

A corpus-based study on contrast and concessivity of the connective *-ciman* in Korean

Hye-Kyung Lee
Ajou University

Providing a corpus-based analysis of the contrastive connective *-ciman* in Korean, this study demonstrates that global connections are as frequent as local connections as opposed to previous literature. In representing various senses possible with a *-ciman* connection, this study adopts a fuzzy representation, where meanings range from conceptual to discoursal. The identified meanings include explicit contrast, denial of expectation, speech act hedges and idiomatic expressions. The fuzzy representation is supported for at least two reasons. First, categorization of some cases is often blurred. Second, it can better capture the relatedness of various meanings whose enduring sense concerns ‘contrast.’ It is further revealed that interpretations of *-ciman* phrases are compositionally made with co-occurring linguistic units. The “pragmatic” meanings of *-ciman* constructions are explained in terms of different levels of representations in which the contrast occurs. We further investigate the possibility of *-ciman* as a stance/discourse marker with accompanying expressions.

Keywords: contrast, concessivity, *-ciman*, Korean, fuzzy representation, stance marker

1. Introduction

Contrast consists of a range of phenomena cross-linguistically. Predominantly, these notions are realized by lexical devices such as the English words *but* or *nevertheless*. In addition to lexical methods, discourse contrast or concessivity can be achieved by use of a future tense in non-temporal use, especially in Romance languages (Baranzini and Mari 2019). Moreover, contrastive markers strongly resonate with epistemic modality, because contrastive markers can help

the speaker distance herself from the propositional content.¹ At the same time, contrast involves a series of arguments in which one point of view is presented in a provisional way, and then necessarily followed by a segment “advancing the opinion favored by the speaker” (Zafiu 2018, 117).

Korean has a repertoire of contrastive devices, one of which is the use of the connective ending *-ciman*. As is the case with most lexical units, the ending *-ciman* can convey a variety of meanings that depend on the linguistic context in which it occurs. Mainly for that reason, the ending *-ciman* has been discussed as either a contrastive or a concessive marker in the Korean linguistics literature (e.g., Lee and Lee 1999; Lee 2000; Park 2014; Lee 2018). Regarding the variety of meanings of the ending *-ciman*, opinions have been divided about whether it has a unitary sense (e.g., Choi 1937; He 1977; Nam and Ko 1983) or dual/multiple senses (e.g., Lee and Im 1983; Yoon 1989; Lee 2000). Following a pragmatic principle dubbed ‘Modified Occam’s Razor’ (Grice 1989, 47), this study adheres to a unitary account of the semantic and pragmatic characteristics of the marker.

Even though the previous studies of the marker under issue provide insightful explanations of the meanings and uses of this marker, most of them are based on data constructed by the researchers. Departing from these existing approaches, this study aims to analyze the marker under consideration by means of authentic corpus data (i.e., the Sejong Corpus). Advocating a unitary approach, the current study will investigate what kinds of meanings are delivered by this marker compositionally with its contexts, and how the relatedness of diverse meanings of the marker can be accounted for.² In doing so, this study also hopes to uncover how the marker under discussion is actually deployed by ordinary speakers.

2. Background

2.1 Contrastive connectives

Contrastive markers such as the English *but* are argued to deliver two major meanings, which are exemplified in (1) and (2).

1. Following the tradition in pragmatics literature (e.g., Sperber and Wilson 1986/1995), the speaker is referred to as *she* and the hearer as *he*, unless the genders of interlocutors are revealed from the context.

2. As one review correctly points out, the process of compositional interpretation needs to be empirically supported for it to be legitimately claimed. While agreeing with the comment, I assume that a general/agreed-upon interpretation of an utterance containing *-ciman* in a specific context can be derived by an “ordinary speaker” who is competent in understanding language and the context.

- (1) Tom is tall *but* Bill is short.
 (2) Tom is tall *but* he is not good at basketball.

The first meaning in (1) is called semantic opposition (Lakoff 1971), external *but* (Halliday and Hasan 1976), contrast use (Blakemore 1987, 1989), or contrast in proposition (Schiffrin 1987)/ content (Sweetser 1990) domain. The second meaning in (2), on the other hand, is dubbed denial of expectation (Lakoff 1971; Blakemore 1987, 1989), internal *but* (Halliday and Hasan 1976) or contrast in knowledge (Schiffrin 1987)/ epistemic (Sweetser 1990) domain. Whereas Lakoff (1971) contends the distinction between (1) and (2) to be semantic, scholars such as Dascal and Katriel (1977), Blakemore (1987), and Fraser (1998) claim that the two are derived from a single sense, from which specific meanings are fleshed out in the context. For example, in her pioneering work, Blakemore (1987) proposes that *but* in both uses functions as a semantic constraint by guiding the listener to interpret the proposition introduced by *but* as being contrasted to the previous utterance (in contrast use) or to a derived proposition (in denial-of-expectation use). In (1), the two propositions are contrasted to each other because the two involve lexical antonyms *short* and *tall* couched in syntactically same constructions. In (2), on the other hand, albeit without an overt contrast either lexical or structural, the interpretation of the second proposition would guide the hearer to infer a proposition from the first one, which can be paraphrased as (3).

- (3) If Tom is tall, he is good at basketball.

(3), which is an expectation inferable from the first conjunct in (2), is denied in the second conjunct of (2). Hence the use of *but* in (2) is a denial-of-expectation. Here expectations can come in many types, including presupposition, entailment and implicature. In the case of (3), the relevant expectation can be an implicature, more specifically, a particularized conversational implicature à la Grice (1989).³

In addition to these two uses of *but*, it can also connect two segments that differ in their speech acts, as illustrated in (4).

- (4) A: Don't you see that the door is open?
 B: I'm not blind, *but* if you want me to close it, why don't you say so straight out?
 (Dascal and Katriel 1977, 158–159)

In (4), a statement is followed by a question and these are connected by *but*. Such uses of *but* as in (4) are called speech-act contrast in Sweetser (1990). Still, the use of *but* in (4) appears to be licensed because a contrast relationship can hold between propositions derived from the two conjuncts, as spelled out in (5) and (6).

3. For various types of expectations, see Fraser (1998).

- (5) I am responding to your question in light of the literal content by saying “I’m not blind”.
- (6) I am challenging your question in light of the way the message was delivered by saying “why don’t you say so straight out?”

As proposed in most previous studies, this study takes ‘contrast’ to be the core and enduring meaning of such contrastive markers as *but*. That is, the ambiguity thesis will be abandoned on the grounds of the parsimony of the sense, spelled out by Grice (1989, 47) as “Modified Occam’s Razor: senses are not to be multiplied beyond necessity”. This principle states that senses are to be proliferated only when necessary as in lexical ambiguity, where unrelated meanings are derived from what is apparently the same word. Otherwise, the intuitive relatedness between the senses possible with *but* cannot be captured. This study adopts a unitary approach, suggesting that various senses possible with a *-ciman* construction carry *contrast* as an enduring or core sense. This core sense is then fleshed out as one of such various meanings in an ad hoc way in a specific context. That is, the intended meaning can be arrived at quite automatically or effortlessly by an interlocutor in a specific context, à la Jaszczolt’s Default Semantics (2005, 2009, 2016, and references therein).

