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# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A*:</td>
<td>Adjunct of reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&lt;sub&gt;con&lt;/sub&gt;:</td>
<td>Adjunct of condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&lt;sub&gt;loc&lt;/sub&gt;:</td>
<td>Adjunct of location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&lt;sub&gt;time&lt;/sub&gt;:</td>
<td>Adjunct of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comb.:</td>
<td>Combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:</td>
<td>Complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, det:</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:</td>
<td>finite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP:</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P:</td>
<td>Predicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep.:</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP:</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS:</td>
<td>Phrase-structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP:</td>
<td>Relative Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V:</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP:</td>
<td>Verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG:</td>
<td>Verbal group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z:</td>
<td>Other elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP:</td>
<td>Object phrase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number in parentheses at the end of each example in Chapter 3 indicates the position of the example’s source in the list of data sources at the end of this thesis.
INTRODUCTION

1. Rationale

I have finished the MA course in English linguistics, and it is time for me to complete the final thesis which partly shows what I have got from this very useful programme. There are many things to write about but I choose to study on Relative clauses in English and its representatives in Vietnamese using Systemic Functional Grammar as the theoretical framework. This is because of some reasons. On the one hand, in linguistics history, English grammar has been described in different ways such as in Chomsky’s Transformational Generative grammar, in Bloomfield’s Immediate Constituent grammar, and in Halliday’s Functional grammar; however, it can be thought that the latest is the most successful in ‘bringing language closer to life’. As Thompson (1996:6) states “it is a full analysis of sentence in both form and meaning as well as their relationship”. Therefore, it is reasonable to use functional grammar system in my study.

On the other hand, I found many Vietnamese learners are experiencing a lot of difficulties when learning to use English relative clauses. They make many mistakes in making clauses containing relative clauses such as lack of relative pronouns, lack of subject-verb agreement. They sometimes say or write some funny Vietnamese sentences which are not pure Vietnamese simply because they translate improperly clauses containing the relative clause in English into their mother tongue. Being a teacher of English, I like to know whether my knowledge of English relative clauses can be used to help my students deal with the problems. Furthermore, I also like to introduce functional grammar to my students as it is a very useful way to look at English grammar as a live system in English language and to study and apply English grammar more appropriately.

Because of the above mentioned reasons, my final thesis is entitled “Relative clauses in English and in Vietnamese: A systemic functional comparison”. I hope this study will help my students and all concerned understand and use English relative clauses more easily. I also hope that this study will be useful for them when translating relative clauses in English into Vietnamese and vice versa.
2. Aims

2.1. Research questions

The study aims at (1) identifying the English relative clauses in terms of their concepts as well as semantic features, (2) finding how relative clauses function in nominal groups and clause complexes, and (3) focusing on the similarities and differences between relative clauses in English and their equivalents in Vietnamese.

In order to reach the target, the following research questions are posed:

1. What are relative clauses?
2. What are the similarities and differences between relative clauses in English and their equivalents in Vietnamese?

I also would like to find out the implications of this study in teaching and learning English relative clauses through translating them into Vietnamese and vice versa.

2.2. Scope of the study

As the title of the study suggests, I focus on establishing the similarities and differences between relative clauses in English and in Vietnamese through describing English relative clauses in terms of their structures and their roles in nominal groups and clause complexes. The description will be based on the view of Systemic Functional grammar.

With the above mentioned aims and due to limited time and size for a minor thesis, I deal with written texts only. The examples for illustrations are taken out from books, textbooks, newspapers and magazines in both English and Vietnamese.

3. Methods of the study

The study is carried out through descriptive analysis and qualitative data activities. The research subject is described, then the examples are provided to illustrate the description. The data collected is also analyzed and grouped into categories so that the contrastive analysis can be done clearly.
4. Design of the study

The study has three main parts. The first major part, **Introduction**, states reasons for choosing the topic, three purposes specifying by three research questions, the methodology, the scope of the study and the design of the study. The second part, **Development**, consists of three chapters. It will provide the readers with the concepts, the structures, the meanings of relative clauses, and the comparison between those in English and their Vietnamese equivalents. **Chapter 1** provides theoretical orientations in which I will explore relative clauses in traditional grammar in terms of structures, types, and functions to see how the grammar looks at relative clauses, whether they are fully described and to get a general view of relative clauses. **Chapter 2** deals with relative clauses in English. In this chapter, a description of relative clauses will be given on the view of functional grammar. English nominal groups and clause complexes which contain relative clauses are used for illustration. Also in this chapter, the concept of the clause, semantic features, and structures are re-examined. **Chapter 3** is the comparison of English relative clauses and Vietnamese equivalent expressions, in which the features of English relative clauses are taken as points of comparison in order to find out the similarities and differences between them. The last part, **Conclusion**, is a summary of the discussed points together with the findings and implications of the study.
Chapter 1
Theoretical Orientations

This chapter will be devoted to give a brief description of various propositions about the relative clauses made by different schools of grammar in terms of generative-transformational grammar, and descriptive grammar. The chapter is also designed to present some weaknesses of the above mentioned trends of linguistics in this field. It also introduces readers with some brief ideas of functional grammar on relative clauses.

1.1. Descriptive Grammar’s Presentation of the Relative Clause

With the publication of the book “A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language” by Quirk and Greenbaum in 1972 (this book, after that, was edited again and divided into two books, one is A Grammar of Contemporary English, the other is A University Grammar of English, each of which deals with different fields in grammar), descriptive grammar established its standpoint in the linguistics field. Whereas prescriptive grammar laid down the law about how the language is supposed to be used, the descriptive grammar in modern linguistics aims to describe the grammatical system of a language, that is, what speakers of the language unconsciously know, which enables them to speak and understand the language. Therefore, it is believed that descriptive grammar provides a good ground for deeper studies in English grammar such as those of transformational-generative and systemic-functional grammar later on.

1.1.1. Relative Clause Structure and Functions in the Complex Noun Phrase

Quirk et al. (1972) placed relative clauses into the section of the complex noun phrase’s postmodification after giving the definition of restrictiveness and non-restrictiveness. According to them, modification can be restrictive or non-restrictive. That is, the head can be viewed as a member of a class which can be linguistically identified only through the modification that has been supplied (restrictive). Or the head can be viewed as unique or as a member of a class that has been independently identified (for example in a preceding sentence); any modification given to such a head is additional information which is not
essential for identifying the head, and we call it **non-restrictive**. For example, in the sentence *Mary doesn’t like the handsome boy over there who has long blonde hair, the boy* is identifiable when we understand that it is the particular boy who was over there, and who has long blonde hair. This modification would not have been restrictive unless there had been more than one handsome boy over there, or if there had been only one handsome boy with long blonde hair at that place.

Another example, *Everyone likes to come to Brunei, which is a very rich but tiny country* has a non-restrictive clause because the identity of Brunei is independent of whether it is rich, tiny or not though this information is useful.

Despite the fact that relative clauses can be restrictive or non-restrictive, it is undeniable that they are playing the function of postmodifiers.

Descriptive grammar describes the conditions governing relative clause forms. For example, the clause *who has long blonde hair* has *who* as the result of the replacement of the word *the boy; handsome* is from the simple sentence: *The boy is handsome.*

The full relative clause’s structure is also described with the focus on the preceding position of the relative pronoun. In restrictive clauses, frequent use is made of a general pronoun *that* which is independent of the personal (in this case, we often use *who, whom*) or non-personal character of the noun it refers to (in this case, we use *which*). However, *that* is very rare in non-restrictive clauses.

The relative pronoun is capable of showing agreement with the Head and of indicating its status as an element in the relative clause structure.

e.g.: *Mary, who... OR Brunei, which...*

Relative pronouns can have a function as *complement, subject or adjunct* in the relative clause. When they are not the subject of the clause, there is a further option that it is omitted. In this case, we say the clause has ‘zero’ relative pronoun as in the example *the boy we met...*

Postmodifying restrictively or non-restrictively is also implemented by non-finite relative clauses as long as the omitted relative pronoun plays the role of the subject of the clause. They are present (V-ing) participle clauses if the relative clause is in present simple, or present continuous; in future simple or future continuous; in past simple or past continuous tense.
e.g.: *The woman cleaning the room is her aunt.*
can be interpreted as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The woman who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>will clean / will be cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleaned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the room is her aunt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-finite relative clauses can also be Past (V-ed) participle clauses. In this case, the participle is often linked with the passive voice. For example, the sentence *The house burnt is my uncle’s one* can be interpreted as *The house which was burnt is my uncle’s one.*

Since with the intransitive verbs the past participles can never be passive, there is no –ed postmodifier corresponding to the relative clause in:

e.g.:  *The man who has arrived at the village is a criminal.*

But not: *The man arrived at the village is a criminal.*

Sometimes, relative clauses can be in infinitive form as in:

*The case to be investigated tomorrow*…

(from: The case which will be/ is to be investigated tomorrow…)

1.1.2. Relative Clause Structure and Functions in the Complex Sentence

Descriptive grammar provides definitions of coordination and subordination to explain the relation between clauses within a complex sentence. When two clauses in one sentence are coordinated with each other, they have equivalent status and function while if Y is subordinate clause of X, Y must be a constituent or a part of X (the superordinate clause). A further terminology distinction has also been given to make the latter relation clearer, that is between an *independent clause*, which is capable of constituting a simple sentence, and a *dependent clause*, which makes up a grammatical sentence only if subordinate to a further clause.

