
 a while rest-and study ACC begin-PST-DEC

'I slept a little, got up, ate breakfast, took a short rest and then began to study' (ibid. 120);

(12) *-mye/ -umye*:

nalssi-to nappu-mye kipwun-to nappu-ta
 weather-also bad (is)-and mood-also bad (is)-DEC

'the weather is bad, and my mood is bad too' (modified from Ho-min Sohn 119);

(121) With some authors, the subject identity in constituents of a multi-clause sentence, or its lack, may play a decisive role in distinguishing between what we classify as coordinate and cosubordinate relationships (cf., Hansol Lee 180 f.):

$S_1 \neq S_2$: *-mye/ -umye* 'and':

ai-nun wus-umye kay-nun ttwi-n-ta
 child-TOP smile-and dog-TOP jump-IND-DEC

'a baby is smiling and a dog is jumping'; as against:

$S_1 = S_2$: *-mye/ -umye* = 'and then':

ai-nun wuyu-lul mek-umje wus-ess-ta
 child-TOP milk-ACC eat-and-then smile-PST-DEC

'a baby smiled while having milk' (ibid.);

The $S_1 \neq S_2$ structure corresponds to what we classify as coordination, while the $S_1 = S_2$ corresponds to cosubordination. This distinction, however, does not seem to be generally accepted.

(13) *-yo* (used to conjoin copulative clauses only):

ku pwun-un oykyokwan i-yo hakca-ta
 that person-TOP diplomat be-and scholar (be)-DEC

'he is a diplomat and a scholar' (Ho-min Sohn 119, modified);

(14) *-nuntey*: as a connective, 'and'; topic introducer (Hansol Lee 185):

nay-ka il-ul ha-nuntey aph-ess-ta
I-NOM work-ACC do-and have-headache-PST-DEC

(SF-PST: *-e-ss* will no longer be separately indicated)

'I was working and I had headache';

or:

ku-taum tokil-ey ka-ss-nuntey motwu-ka chincellhay-ss-ta
then Germany-to go-PST- and all-NOM be nice-PST-DEC

'Then, I went to Germany and everyone was nice' (Keedong Lee 522, modified).

(141) The topic introducing (TI) function sometimes outweighs that of coordinator and the resulting multi-clause complexes lose their primary coordinative nature:

sensayng-nim-i o-si-ess-nuntey naka po-ala
teacher-HON-NOM come-HON-PST-TI go-out see-IMP

'(your) teacher is here, go out and greet him' (modified from Ho-min Sohn 120: 'Your teacher is here. Why don't you go out and greet him');

or:

na nayil pusan-ey ka-nuntey mwue pwuthakhal kes eps-na?
I tomorrow Pusan-to go-TI what need thing is-missing-Q

'I am going to Pusan tomorrow, do you need anything (Keedong Lee 520);

similarly:

8-si-ka toy-ess-nuntey ppalli hakkyo-ey ka-kela
8 o'clock-NOM become-PST-TI quickly school-to go-IMP

'it is eight o'clock; go to school quickly' (ibid. 527);

pi-ka o-nuntey ka-ni?
rain-NOM come-TI go-Q

'it is raining, are (you) going?' (ibid. 529, cf.: 'are you going, even though it is raining?);

i-kkoch-i coh-untey way an-po-ni
this flower-NOM be-nice-and why not-look-Q

'This flower is nice and why don't you look at it?' (Hansol Lee 185).

(142) The *-untey/-nuntey*-linked sentence may sometimes express an adversative and even concessive connotation, as in:

kwulum hancem eps-nuntey pi-ka o-n-ta
cloud not-a-single be not-and/but/though rain-NOM come-IND-DEC

'there is not a single cloud, but it is raining' (Keedong Lee 525, mod.);

(143) Sometimes, the *nuntey* connective simply introduces a longer narrative:

yeysnal i-maul-ey cwumak-i hana i-ssess-nuntey, . . .
long-ago this-village-in tavern/inn-NOM one be-remote PST-TI. . .

