

The Interclausal Syntactic and Semantic Relations of the Periphrastic Causative*

Heechul Lee

(Chonbuk National University/Boise State University)

Lee, Heechul. 2007. **The Interclausal Syntactic and Semantic Relations of the Periphrastic Causative**. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 15(4), 163-178. Lee (1998) seems to assume that a simple sentence of the Korean periphrastic causative construction is neutral in which meaning it expresses, with respect to the concepts of 'causing', letting, permitting, and weak jussive. In other words, it can express either of those concepts, depending upon the context in which it occurs. This paper argues that aspect, modality, or adverbs attached to the first nucleus and /or the second nucleus determine the juncture-nexus types of the Korean periphrastic causative construction in the framework of Role and Reference Grammar. The juncture-nexus type, in turn, determines the meanings expressed by the causative. In other words, the specific concept expressed by the causative nucleus *-key* (CLM) *ha-* 'do' is determined by the juncture-nexus type of the construction. It is the juncture-nexus types that matter with respect to the meanings expressed by the Korean periphrastic causative.

Key Words: periphrastic causative, juncture-nexus type, 'causing', letting, permitting, weak jussive

1. Introduction

Such scholars as Yang (1994), Park (1993), and Song (1988) began to consider Korean periphrastic causative sentences in which aspect, modality, or adverbs are attached to the first nucleus and/or the second nucleus. As a result of containing those elements, the semantic category

* I owe the improvement of this paper to three anonymous readers. All remaining errors are mine.

expressed by the sentence changes. This paper will analyze the sentences with those operators in the RRG framework (Van Valin & LaPolla, 1997; Van Valin, 2005; Yang, 1994, 1999).

This study will make use of four specific concepts, the concept of 'causing',¹⁾ that of letting, and that of permitting as represented in Talmy's (1988, 2003) force dynamics of causation, on the one hand, and the concept of weak jussive, on the other. The representation of the three concepts in terms of force dynamics will play an important role in sorting out the concepts expressed by the Korean periphrastic causative construction. As Kemmer and Verhagen (1994) note, a causative construction might cover more than one type of causation in any given language. Likewise, Yang (1994, 1998), Park (1993), Song (1988, 1996a, 1996b), S.-C. Song (1988), Shibatani (1976), Patterson (1974), and I.-S. Yang (1972) mention that the Korean periphrastic causative construction can express more than one semantic category.

It will be argued that the concept of 'causing' is only expressed by the juncture-nexus type of nuclear cosubordination. It will be further argued that the concept of weak jussive as well as the concept of letting and that of permitting is represented by the juncture-nexus type of core coordination. For what Bratt (1996) argues is monoclausal, there exist two different juncture-nexus types depending upon the concepts expressed by the periphrastic causative.

2. The juncture-nexus types and their interclausal semantic relations

In a nuclear juncture, the relevant operators are aspect, directionals, and negation; in a core juncture, they are modality, directionals, and internal negation; and in a clausal juncture, they are any of the clausal operators, most often tense and illocutionary force. All operators above the level of juncture are shared equally by all units. In a core juncture,

1) Talmy's (1988, 2003) concept of 'causing' is equivalent to the meaning expressed by the typical causative verb 'make'.

for example, all cores are equally within the scope of clausal tense and illocutionary force operators.

Operators play no role, however, in determining the levels of juncture. The levels of juncture are defined purely structurally. In a nuclear juncture, multiple predicates or nuclei constitute what is in effect a single complex predicate with a single set of core arguments. In non-subordinate core junctures, the cores share a core argument. One of the core arguments occurs only in the matrix core, but the shared argument is semantically interpreted as if it were in each linked core.

This section deals with aspect and modality attached to the first nucleus and/or the second nucleus. Yang (1994, 1999) summarizes Korean operators with respect to their scope in his pioneering work.

2.1 Aspect and the concept of causation

Nuclear junctures involve a single core containing multiple nuclei. A couple of English examples are as follows (Van Valin & LaPolla, 1997; Van Valin, 2005):

- (1) a. John forced open the door.
 b. John forced the door open.

In the above example, the two distinct predicates, *force* and *open*, each of which constitutes a distinct nucleus, may occur adjacent to each other, as in (1a), or separated from each other by a core argument, the NP *the door*, as in (1b). The two nuclei function as a single complex predicate.

