

The Multiple Functions of 'Mianhapnida' in Korean*

Jeong Khn Ahn
(Chonbuk National University)

Ahn, Jeong Khn. (2013). The Multiple Functions of 'Mianhapnida' in Korean. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 21(3). 173-198. The purpose of the study was to examine the multiple functions of 'mianhapnida' in Korean, i.e., an IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device) in apology strategies. Based on the researcher's direct observation on the people's use of 'mianhapnida' or others' actual use of 'mianhapnida' in a variety of discourse situations, the study indicated that 'mianhapnida' had six different functions in discourse for the first time in apology studies in Korean. The six functions were remedial, remedial and supportive, supportive, phatic, customary, and unsupportive functions. The study also provided ten terms of apology which reflect the six functions of apology, namely sincere apology, simple apology, thanks and apology, request initiator, attention-getting device, personal relation improvement device, phatic apology, customary apology, unfavorable apology, and not affirmative marker. A number of functional differences in the use of 'mianhapnida' were indicated in the study, distinct from 'I'm sorry' in English or 'sumimasen' in Japanese. The meaning of 'mianhapnida' in Korean was found to be in antonymic distribution in the study, allowing the middle position between denotational and connotational; the meaning of 'mianhapnida' in a remedial function was denotational but connotational in supportive, customary, and unsupportive functions, and neither denotational nor connotational in a phatic function. A complementary distribution was also found in the use of 'mianhapnida' and its equivalent, 'joesonghapnida'; 'joesonghapnida' was mostly used in request initiator, an attention-getting device, and a phatic apology, whereas 'mianhapnida' in other categories. It is recommended that multiple functions should be considered to comprehend the meaning of 'mianhapnida' in discourse.

* This paper was supported by research funds of Chonbuk National University in 2012.

Key Words: speech act of apology, multiple functions of apology, 'mianhapnida' in Korean, apology studies, comparative studies of apology

1. Introduction

As a speech act, apology is a very essential feature in our discourse which is made in an attempt to remedy for the offense we committed against the others. Reflecting the importance of apology in human relations, the studies seeking the universal strategies of apology were executed in a number of languages along with the studies examining the unique apology features of individual languages. In consequence of such studies, some valuable findings in apology studies have appeared since the 1990s that there are universal apology strategies that people employed in all languages.

The most frequently used strategy in apology is IFIDs (Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices) which include a direct mentioning of 'I'm sorry'. Although 'I'm sorry' or its equivalent has been used in common throughout languages as the foremost essential IFID in apology, a very unique use of 'I'm sorry' in individual languages was also found, which is quite understandable since speech acts have reflected the customs or conventions of individual languages in their own ways. In this respect, the studies of 'sumimasen' in Japanese in recent years (Ide, 1998; Long, 2010) have indicated various functions that 'sumimasen' could have in Japanese society. Showing multiple functions in public discourse, 'sumimasen' in Japanese have been used quite differently from the mere interpretation of 'I'm sorry' or 'Excuse me' in English. It means that 'sumimasen' may be used in other meanings in discourse such as an affirmative response to others which is not shown in other languages.

What about Korean? Korean has 'mianhapnida' as the equivalent to 'sumimasen' in Japanese; however, no one has ever attempted to study the multiple functions of 'mianhapnida' in details in discourse even though a lot of apology studies had been done in Korean. In this regard, the study of multiple functions of 'mianhapnida' is highly demanded in apology studies in Korean since 'mianhapnida' have already shown multiple functions in discourse and been used in much more complicated ways than any other languages in the

world. All these circumstances lead to the purpose of the present study which is to examine the multiple functions of 'mianhapnida' in Korean.