'once upon a time, there was a tavern in this village, . . . (ibid. 521, mod.);

or:

yeysnal i-koul-ey nwwunmen apeci-wa ttal-i sal-ass-nuntay, ...
long-ago this-village-in blind father-and daughter-NOM live-PST-TI, ...
'Long ago there lived a blind father and his daughter in this village, ...'

(ibid.);

(144) Atypically, in some contexts, the connective may abruptly be followed by a SE which provokes a change in the hierarchical status of the utterance: NFC>FC and the FC that had to follow the original utterance at its NFC stage, is missing:

pi-ka o-nuntay-yo
rain-NOM come-TI-DEC (SE)

'It's raining. (What shall we do?) (Ho-min Sohn 120);

(2) adversative conjunction (*but*-coordination, mostly tolerating concessive paraphrases; cf. concessive coordination /Ho-min Sohn 121/):

(21) *-na/-una*: 'but':

pelsse pom-i toy-ess-una acik nalssi-ka cha-ta
already spring-NOM become-PST-but still weather-NOM be-cold-DEC
'it is already spring, but it is still cold' (Keedong Lee 498);

or:

ku chayk-un sey-pon-ina ilk-ess-una acikto cal molu- keyss-ta
that book-TOP three-times no-less-than read-PST-but still well not-understand-DUB-DEC
'I have read the book three times, but I still don't understand it' (ibid. 499);

(22) *-toy*: '(may/might) ... but':

param-i pul-toy pi-nun an-o-n-ta
wind-NOM blow-but rain-TOP not-come-IND-DEC

'the wind is blowing, but it is not raining' (Hansol Lee 185);

(23) *-man(un)*: 'but' (as against most other affixal connectives, *-man(un)*, instead of being substituted for the SE, is appended to it):

ce-nun kipp-ess-up-ni-ta man(un)Minca-nun sulph-ess-eyo
I-TOP be-happy-PST-SL-IND-DEC-but Minca-TOP be-sad-PST-POL/DEC

'I was happy, but Minca was sad' (Ho-min Sohn 122);

(24) *-ciman*: 'but'/'although':

apeci-nun no-si-ess-ciman emeni-nun ilha-si-ess-ta
father-TOP play-HON-PST-but mother-TOP work-HON-PST-DEC

'father played, but mother worked' (Ho-min Sohn 121);

(241) Some authors clearly prefer a concessive interpretation:

pi-nun manhi o-ass-ciman swuhwak-un coh -ci an-ha-yo
rain-TOP many come-PST-but/although harvest-TOP be-good NR not-do-DEC
(NR-nominalizer)

'although it rained a lot, the harvest is good';

or:

manna-ki-n manna-ciman mayil-un an-i-ya
meet/see-NR-TOP meet/see-but/although every day-TOP not-be-DEC

'although I see him, I don't see him every day' (Keedong Lee 438-9, modified);

(3) disjunction (*or*-coordination):

(31) *-tunci* . . . *-tunci* 'or':

salm-tunci kwup-tunci maum-taylo ha-sey-yo

boil (it)-or roast (it)-or mind/plan-according-to do-PROP-POL (PROP/OSITIVE)

'do whatever you want to do: you can boil it or roast it'; in response to the question: (*i sayngsen ettehkey ha-lkka-yo?* 'what shall I do with this fish?' (Keedong Lee 558));

or:

pi-ka o-tunci an o-tunci na-nun ttena-keyss-ta

rain-NOM come-or not come-or I-TOP leave-will-DEC

'I will leave whether it rains or not' (Ho-min Sohn 123);

(32) *-kena* . . . *kena* 'or':

Minca-nun nol-kena ca-kena ha-n-ta

Minca-TOP play-or sleep-or do-IND-DEC

'Minca either plays or sleeps' (ibid.);

(33) despite the rich inventory of disjunctive affixes asyndetic juxtaposition is equally frequent:

kyohoy-ey ka-la ma-la ha-ci ma-sey-yo

church-to go-IMP avoid-IMP tell-NR do not-PROP-POL

'don't tell me to go or not to go to church' (ibid.);

or:

cwuk-n-unya sa-n-unya-ka mwuncey i-ta

die-IND-Q live-IND-Q -NOM question be-DEC

'To die or live. That is the question.' (ibid.).

