

# Contrasts between *in*- and *with*-EPPs

**Yonghyun Kwon**  
(Sung-Kong-Hoe University)

**Kwon, Yonghyun.** 2005. Contrasts between *in*- and *with*-EPPs. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 13(4), 113-129. This paper addresses emotional noun phrases which are headed by *in* or *with*. The research is going to look into syntactic contrasts between the two types of emotional prepositional phrases (EPPs): *in*-EPPs such as *in delight*, *in joy*, *in horror*, and *with*-EPPs including *with despair*, *with enthusiasm*, *with fear*. Both of the nouns fall into the semantic category of emotions or sensations in these expressions. We are going to explore how *in*- and *with*-EPPs are different from each other syntactically. The differences will be examined through several tests.

**Key Words:** *in*, *with*, EPP

## 1. Introduction

It is well known that each of the prepositions in English has a variety of meanings, even though many of them are closely or remotely related metaphorically. This is also true of the prepositions *in* and *with*. This paper does not concern itself with all the meanings which *in* and *with* convey. We are going to deal in this research with the two prepositions which are followed by emotional nouns. The combinations of the preposition *in* and emotional noun phrases are termed *in*-EPPs, which stand for emotional prepositional phrases, while they are called *with*-EPPs when the preposition *with* leads emotional noun phrases.

There are numerous combinations of *in* with emotional nouns. Let us take some examples where *in* and emotional nouns come together to form *in*-EPPs.

- (1) a. Oblonsky handed back the letter and continued looking at Karenin *in wonder*, not knowing what to say. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 52)
- b. Snead stared *in disbelief*, then he began to cry. (Grisham, 2001a, p. 5)
- c. From the back row, Fitch watched *in amazement*. (Grisham, 2001b, p. 23)
- d. Medea was staring at her children and crying as if she was *in pain*. (McGovern, 1994, p. 47)

The prepositional phrases, *in wonder* in (1a), *in disbelief* in (1b), *in amazement* in (1c), and *in pain* in (1d) have something in common; they consist of the preposition *in* and the following emotional nouns.<sup>1)</sup>

The other type is that the preposition *with* also comes together with emotional nouns. These combinations form *with*-EPPs. Let us have a look at how *with*-EPPs are used in sentences.

- (2) a. Barr was smiling *with admiration*. (Grisham, 1999, p. 48)
- b. When Carton and Barsad had gone into the next room, Mr Lorry looked at Jerry *with doubt*. (Dickens, 1999, p. 95)
- c. She looked at Vronsky *with terror* in her face. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 41)
- d. Mr Barsad's face had gone very white and his mouth was half open *with surprise*. (Dickens, 1999, p. 4)

The *with*-prepositional phrases above show that *admiration* in (2a), *doubt* in (2b), *terror* in (2c), and *surprise* in (2d) are commonly headed

---

1) Here are some more examples:

- (i) By the time her father got to her, she was *in shock* and her foot had doubled in size. (Grisham, 2001a, p. 52)
- (ii) "I won't disagree with that. But what has made your temper so bad? ...The same old Sydney Carton who was with me at school. Now in high spirits, now *in the depths of misery*." (Dickens, 1999, p. 17)
- (iii) She walked on a few steps *in silence*, gathering up her courage, then suddenly stopped. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 34)

by *with*.<sup>2)</sup> These two constructions in (1, 2) show that while they are both the same prepositional phrases, the first type is headed by *in* while the second one is by *with*.

This research is going to focus mainly on two subjects. The first discussion is whether the choice of either *in* or *with* is simply determined by the following emotional nouns. The second one is how the two prepositional phrases are different in terms of syntactic behaviors.

## 2. Previous studies

Not much linguistic attention has been paid to contrasts between *in*-EPPs and *with*-EPPs. Even so, let us have a look at how the two phrases have been treated.

### 2.1. Eastwood (2001)

Eastwood (2001: 262) discusses the following sentences.

- (3) a. The woman stared *in astonishment*.  
 b. The crowd shouted *excitedly*.