In this case, relative clauses are described as dependent clauses. They are called ‘*sentential clauses*’, clauses which non-restrictively modifies not a noun phrase, but a whole clause, sentence, or even series of sentences.

e.g.: *She kissed him twice – which surprised everybody.*
What distinguishes a relative clause, here, is not a particular syntactic function, but its cross-referring or binding role. The grammatical unit or segment to which it cross-refers is called the **antecedent** and the antecedent of a **sentential clause** is the whole clause or sentence except for the relative clause itself. In the above sentence, the event *she kissed him twice* described in the main clause is the antecedent.

Sentential relative clauses are introduced by the relative word **which**, and are closely parallel to non-restrictive postmodifying clauses in noun phrases. The sentential relative clause has fixed position at the end of the clause to which it relates. And, like other non-restrictive relative clauses, it can be most nearly paraphrased by a coordinate clause.

e.g.:  
*It may have rained heavily, in which case, my friends may get wet at the beach.*

\[\rightarrow \quad \text{It may have rained heavily and in that case, my friends may get wet at the beach.}\]

To conclude, descriptive grammar has implemented perfectly its task of describing how the grammatical system of a language is structured or defined, in this particular case, it has already described the structure and the grammatical function of relative clauses as restrictive, non-restrictive postmodification, in finite or non-finite forms. However, descriptive grammar ignores the pragmatic use of relative clauses in real life. It does not take the language user into account, either. It doesn’t pay attention to the role of the speaker when using relative clauses as a deliberate means of expressing his ideas.

**1.2. Relative Clauses in Transformational - Generative Grammar**

Transformational – generative grammar’s first philosophical and methodological foundations were established when Chomsky’s publication “Syntactic Structure” came to existence in 1957. Chomsky postulated a syntactic base of language (called deep structure), which consists of a series of phrase-structure (PS) rewriting rules, i.e., a series of (possibly universal) rules that generate the underlying phrase-structure of a sentence, and a series of rules (called transformations) that act upon the phrase-structure to form more complex sentences. After that, there have been many changes in the theory, together with other bases, to make it present transformational – generative grammar. Chomkian linguists have found that there is a sense in which PS rules simply duplicate information explicitly specified in subcategorization frames. This duplication is undesirable and it makes the grammar unnecessarily complicated. And, X-
bar theory has been developed as an alternative mechanism which determines the structural representation of lexical and non-lexical categories. It also uses PS rules although PS rules only deal with phrasal level. For example, with PS rules, we have some generalizations of structural representations of verb phrase (VP), noun phrase (NP), prepositional phrase (PP):

\[
\text{VP} \rightarrow \ldots V \ldots \quad \text{NP} \rightarrow \ldots N \ldots \quad \text{PP} \rightarrow \ldots P \ldots
\]

In X-bar theory, XP is the generalization that the structural representation of every category includes a phrase level. In X-bar terminology, the obligatory constituent is called the head of the phrasal level (or maximal projection of X). Therefore, if X = V, XP = VP, and V (X) is the obligatory constituent of VP (XP). X-bar theory puts forwards three principles illustrated as follows:

(i) \( XP \rightarrow \ldots X \ldots \)

(ii) \( X' \rightarrow X + \) complements: a single bar category (the intermediate level between XP and the head X) consists of the head and some complements

(iii) \( X'' \rightarrow \) specifiers (Spec.) + X’: a double bar category consists of a single bar category and some specifiers (specifier is a functional term which refers to the category which is the daughter (at immediate lower level) of XP and the sister of X’ (at the same level)

\[ NP \]

\[ \text{Spec.} \quad N^' \quad N \quad S' \quad \text{Specifiers} \quad \text{Noun} \quad \text{Specifier} \quad \text{NP} \]

The relative clause here is defined as a constituent of a complex noun phrase and modifies the head noun of the relative noun phrase.

\[ \text{NP} \quad \text{Spec.} \quad N^' \quad S' \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{Specifiers} \quad \text{Noun} \quad \text{Specifier} \quad \text{NP} \]

\[ \text{NP} \quad \text{Spec.} \quad N^' \quad S' \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{Specifiers} \quad \text{Noun} \quad \text{Specifier} \quad \text{NP} \]
In the above example the restrictive relative clause has an ‘adjective-like’ function. It is expected to have the same structural status as adjectives. It is neither the complement nor the specifier of the head N or NP. The relative clause is, therefore, an adjunct (Browning, 1991). It is tantamount that the relative clause is adjoined to the Noun Phrase (Determiner + Head noun) and the head noun of a relative clause is base-generated outside the clause (Chomsky, 1977). Together with the development of this school of grammar, this hypothesis, however, doesn’t fulfill the binding theory and C-command requirement.

Kayne (1994) develops Head raising hypothesis to explain this: the Noun phrase raises inside the relative clause. Furthermore, its derivation, the determiner complement hypothesis, emphasizes that the relative clause is syntactic complement of the determiner head of DP (D here means Det(emeriner). However, Kayne (1994) says that only motivation for the Head Raising analysis is empirical, the head D and its complement do not form a constituent.

To conclude, although transformational – generative grammar could touch the deep structure of phrases in the language, there are many other things to put into question. In other words, things like functions of phrase in the whole sentence in terms of syntactically, semantically are not paid enough attention.

1.3. Systemic Functional Grammar’s Position

A modern approach to combining accurate descriptions of the grammatical patterns of language with their function in context is that of systemic functional grammar, an approach originally developed by M.A.K. Halliday in the 1960s and now pursued actively on all continents. Systemic-functional grammar is related both to feature-based approaches such as Head-driven phrase structure grammar and to the older functional traditions of European schools of linguistics such as British Contextualism and the Prague School.

Relative clauses on the view of this grammar are described conceptually and communicatively by their functions as qualifiers in the experiential structure of nominal groups or semantic structure of the group; and as hypotactic elaborating clauses in the structure of clause complexes within the relation of interdependency as well as logical-semantic relation. These functions and the relative clause’s internal structure are discussed in detail in the next chapter.
Chapter 2
Relative Clauses in English on the View of Functional Grammar

Systemic functional grammar has been discussed above with systemic and functional aspects. On the one hand, systemic grammar looks at a language as a network system in which every section is part of the network as a whole. In other words, the theory “interprets a language as a network of relations, with structures coming in as the realization of these relationships”, or the grammar is ‘networked’. In systemic functional grammar, “a language is interpreted as a system of meanings, accompanied by forms through which meanings can be realized” (Halliday, 1994).

On the other hand, the fundamental components of meaning in language are functional components. All languages are organized around two main kinds of meaning, the ‘ideational’ or reflective which is to understand the environment, and the ‘interpersonal’ or active which is to act on the other meanings in the language. Combined with these is a third metafunctional component, the ‘textual’, which breathes relevance into the other two. Besides, each element in a language is explained by reference to its function in the total linguistic system; therefore it can be said that a functional grammar is one that construes all the units of a language – its clauses, phrases and so on – as organic configurations of functions.

In this chapter, based on the above-mentioned things, relative clauses are explored not only in its internal structure but also in its functions when combining with some other elements of language like in combination with other clauses, with nominal groups, with nouns. Functional grammar describes languages through English; therefore in this chapter as well as in other chapters in this paper, English is also taken as the language for illustrations. The main strategies applied here are (i) presenting the functional grammar theory on relative clauses then (ii) establishing definitions and finding out semantic and structural features of relative clauses in English.
2. 1. Internal Structure of Relative Clauses

In this section, the possible positions of relative clauses are discussed first, after that is kinds of relative clauses which are classified according to its internal structures.

2.1.1. Positions of Relative Clauses

Generally, we can use relative clauses to give further information about something or someone when we mention them in some sentence. A relative clause is put immediately after the noun or the nominal group which refers to the person, thing or group being talked about.

e.g.: (the clause in double square brackets is relative clause; the noun is underlined)

*The man [[who came into the room]] was small and slender.*

*Opposite is St. Paul’s Church, [[where you can hear some lovely music]].*

Sometimes, a relative clause can be found after one of the following pronouns: indefinite pronouns such as *someone, anyone, everything*. It is sometimes used after *some, many, much, several, all, those.*

e.g.:  *This is something [[that I’m very proud of]].*

*Karen Blixen was being feted by everyone [[who knew her work]].*

*Like many [[who met him in those days]] I was soon charmed.*

*…the feelings of those [[who have suffered from the effects of crime]].*

In written English, a relative clause (with *which* as relative pronoun) can be used after the primary clause (separated with the primary clause by a comma) to say something about the whole situation described the primary clause, rather than about someone or something mentioned in it.

e.g.:  *Minute computers need only minute amounts of power, [[which means that they will run on small batteries]].*

*I never met Brando again, [[which was a pity]].*

2.1.2. Kinds of relative clauses

Relative clauses have two main kinds according to their structures. They are the finite clause which contains a finite verb as the main verb in the clause; and the non-finite clause which only contains non-finite verbs as the main verb, its finite verb has been omitted.
2.1.2.1. Finite clauses

Full relative clauses

They are relative clauses with the serving of a relative pronoun. The relative pronoun usually acts as the subject or object of the verb in the relative clause; sometimes, it can play the role of adjuncts. The most common relative pronouns are that, which, who, whom, whose.

e.g.:  *Barbara works for a company* [[that makes washing machine]].

*Are these the keys* [[which you were looking for]]?

*Heath Robinson*, [[who died in 1944]], was a graphic artist and cartoonist.