5.1.2. Multi-clause sentences with lexical coordinators:

(1) *kuliko* 'and':

pwusan-ey ka-ss-ta kuliko Minca-wa swuyenghay-ss-ta

Pusan-to go-PST-DEC and Minca-with swim-PST-DEC

'(He) went to Pusan and swam with Minca' (Ho-min Sohn 118)

(2) *kulena* 'but':

inkan-un cwuk-nun-ta kulena sin-un an cwuk-nun-ta

human-TC die-IN-DC but god-TC not die-IN-DEC

'Man is mortal, but God is not' (ibid. 121);

(3) *hokun* 'or':

i kes i-p-ni-kka hokun ce kes i-p-ni-kka?

this thing be-H-IND-Q or that thing be-H-IND-Q

'is it this or is it that?' (Lewin-Kim 87);

5.2. In the semantic domain, the dichotomy is derived from the conceptual equivalence of the conjuncts involved (symmetry) or its lack (asymmetry); the conceptual equivalence, in this context, is synonymous with the conceptual autonomy of the conjuncts while their non-equivalence signals a relationship of conceptual dependence.

Semantic (functional) model of coordination:

(1) coordination: semantic symmetry

(2) cosubordination: semantic asymmetry.

5.2.1. Whereas the structural hierarchy of the multi-clause sentences examined may be defined in formal terms (see 5.1 above), the semantic hierarchy is primarily of interpretative nature. Attempts at introducing formal criteria in the semantic domain with the aim of distinguishing between coordinate and pseudo-coordinate (cosubordinate) relationships (Keedong Lee's distinction in terms of tense representation (1993: 480-481) or Hansol Lee's proposal to distinguish between the two relationships by the identity or non-identity of the conjuncts' subject (1989: 180 f)), as well as similar partial solutions, are not generally accepted and, moreover, they cover only an extremely limited part of the global problem: *ko*-coordination with Keedong Lee (see §5 above); *-mye/-umye* coordination with Hansol Lee (see § 5.1.1. above) and some others.

A joint classification of structural-and-semantic properties of inter-clausal/sentential relationships results in four distinct classes:

- (1) Structural asymmetry (SA) combined with semantic symmetry (SeS):
(structural dependence / conceptual autonomy)
A-type coordination (see the foregoing paragraphs);
- (2) Structural symmetry (SS) combined with semantic symmetry (SeS):
(structural autonomy / conceptual autonomy)
L-type coordination (see the foregoing paragraphs).
- (3) Structural asymmetry (SA) combined with semantic asymmetry (SeA):
(structural dependence / conceptual dependence)
A-type cosubordination:

<i>Payksel</i>	<i>kongcwu-ka</i>	<i>sakwa-lul</i>	<i>mek-ko</i>	<i>cwuk-ess-ta</i>
white snow	princess-NOM	apple-ACC	eat-and	die-PST-DEC

'Princess Snow White ate an apple and died' (Kwon 3).

Cosubordination, as an interpretational deviation from a structural coordination (invalidation of the conceptual equivalence of the conjuncts involved) manifests itself by tolerating various adjunct-type paraphrases incompatible with true coordination. In the present case, the closest adverbial connotations seem to coincide with (a) temporality (*-ko* 'and then') or (b) causality (*-ko* 'because'; for the latter Kwon 3):

- (a) 'Princess Snow White ate an apple and then died';
- (b) 'Princess Snow White died because she ate an apple'.

The incompatibility with coordination (conceptual equivalence still in force) may be confirmed by the impossibility of permutation of the conjuncts, unless thereby generating dubious or nonsensical sentences:

**Payksel kongcwu-ka cwuk-ko/-kose sakwa-lul mek-ess-ta* (modified 5.2.1 (3))

(aa) * 'Princess Snow White died and then ate an apple', or:

(bb) * 'Princess Snow White ate an apple because she died', etc.

- (4) Structural symmetry (SS) combined with semantic asymmetry (SeA):
(structural autonomy / conceptual dependence)

L-type cosubordination:

Payksel kongcwu-ka sakwa-lul mek-ess-ta kuliko cwuk-ess-ta (modified 5.2.1 (3)); for the translation and the assumed mechanism of deviation see *ibid*.