2.2 Contrastive connectives in Korean

Contrastive connection in Korean can be made in at least two ways: by conjunctive adverbials or by conjunctive verbal suffixes. In this study, the second method will be taken up and labelled “contrastive connectives,” because it pertains to the topic of the present study. In Korean linguistics literature, representative contrastive verbal suffixes include, but not limited to, *-(u)na*, *-ciman*, *-ato*, and *-telato*. A group of studies put forward that contrastive connectives can be distinguished between contrast and concession senses and classified accordingly by a range of terms (e.g., Lee and Im 1983; Yoon 1989; Lee 2000). For example, Lee (2000) dubs *-(u)na* and *-ciman* contrastive and *-ato* and *-telato* concessive. As discussed in Section 2.1 above, these bifurcate approaches are not supported for the theoretical reason of Modified Occam’s Razor. Also such taxonomic accounts do not offer clear-cut criteria to demarcate boundaries between categories. After all, in many cases, the same connective is proven to convey both contrastive and concessive senses. Nor can these approaches exhaust all meanings or functions possible with a connective in a specific context, because the meaning quite often arises from the context.

On the other hand, another group of studies suggests a unitary approach, contending that both contrastive and concessive senses are derived from a single

overarching sense, which is labelled in a variety of ways (e.g., Choi 1937; He 1977; Nam and Ko 1983). Nam and Ko (1983) propose ‘incompatibility’ as the core meaning shared by contrastive connectives, which is then fleshed out in specific contexts. On the other hand, the way specific meanings are figured out, extended, or changed has also been explored. According to Park (2014), the core meaning of *-ciman* (i.e., contrast) can be realized in an epistemic domain as in (7), or in a speech act domain as in (8) via metaphoric extension, which is carried out by means of a cross-domain mapping.

(7) I have never worked with him-*ciman*, it seems that he is a nice person.

(8) I need to ask my boss-*ciman*, why don't you visit our office?

Even though previous research on contrastive connectives including *-ciman* has contributed to our deeper understanding of the phenomena under discussion, most studies have focused on constructed data drawn from researchers' expertise on and knowledge of the Korean language. In contrast to previous studies, this paper suggests a fuzzy representation of senses of *-ciman* constructions surfacing from the corpus data. The identified senses include explicit contrast, denial of expectation/implicature, speech act hedges and idiomatic expressions. The rationale behind this fuzzy representation is at least two-fold. First, sometimes, the categorization of an example is rather fuzzy, suggesting that it can serve multiple functions simultaneously. Hence, the boundaries between categories in the current study will be analytical. Second, the fuzzy representation can better reflect relatedness among various senses of *-ciman* constructions. The so-called “pragmatic” senses of *-ciman* constructions, such as denial of expectations and speech acts, are accounted for by means of different levels of representations in which contrast occurs. Furthermore, the possibility of utilizing *-ciman* as a stance/discourse marker is pursued vis-à-vis certain idiomatic expressions.

3. Data and methods

The current study collected research data from the Sejong Corpus (<https://ithub.korean.go.kr/user/main.do>) published by the National Institute of the Korean Language. The corpus site offers two different modes: written and spoken corpora. Whereas the written corpus comes with four different options (i.e., raw corpus, morphologically tagged corpus, morpho-semantically tagged corpus and syntactically tagged corpus), the spoken corpus has only the first two options. This study chose the morphologically tagged spoken corpus because it facilitates searching for target expressions.

The target expression, *-ciman* ‘but, though’, which is tagged as a connective ending in the corpus, was typed in, and then all relevant concordance lines were searched. This search returned 1,381 occurrences. Figure 1 presents the screen capture of the search.

The screenshot shows the search results for the term '-ciman' in the Sejong Corpus. The interface includes a search bar at the top, navigation tabs for '말뭉치' (Corpus), '전자사전' (Electronic Dictionary), '용어/문자찾기' (Term/Character Search), '통합자료실' (Integrated Data Room), '회원교류' (Member Exchange), and '국어정보경진대회' (Korean Language Information Competition). The search results are displayed in a table with columns for '형태소/조사' (Morpheme/Particle), '의미정보' (Meaning Information), '형태의미' (Form Meaning), and '조사' (Particle).

형태소/조사	의미정보	형태의미	조사
지만			EC(연결 어미)
지만			E(응결 어미)
지만서도			EC(연결 어미)
지만은			EC(연결 어미)

Below the table, a summary states: '“지만/EC”에 대한 검색결과는 총 1381건입니다.' (Search results for '지만/EC' are a total of 1381 items). A detailed table shows the first two results:

번호	앞문맥	검색어	뒤문맥	출전
1381	... 지어준? 사실 덜 발달했어, 그까 지리적으로 보면은 서울에서? 훨씬 더	가깝지만,	서울의 영향력이 오히려 일산에 더 많이 미치고, 그 사이에 있는 ...	강의_한국어...
1380	... 그래서 이것을, 미급산수라고 하고, 화통에 있어서는 조선 전기의 화통과, 보다	가깝지만?	사실 이런 정도로 꼼꼼하고 완성도가 높은 작품, 구성적으로나 예니면 필법에 ...	강의_한국어...

Figure 1. Screen capture of the search for *-ciman* in the Sejong Corpus

The culled concordance lines were copied and saved in an Excel file for ease of searching and cleaning the data. Among the collected results, 318 items were excluded from the list because the target form was employed sentence-finally or repeatedly. Because *-ciman* as a connective ending is always employed with a predicate, we examined predicates co-occurring with *-ciman* and found a total of 36 predicate types in the current data. Among them, the top 12 predicate types, which occurred more than 25 times, were targeted for this study. The chosen predicates are presented in Table 1, with their respective frequency counts. A total of 768 tokens were obtained for the current study.

Some of the constructions in Table 1 are variants of the same predicate. For example, in *ha* ‘do’+*ciman* and *ha+yss+ciman*, the second form contains a past

Table 1. Top 12 predicates with *-ciman* in Sejong Corpus

Expressions	Freq.	Expressions	Freq.
<i>ha</i> 'do'+ <i>ciman</i>	144	<i>anh</i> 'not do'+ <i>ciman</i>	36
<i>iss</i> 'be'+ <i>ciman</i>	143	<i>eps</i> 'not be'+ <i>ciman</i>	36
<i>ani</i> 'not be'+ <i>ciman</i>	130	<i>toy</i> 'become'+ <i>ciman</i>	32
<i>molukeyss</i> 'may not know'+ <i>ciman</i>	60	<i>alkeyss</i> 'may know'+ <i>ciman</i>	30
<i>hayss</i> 'did'+ <i>ciman</i>	58	<i>ke</i> 'be that'+ <i>ciman</i>	28
<i>molu</i> 'not know'+ <i>ciman</i>	45	<i>anhass</i> 'was/were not'+ <i>ciman</i>	26
		Total	768

particle *-yss* right after the predicate *ha* 'do'. Similarly in *molu* 'not know'+*ciman* and *molu+keyss+ciman*, the latter has an additional suppositive particle *-keyss*. Even though variants are derived from the same basic form, the presence or lack of these elements (i.e., past particles and suppositive particles) may contribute to the meaning construction or retrieval. For that reason, variants were treated separately in this study.⁴ We then classified finalized lists of tokens according to categories emerging from extracted data, which are adopted and modified from previous research such as Sweetser (1990) and Park (2014). When working on classification, we carefully took the relevant context surrounding *-ciman* constructions into account.

4. Analysis and discussion

We classified the senses of *-ciman* constructions compositionally with contexts, the results of which are presented in Table 2. We again caution that the demarcation is fuzzy rather than taxonomic, for at least two reasons. The first reason lies in blurred boundaries between categories, which suggest that a *-ciman* construction can carry multiple functions simultaneously. In addition, the fuzzy representation can better capture the relatedness between a range of senses possible with *-ciman* constructions, thus conforming to the parsimony of the sense (i.e., senses are not to be multiplied beyond necessity). The categories are aligned along a scale or cline, the ends of which are a conceptual connection and a discursal connection (c.f., Lee 2002). Here a conceptual connection refers to a connection on (elements of) propositional contents, while a discursal connection

4. For example, the formulaic expression, *mianha* 'be sorry'+*ciman*, barely allows the suppositive particle *-keyss* to co-occur with it. Of course, these two can be combined when intended literally.

indicates whatever function a connective performs apart from its conceptual connection. This second type of connection can recurrently be made by the so-called discourse connectives (Blakemore 1987, 1989) or discourse markers (Schiffrin 1987; Fraser 1990, 1998), which encode ‘procedural’ information that guides the hearer to interpret an utterance (Blakemore 1987, 1989). Although it is legitimately assumed that connectives can be distinguished between conceptual and discursal ones, such bipartite approaches will be abandoned in this study, primarily because one connective can frequently perform both functions, depending on contexts.