2. Previous Studies

Apology has been studied in many languages as an important subject in speech acts. In particular, comparative studies on apology were done in a number of European languages under the CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project) in 1987 in order to find out cross-cultural variations when making an apology in individual languages. As the outcome of the CCSARP, some studies (Bergman & Kasper, 1993; Olshtain, 1989; Vollmer & Olshtain 1989) found out that apology was made in different ways taking different strategies for the different language users. In other words, there are language group differences in the use of apology. Bergman & Kasper (1993) indicated that social power was not an important factor when making an apology for Americans and the Thai. Vollmer & Olshtain (1989) mentioned that speakers considered situational features much more than social features when they made an apology. Above all, the eight apology strategies people took when making an apology at the universal level which was proposed by the CCSARP were proved to be a very useful tool in the analysis of apology (Olshtain, 1989). The eight apology strategies are IFIDs, taking on responsibility, explanation, offer of repair, promise of forbearance, intensifiers of the apology, minimizers of the apology, and concern for the hearer. The DCT (Discourse Completion Test) also became a useful research model in the analysis of apology since the CCSARP employed it in apology studies.

Following the CCSARP, apology studies in other languages such as Korean and Japanese had begun in the 1990s in order to see that the universal features of apology suggested by the CCSARP might be applicable to their language or to find out their unique characteristics when making an apology. For that matter, apology studies in Korean produced a number of valuable findings on apology. Ahn (2011, 2012) and Shim (2011) examined apology strategies of Korean. Following the same research model of the CCSARP, Ahn (2011) studied apology in Korean and indicated that Koreans used IFIDs and responsibility

most when making an apology which supports the findings of the CCSARP, however they used explanations, intensifiers, and minimizers far more than other language groups in the CCSARP. Similarly, Whang (2009) and Kang (2011) also stated that Koreans used IFIDs, responsibility, and explanations quite a lot when they made an apology.

Park (2005), Jeon (2006), Lee, H. (2007), and Ahn (2012) reported that Koreans used explanations in a surprising degree when making an apology. Ahn (2012) commented on this unique characteristics of Korean's apology that for Koreans explanations are used to make themselves understood to others to avoid misunderstanding. For that matter, Lee, Y. (2008) also emphasized the importance of understanding for Koreans when they made an apology.

Comparative studies on apology were also done in Korean, Japanese, Chinese, and English. Lee & Park (2011) found out that Koreans include apologies but Americans include thanks when asking a favor. Jang (2011) mentioned that age and social status are the important factors when making an apology for Koreans but not that important for Americans. Fitzgerald (2013) exhibited differences in apology between Australian English and Korean and Son (2012) between Korean and Chinese. Examining the effects of culture on apology for Americans, Chinese, and Koreans, Guan, Park, & Lee (2009) indicated that the three cultures differ in their perceptions on making an apology. Some comparative studies (Kim, J., 2012; Moriya, 2001; Yim & Kim, 2010) on apology were also done between Korean and Japanese. Yim & Kim (2010) mentioned that Koreans give reasons but Japanese excuse themselves when making an apology. Quite interestingly, a number of studies (Kwon, Y., 2000; Park, 2005; Jeon, 2006; Lee, H., 2007; Yim & Kim, 2010; Ahn, 2012) stated that there is a tendency for Koreans to give more accounts when making an apology, compared with Japanese and Americans. Although Sugimoto (1997) indicated that Americans use accounts more than Japanese, these two groups' giving accounts when making an apology is quite less than Koreans. If we follow Wolfson, et al.'s (1989, p. 180) remark on accounts, i.e., if no offense was acknowledged, the response such as mentioning a reason is not an apology, Korean's heavy use of explanations in apology could be treated not as an apology but simply an account. Such a distinction may need further studies on apology for Koreans.