5.2.1.1. From a cross-linguistic point of view, neither the SA/SeS (structural dependence/conceptual autonomy) nor SA/SeA (structural dependence/conceptual dependence) interclausal relationships can be found compatible with (most/all?) typologically representative Indo-European languages. In other words, there are no structurally dependent coordinate (not even pseudo-coordinate) sentences represented in this linguistic area.

5.2.2. Another step towards enhancing the generality range of classification may be achieved by applying the criterion of symmetry to the very dichotomy of symmetry/asymmetry, that is, to classes that had already been classified in terms of this dichotomy. The procedure, conceived as a sort of meta-classification, will reduce the number of extant classes as follows:

- (1) Structural symmetry combined with semantic symmetry (SS/SeS; see 5.2.1(2));
- (2) Structural asymmetry combined with semantic asymmetry (SA/SeA; see 5.2.1(3));
- (3) Structural symmetry combined with semantic asymmetry (SS/SeA; see 5.2.1(4));
- (4) Structural asymmetry combined with semantic symmetry (SA/SS; see 5.2.1(1)).

The reclassification in meta-terms will reduce the number of classified relationships to only two:

- (11) symmetric relationships: SS/SeS and SA/SeA; and
- (22) asymmetric relationships: SS/SeA and SA/SeS.

6. The type of coordinator (affixal/lexical), determining the structural type of a multi-clause sentence (NFC-FC/FC-FC), may itself depend on certain syntactic procedures in which it takes part. Gapping, occurring mostly in colloquial speech, is one such procedure (Ho-min Sohn 129). Let us consider the following sentences:

- (1) *kay-nun koyangi-lul ccoch-ko koyangi-nun cwi-lul ccoch-nun-ta*
dog-TOP cat-ACC chase-and cat-TOP rat-ACC chase-IND-DEC
'a dog chases a cat and a cat chases a rat',
and the gapped variant of the latter:

- (11) *kay-nun koyangi-lul, koyangi-nun cwi-lul ccoch-nun-ta*
'a dog chases a cat and a cat a rat' (ibid.).

So far, no structural change may be observed. In some cases, however, gapping does lead to a structural reconstruction (connective: A > L, with the subsequent shift NFC-FC > FC-FC), as in the case of the A-type coordinator *-una* 'but', replaced by the L-type *kulena*:

- (2) *Minca-nun ecey ttena-ss-una Yongho-nun onul ttena-ss-ta*
-TOP yesterday leave-PST-but -TOP today leave-PST-DEC
'Minca left yesterday, but Yongho left today',
as against its gapped version:
(22) *Minca-nun ecey, kulena Yongho-nun onul ttena-ss-ta*
'Minca left yesterday, but Yongho today' (for particulars, see ibid.).

Of course, the structural shift from NFC-FC to FC-FC is only hypothetical, since the presence of the pre-conjunctive FC may only be assumed.

7. Coordination stands, in all probability, at the origin of what is recently known as verb composition, one of the most productive word-formational procedures of the rapidly expanding lexicon of modern Korean. Speaking of coordination and its subsequent splitting into more refined functions supported by various types of conceptual dependencies is perhaps too risky for an assumption like the present one. Positing simply a sort of paratactic proto-structure as the first step towards the recent verbal compounds would apparently be more appropriate. Whatever their origin might be, the similarity between the syntactic relationships just examined and their fossilized reflexes in the recent verbal compounds (VC) in what follows) is striking. Furthermore, this similarity seems to justify the hypothesis of a continuum nature of the coordination-subordination relationship (see §3, Croft 1991: coordination/subordination continuum). Structurally, the closest parallel between syntactic relationships, on the one hand, and verbal compounds, on the other, could be sought for in the NFC-FC, on the syntactic side, and the non-final (NFV) and final verbs (FV), on the lexical side. Whatever the evolutionary shift from syntactic to lexical relationships was, it resulted in one pivotal functional transformation, namely in a shift from a multi-clause assertive type to that typical of the verbal compounds, that is a shift from multi-assertive utterances (each clausal constituent of a multi-clause sentence is carrier of an assertion of its own, whereas the verbal compounds, typically consisting of two verbs, carry only one shared assertion.