Table 2. Classification of meanings of *-ciman*

	Category	Example in Sejong Corpus (in English translations)
Conceptual ↑	1. Explicit contrast	Adults understand the situation- <i>ciman</i> , children do not.
	2. Denial of expectation/implicature	He was mentally retarded- <i>ciman</i> , he developed gradually.
	3. Speech act hedges	
	3.1. <i>as</i>	Shown in the syllabus- <i>ciman</i> , we will study the relation between computers and corpora...
↓	3.2. <i>as well as</i>	I didn’t study hard- <i>ciman</i> , the professor did not give a good grade.
	3.3 Topic introduction	You can see from campaigns- <i>ciman</i> , the concept of campaigns has changed.
	Discoursal	
	4. Idiomatic expressions	I don’t know well- <i>ciman</i> , it might be this switch.

Examples belonging to 3.1 to 3.3 are sub-categories of speech act hedges. The term ‘speech act hedge’ therefore is employed as a cover/umbrella term that encompasses the three sub-categories together with typical speech act hedges.

Out of the categories presented in Table 2, some are labeled as “pragmatically” inferred meanings (e.g., Yoon 1989; Lee 2000), which include denial of expectation/implicature, speech act hedges, and idiomatic expressions. In contrast to such approaches, we will advocate a unitary analysis, wherein various senses of *-ciman* phrases bear an underlying or core sense, contrast. This core sense then manifests as one of these meanings presented in Table 2 in an *ad hoc* way in a specific context. To repeat, the meaning intended by a speaker is claimed to be fleshed out automatically or effortlessly by an interlocutor in a specific context (à la Jaszczolt’s Default Semantics 2005, 2009, 2016).⁵

5. One reviewers commented how my unitary approach can better explain the multiple meanings possible with *-ciman* than does the null hypothesis that it is polysemous and that various

4.1 Prevalence of global connection

Connections between linguistic units can be either local or global. The literature on contrastive connectives has revolved chiefly around local connections, i.e., ones between two adjacent linguistic units (c.f., Schiffrin 1987). However, examination of the research data of this study reveals that global connections prevail as much as local connections do. The excerpt in (9) illustrates the global nature of *-ciman* connections. (9) is excerpted from a conversation between two speakers who talk about a long road trip they had together. The speakers, who are college students, agree that the trip enabled them to become true friends. The speaker mentions that he is very close to a female friend, Senhuy, even after the speaker and Senhuy have spouses. Before talking about Senhuy, he prefaces his utterance with a *-ciman* clause in line 2, which means that closeness to friends can vary from person to person. Here the *-ciman* suffixed clause stands in a loose contrastive connection with the content of the very last clause (line 5). The two connected conjuncts are intervened by a portion of utterance, which renders the connection global.

- (9) 01 *cikum wuli moim-ey iss-nun chinkwutul-hako-nun*
 now our group-in be-MD friends-with-TC
 → 02 *etten chinmilto-uy chai-nun iss-keyss-ciman*
 some closeness-of difference-TC be-SUP-though
 03 *seywel-i cinaka-to ... Senhuy-ka mwe namphyen-i*
 year-NM go-though Senhuy-NM some husband-NM
 04 *sayngki-ko nay-ka anay-ka sayngki-tunci ... kaney*
 have-and I-NM wife-NM have-regardless regardless.of
kelikkim-epsi
 hesitation-without
 05 *manna-l swu iss-nun sai-ya.*
 meet-MD possibility be-MD relationship-DC
 ‘Even though there are differences in closeness with friends in our
 group, Senhuy and I can meet without any hesitation, regardless of
 whether she and I have spouses in the future.’ [#6CT_0051]⁶

interpretations are derived from these multiple senses stored in the mental lexicon. Both types of approaches can be equally viable, differing in terms of viewing the multiple senses of an expression.

6. For the transcription of the Korean data, the Yale Romanization was used. The abbreviations, which are borrowed and modified from Sohn (1999, 2013), are presented in the Appendix. Because of the limited space, morpheme-by-morpheme glossing is sometimes provided only for relevant parts. File numbers in the Sejong Spoken Corpus are given in square brackets after examples.

In global connections, the *-ciman* clause repeatedly serves the function of speech act hedges, modulating the force of the propositional content of the utterance, as will be addressed in Sections 4.4 below. (10) is excerpted from a conversation about movies. Speaker A comments that film versions of novels are mostly disappointing. The interlocutors then elaborate on the topic by talking about an example of a film adaption of a novel, *thoymalok* ‘Exorcist’s Journal’.

- (10) 01 A: *amwuthun wulinala-twu kulehciman sosel-i*
 anyway our.country-too like.that-ciman novel-NM
yenghwahwatway-se ...
 made.into.film-and
- 02 *silmangha-n kyengwu-ka manhi iss-ess-ten ke kath-ay.*
 be.disappoint-MD case-NM a.lot be-PST-MD that like-DC
 ‘Anyway, although it’s the same in Korea, it looks like film adaptations
 of novels are pretty disappointing.’
- 03 B: *thoymalok.*
 ‘Exorcist Journal’
- 04 A: *thoymalok-un ccom kuke-n mwe.*
 exorcist.journal-TC somewhat that-NM what
 ‘Exorcist Journal is somewhat like that.’
- 05 B: *cwuknu-n cwul al-ass-e kuke po-myense.*
 die-MD possibility know-PST-DC that watch-while
 ‘I thought I was going to die watching that.’
- 06 A: *na-twu mwe thoymalok-uy pisusha-n yu-nun pyellwu*
 I-too some Exorcist.Journal-of similar-MD type-TC much
an cohaha-ciman
 not.like-ciman
- 07 *ku thoymalok mwe seykyephyen mwe ku taumey mwe.*
 that exorcist.journal what world.part what that next what
 ‘I don’t like such works as Exorcist’s Journal either, but there are
 parts about the World and the next’
- 08 B: *honseyphyen malseyphyen*
 chaos.part the.end.of.the.world.part
 ‘There are parts about chaos and the end of the world.’
- 09 A: *honseyphyen malseyphyen mwe ilehkey manhi iss-ntey*
 chaos.part the.end.of.the.world.part what like.this many be-but
 ‘There are parts about the chaos and the end of the world. Like
 these, there are many parts.’
- 10 A: *com yuchihakey tway-ss-tula.*
 Some childish become-PST-DC
 ‘They [parts of Exorcist’s Journal] are a little childish.’ [#6CT_0030]

A's utterance in line 6 begins with a *-ciman* clause, which expresses the speaker's negative attitude/evaluation toward certain types of movies. Noticeable is that the content right after *the -ciman* clause (line 7) does not contrast with the *-ciman* clause, because A digresses from the main topic by enumerating a variety of versions of *thoymalok*. Furthermore, A's utterance in line 7 cooperates with B's utterance in line 8 by elaborating on the different versions of *thoemalok*. As can be seen in A's utterances in line 10, A conveys his negative opinions about *thoymalok*. Then the contents in the *-ciman* clause in line 6 and the succeeding utterances by A do not contrast. What A wants to deliver by the *-ciman* clause is his propositional attitude to the topic, which can be rephrased as in (11) and (12).