He treats *in astonishment* in (3a) and *excitedly* in (3b) in the same way. According to his analysis, *in astonishment* has the same syntactic status as *excitedly* has. The word *astonished* has no corresponding adverb (\**astonishedly*), so it has no other way than to be expressed in

---

2) Here are some more examples:

- (i) "I wanted to avoid that fool, you know, that chemist fellow," he said to her *with a laugh*. (Flaubert, 2001, p. 47)  
 (ii) When the servant had left the room, Oblonsky dressed *with his usual care*. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 2)  
 (iii) Later, Levin went with Oblonsky to one of Moscow's most fashionable and expensive restaurants, where all the waiters knew Oblonsky and treated him *with the greatest respect*. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 2)  
 (iv) She listened to Dolly *with sympathetic kindness*, and soon Dolly began to feel much better. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 12)

the way of *in astonishment*. In contrast, the word *excited* has its corresponding adverb (*excitedly*), which makes it possible to allow *excitedly* in (3b). It seems to him that *in excitement* will be the same as *excitedly*. If it is true, the choice of either *excitedly* or *in excitement* will make no difference. So it is not surprising that he regards *in astonishment* as an adverbial equivalent of *astonished*.

Is it really true to say that *excitedly* and *in excitement* are syntactically the same? Is it true that *in astonishment* should be treated adverbially? These two will be fully discussed later.

## 2.2. Swan (1997)

In regard to *with*-EPPs, Swan (1997: 629) says, "*With* is used in a number of expressions which say how people are showing their emotions and sensations." Some of the related examples are cited here.

- (4) a. My father was trembling *with rage*.
- b. Annie was jumping up and down *with excitement*.

All he mentions is that *with* is related to emotions and sensations in (4). Even though he makes some comments on *with*-EPPs, he does not discuss *in*-EPPs at all. He does not compare *in*-EPPs and *with*-EPPs, nor does he try to grasp how they are different.

What draws our attention here is that *astonishment* takes *in*, as in (3a), while *excitement* takes *with*, as in (4b). If we say *with astonishment* rather than *in astonishment*, and *in excitement* rather than *with excitement*, are the expressions incorrect? If they are not incorrect, does it mean that the different choice of *in* or *with* simply depends on the following nouns, as in *pay by check/credit card/direct debit* as opposed to *in cash*<sup>3)</sup>?

---

3) Lindstromberg (1998: 5) mentions *pay by check/credit card/direct debit* but *in cash*. In these expressions, the word *cash* takes *in* while *check*, *credit card*, and *direct debit* combine with *by*. The different prepositions in these expressions appear to be chosen accidentally. However, he explains they have good reasons for the different choices. The different choices are mentioned in Murphy (2000: 246) also.

### 2.3. Others

Lindstromberg (1998: 216-7) discusses *with-*EPPs.

- (5) a. They cried out *with delight*.  
 b. I almost died *with excitement*.

He points out that *delight* headed by *with* causes the result that *they cried out* in (5a). In other words, *delight* is the cause of *they cried out*. Likewise, *excitement*, headed by *with*, is the cause of *I almost died* in (5b). According to his analysis, *with-*EPPs carry out the role of cause. It is doubtful, however, whether *with-*EPPs always have the semantic role of cause and result. Let us examine (6).

- (6) They set to work *with enthusiasm*.

If his view were correct, (6) would mean that they set to work because of enthusiasm. However, it is not what (6) says. It is that they set to work enthusiastically. So the analysis of cause and result does not necessarily work for *with-*EPPs.<sup>4)</sup>

Quirk *et al.* (1985: 685-6) introduces the metaphorical extensions of *in*, but he does not compare *in-*EPPs with its corresponding *with-*EPPs. He analyzes (7) in a different way from Lindstromberg (1998). He sees *with the utmost courtesy* as indicating *in the manner of the utmost courtesy* rather than in the relation of cause and result.

- (7) We were received *with the utmost courtesy*.

As seen above, the differences between *in-*EPPs and *with-*EPPs have not been clear. Even though there are some mentions of these two phrases in dictionaries such as *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary*

---

4) Various meanings which *with-*EPPs convey are determined in the contextually dynamic relations of *with-*phrases and the other parts of sentences rather than independently of surrounding contexts. The meaning of cause and result is just one of the many.

*English* (2001: 717, 1644), *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2000: 653, 1487), and *Collins Cobuild English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* (2001: 788, 1798), they are not clear, either.