*Nearly all the people* [[whom I used to know]] have gone.

*She asks friends* [[whose opinion she respected]].

Within the relative clause, the relative pronoun can realize any of the functions open to Nominal Groups. Among the above relative pronouns, who and that can be used to refer to a person or group of people; they are used as the subject of the relative clause;

e.g.:  *The man* [[who employed me]] would transport anything anywhere.

*...the man* [[that made it]]

while who, that, or whom are used as the object complement in the relative clauses.

e.g.:  *Suddenly, the work* [[that the Greeks had done from pure love of theory]] became the key to warfare and astronomy.

*That is the girl* [[who I saw yesterday at the party]].

*that, which,* denoting a thing or a group of things, can be the subject or object complement of relative clauses. It is preferable to use that (not which) after the following words: all, any(thing), every (thing), few, little, many, much, no(thing), none, some(thing), and after superlatives.

e.g.:  *British Rail*, [[which has launched an enquiry]], said one coach was badly damaged.

*...pasta* [[which came from Milan]]
…shells \([\text{that my sister had collected}]\).

There was not much \([\text{that the military men could do}]\).

There were only a few \([\text{that really interested him}]\).

Generally, who and which are more usual in written English whereas that is more usual in speech when referring to things.

When something belonging to the person, thing or group talked about is mentioned, a relative clause beginning with whose and a noun group should be used. This combination can function as the subject or object complement of the verb in the clause although the relative pronoun itself, whose, is Modifier, not the Head of this group.

e.g.: …workers \([\text{whose bargaining power is weak}]\).

She asks friends \([\text{whose opinion she respected}]\).

In written English, of which and of whom are sometimes used instead of whose. These expressions can be put after a noun or a nominal group.

e.g.: …circumstances \([\text{the continuance of which was prejudicial to the safety of the public}]\).

I traveled in a lorry \([\text{the back of which the owner had loaded with yams}]\).

Especially, when the word denoting the belonging is a quantifier or a number such as all, some, or a number, many, etc., of which and of whom are usually used after these words instead of before them.

e.g.: The wounded soldiers, \([\text{four of whom nearly died}]\), was sent to the Army hospital.

Others found in relative clauses are: when, where, why, whereby. They all can serve as adjuncts in the clauses although only some certain nouns can be before them. For example, the nouns denoting time in general must be before when, nouns denoting a place in general before where, the word “reason” before why. After “situation, stage, arrangement or system” is whereby.
e.g.:  I want to see you at 12 o’clock, [(when you go to your lunch)].

That was the room [(where I did my homework)].

That’s the reason [(why I am checking it now)].

In addition, when, where, why (can be called relative adverbs) can also be replaced by a proper preposition plus which:

e.g.:  This is the shop [(where my wallet was stolen)].

→  This is the shop [(in which my wallet was stolen)].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative adverb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>in/on which</td>
<td>Refers to a time expression</td>
<td>the day when we met him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>in/at which</td>
<td>refers to a place</td>
<td>the place where we met him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why</td>
<td>For which</td>
<td>refers to a reason</td>
<td>the reason why we met him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this paper, Relative pronouns in functional grammar do not include what because it is considered a compound relative, including both the antecedent and the relative, and is equivalent to “that which”; for example, "I did what he desired" means the same as, "I did that which he desired". Whatever, whoever are put in the same situation.

Relative clauses with prepositions at the beginning of the clause before whom, which are also usually found in written English when the relative pronoun is the object complement of a preposition. However, it’s much more common to place prepositions at the end of the relative clause, especially in informal spoken English. For example, in the clause That is the girl for whom I am waiting, the relative pronoun which is the complement of the preposition for in a prepositional phrase functioning as object of the verb “wait”. The corresponding non-relative clause would be I am waiting for the girl.

In principle, the grammar permits some other choices here. One is the choice that is mentioned above, where the preposition is placed before the relative pronoun. The others are as follows:

That is the girl [[who I am waiting for]].

That is the girl [[whom I am waiting for]].

That is the girl [[I am waiting for]].
In fact, all these possibilities can be used. In practice, the one chosen first is the preferred option for text in a formal register. Although the grammar allows all these possibilities, stylistic norms tend to determine which one is chosen. All the choices are available to the language user, but statistically there are strong preferences according to the kind of text.

However, there are two other considerations, which concern the way in which the preposition functions:

(i) Verb + preposition combinations such as *take after* (= resemble) and *put up with* (= tolerate) represent new “words” whose meaning are independent of their constituent elements (these are called *phrasal verbs*). The two elements (or three) are then inseparable, the preposition must always follow the verb:

```
e.g.: The person [[that/whom he takes after]] is his mother.
      This is something [[that/which I refuse to put up with]].
```

(ii) the preposition may, on the other hand, represent part of a prepositional phrase (a preposition plus a nominal group), and be entirely independent of the verb in its clause. In this case, the preposition always precedes the relative pronoun.

```
e.g.: He signed an agreement. Under this agreement he would be entitled to a commission on sales.
      = He signed an agreement [[under which he would be entitled to a commission on sales]].
```

**Contact clauses**

The contact clause is the relative clause which omits the relative pronoun entirely (but without any further ellipsis) but the meaning is the same as those with proper relative pronouns.

```
e.g.: Socrates was guilty of not worshipping the gods [[that the State worshipped]].
      = Socrates was guilty of not worshipping the gods [[the State worshipped]].
      ...and: The nerves [[which we have just discussed]] are efferent nerves.
      = The nerves [[we have just discussed]] are efferent nerves.
      And: That is the girl [[who I saw yesterday at the party]].
      = That is the girl [[who I saw yesterday at the party]].
```

However, the relative pronoun cannot be omitted:
(i) when it is the Subject of the relative clause;
(ii) in prepositional phrase relatives, when the preposition comes at the beginning of
the relative clause;
(iii) when it is possessive whose;
(iv) when it is where.

with regard to (i), the grammar permits:

This is the man [[that she married]]. (Relative pronoun as Complement)

Or: This is the man [[^ she married]]

And also:

This is the man [[that married her]]. (Relative pronoun as Subject)

But not: This is the man [[^ married her]]

With regard to (ii), the grammar permits:

The road [[^ you are driving on]]

The road [[on which you are driving]]

But not: The road [[on ^ you are driving]]

Or, from the opposite direction, if we omit the relative pronoun when it is Complement of a
preposition, the preposition has to be at the end, not the beginning, of the relative clause.

With regard to (iii), the grammar permits:

the woman [[whose research was so influential]]

but not: the woman [[^ research was so influential]]

with regard to (iv), the grammar permits:

the street [[where you live]]

but not: the street [[you live]]

Note: ^ indicates an omitted relative pronoun (or relative adverb).

When we speak of the omission of the relative pronoun or ‘fronting’ of prepositions, these are
only convenient metaphors to facilitate discussion of varying but related structures. Some
linguists have suggested in the past that relative structures without relative pronouns are best
explained as structures resulting from so-called ‘deletion transformations’ operating on
underlying forms which do contain nominals. In systemic functional grammar, the various 
structures discussed are seen rather as the outcome of choices open to the language user.

2.1.2.2. Non-Finite relative clauses

They can function the same as finite clauses although they don’t have a Subject or a finite. They are not the same as a contact clause, where only the relative pronoun is omitted. Sometimes, we call non-finite relative clauses reduced clauses. They contain a Predicator often realized by non-finite Verbal group (perfective and imperfective in aspect), which can be an “-ing” clause, an “-ed” clause (imperfective – acts in progress, actual, present, ongoing, steady state or dependent proposition), or a “to-” infinitive clause (perfective – goal to be attained, potential, future, change of state, dependent proposal).

e.g.: (a) In modern homes, the mains switch and the fuses are contained in a box

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{P} & \text{C} \\
\mid \text{called a consumer unit} \\
\end{array}
\]

(b) Take off the circlip \[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{P} & \text{C} \\
\mid \text{holding the shaft control level} \\
\end{array}
\]

(c) Cargo \[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{P} & \text{A} & \text{C} \\
\mid \text{to be discharged at the first discharging port} \\
\end{array}
\]

should be loaded last. (Bloor, T & Bloor, M., 1995)

There is an obvious systematic relationship here to clauses with a relative pronoun as Subject and a finite be. Try inserting that is/are/was/were at the start of each of the relative clauses above (T. Bloor & M. Bloor, 1995: 161). For example, the relative clause in (a) has the full form of that is called a consumer unit; in (b) it is that is holding the shaft control level; in (c) is that is to be discharged at the first discharging port. In some cases, there’s a neat fit, in others the result is a little clumsy but roughly speaking, there is a correspondence.

Reduced relative clauses have three basic forms:

(i) “-ing” clauses like in (b) which are basically active in voice;

e.g.: The ship[[carrying containers of standard dimensions]] is called a container ship.

[[carrying …]] = which carries….

The man [[standing at the door]] smiled at me.
[standing…] = who was standing…

(ii) “-ed.” clauses (“-ed” here means a past participle. In some books it is used in the term “-en” clauses) like in (a), which are basically passive in voice;

e.g.: The man [sentenced to death yesterday] has killed 4 people.

[(sentenced…)] = who was sentenced…

The footballer [expected to score in this match] is John Miller

[(expected …)] = who is expected…

(iii) “to-” infinitive clauses as in (d) of which the predicator has the form of “to-” infinitive. The clause here is to answer either the question: “what will/should/must the thing or the person represented by the antecedent do?” or “what or for what will/should/must we do with it/him?”

e.g.: You must be the first person [(to inform him that news)].