(11) If I don't like such works as *thoymalok*, I should not talk about them.

(12) I am talking about them.

The second clauses of (11) and (12) contrast with each other. The *-ciman* clause in line 6 performs a concessive function from A's perspective, attenuating A's act of stating his evaluation of certain types of novels.

4.2 Explicit contrast

Explicit contrast consists of occurrences in which contrast is manifested by means of explicit lexical or structural contrast combined by a *-ciman*, as demonstrated by the first sentence in Table 2 above. To repeat, this type is dubbed semantic opposition (Lakoff 1971), external contrast (Halliday and Hasan 1976), or contrast use (Blakemore 1987, 1989). Another example can be seen in (13) below.

- (13) 01 *kulayse i tungkanchekto-eyse-nun*
 so this interval.scale-on-TC
 → 02 *phullasu-nun kyey-san-i toy-ciman kophaki-nun an*
 addition-TC calculation-NM be.done-ciman multiplication-TC not
twayyo.
 be.done
 03 *kophaki ha-nun uymi-nun ku tases pay-lanun*
 multiplication do-MD meaning-TC that five times-so.called
 04 *uymi-ka an toyn-ta-nun ke-yeyyo*
 meaning-NM not become-DC-MD point-DC
 'So, on this interval scale, **addition can be calculated, but multiplication cannot be done.** The logic of multiplication does not hold (on the interval scale)?' [#6CT_0002]

(13) is excerpted from a lecture on research methodology including quantitative measurement scales. In this specific part, the speaker explains the characteristics of interval scale with reference to other types of scales. What contrasts in this example are two lexical terms, *addition* and *multiplication*. Lexical contrast can be of various kinds (e.g., Lyons 1977) ranging from complementary antonyms (i.e., *dead* vs. *alive* and *male* vs. *female*) to taxonomic sisters (i.e., color terms and days of a week). In (13), the relevant contrast is that of taxonomic sisters that are from a set of paradigmatically contrasting elements. As Lyons (1977) points out, contrast here does not carry any implication as to the number of contrasting elements in a set.

In some cases, the concept of lexical contrast needs to be expanded to accommodate examples like (14), because semantic contents of two units do not stand in a strict contrastive relationship. Excerpt (14) is from a monologue of a student who has been to Afghanistan as a participant in a relief work project. The speaker provides an account about a tribe whose language lacks a writing system.

- (14) 01 *callalapatu-ey sa-nun mincok-un phasyai-lanun congkok-i-ketunyo.*
 Zalarabad-in live-MD people-TC Pashay-be.called tribe-be-DC
 → 02 *kuntey i mincokun ku mwullon malun iss-ciman*
 but this tribe that of.course spoken.language be-though
 03 *kulca-ka eps-ess-ten ke-ya*
 written.language-NM not.have-PST-MD that-DC
 ‘The people of Zalarabad are Pasha. They, of course, have a spoken
 language, but they didn’t have any written language.’ [#6CT_0013]

In (14), the two lexemes, *mal* ‘spoken language’ and *kul* ‘alphabet’, are contrasted. Then a set of contrastive lexemes is set up, in which spoken language and written language constitute the elements of the set. Structurally the two contrasted lexemes are couched in parallel syntactic patterns: *malum isssta* (spoken language exists) vs. *kulcaka epsta* (written language does not exist). On the other hand, as will be discussed in Section 4.3 below, occurrences like (14) can be construed as an instance of denial of expectation because the clause suffixed by a *-ciman* evokes an inferred proposition that if a tribe has a spoken language, it commonly has a written language. This very expectation is denied in the second clause. This phenomenon supports the fuzzy representation of categories proposed in this study, because a *-ciman* clause performs dual functions at the same time.

4.3 Denial of expectations

Examples in this category contain the use of *-ciman* which signals that the content of an upcoming talk is read as a denial of any expectations inferable from the content of an expressed clause (e.g., Blakemore 1987; Schiffrin 1987). For that reason,

contrast in this use is claimed to have a cancellative function (Bell 1998). Excerpt (15) is from a monologue about a movie, *Beautiful Mind*. The speaker comments that the main character of the movie was a brilliant man, although the speaker thinks he was beautified too much in the film.

- (15) 01 *nemwuna ku yenghwa-eyse mihwasikhye-ss-ta lanun*
 too.much that movie-in glorify-PST-DC like
 02 *sayngkak-i tule-se com anthakkap-ki-n hay-ss-ciman*
 thought-NM come.to-and a.little sorry-NOM-TC do-PST-ciman
 03 *ku salam cachey-nun koyngcanghi hwullyunghan salam-i-n ke*
 that person self-TC extremely outstanding person-be-MD that
kath-kwu.
 see-DC
 ‘Although I was sorry to think that he was glorified too much in the
 movie, he seemed to be a great man himself.’ [#6CT_0019]

In (15), there is no pair of contrasted lexical items in the two clauses connected by *-ciman*. Instead, the clause suffixed by *-ciman* can trigger an inference as in (16).

- (16) If I felt sorry to think that he was glorified too much, I think that he was not that outstanding.

However, this inferred information expressed in the second clause of (16) is denied in (15). By means of this, the contrast conveyed by *-ciman* is legitimized. Propositions derivable from the first clause can differ in their nature (Fraser 1998; Lee 2002). Specifically the choice of such propositions is constrained by the content of the second conjunct, as shown in (16). Blakemore (1987, 1989) contends that the English discourse connective *but* constrains the way the utterance *but* introduces. However, Lee (2002) proves that discourse connectives including *but* also contribute to the way the preceding utterance is construed, as illustrated in (16).

(17) is an excerpt from a conversation between two speakers about an array of topics such as cultures, movies, and life. Speaker A says that he had pizza with a mutual friend, Ciyeng. Responding to A, B comments that A should sometimes eat *pindayttek*⁷ (obviously as opposed to the representative western dish, pizza), because A is old enough to prefer Korean food to western food (line 7). As a response to B’s comment, A says that although he likes *pindayttek*, he eats pizza only rich with cheese (lines 8–9).

7. “This is one of the mandatory dishes on traditional holidays or special festive occasions. Also called *nokdujijim* or *binjatteok*, *bingdaetteok* is made by peeling and soaking mung beans, grinding them, and then pan-frying with various vegetables.” (Retrieved on 27 August, 2019 from <https://terms.naver.com/entry.nhn?docId=5700793&cid=42701&categoryId=63067>)

- (17) 01 B: *ciyeng-i-lang mwel mekesstakwu?*
 ‘What did you say you ate with Ciyeng?’
- 02 A: *phisca.*
 ‘Pizza.’
- 03 B: *etten ciyengi*
 ‘Which Ciyeng?’
- 04 A: *kwupen a kwupeni anikwuna sonciyeng.*
 ‘Student ID number 9, ah, not number 9, but Ciyeng Son.’
- 05 B: *a sonciyeng.*
 ‘Ah, Ciyeng Son.’
- 06 A: *ung toykey kkwulkkwulhayse phica mekca hay kacikwu ipmas tolase tto kulen ke cohahacanha tto.*
 ‘Yes, I was so grumpy that I suggested having pizza. When I have a good appetite, I love that kind of food too.’
- 07 B: *phicaman cohahay naika myech kayntey pintayttektwu com mekkwu kakkum eng?*
 ‘You only like pizza. I think you’re old enough to eat pintayttek often, huh?’
- 08 A: *pintayttek-twu cohaha-ciman phica-twu chicu-ka manhi*
pintayttek-too like-ciman pizza-too cheese-NM much
- 09 *tulun ke-man mek-e.*
put.in thing-only eat-DC
 ‘Although I like pintayttek, I only eat pizza rich with cheese.’
- 10 B: *salccye*
 ‘You’ll get fat.’