Let us consider the following constructions of formally unconnected verbal sequences:

kwup-ta 'roast, broil' + *mek-ta* 'eat':

Chelswu-nun pam-ul kwuw-e mek-ess-ta

TOP chestnut-ACC broil-SF eat-PAST-DEC

'Chelswu broiled and ate the chestnut', (lit. 'Chelswu broil-ate the chestnut')

(Kang 6).

7.1. The structural evolution might have started from the (a) sentential through (b) phrasal to the (c) recent lexical linkage (to represent the hypothetical sequence, the *-ess-* complex has to be analyzed into *-e-* (SF) and *-ss-* (PST)):

(a) S-O-V_{tensed} + S-O-V_{tensed}: **Chelswu-nun pam-ul kwuw-e-ss-ta* () *Chelswu-nun pam-ul mek-e-ss-ta* *'Chelswu broiled the chestnut () Chelswu ate the chestnut';

(b) S-O-V_{tensed} + V_{tensed}: **Chelswu-nun pam-ul kwuw-e-ss-ta* () *mek-e-ss-ta* *'Chelswu broiled () ate the chestnut', i.e., with S-O (subject and object) sharing;

(c) S-O-V_{tenseless} + V_{tensed}: *Chelswu-nun pam-ul kwuw-e()* *mek-e-ss-ta* 'Chelswu broiled (and) ate the chestnut' (for literal translation see above), i.e. with S-O-V₊ (subject, object and tense) sharing;

The tense glossing in (a) and (b) is hypothetical with no direct relation to the assumed sequence of structural transformations. The functional value of the vir-

tual connective () entirely depends on the interpretation of the semantic content of the verbs involved. The interpretational freedom of the latter may be illustrated by a large scale of tolerated paraphrases. The (c) sentence may alternatively be conceived as:

- (i) 'Chelswu broiled (and) ate the chestnut': (both V-constituents denoting autonomous concepts independent of each other): coordination;
- (ii) 'Chelsu broiled (and then) ate the chestnut: constituents are organized in a temporal sequence, possibly paraphrased as 'After broiling (having broiled) the chestnut, Chelswu ate it': subordination (cosubordination in this study);
- (iii) 'Chelswu broiled the chestnut (in order/ with aim) to eat it', with a final clause characteristics: subordination (cosubordination); etc.

Similar interpretational freedom may be observed with most VCs:

nwul-ta 'crush, squeeze' + *cwuki-ta* 'kill' (< *cwuk-* 'die'; -i causative):

John-i kaymi-lul nwul-e cwuki-ess-ta

NOM ant-ACC crush-INF kill-PST-DEC;

'John killed the ant by crushing it' (Yi 1996: 2; quot Kang 7);⁷

or:

kwulm-ta 'fast, starve' + *cwuk-ta* 'die': 'starve to death':

ku keci-ka kwulm-e cwuk-ess-ta

that beggar-NOM starve-SF die-PAST-DEC

'The beggar starved to death' (Kang: ib.), with a connotation of causality (died of hunger'),

or:

ttut-ta 'nibble, pick, pull out' + *mek-ta* 'eat': 'graze':

(kudul-un) . . . sinsenhan yelum phwul-ul ttut-e-mek-kitoha-mye

(they-TOP) fresh summer grass-ACC graze EMPHAT-and

(They: the animals) . . . did enjoy nibbling at (grazing on) the fresh summer grass and . . . (Orwell, *Animal Farm*, for the author's original text see § 8).

7.2. Typically, the constituents of verbal compounds considerably differ in their semantic import and so does their respective position in the compound: one verb carries the main semantic load while the other merely modifies it:

say-ka nal-a ka-ss-ta

bird-NOM fly-SF go-PAST-DEC

'the bird flew away' (lit. 'the bird fly-went') (ibid. 6),

as against:

say-ka nal-a wa (o-a)-ss-ta

fly come

'the bird came in (flew in)', etc.