### 3. Are they determined by following nouns?

Different nouns sometimes take different prepositions without obvious reasons, as in *a reason for the delay* rather than *\*a reason of the delay*, *a cause of the explosion* rather than *\*a cause for the explosion*, *an increase in oil prices* rather than *\*an increase of oil prices*, *a solution to the question* rather than *\*a solution of the question*. In these cases, it is not always easy to explain why a choice of different prepositions is not tolerated with some nouns. There are many instances where reasons for the particular combinations are not convincing. Such cases have been just treated as if they are bundled together in that particular way without any reason. Then, should *in*-EPPs and *with*-EPPs be treated as such exceptions?

Let us examine whether the choice of *in* or *with* is really determined by the subsequent nouns. The examples in (8) appear to suggest that noun *silence* is always headed by *in*.

- (8) a. She took her seat in her husband's carriage *in silence*.  
(Tolstoy, 2001, p. 22)
- b. They rode *in silence* for a while and watched the traffic.  
(Grisham, 1999, p. 48)
- c. The two friends sat *in silence* at the table. (Dickens, 1992, p. 26)
- d. The people of the city watched *in silence*. (McGovern, 1994, p. 31)

Judging from (8), it seems to be safe to say that the noun *silence* seems to be preceded by *in*.<sup>5)</sup> These many examples seem to support

---

5) Here are more examples:

(i) He got up and moved towards the door. Anna got up, too. Bowing to her *in*

that whether to choose *in* or *with* is determined by the following nouns. Let us check this out with the noun *surprise*.

- (9) a. "You don't need to follow him," Sam said. The other men looked at him *in surprise*. (McRobbie, 1994, p. 13)
- b. She looked *in surprise* at the gold room. (Foulds, 1992, p. 4)
- c. He looked at me *in surprise*. (Bronte, 1993, p. 38)
- d. "I had a note from Stiva telling me you were here."  
"From Stiva?" said Dolly *in surprise*. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 25)

In (9), *surprise* may seem to be always led by *in*.<sup>6</sup> Does this mean that *surprise* cannot be joined with *with*. Let us look at (10).

- (10) As Anna sat down in the carriage, Oblonsky noticed *with surprise* that her lips were trembling and she had difficulty in keeping back her tears. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 12)

(10) has the expression *with surprise*, not *in surprise*. This implies that *with-*EPPs and *in-*EPPs are both possible options. So the choice of *in-*EPPs or *with-*EPPs cannot be said to be affected by the following nouns. Rather, it leaves the possibility open that *in-* and *with-*EPPs have separate roles. Let us check this with the noun *fear*.

- (11) a. Trembling *with fear*, she went to the door of the carriage,

---

*silence*, he let her pass. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 36)

- (ii) She walked on a few steps *in silence*, gathering up her courage, then suddenly stopped. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 34)
  - (iii) He sat for a long time *in silence*. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 61)
  - (iv) The old servant bowed *in silence*. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 62)
  - (v) He held her *in silence*. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. p. 64)
- 6) Here are some more examples:
- (i) He turned to Oliver *in surprise* and said gently. (Dickens, 1992, p. 9)
  - (ii) Antigone looked at her sister *in surprise*. (McGovern, 1994, p. 27)
  - (iii) "Why! It's Nancy!" he cried *in surprise*. (Dickens, 1992, p. 28)

but a man and his wife were coming in and she could not get out. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 92)

b. Maggie, trembling *with fear*, was taken on board the Dutch ship. (Eliot, 1995, p. 62)

*Fear* takes *with* in (11) while *in* is chosen in (12). This shows that *in*-EPPs and *with*-EPPs exist independently.

(12) a. I have to do something about it. If I don't, all the parents in Athens will live *in fear*. (Foulds, 1992, p. 32)

b. "Let me go! Let me go!" he cried out *in fear*. (Dickens, 1992, p. 27)

(11, 12) reveal that the same noun *fear* can be headed by either *in* or *with*. The same emotional nouns can be allowed to have *in* or *with*. The different prepositions seem to have to do with the different functions of the emotional phrases. The following nouns simply do not affect the determination of prepositions. The examples in (13-15) further support the observation.<sup>7)</sup>

(13) a. "Bob!" Maggie cried *in delight*. (Eliot, 1995, p. 47)

b. Maggie felt his admiring eyes upon her, and blushed like a rose, while Lucy laughed *with delight* at her little joke. (Eliot, 1995, p. 33)

(14) a. Fagin did not stop to hear any more. He gave a loud cry *in anger*. (Dickens, 1992, p. 38)

---

7) The nouns *horror* and *despair* show the contrastive uses of *in* and *with* below.