[(to inform…)] = who ought to inform…

The doctor [(to examine Tom this evening)] is from a very famous hospital in America.

[(to examine…)] = who will examine…

2.2. Relative clauses in relation with other language elements

Functional grammar looks at relative clauses at some positions. In clause complexes, relative clauses appear as dependent clauses which give comments on a part or the whole main clause. Relative clause also serves as a qualifier in a nominal group (in the experiential structure of the group) or a postmodifier (in the logical structure of the group) or a subordinate clause in another clause. In the latter case, relative clauses are seen as a kind of rankshifted clauses or embedded clauses (Halliday, 1994). However in this paper, to be clear, I just explore the functions of relative clauses in the experiential structure of nominal groups and in the structure of clause complexes

2.2.1. Functions of Relative Clauses in Nominal Groups

1. Although in practical situations, nominal groups as well as relative clauses are not often used separately but in combination with other language elements to form larger units, I decided to examine relative clauses not in clauses but in nominal groups because in fact the relative clause functions as a constituent of a nominal group rather than of a simple clause.
e.g.: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject (S)</th>
<th>Finite (F)</th>
<th>Complement (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The man [[who came to dinner yesterday]]</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>her boyfriend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the example above, the whole clause has the structure of S-F-C, in which the subject (S) is a nominal group with a relative clause as one of its constituents.

It is obvious that relative clauses, in their own structure (finite or non-finite), are of higher rank than or at least equivalent to the rank of the nominal group. When the relative clause plays the role of a constituent of the nominal group, they are said to be ‘rankshifted’, by contrast with the ‘ranking’ ones which function prototypically as constituents of the higher units. (Halliday, 1994: 188)

It should be more convenient to look through all nominal groups’ constituents. In Hallidayan grammar, the nominal group can include such constituents as Thing, Classifier, Epithet, Qualifier, Numerative, and Deictic when we look at its experiential structure. These terms carry the senses of semantic relations, not those of syntactic ones. **Thing** names class of items in the real world. As the semantic core of the nominal group, it may be a common noun, a proper noun, or a pronoun. **Classifiers** are those elements that surround a thing to indicate particular subclasses of the class represented by the thing. It is very usual that several classifiers cluster around a thing to indicate subclasses of more concreteness. A classifier can be an adjective, a participle, or a noun. It is theoretically said that the combination “Classifier + Thing” is enough to name all issues acceptably. **Epithets** don’t create any new acceptable meaning but inform a characteristic of the referred class/subclass as additional information helping the converser to refer to a group of more particular items of a subclass. Therefore, they are adjectives. Like epithets, **Qualifiers** inform characteristics of the referred in the form of post-positioned elements, whose main types are relative clauses, appositive clauses or prepositional phrases. In other words, Qualifiers can play the same role as adjectives in nominal groups. **Deictics** all share the meaning of “pointing”, i.e. indicating whether or not some specific subsets of the thing are meant. They fulfill the function demonstratively (as the, this, that, these, those do), possessively (by possessives and genitives as my, your, his, one’s, Mary’s…) or interrogatively ((as what(ever), which(ever), whose(ever)…). **Numeratives**
indicate numerical features of the subset represented by other elements of the nominal group. They are quantifying numeratives (or quantitatives) and ordering numeratives (or ordinatives) which can be both exact and inexact.

In this section, I pay my special attention to the qualifying role of relative clauses in nominal groups. Like ranking elements of the nominal group, the Qualifier also has the function of characterizing the Thing; or in other words, it specifies which member or members of the class designated by the noun. Thus, the Deictic the is usually used at the first place of the group, signaling that the characteristic in question is definite; and when the Deictic a is involved, it gives the sense of typical exemplifying at the beginning of the groups. But the characterization here is in terms of some process with which the Thing is, directly or indirectly, a participant. In the case that the qualifier is a relative clause, the Thing is the participant in a major process (while the qualifier is a prepositional phrase, the Thing will be the participant in a minor process).

e.g.:  ...the pobble [[who had no toes]]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deictic</th>
<th>Thing</th>
<th>Qualifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process: relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possessed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the example above, it is the Thing pobble which plays the role of a participant (Possessor) in the relational process presented in the relative clause after it.

2. Not only finite relative clauses can specify or give information about a person or a thing denoted by the Thing of a nominal group, but non-finite clauses can also do the same functions.

e.g.: (words underlined denote Thing)

   Do you know the **woman** [[talking to Tom]]?

   The **boy** [[injured in the accident]] was taken to the **hospital**.

In a relative clause of this kind (both finite and non-finite), usually, the information provided is crucial in understanding the meaning of the noun it follows. For example in The house is being renovated, it is not necessarily clear which house is being renovated because there is no defining information. In other words, the purpose of the relative clause here is to clearly define
who or what we are talking about. Without this information, it would be difficult to know who or what is meant. This kind of relative clauses is called **defining relative clauses**.

**e.g.:** *The boy [[who ran away]] was Peter’s son.*

The relative clause [[who ran away]] answers the question “which boy?” So, it is easy to understand that the clause plays the role of the Qualifier of the core noun, i.e. to define it. The defining relative clause is not separated with the defined noun by any punctuation. Again, defining relative clauses can be finite (full relative clauses with **Wh**-words (except what) or **that** as relative pronouns; or contact clauses as discussed in the previous sections) or non-finite (in the discussed forms). Many examples mentioned above prove this.

### 2.2.2. Functions of Relative clauses in clause complexes

Hallidayan grammar interprets the relation between clauses in the clause complex by two systemic dimensions: “These two (systems) together will provide the functional framework for describing the clause complex”. (Halliday, 1994).

(i) the system of interdependency or ‘tactic’ system, parataxis and hypotaxis which is general to all complexes – word, group, phrase and clause alike – which is the relation of modifying where one element modifies another paratactively (the elements have equal status) or hypotactically (between a dependent element and its dominant);

(ii) the logical-semantic system, expansion (with three ways of expanding a clause: elaborating; extending and enhancing) and projection (a representation of a linguistic representation by quoting, reporting, projecting), “which is specifically an inter-clausal relation” (Halliday, 1994).

Relative clauses appear together with the relation called hypotactic elaboration. This means that the relative clause as a dependent clause serves to elaborate the meaning of a part of or the whole independent clause in a clause complex by specifying or describing it. The relative clause playing this role often belongs to **Non-defining Relative Clauses** which provide interesting additional information which is not essential to understanding the meaning of the whole complex. To be clearer, they are subordinate clauses giving a supplementary, optional comment in relation to a part of or the whole of the main clause or sometimes subsequent information to the previous clause.
e.g.:  *She married the rich old man, [[which didn’t surprise anyone]].*

⇒ *the marriage didn’t surprise anyone.

*The meeting finished late, [[which didn’t allow me to see you on time]].*

⇒ *the late finishing of the meeting didn’t allow me to see you on time.

In other words, whereas defining relative clauses give a particular subset of the general class suggested by the central noun to make it specific, non-defining relative clauses give “further characterization of something that is taken to be already fully specific” (Halliday, 1994: 227). Moreover, correct punctuation is essential in non-defining relative clauses. Unlike the defining clause, the non-defining clause is separated from the primary clause by a comma or sometime by a dash. If the non-defining relative clause occurs in the middle of the clause complex, a comma is put before the relative pronoun and at the end of the clause. In that case, the sequence in the clause complex will be \( a << \beta >> \) in which \( a \) is the symbol of the primary clause, and \( \beta \) is the symbol of the secondary clause, \( a = \beta \) is the notation of hypotation. If the non-defining relative clause occurs at the end, a comma is put before the relative pronoun. In that case the sequence will be \( a ^ = \beta \). Finite and non-finite relative clauses both can serve as hypotactic elaborations (Thompson, 1996:202)

### 2.2.2.1. Finite clauses

In “An Introduction to Functional Grammar” (1994) Halliday grouped these clauses into 3 groups:

(i) clauses with *which* whose domain is either the whole of the primary clause or some part of its (which is more than a nominal group.). However, the former case is less frequent.

*e.g.:  *The city is developing rapidly, [[\( \beta \) which is the result of everybody’s effort]].*

In the above example, the relative pronoun *which* denotes the event *the city is developing rapidly.*

*e.g.:  *I was afraid of him so I tried not to meet him, [[\( \beta \) which made me panicked]].*

The relative clause above means “meeting him made me panicked”.

(ii) Clauses with *which* (occasionally not *that*), *who, whose* which further characterize a nominal group:

*e.g.:  *She hates black cats, [[\( \beta \) which always make her sick]].*
which in the above instance denotes black cats so the relative clause with which here has the domain of this nominal group.

(iii) clauses with when and where give additional information about time or place.

e.g.: I've been to Uncle Ho’s mausoleum, [[where Uncle Ho’s body has been stored very carefully]]

The additional information in the relative clause above is about Uncle Ho’s mausoleum.

In fact, in some cases, some non-defining relatives can be analyzed rather as belonging to extension than to elaboration:

e.g.: I give it to my sister, who gives it to her daughter. (an additive: who means “and she”)

It was bought by a doctor, whose (of whom) voice impressed everybody. (an additive: the possessives “do not further characterize the noun that constitutes their domain but add a new one related to it” (Halliday, 1994:229)).

However, “for most purposes these all other non-defining relatives can be treated as elaborating” (Halliday, 1994: 229).