[#6CT_0039]

In lines 8 through 9, A conjoins two clauses using *-ciman*. Here we can observe a lexical contrast between *pintayttek* and *pizza*, whereby the use of *-ciman* is accommodated. At the same time, the contrast can be viewed to hold between derived/inferred propositions of the two conjuncts. From the first conjunct of A’s utterance in line 8, we can derive an assumption that A behaves according to his age (i.e., A likes *bindayttek*, as expected by ordinary Korean adults). From the second conjunct, we can infer a proposition that A does not quite follow this convention (because he eats the representative western food, pizza, even rich with cheese which is generally believed to be dispreferred by average Korean adults). The contrast here occurs between these two derived propositions.

4.4 Speech act hedges

As discussed in Section 4.1 above, *-ciman* clauses can serve as a hedge of an assertion, marking the speaker's concessive attitude toward the assertion (c.f. Schiffrin 1987). Even though definitions and usages of the term, 'hedge', may vary in the literature, a hedge usually refers to "a particle, word or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set" (Brown and Levinson 1987, 145). Hedges can also be defined as methods of mitigating the force of an assertion for pragmatic reasons such as displaying politeness or avoiding full commitment.

(18) is excerpted from a dialogue between two friends about employment. The speaker of (18) states that her employed friends complain about excessive working hours. Never having prepared for job hunting, the speaker feels envious of such friends despite their complaints about long working hours.

- (18) 01 *chwiephan aytulun ... maynnal sinipsawenila yelhansiey tuleka ...*
hamyemse
 'Those who are employed ... complain that they leave office at 11 p.m.
 and come back at 5 a.m.'
- 02 *solcikhi tulekassunikka ku thwucengul hakwu issi kyayneytuli*
 'Honestly, they can complain because they are employed.'
- 03 *acik nanun nayka cikcepcekulo an kyekkese*
 'Because I've never experienced it directly yet,'
- 04 *nay-ka mwe-lako ha-l swu iss-nun ipcang-un*
 I-NM anything-as say-MD possibility possibility-TC position-TC
an-i-ciman
 not-be-ciman
 'I'm not in a position to say anything about it, but'
- 05 *pwuleptanun sayngkakto tulko solcikhi cenpwu ta chwiepi toynun*
palamey.
 'I feel envious of them, honestly, because they have jobs.' [#7CT_0016]

In line 4, the speaker employs a *-ciman* clause, which asserts that she is not in a position to say anything because she did not go through the employment problem herself. Then she expresses her envy of her employed friends. The *-ciman* clause in this excerpt clearly conveys the speaker's concessive attitude toward the upcoming assertion about her feeling about such friends, mitigating the force of this assertion.

When combined with a concessive marker, phrases corresponding to the English phrase *I don't know* in different languages have turned out to function as a

forward-looking marker revealing that “the speaker is not fully committed to what follows in his/her turn” (Weatherall (2011, 317) in English and Helmer et. al. (2016) in German). In these cases, both lexical and structural properties compositionally contribute to engendering such concessive meanings. (19) is taken from the same corpus as (9) above, in which two interlocutors talk about a long road trip. In line 1, speaker A, who is a college student in his twenties, makes a verbal mistake. He must have wanted to say that he has not lived very long, but actually he said that he has lived long. Noticing this mistake, A corrects himself in line 3, but his mistake is laughed at by B in line 4. A repeats himself in line 5 by saying that because he has not lived long, he does not know very well. Then he gives his opinion about the subtlety involved in relationships between men and women.

- (19) 01 A: *kuntey ku namnyekwankyeylanun key cham omyohanila nato manhi sala pwase.*
 ‘So the relationship between men and women is so weird. **Because I’ve lived long.**’
- 02 B: *macayo.*
 ‘Right.’
- 03 A: *manhi sal-a po-ci anh-ase molu-ciman.*
 long live-and see-NOM not.do-because not.know-ciman
 ‘**Although I don’t know** because I’ve not lived long.’
- 04 B: *nato manhi sala pwase.*
 ‘(Did you say) **because I’ve lived long?**’
- 05 A: *ani manhi sala poci anhase calun moluciman*
 ‘No, **although I don’t know well** because I’ve not lived long.’
- 06 *ku cham mimyohaci cham selokaney isengilan concayka cham yomwulin ke kathay*
 ‘It’s so subtle. It seems that the opposite sexes are weird.’
- 07 *issumyen pwutamtoykwu epsumyen tto pokwu siphkwu.*
 ‘If you have a partner, you feel pressured. If you don’t, you miss one.’
- [#6CT_0051]

In (19), the predicate used in the *-ciman* clause is *moluta* ‘not know’, which is a representative epistemic modality marker. As in other languages such as English and German, the predicate *alta* ‘know’ and the ending *-ciman* collectively yield a concessive meaning, making the whole *-ciman* clause a hedge.

A few senses of *-ciman* clauses drawn on or related to the speech-act-hedge meaning are identified including comparison (i.e., *as*), addition (i.e., *as well as*), and topic introduction, which are discussed in Sections 4.4.1 through 4.4.3.

Although the senses they carry are subtly distinguished, they still retain a common property of packaging the content in the *-ciman* clause as if it were given/old information or background knowledge. The *-ciman* clause in these cases thus functions as a hedge for the speaker to reduce the onus of presenting a new sub-topic. To repeat, these functions compositionally result from lexical meanings of the predicate, the marker *-ciman*, and the context. This is why the following three senses collapse under the overarching speech-act hedge category.

4.4.1 Referring to a precondition or prior information (i.e., *as*)

A *-ciman* clause sometimes can carry the meaning of the English word *as* or *like*. Specifically, a *-ciman* clause can be employed to refer to a previously mentioned or presupposed assumption, simultaneously conveying the speaker's hedging attitude that she wishes to be excused for repeating what has already been discussed or known to the interlocutors (Lee 2018). By doing so, the speaker can achieve a couple of discourse goals. She can remind her interlocutors of information already presented or presupposed, helping them comprehend what follows. In addition, the speaker can lessen the burden of repeating the same piece of information by adopting such hedging strategies.

(20) is an excerpt from a doctor's lecture on children's mental-health issues, including autism. In line 3, the doctor cites autism as the most representative mental disorder which was discussed with reference to a Korean movie, *Marathon*. The main character of the movie is an autistic young man who overcame adversity to be a great marathoner.

- (20) 01 *i cenpancekin paltaley mwunceyka issnun aytul ceyka chilyohanun pangpepiketunyo*
 '(This is) the way I treat the children who have a problem with overall development.'
- 02 *kuntay i cwungeyse kacang tayphyocekin cangayka yelepwn sowi malhanun*
 'But among them, the most representative disorder is, ladies and gentlemen, the so-called, '
- 03 *akka ceyka ku malathon yayki-to ha-yss-ciman caphyey cangay*
 a.while ago that Marathon story-too tell-PST-ciman autism disorder
kyeythong-i-eyyo
 type-be-DC
 'as I mentioned the movie Marathon a while ago, it is a kind of the autism disorder.'
- 04 *ike icey caphyey cangaynun cenpancek paltal cangayla kulayse ...*
 'So autism is called an overall developmental disorder.' [#9CT_0006]

The *-ciman* clause can also be used to represent the information available from the context in some form or other. (21) is from a medical lecture to the public by a doctor, in which the doctor starts his lecture by mentioning osteoporosis. As the excerpt is from the very onset of the talk, nothing was discussed before. However, it is inferable from the speaker's utterances that the topic of the talk *osteoporosis* must have been presented as the title of the presentation material. The *-ciman* clause in line 4 informs the audience that the topic appears as the title. At the same time, it serves as a hedge, allowing the speaker to excuse herself to repeat the same information.