As shown in the findings of the CCSARP (Vollmer & Olshtain, 1989), IFIDs such as 'I'm sorry' are the most frequently used apology strategies among other apology strategies. Reflecting the importance of IFIDs in apology strategies, studies on IFIDs in apology in other languages like Japanese have also been done. Unlike English, 'sumimasen' in Japanese expresses both thanks and apology in a single utterance of 'sumimasen' (Lebra, 1976; Coulmas, 1981). For instance, Japanese may say 'I'm sorry' to express gratitude, which would make foreigners puzzled. Beyond this dual function of apology-gratitude expressions of 'sumimasen', Ide (1998) even demonstrated that 'sumimasen' shows multiple functions such as a remedial and a supportive function, as indicated in Fig. 1 below:

'sumimasen' in Japanese	
'Denotational', 'Semantic'	
Remedial	Sincere apology
	Quasi-thanks and apology
	Request
Remedial	Attention-getting/Leave-taking
and	
Supportive	Affirmative, confirmational
Supportive	Acknowledgment marker
'Connotational', 'Ritualistic'	

Fig. 1. Multiple functions of 'sumimasen' in Japanese taken from Ide (1998, p. 523)

Using Goffman's (1971) notion of remedial and supportive interchanges in human relations, Ide (1998) classified the use of 'sumimasen' into the three different functions in apology. As shown in Fig. 1, the three functions are remedial, remedial and supportive, and supportive functions and in each function there are specific terms which indicate the function. Sincere apology, quasi-thanks and apology, and request display a remedial function in 'sumimasen' and affirmative and confirmational responses to others or an acknowledgment marker in discourse indicate a supportive function in 'sumimasen'. For example, *Okurete sumimasen* 'Sorry for being late' (Ide, 1998, p. 514) indicates a remedial function while *Hai doomo sumimasen* 'Yes, sumimasen'

as a response to *Omatase itashimashita* 'Sorry to have made you wait' (Ide, 1998, pp. 519-20) indicates a supportive function in 'sumimasen'.

Recently, Long (2010) even proposed that apology-gratitude expressions in Japanese are the outcome of the negotiations of the interlocutors' role-relations in discourse situations, downgrading Ide's (1998) multiple function account of 'sumimasen' as the simple indication of the complex use of 'sumimasen' in discourse.

In light of the fact that a number of important studies on the multiple functions of 'sumimasen' have already been done in Japanese such as Ide (1998), Long (2010), and Jeong (2011), multiple functions of 'mianhapnida' in Korean should be studied, too, since 'mianhapnida' has already been used in various functions and ways in actual discourse and no one has ever attempted to mention them.

3. The Multiple Functions of 'Mianhapnida' in Korean

As IFIDs in apology, Korean has 'mianhapnida' and its variants 'mian', 'mianhe', and 'mianhada' or its equivalent 'joesonghapnida' and its variant 'joesongheyo'. For the convenience of analysis, 'mianhapnida' is used in the present study as a cover term which represents IFIDs in apology in Korean except a few cases in which the use of 'joesonghapnida' is highly required. In addition, the study only deals with IFIDs in apology so that other apology strategies such as explanations, responsibility, and concern for the hearer are not treated in the analysis of the study.

All the instances of IFIDs in apology in Korean introduced in the study are taken from the researcher's direct observation on the people's use of IFIDs or others' actual use of IFIDs in apology in a variety of discourse situations. As the previous Japanese studies on multiple functions of 'sumimasen' such as Ide (1998), instances showing IFIDs are described and arranged in an appropriate function in apology in the present study, too.

Instances of IFIDs in Korean are arranged in six different functions in apology in the study such as remedial, remedial and supportive, supportive, phatic, customary, and unsupportive functions. The study takes remedial,

remedial and supportive, and supportive functions from the previous studies such as Ide (1998) and introduces the other phatic, customary, and unsupportive functions as newly added ones to the analysis of apology in Korean. In addition, the study also provides each function with appropriate terms of apology which reflect the function as indicated in the following:

3.1. Remedial function

'Mianhapnida' in a remedial function is used when one attempts to compensate for the act which might do harm to the others. In this study sincere apology, simple apology, thanks and apology, and request initiator belong to the remedial function of 'mianhapnida'.