In prepositional non-defining relative clause, it is almost a general rule for the preposition to come before the relative pronoun:

e.g.: The new hospital, [[in which the Queen has taken a great personal interest]], will be officially opened in March.

The headmaster, [[with whom the parents had discussed their son’s future]], advised the boy to take up engineering.

One important exception is the verb+preposition combinations mentioned in the section above.

e.g.: No one puts any faith in the Government’s promises, [[which they have frequently gone back on in the past]].

2.2.2.2. Non-finite clauses

In fact, non-finite relative clauses can have the same functions as finite clauses. Their domain of commenting can also be one nominal group or some larger segment of the primary clause, up to the whole clause. Also, non-defining non-finite relative clauses have the same forms as defining non-finite relate clauses, that is, they can be “-ing” clauses, “to- infinitive” clauses, or “-ed” clauses.
e.g.: *There has just been a big explosion there, [[β blowing everything away]].*  
The clause β means that *the big explosion blows everything away.*

*Her interest is the same to mine, [[β to discover unexplored lands in the world]].*  
The clause β here means that *my interest is to discover unexplored lands in the world.*

*The working boiler, [[β heated by fuel oil]], is producing an exceeded amount of steam.*  
The clause β here means that *the boiler is heated by fuel oil.*

However, non-finite relative clauses often bring about some ambiguity; that is, sometimes it is difficult to decide the meaning of the deleted subject in the clause. But, it is quite unnecessary to answer the question like this because the meaning of the non-finite clause is usually left implicit.

**2.3. Summary**

In this chapter, the internal structure of the relative clause is discussed thoroughly with relative pronouns including *which, that, who, whose, whom,* and relative adverbs including *when, where, why*; with possible positions of the clause that are after nouns or after some pronouns to form nominal groups, and after or in a primary clause to form a clause complex. Based on the structure of the relative clause, kinds of relative clauses are also mentioned with two main kinds: *finite clauses* (with full finite clause, contact clause); *non-finite clauses* (with ‘–ing’ clauses, ‘–ed’ clauses, ‘to- infinitive’ clauses)

The chapter is also designed to discuss the functions of relative clauses. On the view of functional grammar, relative clauses have different functions when combining with different language elements. Firstly, they are Qualifiers in Nominal groups. In this case, they are *defining relative clauses* which define the Thing expressed by the core noun in the group. Secondly, they are dependent clauses playing the role of hypotactic elaboration in clause complexes. They elaborate the meaning the whole primary clause, a part of the clause or a nominal group in the clause. In this case, they are *non-defining relative clauses* which give comment or further information about the thing or the event expressed in the primary clause. Defining relative clauses are not spoken on separate tone group, not separated from the rest of the nominal group by punctuation, whereas, non-defining relative clauses are spoken on separate tone group, with tone concord, written with separating punctuation symbols, usually
commas. Non-defining relative clauses don’t include that as relative pronoun, or contact clauses as one of its kinds, but defining relative clauses do.

To conclude, a definition of the relative clause should be released. The relative clause can be defined as the clause (finite or non-finite) having following characteristics:

(i) usually appearing after an antecedent, which is a noun, a nominal group or another clause.

(ii) Giving defining information on the Thing to form a nominal group or giving non-defining (extra) information on the main clause or on one part of the main clause to form a clause complex.

(iii) Within the relative clause itself, one of its parts (subject or a part of subject, complement, or adjunct) denotes either the meaning of the Thing (if the combination forms a nominal group) or of the main clause or one of its parts (if the combination forms a clause complex). The meaning is usually expressed by the relative pronoun in the full finite relative clause or it is implicitly understood in the contact clause or in the non-finite clause.

Through the knowledge discussed in this chapter and in the previous one, I have a better understanding about the relative clause in general and about the relative clause in English in particular. It is also a good basis to make a comparison of English relative clauses with the equivalent presentations in Vietnamese which will be done in the next chapter.
Chapter 3
Relative Clauses in English and in Vietnamese – A Comparison

The main purpose of this chapter is to make a comparison between relative clauses in English and their equivalents in Vietnamese in terms of structures and functions. English relative clauses are taken as points of comparison in this chapter. This means that based on the relative clause' functions in English, the chapter is to find out how Vietnamese language fulfils the same functions, whether there are differences in structure between the two languages when serving the same purposes. The comparison is made not only by the translation method but also with the reference from real examples found in books and newspapers as well as electronic newspapers in both English and Vietnamese.

3.1. Defining Relative clauses as Qualifiers

The relative clause functioning as Qualifier in the nominal group has equal status to other functional elements like deictic, numerative, epithet, classifier. It is formed to serve as a useful, dynamic tool for specifying any reference so far as other kinds of modifier can not, especially, when the modifying information involves activities which must be expressed by action verbs. In English, the function of qualifier in the nominal group, that is, to characterize the Thing, can be done by either finite or non-finite relative clauses.

3.1.1. Finite Relative Clauses as Qualifiers

3.1.1.1. Relative pronoun as the subject of the clause

Although in English the Subject of the relative clause can be represented by different relative pronouns (who, which, or that), in Vietnamese it can be represented by the word “mà”, which some linguists consider as Vietnamese relative pronoun.

e.g.:
At her funeral, Dave and I were among the grandchildren who were pall-bearers. (3)

Trong tang lễ của bà, Dave và tôi là ở trong số những đứa cháu mà được hỗ tang bên quan tài bà]]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deictic</th>
<th>Thing</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>Predicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>grandsons</td>
<td>[who were pall-bearers]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the relative pronoun serves as the subject of the defining, finite relative clause, it cannot be omitted. Unlike in English, in Vietnamese, the relative word mà can be removed.

e.g.: What is the relation between the code and the culture [[which creates it]]? (5)

=> Mối quan hệ giữa mã hiệu và nền văn hóa [[đã tạo ra nó]] là gì?

The definite meaning of “the” in English can be represented by the definer “cái” in Vietnamese (Nghi, C.T., 2004). It is put in front of the core noun of the noun phrase, but only when the noun is a common noun:

e.g.: Cái thằng bé [[mà vìa chạy qua đấy]] là con chỉ Lý đấy! (6)

The boy [[who has passed]] is Ly’s son.

But not: Cái ai mà …. 

Nevertheless, this definer usually makes the text seem to be informal and is used almost only in spoken language. Apart from that, the definite meaning is usually implicitly understood in Vietnamese.

In Vietnamese, removing “mà” like in above examples is considered natural. Without mà, the rest is a verb phrase only. Besides, although in Vietnamese the sense of tense does not exist (Hào, 1998), words which can help to make time of acts clearer like “dã, dang, sê, sáp, mồi, vìa...” can stand at the beginning position of the phrase. All these additional words, however, are not conjunctions in Vietnamese, making sure the qualifying relation between the phrase and the core noun. The verb phrase can still be considered as a relative clause.

Despite the difference represented by the possibility to remove the subject relative pronoun, we can see the equivalence between English and Vietnamese in the relative clause of this kind (which deictic can be used in this case is not considered here, but the attention is put on the structure of the relative clause).
3.1.1.2. Prepositional relative clauses

The first situation to discuss here is when the preposition + the relative pronoun represents parts of a prepositional phrase, and it is independent of the verb in its clause. In the clause, the prepositional phrase functions as Adjunct (Halliday, 1994). The combination of preposition plus relative pronoun tends to precede the relative clause. In this case we can see the difference between English and Vietnamese:

e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The two sides have agreed to have further talks on the pay and productivity structure [under which the men would be paid at an hourly rate] (4)</td>
<td>Hai bên đã đồng ý sẽ có thêm những cuộc thảo luận về [mà theo do tôi phải trả lại hết tiền cho ông trong 3 tháng cá] (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepositional phrases of this kind can easily find their equivalents in Vietnamese. They are combinations of mà plus a proper preposition plus the demonstrative pronoun ðó/ðây. ðó is used to refer to the Thing itself. There is a repetition here when mà and ðó both refer to the Thing, but mà is relative word; and ðó is a demonstrative pronoun.

e.g.:

More examples:

| Tôi chưa nghe đến cái luật nào [mà theo do tôi phải trả lại hết tiền cho ông trong 3 tháng cá]. (6) |
| => I’ve never heard about any law [[according to which I have to repay you all in three months]]. |

The language teachers’ association provides the medium [[through which ideas can be shared and discussed]]. (4)
The second situation to discuss is when the relative pronoun is an object complement of the combination of verb + preposition. If the combination is a phrasal verb, which represents a new word whose meaning is independent of their constituent elements, the situation is the same to one displayed in the subsection 3.1.1.3. below, therefore it is not mentioned here. Beside the situation, the preposition is often placed at the end of the clause and the relative pronoun can be omitted. And in this case, the two languages can be the same.

e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>He is not</th>
<th>the</th>
<th>person</th>
<th>[[(whom)</th>
<th>you can believe</th>
<th>in]] (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anh ta không phải là</td>
<td>người</td>
<td>[[(mà)]</td>
<td>có cõ thể tin</td>
<td>vào]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deictic</td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>(RP)</td>
<td>SF + V</td>
<td>Prep.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the clause appears in a formal written context, the preposition can be placed at the beginning of the clause.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This is</th>
<th>The</th>
<th>man</th>
<th>[[of</th>
<th>[[(whom)</th>
<th>she was always thinking] (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deictic</td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Prep.</td>
<td>(RP)</td>
<td>SF + V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But in Vietnamese, the combination of a verb plus a preposition can also be found easily such as nghĩ về, nói tới, quan tâm tới, tin vào, đưa cho, etc. However, they are not often separated, even to make the relative clause formal. They always follow the verb.

e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Đây là</th>
<th>người đàn ông</th>
<th>[[(mà)]</th>
<th>cõ vân hàng nghĩ</th>
<th>tối]]. (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deictic</td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>(RP)</td>
<td>SF + V</td>
<td>Prep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.1.3. Relative pronoun as the object complement of the clause

which, who, whom, that all can serve as object complement in the relative clause. Which denotes thing(s), while who, whom denote person(s), and that can be used for both. All can be omitted. Vietnamese relative clauses in this case are the same:

e.g.:
### 3.1.1.4. whose as relative pronoun

In English, *whose* as well as *of whom, of which* can denote possessive, or genitive relating to its antecedent noun or nominal group. In the relative clause, *whose* is also followed by a noun or a nominal group which represents something “belonging” to the person or thing denoted by the antecedent. This combination can function as the relative clause’s subject, object complement or adjunct.