(i) At that moment Karenin read on her face *with horror* the love which he did not wish to know about. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 22)

(ii) Snead reached the balcony in time to scream *in horror*. (Grisham, 2001a, p. 5)

(iii) "No," said Anna slowly, looking *with despair* into his cold face. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 22)

(iv) She and her children did not have enough butter or eggs. Dolly was *in despair*. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 24)



b. ...she felt herself growing pale and her lips trembling *with anger* at this cold, unfeeling man who was so calmly intending to ruin her innocent friend. (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 45)

(15) a. "Are you *in love*?" she said, with a little cough. (Flaubert, 2001, p. 48)

b. Her eyes shone *with love*. (Foulds, 1992, p. 33)

What we have seen from the examples above is that the choice of *in* or *with* has nothing to do with the following nouns. Now we need to investigate how *in-* EPPs and *with-*EPPs differ in respect of syntax.

## 4. How are they different?

### 4.1. copular verb test

Copular verbs are typically used to join an adjective or noun complement to a subject, (Swan, 1997, pp. 135-6). Let us compare (16a, b)

(16) a. The problem looked *impossible*.

b. Isabel *suddenly* looked at him.

In (16a), the verb *looked* joins the adjective complement *impossible* to the subject *the problem*. In this instance, *looked* functions as a copular verb and links the complement and the subject. On the other hand, in (16b), the verb *looked* does not function as a copular verb. That is why the adverb *suddenly*, not the adjective *sudden*, is used there. In this case, the verb *looked* acts just as an ordinary verb, like *walk*, *run*, *jump*, etc.

Let us consider how *in-*EPPs and *with-*EPPs work in copular verbal constructions.

- (17) a. He seems *happy*.
- b. He seems *in shock*.
- c. \*He seems *with shock*.

The verb *seem* is a copular verb, and it needs a complement to be linked to a subject, as in (17a). (17b) is correct while (17c) is not. This contrast proves that *in shock* functions like an adjective while *with shock* does not.

The verb *look* acts either as a copular verb or as an ordinary verb. Let us see how (18) are different.

- (18) a. He looked *in shock*.
- b. He looked *with shock*.

(18a, b) are both correct. However, they do not refer to the same situation. *Look* in (18a) acts as a copular verb, and so *in shock* is a complement to the subject. (18a) means *He had a look of being shocked*. However, (18b) does not have the same meaning as (18a) does. As shown in (17c), *with*-EPPs are not used as a complement to a subject. So *with shock* does not function as a complement to the subject in (18b). Instead, *with shock* is like an adverbial phrase and modifies the verb *looked*. Considering this, (18b) means *He looked in the manner of being shocked*. To make the semantic differences clear, *in shock* in (18a) has what is called the state sense whereas *with shock* in (18b) has the manner sense. Syntactically speaking, *in shock* is a complement to the subject while *with shock* is an adverbial phrase and modifies the verb.

Let us have another example to appreciate the difference more clearly.

- (19) a. He appeared *in fright*.
- b. He appeared *with fright*.

The verb *appear* acts either as a copular verb or as an ordinary verb. *In fright* is a complement to the subject in (19a) while *with fright* is

like an adverb and modifies the verb *appeared*. As a result, the two sentences have different meanings. (19a) has the same meaning as the sentence *It appeared that he was in fright*. However, (19b) has a sense of *He made a frightened appearance*.

The syntactic and semantic differences of *in-*EPPs and *with-*EPPs are further obvious in sentences (17, 18, 19).

#### 4.2. The *how* test

*How* is often used to indicate a manner of doing something. *How* is one of the manner adverbs, which modifies verbs. Let us have a look at (20).

- (20) a. How did he stare?  
 b. He stared *with disbelief*.  
 c. \*He stared *in disbelief*.

(20) is a question of asking the way the person (*he*) stared. It is not a question of asking what state of emotion the person (*he*) was in when he stared at something. So the corresponding answer to (20a) should be like (20b), not (20c). The contrast in (20b, c) supports that *in-*EPPs and *with-*EPPs are not the same in the aspect of meaning.