Let us consider aspect attached to the second nucleus as follows:

- (2) emeni-ka atul-eykey/ul kongpwuha-key ha-ko.iss-ta
 mother-NOM son-DAT/ACC study-CLM do-CONT-DEC
 ‘The mother is making the son study (and, as a result, the son is studying).’

In the above sentence, the continuative aspect has scope over both nuclei. Aspect is a nuclear operator because it specifies the internal temporal structure of the event itself, without reference to anything else. Hence the sentence shows the instance of nuclear cosubordination as its juncture-nexus type. It can possibly express the concept of 'causing' since the aspect attached to the second nucleus does not change the concept of 'causing'.

Let us consider aspect attached to the first nucleus, as follows:

- (3) emeni-ka ai-eykey/lul sathang-ul mek-ko.iss-key
 mother-NOM child-DAT/ACC candy-ACC eat-CONT-CLM
 hay-ss-ta
 do-PST-DEC
 'The mother let the child eat candies./ The mother let the child keep
 eating candies.'

Park (1993) claims that the periphrastic causative construction does not necessarily express the causative relation in the sense of the Interclausal Semantic Relations Hierarchy. The aspect marker attached to the first nucleus gives the sentence the concept of letting, not the concept of 'causing', as also seen in the above translation. Hence the above sentence, in which the aspect is attached to the first nucleus, expresses the concept of letting, not the concept of 'causing' any more. The structure of the sentence has core coordination as its juncture-nexus type.

In the above sentence, in terms of Talmy's (1998, 2003) force dynamics of causation, the Agonist, child, wants to eat candies. The Antagonist, mother, has control over the Agonist. The Antagonist releases her force over the Agonist. The child gets to eat candies. Thus the Agonist accomplishes his desire, that is, he eats the candies. Alternatively, the child is already eating the candies and the mother does not impinge on the child's activity. The 'keep V-ing' translation reflects this latter interpretation.

Let us consider a sentence in which the aspect is attached to both the first nucleus and the second nucleus, as follows:

- (4) emeni-ka ai-eykey/lul sathang-ul mek-ko.iss-key
 mother-NOM child-DAT/ACC candy-ACC eat-CONT-CLM
 ha-ko.iss-ta
 do-CONT-DEC

‘The mother is letting the child eat the candies./ The mother is letting the child keep eating the candies.’

In the above sentence, the aspect marker, *ko.iss*, ‘CONT’ attached to the first nucleus, *mek-* ‘eat’ gives the sentence as a whole the concept of letting, not that of ‘causing.’ The continuative aspect gives the sentence an interpretation in which the Agonist does what he has been doing or wants to do. In other words, it can be the concept of ‘onset letting’ or that of ‘extended letting’ (Talmy 1988, 2003). Thus the sentence is intended to mean the concept of letting, with core coordination as its juncture-nexus type.

The second nucleus also contains the same aspect marker as the one attached to the first nucleus. The continuative aspect marker on the second nucleus gives the sentence as a whole the continuative aspect. An aspect marker attached to the first nucleus restricts the possible interpretation of the sentence while the aspect marker attached to the causative nucleus just changes the aspect of the whole sentence. Song (1988) argues that the lower and higher verbs do not constitute a complex nucleus. In summary, the above sentence expresses the concept of letting with an instance of core coordination.

At a first glance, the above sentence might look like an instance of nuclear coordination. A more careful study of the sentence would show that it has core coordination as its juncture-nexus type since each nucleus can be modified by a core operator, as follows:

- (5) emeni-ka ai-eykey/lul sathang-ul mek-ko.iss-ulswiiss-key
 mother-NOM child-DAT/ACC candy-ACC eat-CONT-ABLE-CLM

ha-ko.iss-ulswueps-ta
do-CONT-UNABLE-DEC

2.2 Modality and meanings expressed by periphrastic causatives

Core operators express relationships between the core argument(s) and the nucleus. We can paraphrase *John must leave* as *John is obliged to leave*, which shows the relationship of obligation between *John* and *leave*. We cannot say **John is possible/necessary to leave tomorrow*, but rather *John is permitted/obliged/ to leave tomorrow*. This shows the difference between the status of the core operator, modality, and the clausal operator status. The deontic modals represent the relationship between an argument of a core and its nucleus. On the other hand, the clausal operators modify the whole proposition. It is interesting to note that the two different scopes of the same modals can correctly predict the (un)grammaticality of sentences containing the paraphrase of the modals.