**e.g.:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The</th>
<th>people</th>
<th><strong>[(whose house) we rented]]</strong>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deictic</td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Relative clause as Qualifier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RP + noun (belonging thing) = C</th>
<th>S F P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>những người</td>
<td><strong>[mà nhà cửa họ]</strong> (chúng tôi thuê)]...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RP + noun (belonging) + <strong>cúa (of)</strong> + pronoun (referring to Thing) = C</th>
<th>S F P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.1.5. where as the relative adverb

The relative clause with where as the relative adverb usually qualifies a noun referring to a general place such as a room, a house, a village, etc. where functions as an adjunct (circumstantial – spatial) in the relative clause.

e.g.: I had never before taken any of my medals out of the bank vault [[where I usually kept them]] (3)

=> Trước đây tôi chưa bao giờ lấy bất kỳ tấm huy chương nào của mình ra khỏi ngân hàng [[nơi tôi thường cất giấu]]

In Vietnamese grammar, “nơi” (place) is a noun, therefore, Vietnamese equivalent of the relative clause of this kind in English is not a relative clause but a nominal group with “nơi” as the Thing and the clause after it as its qualifier. In other words, Vietnamese has no relative clauses to qualify a place. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tôi vẫn còn giữ rất nhiều kỷ niệm về</th>
<th>những vùng đất</th>
<th>nơi</th>
<th>tôi đã từng đến và đi. (11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nominal group (appositional)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relative clause</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve still kept a lot of memories of</td>
<td>areas</td>
<td><strong>[where]</strong></td>
<td><strong>I ever came and left]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relative clause (Qualifier)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RP</strong></td>
<td><strong>S F P</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.1.6. when or why as relative adverb

Like where, when and why both can play the function of an adjunct in the relative clause. While when replaces a temporal adjunct, why can replace a causal adjunct in the clause. These relative adverbs can be omitted.

When the relative clause qualifies a time, it is also equivalent to a Vietnamese relative clause with, again, the relative word mà at the beginning. Like when, mà can also be omitted without affecting the meaning of the clause.

e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It made me flash back to</th>
<th>the time</th>
<th>[(when)] I won the red hearts at the former fair...]. (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nó đưa tôi trở về với</td>
<td>khoảng khá</td>
<td>[(mà)] mà tôi chơi thắng được hai trái tim màu đỏ tại hội chợ năm nào]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deictic</td>
<td>Relative clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RP as A^time S F P C A^Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the English relative clause defines a reason, its Vietnamese equivalent can be a clause often preceded by the interrogative word tài sao or vì sao although is, of course, not a question. At here, there has been an interesting similarity between English and Vietnamese in grammatical form.

e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You haven’t given me</th>
<th>one reason</th>
<th>[(why) I should agree to help you]]. (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Câu Bạn chưa đưa ra cho tôi</td>
<td>một Lý do</td>
<td>[(tài sao) tôi nên đồng ý giúp câu]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerative</td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Relative clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another way to define a reason in Vietnamese is to use a verb phrase with the main verb is khiến/khiển cho, or làm/làm cho (to cause, to make) especially when the act in the qualifying part has been done already. This verb phrase can be considered as a relative clause.

e.g.:  Maybe that’s the reason [[the wheels have stopped]]. (3)

=> Có lẽ đó chính là lý do [[khiển các bánh xe dừng lại]].

Đây là nguyên nhân [[khiển bệnh dịch lan ra nhanh hơn]]. (8)
3.1.2. Non-finite Relative Clauses as Qualifiers

As mentioned in the above sections, non-finite relative clauses, in general, have neither a Subject (a relative pronoun) nor a finite, but mainly contain a Predicator which is realized by a non-finite verbal group (perfective and imperfective in aspect). The clause can be an “-ing” clause, an “-ed” clause, or a “to-” infinitive clause.

In Vietnamese, in fact, there is nothing called a non-finite relative clause because the sense of tense doesn’t exist explicitly; it is only equivalent to a verb phrase functioning as a qualifier in a nominal group.

3.1.2.1. “-ing” clauses

The “-ing” clause can be defined in other way as the reduced form of the relative clause which is active in voice, in steady state or present in tense, and/or continuous in aspect; whose relative pronoun plays the role of the clause’s Subject. It is just different from the full clause in that the tense in the full clause is made clear by the finite, whereas, the tense in the reduced clause can be made clear only by the context in which the clause appears. Therefore, the full form and the reduced form of this kind of clause can have the same equivalent in Vietnamese, that is, a relative clause which mainly involves a verb phrase.

e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khu vực này có</th>
<th>nhiều</th>
<th>nhà hàng</th>
<th>[[phục vụ món cà ri dê, gà, cá, và các loại bánh ngọt đặc biệt của Ấn Độ]] (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This area had</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>restaurants</td>
<td>[[serving curried goat, chicken, fish and special Indian cakes]]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerative</th>
<th>Thing</th>
<th>Relative clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, present participle in Vietnamese usually means something in present progress. The progressive form đang is used then. If past progress is referred to, time markers must be used.
### 3.1.2.2. “-ed” clauses

“-ed” or “-en” clause is also one kind of reduced clauses. Its full form is the clause in passive. Here there are two cases. First, the doer of the action in the clause is not mentioned. Vietnamese relative clause in this case comes in the form of a verb phrase too, but with a passive particle (*được* – introducing neutral or positive effect; *bị* - denoting negative effect) at the beginning.

**Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deictic</th>
<th>Thing</th>
<th>Non-finite relative clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, the doer is mentioned in the clause. Because the passive voice is not commonly used in Vietnamese, in this case unlike in English, the verb must be placed after the doer. And the doer is introduced by one of the words *do* (by); *bị, được*.

**Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deictic</th>
<th>Thing</th>
<th>Non-finite relative clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But:
In fact, this case can be considered as a case in which the Thing is qualified by a verb phrase with passive meaning. The passive meaning can sometimes be represented by the particle denoting passive “đã” or “bị”, sometimes by nothing but understood implicitly with the help of the lexical meaning of the verb only.

e.g.:

*Kem và các loại bánh ngọt [[bán ở cửa hàng]] đều do chính tay ông và các con cô làm.* (2)

=> All cream and cakes [[sold at the store]] are made by her husband and children themselves.

In the last case, “bị” and “đã” are not used but the verb bán (sell) denotes an action in which somebody sells something, however, the antecedent nouns cream, cakes are not somebody, we can understand that bán here means đã bán.

### 3.1.2.3. “to- infinitive” clauses

In English, “to-” infinitive clauses denote some goal to be attained, something potential, future, a change of state, or a dependent proposal. However the aspect is not described explicitly. Whereas, in Vietnamese the meaning of Aspect is usually represented explicitly by words such as sẽ (introducing future), cần, phải (introducing proposal), đề (introducing goal to be attained), which will precede the verb phrase.

e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This is</th>
<th>a point</th>
<th>[[to bear in mind]]. (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Relative clause as Qualifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-to infinitive clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But:
3.2. Non-defining Relative Clauses as Hypotactic Elaboration in Clause Complexes

3.2.1. When the relative clause elaborates one part of the primary clause

3.2.1.1. Finite relative clauses

Finite relative clauses of this kind must have a relative pronoun, this means that there are no contact clauses to do this function. The relative pronoun that can not be used in these cases. The non-defining relative clause here gives additional information about a part of the main clause (a nominal group or a larger segment), but doesn’t define it. Whether we include the relative clause or not, the meaning of the main clause remains exactly the same. In fact the main clause and relative clause could (though with less economy) be presented as two separate statements. The relative clause could even be represented by an independent clause in parenthesis. In this case it is clearly seen as incidental information.

e.g.: *The Victoria Line, [[which was opened in March 1969]], was London’s first complete new tube for 60 years.*

= *The Victoria Line (it was opened in March 1969) was London’s first complete new tube for 60 years.*
The Victoria Line was London’s first complete new tube for 60 years. It was opened in March 1969.

When the relative pronoun is Subject

The relative pronouns **which** and **who** are often used in this case. When **who** is used, its domain must be human.

e.g.:  *I was in the construction business along with my dad, [[who owned the company]].* (2)
酿酒布料
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=> Tôi làm trong ngành xây dựng cùng với bố tôi, [[người sở hữu công ty]].

As I took a bow, I stole a quick glance at my family, [[who were all standing up and clapping and cheering as hard as they could]]. (2)

=> Lúc cúi chào khách, tôi trum liếc nhìn về phía gia đình mình, [[những người đang đứng cả đấy vỗ tay hết mình chúc mừng tôi]].