⁷ The distribution of semantemes in the Korean verbal compounds quoted is not quite dissimilar to components of the English verb-adject complexes, like *shoot dead* (the fatal issue of 'shooting', in Slavic languages, may be marked by a switch from the imperfective to perfective aspect in combination with a prefixal modifier, as in Slovak *striel'at' – zastrelit'*).

7.3. The relation of verbs in VC constructions is relatively loose, as confirmed by the insertion of various adjunct elements between them, as in *mil-e nwup-hi-ta* 'to push (in order, with aim) to lay down':

ku-nun ku-nje-lul mil-e ttang-ey nwup-hi-ess-ta (1984 nyen, 132);
 he-TOP she-ACC push-SF ground-to lay-down-CAUS-PST-DEC
 'he pressed her down upon the grass' (1984, 132).

8. Coordination in context (Textual samples)

8.1. In longer sentence complexes of a dominant coordinate nature, coordinators tend to alternate with subordinators, if any (within coordinate sequences), as well as with stem formatives (SF, see note 2) operating here as true connectives (only inter-sentential and inter-clausal connectives are taken into account and bold-represented):

*ku-tul-un thayna-se pinminkwul-eyse cala>(*a) yeltwu sal-i toy-myen*
 they TOP be born and slums, gutters in grow up SF 12 age-at become when
cakepcang-ey naka-ko aluntawum-kwa sengyek-ul nukki-nun
 work(shop)-to go out-and beauty-and sexual desire ACC feel-GER
camkkan tongan-uy kkochtaw-un kikan-ul kechi-e sumwu sal-ey
 little while GEN blossoming ADJ period-ACC go through-SF 20 age-at
kyelhon-ul ha-ko selun sal-ey cwungnyen-i toy-mye taypupun
 marriage-ACC conclude-and 30 age-at middle-aged-NOM become-and the major part
yeyswun sal-ey cwuk-nun-ta (1984 nyen, 82);
 60 age-at die-IND-DEC

'They (the proles) were born, they grew up in the gutters, they went to work at twelve, they passed through a brief blossoming period of beauty and sexual desire, they married at twenty, they were middle-aged at thirty, they died, for the most part, at sixty' (1984, 74);

Representation of operators:

co(sub)ordinators (4): *-se*, *-ko* (2x), *-mye*;

subordinator (1): *-myen* ('when' /they reached twenty/);

affixless stem formatives (see note 2) (2): *-*a* (synchronously, inherent in the verbal basis *cala* > **cala-a*);

achim isul sok-ey kwull-e-po-kidoha-ko sinsen-han yelum
 morning dew interior-in roll SF enjoy EMPH-and fresh summer
phwul-ul ttut-e-mek-kitoha-mye kem-un hulktenki-lul
 grass-ACC graze EMPH-and black-ADJ clods of earth-ACC
chy-e-tul-e kaci-ko ku-phwungyohan naymsay-lul math-a po-
 kick up-SF continue-and that-rich scent-ACC snuff-SF enjoy
kitohay-ss-ta (Tongmwul nongcang, 350);
 EMPH-PAST-DEC

'They (the animals) rolled in the dew, they cropped mouthfuls of the sweet summer grass, they kicked up clods of the black earth and snuffed its rich scent' (Animal Farm, 13);

lit. '(They) did enjoy rolling in the morning dew and (they) did enjoy nibbling at the fresh summer grass and (they) did not cease kicking up the black clods (of earth) and (they) did enjoy snuffing (their) rich scent.'

Coordinators (3): *-ko, mye* (as part of the emphasizing construction *kito-ha-*), and *-ko*.

8.2 Coordinative strategies help to process accidentally occurring longer sequences of right-branching embedded clauses that have to be transferred to Korean, a left-branching language. In theory, post-nominal RCs in a SVO language like English may be combined in chains of illimited length and complexity. Let us consider the following sequence:

"We were visited by a neighbour who just returned from America where he called on his daughter (who was) married to a deputy for the Democratic Party that gained no access to the Parliament . . ."