Let us consider a couple of sentences, as follows:

- (6) a. I ordered Fred to force open the door.
b. John forced the door to open.

Each of the above sentences is made up of two cores, each with its own nucleus: In (6a) *I ordered Fred* and *Fred force open the door* and in (6b) *John forced the door* and *the door open*. In this type of core juncture, there is a core argument which is semantically an argument of the nucleus in each core (*Fred* in (6a) and *door* in (6b)). It occurs only once in the core carrying the clausal operators: this is the matrix core of the construction.

Let us consider some sentences containing modality, which is a core operator (Yang 1994, 1999; Song 1988), as follows:

- (7) emeni-ka atul-eykey/ul kongpwuha-key ha-lswuiss-ta
mother-NOM son-DAT/ACC study-CLM do-ABLE-DEC
'The mother can make the son study.'

In the above sentence, the core operator (Yang 1994, 1999) *lswuiss* 'ABLE' has scope over the complex nucleus, modifying the relation of the actor to it. The meaning of the sentence can be represented as *mother can [make study] son*. The sentence expresses the concept of 'causing' in Talmy's (1988, 2003) sense, which is one of the meanings possibly expressed by the periphrastic causative construction. The construction employs an instance of nuclear cosubordination as a way of expressing the concept of 'causing'.

Let us consider a sentence in which modality occurs in the first nucleus, as follows:

- (8) emeni-ka ai-eykey/lul nol-swuiss-key hay-ss-ta
 mother-NOM child-DAT/ACC play-ABLE-CLM do-PST-DEC
 'The mother permitted the child to play.'

The modal *lswuiss* 'ABLE' is attached to the first nucleus, *nol* 'play' in the above sentence. The modal on the first nucleus gives the sentence the concept of permitting, not that of 'causing', as the translation also shows. In more detail, what the above sentence means from the perspective of Talmy's (1988, 2003) force dynamics of causation is: the Antagonist, mother, is out of the way of the Agonist, child. The child can play if he wants. It is up to the child's decision whether he plays or not.

Talmy (1988, 2003) provides the representations of the concept of letting and that of permitting in his force dynamic terms. He differentiates the concept of letting from that of permitting. To reiterate his point in Givon's (1984) terms, some manipulative verbs are implicative, so that if they (or their main clauses) are true, the complement is also true. For example, *The mother let her son play* implicates *Her son played*. These verbs thus code successful manipulation. Other verbs are non-implicative, so that neither success nor failure of the manipulation is strictly implied by the truth of the main verb (or clause). For instance, *The mother permitted her son to play* does not imply *Her son played*. These are thus verbs of attempted

manipulation.

Let us consider a sentence in which modality occurs in both nuclei, as follows:

- (9) emeni-ka ai-eykey/lul nol-swiiss-key ha-lswiiss-ta
 mother-NOM child-DAT/ACC play-ABLE-CLM do-ABLE-DEC
 'The mother can permit her son to play.'

The above sentence shows that the modality occurring in the first nucleus determines the concept expressed by the sentence. The concept expressed by the sentence is that of permitting.

Song (1988) argues that the modality of the higher verb does not affect that of the lower verb, and that the modality of the lower verb is dependent only upon the modal attached to the lower verb. There will, otherwise, be conflict in modality of the lower verb, as follows:

- (10) emeni-ka atul-eykey/ul nol-swueps-key ha-lswiiss-ta
 mother-NOM son-DAT/ACC play-UNABLE-CLM do-ABLE-DEC
 'The mother is able not to permit the son to play./The mother can preclude the son from playing.'

In the sentence above, if the modality of the higher verb had its scope over both the lower and higher verbs, there would be conflict in modality of the lower verb since the modal attached to the lower verb is the opposite of the one attached to the higher verb. Thus, Song (1988) justifiably argues that the pattern is the case of coordination, not that of cosubordination.