In Vietnamese, it is quite easy to find a word referring to human in general, it is the noun “người” (singular) or “những người” (plural) (những is a numerative, means *more than one*). The secondary clause giving additional information to a part of the primary which refers to some person(s) in English can be transformed into a nominal group in Vietnamese with the noun “người” or “những người” as the Thing and a verb phrase as Qualifier. This nominal group can be considered as an apposition to some part of the main clause.

e.g.:  *The ethnic minorities, [[the people living on this land]], don’t take part in the tourism activities, either.*

=> The ethnic minorities, [[who live on this land]], don’t take part in the tourism activities, either.

This way is often used when the Thing is the Actor of the act presented in the verb phrase. When it is the Goal, the noun can be omitted. At this time, the additional information can be represented by a verb phrase only, with the word *bị, được, or do* (do is used only when the Actor appears in the phrase) coming first.

e.g.:  *Các lực lượng Việt Minh yêu nước chiến đấu chống lại thực dân Pháp [[được người Mỹ hậu thuẫn]].* (2)
Patriotic Viet Minh forces fought against the French colonialists, [who were backed by the Americans].

When the additional information given to a thing, it is a little bit different. The part of the primary clause is repeated in a short way (by using a common noun referring to that thing) to be the core noun in a nominal group in Vietnamese when the act referred to in the qualifier is in active and the whole nominal group is used for emphasizing. In fact the nominal group can be considered as an apposition in the main clause, which is sometimes introduced by the particle “là”

e.g.: Sài Gòn có thể tự hào về đường Catinat, [[là con đường có những nét độc đáo riêng]]. (2)

=> Sai Gon can be proud of Catinat Street, [[which is unique in its own way]].

When the information is not emphasized, Vietnamese tends to reduce the clause into a verb phrase functioning as an apposition to a part of the main clause.

The Prime Minister’s reshuffle means that the Cabinet, [[which now has twenty-two members]], will be reduced to twenty. (4)

=> Cuộc cải tổ nội các của Ông Thủ tướng có nghĩa là Nội các, [[giờ có hai mươi hai người]], sẽ bị cắt giảm xuống còn hai mươi người.

Một kho lúa bỏ hoang, [[được dùng làm nhà kho]], nhìn như thế sắp đổ sập xuống. (2)

=> An abandoned barn, [[which is used as a warehouse]], looks as if it were about to collapse.

This reducing way is similar to the way to create the non-finite clause in English.

When the relative adverb is where

The way to add information on a place in Vietnamese is a little bit different from in English. When in English, it is to use a relative clause with where as the relative pronoun to denote the place, in Vietnamese it is to use a nominal group as an apposition phrase with nơi as the Thing to denote the place. In fact, in Vietnamese there’s no way to use a relative clause to do this function.

e.g.: Several times each week, Melissa goes off to her father’s house, [[where he lives with his new wife]]. (3)
Several new southerners had come from regions in the Center, where contempt for feudal authority and Confucianism was common.

When relative pronoun is *whose*

The non-defining relative clause with *whose* as the relative pronoun gives some interesting information on something that belongs to another referred by one part of the main clause.

**e.g.:** You may have heard of this boy, [[whose books brought about so many reforms in the treatment of children and the poor]]. (3)

=> Bạn có thể đã nghe nói đến cậu bé này, [[những cuốn sách của cậu ấy đã đem lại những cải thiện trong cách đối xử với trẻ em và người nghèo]].

In Vietnamese this task is often done by an independent clause.

**e.g.:** Phân lón môi người thích cúc đại đỏ, [[cánh hoa trắng hoặc vàng hoàng yến]]. (1)

=> Popular preference goes to the đại đỏ variety of Chrysanthemum, [[whose petals are white or canary-yellow]].

Mỗi cậu độ gồm hai vế, [[các từ của mỗi vế phải đối nhau cả thanh đều lẫn ngược nghịch]]. (1)

=> A pair of parallel sentences comprises two parts, [[whose words must stand opposite to one another in the six tones of the Vietnamese language as well as in meaning]].

When the relative clause is preceded by a preposition

In Vietnamese, a prepositional phrase can also precede the dependent clause. One case has been mentioned in the section III.1.1.5 above.

**e.g.:** Tình nên lựa chọn các hình thức tuyên truyền phù hợp và còn dần tốc thiểu số hơn như tổ chức các hoạt động giao lưu với du khách, [[qua đó những thói quen ừng xỉn và giao tiếp tốt có thể tạo dựng được]] (11)
The province authorities should choose propaganda methods more suitable with the ethnic minorities here such as organizing cultural exchanges between them with tourists, [[through which good communicative habits and behaviors can be formed]].

The other case is a little bit different. Because in English, the semantic relation between the primary clause and the non-defining relative clause is loose, the complex can be equivalent to two independent clauses. The second clause always contains the adjunct which is transformed from the preposition-relative pronoun combination. The same situation can be found in Vietnamese. The adjunct now is often a combination of a proper preposition + (the core noun) + dō/này/áy (demonstrative)

e.g.:

Theo chỉ dẫn, tôi đã đến đặc con đường. [[Trên con đường này, những ngôi nhà nhỏ lấp xấp nằm dưới những tán cây phượng]]. (2)

=> Following the instructions, I reached the road. On this road, small low-roofed houses lied in the shade of flamboyant trees.

=> Following the instructions, I reached the road, [[on which small low-roofed houses lied in the shade of flamboyant trees]].

When the relative pronoun is the object complement

In this case, unlike in defining relative clauses, the relative pronoun in non-defining relative clauses, whom or which, can not be omitted.

e.g.: She realized that this must surely be her little Tzippie, [[whom she had cared for after the accident]]. (3)

=> Bà đã nhận ra đây chắc chắn là Tzippie bé nhỏ của bà, [[người mà bà đã chăm sóc sau vụ tai nạn kia]].

Những đường phổ là lối, những nơi nhà thưa thớt, và một sự hòa trộn âm đầm – đố chính là tran Gia Định, [[mà chúng ta gọi là Sai Gon]]. (2)

=> Muddy streets, scattered houses, and a relatively miserable mix – this is the town of Gia Dinh, [[which we call Sai Gon]].

In Vietnamese, when the thing or person commented appears as the object in the commenting part, it comes in the same form as when it appears as the subject.
When the relative pronoun is **when**

To give more information on a fully specified time, in English, we often use a relative clause with **when** as the relative pronoun; and in Vietnamese, a nominal group with *khi, lúc* as the core noun is still used.

e.g.:  
Hồ van làm như thứ xa xỉ,[[khi các nhà thơ nhà văn có biết tái nhìn thấy các thần linh đi lại trên trái đất dưới hình dạng con người]]. (1)  
=> They did as in ancient time, [[when poets and writers had the gift of seeing divinities in human form walking on earth]]

3.2.1.2. **Non-Finite relative clauses**

The non-finite relative clause in English here is equivalent to either a verb phrase or a nominal group in Vietnamese in the same way as explained in the section of III.1.2. about non-finite, defining relative clauses.

e.g.:  
God has two angels now, [[walking around heaven together as they did here on earth]]

3.2.2. When the relative clause elaborates the whole primary clause

3.2.2.1. **Finite relative clauses**

In this case, only **which** can be used as the relative clause. It refers to the whole previous clause. In other words, it says something about the whole situation described in the main clause to act happening in it, giving it some comment, or some more interesting information.

The relative clause in English can be equivalent to either an independent clause or a verb
phrase in Vietnamese. When an independent clause is used, the phrase việc này or điều này is often used to refer to the whole situation in the previous case.

e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>He never watered his new trees</th>
<th>[[which flew in the face of conventional wisdom]] (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main clause</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hypotactic elaboration – relative clause</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Finite VG + Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>FP A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But:

Không bao giờ ông tưới nước cho những cây mới sinh trưởng của mình, (điều này). ngược hàn với những hiệu biệt thống thường

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paratactic elaboration – independent clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun+demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2.2. Non-Finite relative clauses

The case in which a reduced clause is used to talk about the situation in the primary clause can be found in English; especially when the situation is the actor of the act represented by the verb in the reduced clause. This case in English is represented by an “-ing” clause. However, like in the above section, in Vietnamese either a verb phrase or an independent clause can do the function.

e.g.:  Russia quickly threatened retaliation, [[marking a new low point in Britain’s relations with Moscow under President Vladimir Putin]]. (13)

=> Nga nhanh chóng deọta để trả đũa, [[(việc này) đánh dấu một bước lùi mới trong những mối quan hệ của Anh với Mát-co-va dưới thời tổng thống V. Putin]].

Ô Tân Dinh có nhiều ngành nghề-dịch vụ vận tải gần với sản xuất nông nghiệp hàng hóa, [[đã làm thay đổi nhận nghĩ, cách làm của người dân]]. (10)

=> In Tan Dinh, many transportation services cooperate with the agricultural commodity production, [[changing the way local people think and do]].
When the situation in the primary clause is the Goal in the commenting clause which is passive in voice, we can have another kind of reduced clause, that is an “-ed” clause. This case, however, is less common in English.

*e.g.*: *Naval architects of the Lloyd company built the ship in only four months, [[supposed to be impossible]].* (4)

=> Các kỹ sư hàng hải của hãng Lloyd đã đóng con tàu này chỉ trong có bốn tháng, [[điều này vốn được coi là bất khả thi]].