- (21) 01 *yey yelepwun annyeng annyenghasyessupnikka cehuy ku seypulansu pyengwenhako*
 'Hello, everyone, how are you? Severance Hospital and,'
 02 *hankyeleysinmwuni kongtongulo kaychoyhanun wuli a kenkang kongkaykangcwaey ...*
 'the Hankyoreh newspaper are co-holding this public lecture on health.'
 03 *a onulun ceyka malssum tulilyeko ha-nun kenun,*
 'What I am going to present today is'
 → 04 *a yeki ceymok-ey-to ilehkey nawa iss-ciman*
 'ah here title-in-too like.this appear be-ciman
 'um, as shown in the title here,'
 05 *a soli epsnun a pamsonnim koltakongcung ilen nayyongul kaciko*
 'the topic of a soundless thief, Osteoporosis.'
 06 *a ceyka malssumul tulikeyssupnita.*
 'I am going to give you a talk about it.'

4.4.2 Adding information (i.e., in addition to)

Some *-ciman* clauses impart the sense of addition, roughly synonymous with the English expression *in addition to*. Still, they simultaneously convey a hedging connotation, reducing the weight of the information contained in *-ciman* clauses and thus bringing to the foreground what follows the *-ciman* clauses. Then the contrast can be made between different degrees of importance allotted to two compared parts. In examples classified as belonging to this category, the particle *-to* 'too' concurrently plays a significant role in constituting this information-adding interpretation. The compositional nature involved in the elucidation of a *-ciman* clause is again buttressed here.

In (22), the speaker talks about his close friends, one of whom is said to be especially cherished by the speaker. In line 2, the speaker states that he remembers

that specific friend because he is an old friend of the speaker. In upcoming talks, the speaker adds another reason why he remembers that specific friend.

- (22) 01 *i chinkwunun mwel hanun salaminyamyen hayyangtaylul colephako*
 ‘What this friend does is, he graduated from the Ocean University,’
 02 *kwuntay taysin cikum paylul sam nyen thako isse il hang sam hangsalo ...*
 ‘instead of serving in the army, he’s been on a boat for three years now as a
 first, a third mate.’
 03 *i chinkwu-ka way kieknamnya-myen-un na-lang olaytoyn*
 this friend-NM why be.remembered-if-TC I-with old
chinkwu-i-kito ha-ciman,
 friend-be-too be-ciman
 ‘The reason I remember this friend is that **in addition to** being an old
 friend of mine,’
 04 *cengmal nayka kunkka i chinkwu maley i chinkwuka ilehkey hayla han ke*
 ‘(I can really follow) what he advised me to do.’
 05 *nay insayngi kelling mwunceyil ttay nayka ttalakal swu issul mankhumey*
chinkwuya.
 ‘He is such a friend that I can follow his advice on matters of my life.’
 [#5CT_0017]

What the speaker intends to convey is that in addition to being an old friend, this very friend is memorable because he can be consulted with even about life-threatening problems. Therefore the *-ciman* clause here conveys information which is treated as primary, serving as a springboard for further crucial information.

This function of a *-ciman* clause is more conspicuous in (23). The speaker in (23) talks about how he won his girlfriend’s heart and eventually got married. The speaker and his wife first met in the U.S. when they were students. After a while, the speaker alone returned to Korea, but he went back to the U.S. again to see her with a special present. The ostensible reason was to pick up his luggage in the U.S.

- (23) 01 *me senmwuley cip kathun ke issessnuntey me ssayngssu suthoanka?*
 ‘There was a gift shop or something. Um, Thanks Store?’
 02 *kekise phocang com yeypukey phocanghay talla kulayssnuntey,*
 ‘I asked them to wrap the present beautifully there.’
 03 *kuke kaciko mikwukey kaseyo.*
 ‘I went to the States with the present.’

- 04 *cey yuilhan mokcek-un cim kaci-le o-n kes-to*
 my only purpose-TC luggage bring.back-to come-MD thing-too
iss-ciman,
 be-ciman
 ‘The only purpose of my visit was to bring my luggage back, but **in addition to that,**
- 05 *tasi han pen e phyohyenhaki wihayse wase*
 ‘Once again, um, I went there to confess my love.’
- 06 *mannacakwu kulayssteni kkamccak nollay. e hankwuk tuleon ke aninya kwu?*
 ‘When I asked her to meet, she was surprised and said, “Huh, didn’t you go back to Korea?” [#8CT_0031]

In line 4 in (23), the speaker mentions that the only reason to return to America was to bring back his luggage. Right after that, the speaker continues that the more important reason was to confess his love. In this narrative, the excuse contained in the *-ciman* clause is described as ostensible, whereas the reason revealed by the following utterance becomes far more prominent and relevant. In this respect, this function of *-ciman* is quite similar to another Korean contrastive connective *-nuntey*, which was proven to provide background information (e.g., Lee 1991; Lee 1993; Park 1999) or establish the situation.

4.4.3 *Introducing a sub-topic*

The *-ciman* clause can also be deployed to introduce a sub-topic of a main topic, organizing the content of the *-ciman* clause to be already known to the interlocutors. Here the compositional nature involved in the construal of a *-ciman* clause is pronounced most prominently, because the predicate immensely contributes to this topic-introducing sense.

(24) is an excerpt from a dialogue between two persons who converse about politics focusing on recent presidential elections. Speaker A describes how the then presidential candidate of a minority party (Mr. Kwenyengkil) made fun of the then two major political parties. In line 4, speaker B introduces a sub-topic, which is election campaigns, utilizing a *-ciman* clause. He then elaborates on that sub-topic by commenting that the ways election campaigns are conducted have changed in a positive way. As well as bringing up a new sub-topic, the *-ciman* clause in (24) accomplishes a hedging purpose by rendering the sub-topic introduced in the *-ciman* clause familiar to the interlocutors.

- (24) 01 A: *mak selo mak mincwutang ccokilang hannalatangi yaykihanikka*
 ‘As the Democratic Party and the Grand National Party were talking to each other,
 02 *kwenyengkil ssika hanun yaykika e hannalangtangun wencopwuphaytangiyo*
 ‘Mr. Kwenyengkil said, “the Grand National Party is the original corruption party,’
 03 *mincwutangun sincangkayeptangintey mwel hal mal issnyako ...*
 ‘and that the Democratic Party is a novice party, so what can you say?’”
 → 04 B: *kunikkan senke wuntong-ul pwa-to al-keyss-ciman*
 so election campaign-AC see-even know-SUP-ciman
 ‘As you can notice from the election campaigns,’
 05 *ma senke wuntongilan kaynyemto manhi tallacyesse.*
 ‘the notion of election campaigns has changed dramatically.’
 [#7CT_0038]

As discussed in 4.4 above, the predicate *alta* ‘know’ in (24) plays a substantial role in conveying the above-mentioned function. However, even non-epistemic predicates can denote a similar sense, as shown in (25), where the predicate *nukkita* ‘feel’ is used. In (25), a male speaker in his twenties recites a narrative about love. Prior to this excerpt, he talked about his first love, which failed badly. He adds that he had recently started reading a book, *Men are from Mars, Women Are from Venus*, which is about common relationship problems between men and women. He then brings up a sub-topic about the book, i.e., what he feels about the book in line 5.

- (25) 01 *kulen ke (hethalkam) ttaymwuney swipkey isengeykey takakaci moshantanun cem*
 ‘Because of that (despondency), (I) cannot easily get close to girls.’
 02 *mwe mwe kathun namca chinkwutul kathun kyengwuya mwe*
 ‘Um, um, in the case of male friends,’
 03 *ilen yayki celen yaykihata pomyenun chinhaycil swu issciman waynci kelikami nukkyecinun*
 ‘I can make friends with them, talking to each other. But, somehow I feel distant (with female friends).’
 04 *mwe yocumey poki sicakhan chayki mwe hwasengeyse on namca kumsengeyse on yeca?*
 ‘Um, the book I recently started reading is “Men Are from Mars, Women Are from Venus”?’