As also seen in the glosses of the above sentence, it does not represent the concept of 'causing' in Talmy's (1988, 2003) sense any more. It rather means the concept of permission. As Song (1988) claims, the sentence is an instance of core coordination. The sentence containing modality in the first nucleus expresses the concept of permitting, not that of 'causing'.

3. Adverbs and weak jussive

This section investigates what the behavior of adverbs show about the juncture-nexus type of the periphrastic causative construction. Two types of adverbs such as temporal and locational adverbs are examined with respect to what their behavior in modification shows about the juncture-nexus types of the construction.

The following English example illustrates that adverbs to be dealt with in this section are core operators.

(11) Sam asked Fred to leave tomorrow.

Tomorrow in the above example has to modify *leave* only; it is incompatible with the past tense of *ask*. This is not a problem for the layered structure of clause. Peripheral adverbs such as this are modifiers of core, not the clause, while tense is a clausal operator, and therefore should be possible in this construction.

3.1 Temporal adverbs

Let us consider the following sentence, which contains temporal adverbs.

(12) kumyoil-ey nay-ka haksayng-eykey toyoil-ey chayk-ul
 Friday-on I-NOM student-DAT Saturday-on book-ACC
 ilk-key hay-ss-ta
 read-CLM do-PST-DEC
 'On Friday, I told the student to read the book on Saturday.'

The concept of direct causation is only possible by definition when the temporal domain is the same both for the causing action and for the caused event. The above sentence has different temporal domains for the causing action and caused event. Hence the above sentence expresses a weak jussive meaning, not the concept of 'causing', as also

seen in the translation.

A sentence containing a single temporal adverb, which is a core adverb, can have the syntactic structure of nuclear cosubordination. A sentence containing two different temporal adverbs, on the other hand, cannot have the syntactic structure of nuclear cosubordination. It involves a core juncture, and cannot express the concept of 'causing', as seen in the above example.

Let us consider a morphological causative sentence containing two different temporal adverbs, as follows:

- (13) * ecey emeni-ka atul-eykey onul chayk-ul
 yesterday mother-NOM son-DAT today book-ACC
 ilk-hi-ess-ta
 read-CAUS-PST-DEC
 'Yesterday the mother made her son read the book today.'

The above ungrammatical sentence shows that two different temporal adverbs cannot occur in the morphological causative construction. The ungrammaticality of the above sentence can be explained in terms of the logical structure (Van Valin & LaPolla, 1997; Van Valin, 2005). Peripheral bare NP adverbs like *today* and *yesterday* take the logical structure of the core as their argument. A single core cannot contain two different temporal adverbs conflicting each other. From the ungrammaticality of the morphological causative sentence with two different temporal adverbs, it is confirmed that the periphrastic causative sentence with two different temporal adverbs does not express the concept of 'causing', and that the sentence involves the syntactic structure of core juncture. This predicts that the causee NP can occur between the nuclei, as follows:

- (14) ecey emeni-ka onul hankwuk-ulo
 yesterday mother-NOM today Korea-to
 tola.o-key atul-eykey hay-ss-ta
 return-CLM son-DAT do-PST-DEC
 'Yesterday mother told (commanded) her son to [return to Korea today].'

3.2 Locational adverbs

Like temporal adverbs, the locational adverb modifies the core of the sentence. In other words, locational adverbs are core operators. Both the causation and the caused event are in the same locational domain in the concept of direct causation.

Let us consider a sentence in which the causing action and caused event have different locational adverbs modifying them, as follows:

- (15) *pwuek-eyse emeni-ka atul-eykey pang-eyse*
 kitchen-LOC mother-NOM son-DAT room-LOC
kongpwuha-key hay-ss-ta
 study-CLM do-PST
 'In the kitchen mother told her son [to study in the room].'

In the above sentence, the adverb *pwuekh-eyse* 'in the kitchen' modifies the matrix core while the adverb *pang-eyse* 'in the room' modifies the embedded core. This phenomenon of adverbial modification shows that the sentence is an instance of core coordination. The fact that the sentence is grammatical shows that it involves core juncture. By definition, the above sentence does not represent the concept of 'causing' any more with the two different locational adverbs modifying the embedded and matrix cores. It rather expresses the concept of weak jussive, as also seen in the translation of the sentence. It is shown here that sentences cannot express direct causation when the embedded and matrix cores are modified by different locational adverbs.