The English sentence that was thought of as a device for testing the capability of a left-branching language (Korean) to deal with corresponding syntactic structures in a right-branching language (English). The Korean translation, due to a linguistically trained native speaker, resulted in three separate versions. The evidence acquired can in no way confirm, for Korean, a language structurally very close to Japanese, Kuno's feeling about Japanese sequences of embedded left-branching clauses, as possibly 'extended arbitrarily far', neither his assertion of their grammaticality and intelligibility (*ibid.* 7-8) can be unconditionally trusted. Let us compare the two strategies: Japanese, free from coordinate elements, and Korean, offering three separate Korean versions of the English sentence with a varying degree of coordinative remodelling.

Japanese:

John ga katte-iru neko ga korosita nezumi ga tabeta tiizu wa kusatte-ita
 NOM keep/PM cat NOM killed rat NOM ate cheese TOP rotten-was/PM
 "John keeps a cat that killed a rat that ate cheese that was rotten".

Korean:

- (i) *uyhoy-ey tuleka-ci mos-ha-n mincwutang tayuywen-kwa kyelhonha-n*
 parliament-to enter NR not (PST/RC₁) Democratic Party deputy-(to) get married (PST/RC₂)
ttal-ul pangmwunha-ko mikwuk-eyse mak tolao-n iussalam-i wuli
 daughter-ACC visit-and America-from just return (PST/RC₃) neighbour-NOM our
cip-ey wa-ss-ta (S)
 house-to come-PST-DEC
- (ii) *ttal-un pangmwunha-ko mikwuk-eyse mak tolao-n iwussalam-i wuli*
 daughter-TOP visit-and America-from just return (PST/RC₁) neighbour-NOM our
cip-ey wa-ss- nuntey, ku ttal-un uyhoy-ey tuleka-ci mos-ha-n
 house-to come-PST- and/TI⁸ that daughter-TOP parliament-to enter-NR not (PST/RC₂)
mincwutang tayuywen-kwa kyelhonhay- ss-ta (S)
 Democratic Party deputy-to get married PST-DEC

⁸ For TI, see 5.1.1 (141-144).

- (iii) *iussalam-i wuli cip-ey wa-ss-nuntey ku-nun mak mikuk-eyse*
 neighbour-NOM our house-to come-PST- and/TI he-TOP just America-from
tolawa-ss-ta (S₁). ku-kos-eyse ttal-ul pangmwunhay-ss-nuntey ttal-un
 return-PST-DEC that place-in daughter-ACC visit-PST-and/TI daughter-TOP
mincwutang tayuywen-kwa kyelhon-ul hay-ss-ess-ta (S₂).
 Democratic Party deputy-to/with marriage-ACC conclude-PST₁-PST₂-DEC
kulena mincutang-un uyhoy-ey tuleka-ci mos-hay-ss-ta (S₃).
 nevertheless DP-TOP parliament-to enter-NR not do-PST-DEC

As is evident, Korean proved to be virtually incapable of dealing with the syntactic pattern of the purposefully expanded English sentence without the help of coordinators linking the embedded clauses together. The order of the three Korean versions of the English model sentence follows the sense of a successively increasing impact of coordination, with its maximum reached in the version (iii).

The English model sentence, consisting of four post-nominal (right-branching) RCs, has no coordinator at all in contrast to any of the three Korean versions:

The items (i) and (ii) are one-sentence versions with a varying number of pre-nominal (left-branching) RCs and coordinators (C), as against the item (iii) which is a three sentence version with three coordinators and no RC at all. The last version, however, consisting of three separate sentences and two inter-sentential junctures, substituted (in this particular context) for coordinators and their conjunctive function, actually harbours four coordinators, two real and two virtual ones.

When focusing attention on only three criterial features:

(S) – the number of sentences of which consists the analysed textual sample,

(RC) – the number of RCs occurring therein,

(C) – the number of coordinators occurring therein, the English-Korean contrastive comparison may be presented in symbolic terms as follows:

English: S (1), RC (4), C (0);

Korean (i): S (1), RC (2), C (1);

(ii): S (1), RC (3), C (2);

(iii): S (3), RC (0), C (2 + 2).