- 05 *ku chayk-ul ccokum ilkepo-myense nukki-nun ke-ciman,*
 that book-AC a.little read-while feel-MD thing-ciman
 ‘This is what I feel while I read the book.’
- 06 *cham pyelkayuy sayngmwulikwuna sayngkakanun phaytheni ayey*
thullitanun ke
 ‘(Men and women) are totally different creatures. The ways they think
 are different.’ [#7CT_0010]

By couching this subtopic in a *-ciman* clause in line 5, the speaker can hedge against the burden of introducing this new sub-topic, thus making his utterance sound more modest.

4.5 Idiomatic expressions

When *-ciman* is combined with some lexical hedges such as *sorry*, *excuse me*, and *I don't know*, the whole *-ciman* clause constitutes an idiomatic expression. Indeed, it is well known that hedging can be achieved by a variety of devices ranging from particles to prosodic clues (e.g., Brown and Levinson 1989). In Korean, expressions such as *I am sorry-ciman*, *excuse me-ciman*, and *I don't know-ciman* have been approached as stereotypical examples of *-ciman*-based idioms (e.g., Lee and Lee 1999; Park 2014). Among the data of the current study, a set of such idiomatic expressions was also identified.

The segment in (26) is excerpted from a multi-party conversation of three close friends, addressing an array of topics including movies. In (26), the participants exchange their thoughts about a movie, *The Rainmaker*. This movie features stories and scenes of trials, in one of which the main character's (lawyer of a plaintiff) skillful performances stand out prominently, quieting the court and even influencing the jury's decision. In (26), the three interlocutors share their opinions about such clichés of Hollywood movies' court scenes. In line 9, participant C, prefacing his utterance with *I am sorry-ciman*, states that court scenes are all the same. Indeed the same speaker (speaker C) utters the same assertion in line 2 and repeats it in line 9. The only difference is the presence of *I am sorry-ciman* in line 9. The speaker does not utilize this *-ciman* clause because he literally feels sorry. Rather, he uses it as an idiomatic expression, emphasizing his opinion about such a typical unfolding and simultaneously showing and seeking consent among the speakers. The other speakers agree and use the same expression, as demonstrated in lines 3, 8, and 10.

- (26) 01 A: *mak mwela kulenikka cangnay coyonghayciko mak ilen ke anya?*
 ‘(The lawyer) says something. The court becomes quiet. Something like that?’
- 02 C: *tay taypwupwun ta kulay. Haha.*
 ‘It’s almost like that. Ha-ha.’
- 03 B: *taypwupwun ta kulay. mwela kulemyen pepceng ta coyonghayciko.*
 ‘It’s almost like that. If the lawyer says something, the whole court becomes quiet.’
- 04 C: *haha kuchi.*
 ‘Ha, ha, right.’
- 05 A: *mak mwela kule.*
 ‘The lawyer says something.’
- 06 B: *paysimwen neme kako mak.*
 ‘The jury turns to support the lawyer.’
- 07 A: *pepceng coyonghayciko mak kkullye nakako ike anya?*
 ‘Isn’t it that the courtroom becomes quiet and somebody is just dragged out?’
- 08 B: *ta kulay.*
 ‘It’s all like that.’
- 09 C: *ta kul-ay ta! mianha-ciman ta kulehta-n-ta.*
 all like.that-DC all be.sorry-ciman all like.that-IN-DC
 ‘It’s all like that! **I am sorry, but** it’s all like that.’
- 10 B: *ta kulay.*
 ‘It’s all like that.’ [#7CT_0029]

Another *-ciman*-based idiom recurrently addressed in the literature is *I don’t know-ciman*. Of special interest is that this construction involves the so-called epistemic predicate *know* in its negative form. Examination of contexts of this idiomatic phrase frequently indicates that users do not lack knowledge about the issue in question. Rather this idiomatic expression serves as a prepositioned epistemic hedge (Weatherall 2011), showing that the speaker is not completely committed to what follows.

The monologue in (27) is taken from a seminar on language learning and errors. While explaining redundancy in spoken language, the speaker mentions a scholar called George who criticized the methodology of oral auditory language teaching with great acrimony. The expanded context indicates that the speaker is quite knowledgeable about redundancy in language use and its relevant literature. Nevertheless, he moderates the force of his argument by using an *I don’t know very well-ciman* in line 4.

- (27) 01 *mwe wulika yaykilul hamyense ipmaleysenun panpokul manhi hakey*
toycanhayo ...
 ‘Well, as we talk, we repeat ourselves a lot in spoken language.’
- 02 *ku thukhi ipmaleyseuy kulen ku kanthwusa sayongina mwe phyohyenuy*
panpokina,
 ‘Especially in spoken language, use of interjections or repetition of expressions,’
- 03 *kulen kel uymihanun ken anin ke kathkwuyo yeysl tulse ku, swuep*
sikaney,
 ‘I don’t think these are what is meant. For example, in class,’
- 04 *um cal molu-keyss-ciman,*
um, well not.know-sup-ciman
 ‘um, I don’t know very well, but,’
- 05 *thukhi i cocilanun salami kwutwuchengkaksik ku pangpepul ...*
 ‘particularly, this scholar named George (criticized) the oral auditory methodologies.’
- 06 *acwu sinlahahey piphanhako isstanun kulen nayingongi issketunyo?*
 ‘It is said that he criticized this methodology very harshly?’
- [#6CT_0003]

This *ciman* clause as an idiomatic chunk fulfills a politeness purpose, marking the speaker’s concessive attitude to the audience rather than conveying its literal meaning.

As such, these rather fixed chunks such as *I am sorry-ciman* and *I don’t know-ciman* can serve as stance or discourse markers (Carter and McCarthy 2006),⁸ which express the speaker’s stance/attitude towards the following message much more than delivering propositional content meanings, largely because their literal meanings are bleached, conveying instead the speakers’ concessive stance or attitude toward the upcoming utterances and simultaneously meeting any desired politeness expectations. It is seldom the case that function words (i.e., pronouns, prepositions, and conjunctions) or affixes (i.e., suffixes and prefixes) serve as stance markers. Cross-linguistically, most stance markers developed out of content words, such as nouns, adjectives, or adverbs (e.g. Gray and Biber 2014). How-

8. Stance markers are classified as a sub-category of pragmatic markers by Carter and McCarthy (2006). In linguistics literature, the same marker has been dubbed in different terms, including, but not limited to, discourse markers (e.g. Schiffrin 1987; Fraser 1990), discourse particles (e.g. Schourup 1985; Mosegaard Hansen 1998), and discourse connectives (e.g. Blakemore 1987).

ever, as discussed in Lee (2015), the Korean first-person plural pronoun *wuli* ‘we, our’ functions as a stance marker in contemporary spoken Korean. This argument was supported by the fact that the pronoun *wuli* demonstrates the properties of common nouns such as pluralization (e.g., *wuli-tul* ‘we-plural’) or suffixation by a possessive marker *-uy* (e.g., *wuli-uy* ‘we-of’). In a similar vein, the ending *-ciman* may function as a stance marker together with certain co-occurring idiomatic expressions, even though it is not a content word or a free morpheme.