*How* is not always used to indicate the manner of doing something. Sometimes it can be used to ask about the state of emotion. So the question of *How did he look?* is ambiguous. It has two meanings. One is about the manner of looking, and the other is about the state of emotion in which the person was<sup>8)</sup> The two different answers are possible, as in (21).

- (21) a. He looked *in disbelief*.  
 b. He looked *with disbelief*.

---

8) In the question of *how are you*, one of the typical answers is *I'm fine*. The *how* in this case indicates the state of conditions such as health, welfare, emotion.

When the answer is (21a), the question is understood as indicating what state of mind he was in. On the other hand, when the answer is (21b), the same question is regarded as indicating *In what manner he looked*. The same difference is found in (18).

### 4.3. Acceptability in movement

As mentioned earlier, *in*-EPPs play the role of complement to a subject, while *with*-EPPs modify a verb. This shows that *in*-phrases have to do with subjects rather than verbs. On the other hand, *with*-phrases behave differently. They are related to verbs rather than to subjects. This different relation causes different results when they perform a syntactic movement. Let us have a look at (22).

- (22) a. The man standing by the road cried out *in pain*.  
 b. The man standing by the road cried out *with pain*.

(22a, b) are both correct. *In pain* is out of the boundary of the verbal phrase *cried out* in (22a). *With pain* is within the boundary because it modifies the verbal phrase. Because of this syntactic difference, the two sentences produce a difference in correctness when *in pain* and *with pain* move from the end of the sentence to the front. (23a) is still acceptable while the acceptability of (23b) is doubtful.

- (23) a. *In pain*, the man standing by the road cried out.  
 b. \*(?) *With pain*, the man standing by the road cried out.

If *with pain* moves from the end to the front as in (23b), it is too distant to modify *cried out*, which is still located at the end. When modifier and modified come syntactically close together, it is much easier to connect them semantically. This is the principle of adjacency. (23b) violates the principle. However, (23a) does not violate the principle even if the same syntactic transformation takes place. Even when *in pain* is located at the front of the sentence, it is adjacent to the subject

*the man*.<sup>9)</sup> *In pain* and *the man* get closer when *in pain* moves to the front. That is why the movement does not violate the principle of adjacency in (23a).<sup>10)</sup> The different degree of acceptability in (23) is caused by the different functions of *in-*EPPs and *with-*EPPs.

#### 4.4. Small clause or not?

Chomsky (1982: 107) defines a small clause as a clausal structure lacking INFL<sup>11)</sup> and the copula. According to his definition of a small clause, (24) contains a small clause, which is the bracketed part.

(24) They consider [each other foolish].

In (24), *each other* and *foolish* take a relation of subject and predicate.<sup>12)</sup> However, they cannot form a full clause, because they lack INFL and copula. That is why [each other foolish] in (24) is termed a small clause.

*In-*EPPs can be considered as a type of small clause, following the definition of Chomsky (1982). Let us have a look at (25).

---

9) Another possible explanation is that (23a) has the syntactic structure of [*PRO in pain*], *the man standing by the road cried out*. In this analysis, PRO plays the subject for *in pain*.

10) One of the reviewers asked a question about (22a). *In pain* is located at the end of the sentence, so that it is far away from the subject, *the man*. The question was why (22a) is still correct even though *in pain* is at a distant location from the subject, violating the principle of adjacency. The answer is that it does not violate the principle when we consider that (22a) is analyzed into *The man standing by the road cried out [PRO in pain]*. This analysis is exactly the same as (25b). Another question was why the sentence, *how did the man standing by the road cried out*, is correct even if *how* is at the front just like (23b). The difference comes from the fact that *wh*-question words such as *what*, *why*, *how*, etc. are freer to move (*wh*-movement) while ordinary adverb phrases are more restricted to movement.

11) For more on INFL, see Chomsky (1982: 18). INFL has an important role in determining whether clauses are infinite or finite.

12) Needless to say, *each other* is an object of the verb *consider*. In this sense, *each other* has a dual role in that it is the semantic subject of *foolish* as well as the syntactic object of *consider*.

- (25) a. He held her *in silence*.  
 b. He held her [PRO *in silence*].