Let us consider a morphological causative sentence containing two different locational adverbs, as follows:

- (16) * *pwuek-eyse emeni-ka atul-eykey pang-eyse*
 kitchen-LOC mother-NOM son-DAT room-LOC
chayk-ul ilk-hi-ess-ta
 book-ACC read-CAUS-PST-DEC

The ungrammaticality of the above sentence shows that the

morphological causative sentence cannot have two conflicting locational adverbs. This fact confirms that the periphrastic causative sentence with two locational adverbs does not express the concept of 'causing'.

3.3 Summary

If two different temporal or locational adverbs occur in a sentence, the sentence does not express the concept of 'causing' or direct causation. In other words, if there is difference in temporal or locational domain between a causing event and a caused event, the concept of 'causing' or direct causation cannot be expressed any more. The two temporal or locational adverbs modify different cores of the sentence in which they occur. Hence the periphrastic causative sentence containing two different temporal or locational adverbs involve core coordination and it expresses the concept of weak jussive.

4. (In)separability and its relation to the juncture-nexus types

The inseparability of the first and second nuclei in ordinary scrambling also points to the complex nucleus status of two nuclei. Let us consider sentences which involve the syntactic structure of nuclear cosubordination, and accordingly, which express the concept of 'causing'.

- (17) a. pang-eyse emeni-nun ai-eykey os-ul
 room-LOC mother-TOP child-DAT clothes-ACC
 pes-key hay-ss-ta
 take.off-CLM do-PST-DEC
 ' In the room, the mother undressed the child.'
- b. * pang-eyse emeni-nun os-ul
 room-LOC mother-TOP clothes-ACC
 pes-key ai-eykey hay-ss-ta
 take.off-CLM child-DAT do-PST-DEC
- c. * pang-eyse ai-eykey os-ul
 room-LOC child-DAT clothes-ACC

- pes-key emeni-nun hay-ss-ta
 take.off-CLM mother-TOP do-PST-DEC
- d. * emeni-nun ai-eykey os-ul
 mother-TOP child-DAT clothes-ACC
 pes-key pang-eyse hay-ss-ta
 take.off-CLM room-LOC do-PST-DEC

The above sentences show that in the syntactic structure of nuclear cosubordination, nothing can intervene between the nuclei. Positing the nuclear cosubordination for the juncture-nexus type of sentences with dative or accusative case when expressing the concept of 'causing' explains the inseparability of the first nucleus and the causative nucleus.

Let us consider sentences which contain two temporal adverbs and which involve scrambling, as follows:

- (18) a. ecey emeni-ka atul-eykey onul hankwuk-ulo
 yesterday mother-NOM son-DAT today Korea-to
 tola.o-key hay-ss-ta
 return-CLM do-PST-DEC
 'Yesterday mother told (commanded) her son to [return to Korea today].
- b. ecey emeni-ka onul hankwuk-ulo
 yesterday mother-NOM today Korea-to
 tola.o-key atul-eykey hay-ss-ta
 return-CLM son-DAT do-PST-DEC
 'Yesterday mother told (commanded) her son to [return to Korea today].
- c. ecey atul-eykey onul kankwuk-ulo
 yesterday son-DAT today Korea-to
 tola.o-key emeni-ka hay-ss-ta
 return-CLM mother-NOM do-PST-DEC
 'Yesterday mother told (commanded) her son to [return to Korea today].
- d. emeni-ka atul-eykey onul hankwuk-ulo
 mother-NOM son-DAT today Korea-to
 tola.o-key ecey hay-ss-ta
 return-CLM yesterday do-PST-DEC
 'Yesterday mother told (commanded) her son to [return to Korea today].

The above sentences are instances of core coordination. They show that in the syntactic structure of core coordination, an element in the matrix core can intervene between the two nuclei. The syntactic structure of core coordination does not express the concept of 'causing' and allows an element to interrupt the contiguity of the nuclei.