REFERENCES

- CROFT, William (University of Manchester). 1991: *www. Pagina de Antonio Ruiz Tinoco 2002, 04 01, © A.R. Tinoco 2001.*
- KANG, Seung-Man 1997: *A Comparative Analysis of SVCs and Korean V-V Compounds* (A University of Florida conference report). [http:// fccl.ksu.ru/issue 001/conf_gen97/ kang.pdf](http://fccl.ksu.ru/issue_001/conf_gen97/kang.pdf).
- KUNO, Susumu 1973: *The Structure of Japanese Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, The MIT Press.
- KWON, Nayoung 2004: *Syntactic and Semantic Mismatches in the Korean ko-Constructions*. <http://ling.ucsd.edu/~fukuda/HandoutWccfl23NY.pdf>.

- LEE, Hansol, H.B. 1989: *Korean Grammar*. Oxford University Press
- LEE, Keedong 1993: *A Korean Grammar on Semantic-Pragmatic Principles*. Seoul, Hankuk-munhwasa.
- LONGACRE, Robert E. 1985: 'Sentences as combinations of clauses'. In: Shopen 1985: 235-286.
- MAZUR, Yu.N. 1960: *Korejskij jazyk (Korean Language)*. Moskva, Izd. vost. lit.
- MINJUNG, Essence: *Korean-English Dictionary*. Seoul, Minjungseorim 1992.
- SHOPEN, Timothy (Ed.) 1985: *Language typology and syntactic description*. Vol.ii. *Complex constructions*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- SOHN, Ho-min 1994: *Korean*. Routledge, London and New York.
- YANG, Byong-Seon 1994: *Morphosyntactic Phenomena of Korean in Role and Reference Grammar* (A State University of New York at Buffalo dissertation, 1994 – <http://wings.buffalo.edu/linguistics/dissertations/yang/YANGDis.pdf>).
- YI, E-Y. 1998: *Adjunction, Coordination and their Theoretical Consequences*. In Doeleman (Ed.): *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics* 16, 188-252. NY: Cornell University (quot. Kwon 2004).
- YOON, J. H-S. 1997: *Coordination (a)symmetry*. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 7, 3-30 (quot. Kwon 2004).

TEXTUAL AND LEXICOGRAPHICAL SOURCES

- Minjung Essence Korean-English Dictionary*. Seoul, Minjungseorim 1992.
- Coci Owel / Kim Hoy-Cin: *Tongmwul nongcang. 1984nyen*. Seoul, Pomusa 1993.
- George Orwell: *Animal Farm*. London, Penguin Books 1989.
- George Orwell: *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London, Penguin Books 1990.

SYMBOLS USED IN GLOSSING MORPHEMES AND CLAUSE TYPES:

- ACC – accusative
- C – coordinator
- (c) – functionally unspecified coordinator
- CAUS – causative
- DEC – declarative sentence mood
- DUB – dubitative
- EMPH – emphatic
- FC – final clause
- FV – final verb
- HON – honorific (all types of honorific representation)
- IMP – imperative
- IND – indicative
- NFC – non-final clause
- NFV – non-final verb
- NOM – nominative

NR – nominalizer
 PAS – passive
 PL – plural
 PM – progressive mood
 POL – polite speech level
 PROP – propositive
 PST – past tense
 PST₁ – PST₂ – remote past
 Q – question, interrogative
 QUOT – quotative
 RC – relative clause
 S – sentence
 SA – structural asymmetry
 SE – sentence ender
 SeA – semantic asymmetry
 SeS – semantic symmetry
 SF – stem formative (see note 2)
 SL – specific speech level marker
 (unrelated to the sentence type)
 SS – structural symmetry
 TI – topic introducer
 TOP – topic marker
 VC – verbal compound

TRANSCRIPTION AND GLOSSING

Korean data are presented in the Yale system of transliteration. With some authors minor corrections were needed to keep the Yale system consistent: *Chelsu* > *Chelswu*, *kuw-e* > *kwuw-e* (Kang), and the like. An attempt was made to unify the intricate system of morpheme glossing, markedly differing with individual authors.