(25a) is an S-structure while (25b) is the D-structure of (25a). In (25b), [PRO *in silence*] falls into a category of small clauses. PRO is a subject, and *in silence* is the predicate of the subject, PRO. PRO and *in silence* form the relation of subject and predicate, which indicate a clause. However, [PRO *in silence*] is not qualified for a full clause because they lack INFL and copula.

(24) and (25a) both contain a small clause. Even so, the small clauses are different from each other. [each other foolish] is an essential part of the whole sentence in (24) whereas [PRO *in silence*] is not in (25). If we take [each other foolish] out of (24), only *They consider* remains. *They consider* alone is not qualified to be a full sentence, because the thought is incomplete. This way, [each other foolish] is an essential part of (24). However, even if [(PRO) *in silence*] is taken out of (25), *He held her*, which remains, is still a good sentence, because it is a complete thought in and of itself. In this respect, the small clause in (24) is an essential one while the small clause in (25) is an additional one. *In-EPPs* can become either an essential or an additional small clause. All the examples in (1, 8, 9) are additional small clauses. But the examples in (17a, 18a, 19a, 21a) belong to the category of an essential small clause.

*With-EPPs* cannot form a small clause. Let us consider (26).

- (26) a. She was smiling *with admiration*.  
 b. She [was smiling with admiration].  
 c. \*She was smiling [PRO with admiration].

(26a) is syntactically analyzed into (26b). In (26b), the verb *smile* and *with admiration* cling together. They fall together within the verbal phrase. Within the verbal phrase, *with admiration* modifies the verb *smile*. However, if we analyze (26a) into (26c), it goes so far as to mean that PRO is a subject, and that *with admiration* is the predicate.

As seen in (17), *with*-EPPs cannot be a predicate. That is why (26a) cannot be analyzed into (26c). (25, 26) prove that *in*-EPPs and *with*-EPPs have a different status.

## 5. Conclusion

*In*-EPPs and *with*-EPPs are frequently used as an important part of a sentence. Despite their frequency, the two types of EPPs have not caught much attention from linguists. They have apparent similarities, but these two phrases are not what they appear to be. We have considered whether the choice of *in* or *with* has to do with the following nouns. This research has shown that the choice is not affected by the following nouns. This observation supports that the same emotional nouns can take *in* or *with*. Even so, it does not follow that they behave in the same way syntactically. Furthermore, they are different in terms of meaning. This paper have addressed the semantic and syntactic differences of the two EPPs through several tests such as constructions with copular verbs, the *how*-test. We have also seen that the two phrases show different degrees of acceptability when *in*-EPPs and *with*-EPPs move from the end to the front of a sentence. Lastly, it is pointed out that *in*-EPPs can be a part of a small clause, whether it is essential or additional while *with*-EPPs cannot. All these differences support that the two phrases are syntactically and semantically different.

## References

- Bronte, C. (1993). *Jane Eyre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1982). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Holland: Foris Publications.
- Collins Cobuild English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*. (2001). Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Dickens, C. (1992). *Oliver Twist*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dickens, C. (1999). *A Tale of Two Cities*. Essex: Pearson Education

Limited.

- Eastwood, J. (2001). *Oxford Guide to English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eliot, G. (1995). *The Mill on the Floss*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flaubert, G. (2001). *Madame Bovary*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Foulds, D. (1992). *The Golden Touch and Other Stories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grisham, J. (1999). *The Pelican Brief*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Grisham, J. (2001a). *The Testament*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Grisham, J. (2001b). *The Runaway Jury*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Lindstromberg, S. (1998). *English Prepositions Explained*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. (2001). Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- McGovern, K. (1994). *Stories from Greek Tragedies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McRobbie, D. (1994). *The Talking Tree and Other Stories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Murphy, R. (2000). *Grammar in Use Intermediate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. (2000). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Swan, M. (1997). *Practical English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tolstoy, L. (2001). *Anna Karenina*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Tyler, A. & Evans, A. V. (2003). *The Semantics of English Prepositions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



Yonghyun Kwon  
English Department  
Sung-Kong-Hoe University  
1-1 Hang-Dong, Guro-Gu, Seoul  
152-716, Korea  
Phone: 82-2-2610-4255  
Email: yhkwon@mail.skhu.ac.kr

Received: 30 Sept, 2005

Revised: 12 Dec, 2005

Accepted: 15 Dec, 2005