5. Conclusion

The significance of this paper lies in its employment of Talmy's (1988, 2003) force dynamics of causation and its distinction between the concept of letting and that of permitting. Following its distinction, it argues that the Korean periphrastic causative construction can express not only the concept of permitting, but also that of letting, among others, depending upon the operators attached to the lower verb. Starting from its assumption that a simple sentence of the Korean periphrastic causative construction is neutral in the meanings that it can possibly express, it shows how aspect, modality, and adverbs determine the interclausal syntactic relations, and in turn, how the interclausal syntactic relations determine the interclausal semantic relations. It claims that in the construction, the concept of 'causing' is expressed by the juncture-nexus type of nuclear cosubordination, and that the juncture-nexus type of core coordination represents the concept of letting, that of permitting, and that of weak jussive (telling), among others. It follows that the Korean periphrastic causative construction can express several different semantic categories. It would also be interesting to study in the next paper how negation in the construction interacts with the interclausal relations.

References

- Bratt, E. O. (1996). *Argument composition and the lexicon: Lexical and periphrastic causatives in Korean*. Doctoral dissertation. Stanford University, CA.
- Givón, T. (1984). *Syntax: a functional-typological introduction*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins Publishing Co.

- Kemmer, S. & Verhagen, A. (1994). The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 5, 115-156.
- Lee, H.-C. (1998). *The syntax and semantics of the Korean periphrastic causative construction*. Doctoral dissertation. SUNY, Buffalo, NY. [Published by Hanshin Mwonhwasa in Seoul, Korea]
- Park, K.-S. (1993). Korean causatives in Role and Reference Grammar. Unpublished M.A. project. SUNY, Buffalo, NY.
- Patterson, B. S.-J. (1974). *A study of Korean causatives*. M.A. thesis. University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI. [Published by Working Papers in Linguistics, University of Hawaii, 6(4), 1-51.]
- Shibatani, M. (1976). The grammar of causative constructions: a conspectus. In M. Shibatani (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 6* (pp. 1-40). New York: Academic Press.
- Song, J.-J. (1988). Clause linkage in Korean periphrastic causative and purposive constructions. *Language Research*, 24, 583-606. Seoul, Korea: Seoul National University.
- Song, J.-J. (1996a). Korean periphrastic causative constructions in Role and Reference Grammar. *Language Research*, 32, 665-689. Seoul, Korea: Seoul National University.
- Song, J.-J. (1996b). *Causatives and causation: a universal-typological perspective*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Song, S.-C. (1988). Explorations in Korean syntax and semantics. *Korea Research Monograph*, 14. Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies.
- Talmy, L. (1988). Force dynamics in language and cognition. *Cognitive Science*, 12, 49-100.
- Talmy, L. (2003). *Toward a cognitive semantics: typology and process in concept structuring (language, speech, and communication) (Vol. 2)*. Boston, M.A.: The MIT Press.
- Van Valin, R. D. (1993). A synopsis of Role and Reference Grammar. In R. D. Van Valin (Ed.), *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar* (pp. 1-164). Amsterdam, Holland: John Benjamins.
- Van Valin, R. D. and LaPolla, R. J. (1997). *Syntax- structure, meaning & function*. Cambridge University Press.

- Van Valin, R. D. (2005). *Exploring the syntax-semantics interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yang, B.-S. (1994). *Morphosyntactic phenomena of Korean in Role and Reference Grammar: Psych verb constructions, inflectional verb morphemes, complex sentences, and relative clauses*. Doctoral dissertation. SUNY, Buffalo, NY. [Published by Hankwuk Mwonhwasa in Seoul, Korea]
- Yang, B.-S. (1998). Clause linkage and interclausal relations hierarchy in Korean. *Korean Journal of Linguistics*, 23(2), 343-365.
- Yang, B.-S. (1999). An RRG account of Korean verbal inflection: operator projection. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 7(3), 275-296.
- Yang, I.-S. (1972). *Korean syntax: case markers, delimiters, complementation, and relativization*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI. [Published by Working Papers in Linguistics, University of Hawaii, 4(6), 1-294.]

Heechul Lee

Department of English Education

College of Education, Chonbuk National University

664-14 Duckjin-dong, Duckjin-gu

Jeonju 561-756, Korea

Email: hlee@chonbuk.ac.kr

Department of Bilingual Education

College of Education, Boise State University

1910 University Drive

Boise, Idaho 83725-1725, U.S.A.

Phone: 1-208-334-2262

Email: heechullee@boisestate.edu

Received: 30 September, 2007

Revised: 3 December, 2007

Accepted: 7 December, 2007