5. Conclusion

Departing from most previous studies on the Korean contrastive ending *-ciman* which have revolved around constructed data, in this paper we conducted a corpus-based analysis of this ending. Connections between linguistic units can be made either locally or globally. Previous literature on contrastive endings has primarily focused on local connections, i.e. two adjacent linguistic units. However, we demonstrated that global connections are frequently entertained by ordinary speakers. Adopting a fuzzy representation, we identified a range of meanings possible with *-ciman* constructions emerging from corpus data. The identified meanings include explicit contrast, denial of expectation, speech act hedges, and idiomatic expressions. Under speech act hedges, several sub types were further suggested. The fuzzy representation can be supported for at least two reasons. First, taxonomic categorization of a substantial number of examples is often fuzzy, strongly indicating that they can bear multiple functions simultaneously. Second, the fuzzy representation can better reflect the commonalities of various senses possible with *-ciman* constructions, whose underlying or enduring sense concerns ‘contrast’. We also demonstrated that construal of a *-ciman*-based construction is compositionally solicited together with other accompanying linguistic units, principally the predicate and certain particles. This was illustrated by a range of examples, where the predicate or a specific particle mutually contributes to the construal of a *-ciman* clause.

The so-called “pragmatic” meanings of *-ciman* constructions, such as denial of expectations and speech acts were accounted for by means of different levels of representations in which the contrast occurs. Furthermore, we speculated that the ending *-ciman* can be employed as a stance/discourse marker together with certain co-occurring idiomatic expressions. Some fixed expressions suffixed with *-ciman* can be used to express speakers’ concessive attitude toward an assertion and thus allow them to moderate the burden of asserting the message in a proper way.

Abbreviations

AC	accusative particlending
DC	declarative sentence-type ending
IN	indicative mood suffixending
MD	pre-nominal modifier suffix
NM	nominative particlending
NOM	nominalizer suffix
PST	past tense suffixending
SUP	suppositive mood suffixending
TC	topic-contrast particle

References

- Baranzini, Laura, and Alda Mari. 2019. "From Epistemic Modality to Concessivity: Alternatives and Pragmatic Reasoning per absurdum." *Journal of Pragmatics* 142: 116–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.01.002>
- Bell, D.M. 1998. "Cancellative Markers: A Core/Periphery Approach." *Pragmatics* 8: 515–541. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.8.4.03bel>
- Blakemore, Diane. 1987. *Semantic Constrains in Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blakemore, Diane. 1989. "Denial and Contrast: A Relevance Theoretic Analysis of But." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12: 15–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00627397>
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephan Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085>
- Carter, Ronald, and Michael McCarthy. 2006. *Cambridge Grammar of English: A Comprehensive Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Choi, Hyenpay. 1937. *Wulimalpon*. [Korean Grammar]. Seoul: Top Publishing.
- Dascal, Marcelo, and Katriel Tamar. 1977. "Between Semantics and Pragmatics: The Two Types of 'but' – Hebrew 'aval' and 'ela'." *Theoretical Linguistics* 4: 143–172. <https://doi.org/10.1515/thli.1977.4.1-3.143>
- Fraser, Bruce. 1990. "An Approach to Discourse Markers." *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 383–395. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90096-V](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90096-V)
- Fraser, Bruce. 1998. "Contrastive Discourse Markers in English." In *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*, eds. by A. H. Jucker, and Y. Ziv, 301–326. Amsterdam: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.57.15fra>
- Gray, Bethany, and Douglas Biber. 2014. "Stance Markers." In *Corpus Pragmatics*, eds. by Karin Aijmer, and Christoph Rühlemann, 219–248. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, Paul. 1989. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Halliday, M.A., and R. Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- He, Wung. 1977. *Wuliyeysmalpon* [Grammar of Old Korean]. Seoul: Saymmwunhwasa.
- Helmer, Henrike, Silke Reineke, and Arnulf Deppermann. 2016. "A Range of Uses of Negative Epistemic Constructions in German: ICH WEIß NICHT as a Resource for Dispreferred Actions." *Journal of Pragmatics* 106: 97–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.06.002>

- Jaszczolt, Kasia. 2005. *Default Semantics: Foundations of a Compositional Theory of Acts of Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199261987.001.0001>
- Jaszczolt, Kasia. 2009. *Representing Time: An Essay on Temporality and Modality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaszczolt, Kasia. 2016. *Meaning in Linguistic Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199602469.001.0001>
- Lakoff, Robin. 1971. "If's, and's and but's about Conjunction." In *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*, eds. by C. Fillmore, and D. Langendoen, 114–149. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston. 114–149.
- Lee, Huyca, and Conghuy Lee. 1999. *Theyksuthu Pwunsekcek Kwuke Emiuy Yenkwu* [A Text-Analytic Approach to Korean Endings]. Seoul: Hankwukmwunhwasa
- Lee, Hye-Kyung. 2002. "Towards a New Typology of Connectives with Special Reference to Conjunction in English and Korean." *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 851–866.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)00065-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00065-0)
- Lee, Hye-Kyung. 2015. "A Corpus-Pragmatic Analysis of Wuli." *Discourse and Cognition* 22(3): 59–78. <https://doi.org/10.15718/discog.2015.22.3.59>
- Lee, Hyo Sang. 1991. Tense, Aspect and Modality: A Discourse-Pragmatic Analysis of Verbal Suffix in Korean from a Typological Perspective. Ph.D. Dissertation, UCLA.
- Lee, Iksep, and Hongpin Im. 1983. *Kwukemwunpeplon*. [Korean Grammar]. Seoul: Tayhaksa.
- Lee, Keedong. 1993. "The Pragmatic Function of the Connective Nuntey." *Ene* [Korean Journal of Linguistics] 5(1): 119–135.
- Lee, Keum-Hee. 2018. Pocosa manun kyelhaphyeng yenkyel phyohyenyey tayhaye: -cimanun, -tamanun, -(u)kkamanun lyu cwungsimulo. [Final endings + particle Maneun on coupled forms focused mainly -jimeun, -damaneun, -eulkkmaneun]. *Kwukehak* [Journal of Korean Linguistics] 86: 63–88.
- Lee, Unkyeng. 2000. *Kwukeuy Cepsokeki Yenkwu* [A Study of Korean Conjunctive Suffixes]. Seoul: Tayhaksa.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Mosegaard Hansen, Maj-Britt. 1998. *The Function of Discourse Particles: A Study with Special Reference to Spoken Standard French*. Philadelphia: Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.53>
- Nam, Kisim, and Yengkun Ko. 1983. *Phyocwunkwukemwunpeplon*. [Grammar of the Standard Korean]. Seoul: Top Publishing
- Park, Jae-Yeon. 2014. "Hankwuke Yenkyelemi Uymi Hwacangeyseuy Hwanyuwa Unyu [Metonymy and Metaphor in the Semantic Extensions of Korean Connective Endings]." *Kwukehak* [Journal of Korea Linguistics] 70: 117–155.
- Park, Yong-Yae. 1999. "The Korean Connective Nuntey in Conversational Discourse." *Journal of Pragmatics* 31:191–218. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(98\)00060-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00060-5)
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611841>
- Schourup, Lawrence. 1985. *Common Discourse Particles in English Conversation*. New York: Garland.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. 1999. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. 2013. *Korean*. Seoul: Korea University Press
- Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson. 1986/1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* (Second edition with postface). Oxford: Blackwell.

- Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620904>
- Weatherall, Ann. 2011. "I Don't Know as a Prepositioned Epistemic Hedge." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 44(4): 317–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2011.619310>
- Yoon, Phyenghyen. 1989. Kwukeuy Cepsokemiy Tayhan Yenkwu. [A study of Korean Conjunctive Suffixes]. Ph.D. Dissertation. Cheonnam National University, Korea.
- Zafiu, Rodica. 2018. Epistemic and Evidential Markers in the Rhetorical Context of Concession. *Journal of Pragmatics* 128: 116–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.07.008>

Publication history

Date received: 7 July 2020

Date accepted: 5 July 2021

Published online: 24 August 2021