This case in Vietnamese tends to come in the form of an independent clause rather than a verb phrase because the relation between the primary clause and the dependent is quite loose.

The next case to be discussed here is when the reduced clause has the form of a “to- infinitive” clause to denote the situation should be affected in some way or will do something. This is also less common in English than the way to use finite clause, and then will be left unexplained in this paper. However, in Vietnamese an independent clause is usually used to fulfill the requirements.

*e.g.*: *Dịch bệnh đang lan nhanh, [[điều này phải nhanh chóng được các cơ quan chức năng làm rõ]].* (8)

=> The epidemic is spreading quickly, [[then this should be examined immediately by the authorities]].

    The epidemic is spreading quickly, [[which should be examined immediately by the authorities]].

    The epidemic is spreading quickly, [[to be examined immediately by the authorities]].

### 3.3. Summary

To make the chapter convenient to follow, the chapter will be summarized in the form of tables. Table 1 draws out the similarity and difference between English defining relative clauses and its equivalent in Vietnamese in grammatical form, taking English relative clause’s functions comparison points. Table 2 shows the comparison between English non-defining relative clauses and their equivalents in Vietnamese.

The word in the bold parentheses exists or not depending on the situation. Both ways is acceptable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying person(s) or thing(s)</td>
<td><strong>RP (which, that, who) as Subject:</strong> RP + Finite VG + Z</td>
<td>The same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RP (which, that, whom) as Object:</strong> (RP) + S + Finite VG + Z</td>
<td>(mà) + S + VP + Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RP (which, whom) following a Prep.:</strong> - Prep. + RP as Object: Prep. + RP + S + finite VG + Z</td>
<td>(mà) + S + V + Prep. + Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prep. + RP as Adjunct: Prep. + RP + S + finite VG + Z</td>
<td>mà + Prep. + dó + S + VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>“-ing” clause: -ing participle phrase</strong></td>
<td>nearly the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>“-ed” clause: Past participle phrase</strong></td>
<td>nearly the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>“to-” infinitive phrase</strong></td>
<td>nearly the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying person(s) or thing(s) by its belonging</td>
<td><strong>RP (whose) + nominal group (belonging) combination as Subject:</strong> Comb. + finite VG + Z</td>
<td>Nearly the same as in E Comb. = mà + nominal group (belonging) + cũa + pronoun (owner) Comb. + VP + Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thing(s) or person(s)</td>
<td><strong>RP (whose) + nominal group combination as Object:</strong> Comb. + S + finite VG + Z</td>
<td>Comb. + S + VP + Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying time</td>
<td><strong>(RP (when)) + S + finite VG + Z</strong></td>
<td>The same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(mà) + S + VP + Z</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying place</td>
<td>RP (where) + S + finite VG + Z</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying reason</td>
<td>(RP (why)) + S + finite VG + Z</td>
<td>The same as in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elaborating person(s) or thing(s) referred to by one part of the main clause</td>
<td><strong>RP (which, who) as Subject:</strong></td>
<td>Different from in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active clause:</td>
<td>- Noun/group denoting human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP + Finite VG + Z</td>
<td>(Người/những người) + (mà) + VP + Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive clause</td>
<td>- (là) + noun/group denoting the thing to be elaborated + VP + Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP + Finite VG + Z</td>
<td>(được/bị) + VP + Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RP (which, whom) as Object</strong></td>
<td>The same as in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP + S + Finite VG + Z</td>
<td>mà + S + VP + Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RP (which, whom) following a Prep.:</strong></td>
<td>Different from in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prep. + RP as Object:</td>
<td>mà + S + V + Prep. + Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep. + RP + S + finite VG + Z</td>
<td>Prep. + dòng + S+ VP (= an independent clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prep. + RP as Adjunct:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep. + RP + S + finite VG + Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Non-finite</strong></td>
<td>Nearly the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“-ing” clause:</td>
<td>VP + Z;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ing participle phrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>“-ed” clause:</td>
<td>“to-” infinitive clause:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past participle phrase</td>
<td>to- infinitive verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nearly the same VP + Z</td>
<td>Nearly the same VP + Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elaborating person(s) or thing(s) referred to by one part of the main clause by its belonging thing(s) or person(s)</th>
<th>$RP \ (\text{whose}) + \text{nominal group (belonging) combination as Subject:}$</th>
<th>Different from in English $\text{Comb. = nominal group (belonging) + cùa + pronoun (owner)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comb. + finite VG + Z</td>
<td>Comb. + VP + Z = an independent clause</td>
<td>$\text{Comb. + S + VP + Z}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$RP \ (\text{whose}) + \text{nominal group}$</td>
<td>Or:</td>
<td>S + VP + Comb + Z (both are independent clauses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{combination as Object:}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comb. + S + finite VG + Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elaborating time referred to by one part of the main clause</th>
<th>$RP \ (\text{when}) + S + \text{finite VG + Z}$</th>
<th>Different from in English $\text{khi, lúc + S + VP + Z = nominal group}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elaborating place referred to by one part of the main clause</th>
<th>$RP \ (\text{where}) + S + \text{finite VG + Z}$</th>
<th>Different from in English Noun denoting place $\text{(nơi) + S + VP + Z}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elaborating situation in the whole main clause</th>
<th>Finite clause $\text{The situation is referred to by RP (which) \text{ as object in active clause:}}$</th>
<th>Different from in English: $\text{The situation is referred to by diệu này/việc này (noun + a demonstrative)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Finite clause</td>
<td>RP + S + finite VG + Z</td>
<td><strong>Điều này/việc này + S + VP + Z = an independent clause</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RP as subject:</strong></td>
<td>RP + finite VG + Z</td>
<td><strong>Điều này/việc này + VP + Z = an independent clause</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Or</strong>: VP + Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Ing clause:</strong></td>
<td><strong>“-ing”</strong> participle phrase</td>
<td>Nearly the same as in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-ed clause:</strong></td>
<td>VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past participle phrase</td>
<td>Different from in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>“to-” infinitive clause:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Điều này/việc này + VP + Z = an independent clause</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>“to-” infinitive phrase</strong></td>
<td>Nearly the same as in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VP or independent clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

1. Conclusion

This paper is designed to find out what the relative clause is, what its functions are, and what the difference and similarity between the relative clause in English and its equivalent in Vietnamese, which can fulfill the same functions as the relative clause in English can, are. This is also to find how the study can be used in practical learning, teaching and translating English.

The relative clause in English is quite complicated to define because it requires a synthesized knowledge about its internal structure, its functions when combined with other language elements. In this definition, we can find that, English relative clauses can be finite or non-finite clause. When they are finite, they can be introduced by one of relative pronouns, which are who, which, that, whom, whose, or relative adverbs, which are when, why, where. In some cases they can be omitted, in others, they cannot. When they are non-finite clauses, they can be “-ing” clauses, “-ed” clauses, or “to-infinitive” clauses.

Relative clauses have two main functions. One is that they are to define subsets, that is to specify a particular subset of a general class therefore they can be a necessary qualifying element in a nominal group especially when the classifier can not provide enough qualifying information. In this case, they are called defining relative clauses. The other function is that the relative clause is also used when we want to give some additional information about things or persons which are already fully specified. Generally, the clause within a clause complex plays the function of hypotactic elaboration of the whole main clause or any of its constituents. In this case they are non-defining clauses.

Vietnamese of course has its own ways to do the above functions. In most of the cases, they are the same to the ways English does. Vietnamese grammar also offers structures qualifying a noun which are in the form of a relative clause: mà (as a relative pronoun) plus a verb phrase together with other elements if any. mà can be omitted sometimes in the same way but sometimes in the different way from the way relative pronouns in English are omitted. When mà is removed, the qualifier becomes a verb phrase. The similarities between the two
languages may be explained by the fact that all languages must find the way to define things they are talking about by giving defining information at the closest position. The position of a defining relative clause in English or simply a Vietnamese verb phrase is the most appropriate. To elaborate a noun which has been fully specifying, Vietnamese structures are quite different from English, that is, they usually have the form of a nominal group or sometimes an independent clause. The difference may be caused by the lack of relative pronouns which should be used in this case in Vietnamese. “mà” has too strong linking power to be a relative pronoun in a non-defining relative clause. Generally speaking, English and Vietnamese have many similarities in this field, therefore, Vietnamese learners who are learning English can overcome their difficulties in using English relative clauses when using the right way.

2. Implications

In fact the comparison is not only to find out the similarity and the difference in grammatical form between the two languages, but to find how we can take advantage of it. The writer of this paper wants to draw out some implications of the study to provide learners and teachers of English. First, based on the structure of relative clauses, students can have some exercises on recognizing relative clauses, distinguishing them from Wh-questions, adjunctive clauses. Based on functions of relative clauses, the teacher can give some useful lessons requiring students to define words referring to things or persons by using simple questions: “What is…?” Or, she can let her students give more information about things or persons they know well in the form of a relative clause. English can be learnt through translation, therefore, the teacher and students can use this way to learn relative clauses. With English-Vietnamese translation exercises, the teacher should instruct her students to analyse the relative clause to know what kind it is, and find out the most proper equivalent in Vietnamese. It is not necessary to translate the form of relative clauses in English into Vietnamese but it is to transfer their meanings into the target language properly. With Vietnamese-English translation exercises, students should analyse the function of the clause which is likely to be translated into a relative clause in English, the context in which the clause appears, to find out whether a relative pronoun should be used, which relative pronoun should be used or what form of the relative clause should be.
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