(1) 'Mianhapnida' as sincere apology

'Mianhapnida' is used when one makes a sincere apology towards the others in the following instances:

- a. 남자: "어찌다 일을 이렇게 만들었습니까?"
 Man: "How come you made things this way?"
 여자: "미안합니다. 제가 큰 실수를 했습니다."
 Woman: "Mianhapnida (I'm sorry). I made a big mistake."
- b. 남자 1: "얼마나 더 기다려야 됩니까?"
 Man 1: "How long should I wait?"
 남자 2: "약속을 지키지 못해 미안합니다."
 Man 2: "I'm sorry that I couldn't keep the promise."
- c. (부모님 무덤 앞에서)
 "엄마 살아 계실 때 잘 했어야하는데. 그 땐 어찌나 철이 없었던지.
 이제 와서 후회하네. 정말 미안해. 엄마."
 (Before the mom's tomb)
 "I should've behaved well, Mom. I didn't know that at that time.
 Now I regret. I am really sorry, Mom."

'Mianhapnida' is used here to seek forgiveness which reflects its remedial

function. As shown above, the variants of ‘mianhapnida’ such as ‘mianhe’, ‘mian’, and ‘mianheyo’ may be used when making an apology.

(2) ‘Mianhapnida’ as simple apology

The difference between a sincere apology and a simple apology lies in its degree of apology. As a simple apology, the use of ‘mianhapnida’ may not be necessary for seeking forgiveness. It simply expresses one’s intention to make an apology as shown in the following:

- a. 남자 1: “오랜만이군요. 잘 지내시죠?”
 Man 1: "Long time no see. How are things going?"
 남자 2: "미안합니다. 자주 연락드리지 못해."
 Man 2: "I'm sorry that I couldn't contact you often."
- b. 여학생 1: "우리 아빠는 맨날 나한테만 뭐라고 해"
 Girl 1: "My dad always scolds me."
 여학생 2: "그런 아빠라도 곁에 있는 게 어디야"
 Girl 2: "I envy you. You have such a father with you."
 여학생 1: "응? 너희 아빠 어디 있는데?"
 Girl 1: "What? Where is your father?"
 여학생 2: "저기 하늘나라에"
 Girl 2: "He passed away."
 여학생 1: "미안...."
 Girl 1: "Sorry..."

Because it is simple, the use of ‘mianhapnida’ is just an indication of making an apology. In this regard, the degree of a remedial function in a simple apology is weaker than a sincere apology. Accordingly the meaning of ‘mianhapnida’ in a simple apology becomes less denotational than a sincere apology. Interestingly, like in a sincere apology, ‘mianhapnida’ is mostly used in this simple apology, too. In other words, its equivalent ‘joesonghapnida’ is rarely used here.

(3) 'Mianhapnida' as thanks and apology

Thanks and apology are the two distinct speech acts for the most part, but they are closely related with one another like the two faces of a coin in some cases. For some reason, one's indebtedness to the others elicits thanks to them, yet in turn this thanks often triggers an apology to them, too. In other words, we often make an apology because we are thankful to the others as shown in the following instances:

a. 딸: "엄마 아빠는 나 용돈 너무 조금 주는 거 아닌가요?"

Daughter: "Don't you (father and mother) think you give me little money?"

엄마: "엄마 아빠가 너 공부할 땐 경제적 지원에 대해선 아무 것도 신경쓰지 마라고 해놓고선 이렇게 너 맘 아프게 해서 미안해 우리 딸.

이것저것 하고 싶은 것도 많은 나인데. 엄마 아빠가 너무 미안해"

Mom: "We are sorry for that. We couldn't give you much money although we told you you'd never worry about money.

We know that you'd have many things to do at your age.

We are sorry."

딸: "엄마가 그렇게 말하니 내가 정말 고맙고 미안하네"

Daughter: "You said like that. I'm really grateful to you and sorry."

In this case, the daughter is sorry to the parents, too, not only because of her mom's direct mentioning of 'we are sorry' to her but because of their concern on her as a daughter. The daughter's feeling of thanks to the parents elicits an apology.

b. 딸: "엄마. 나 성적 나왔어. 근데 잘못 봤어. 미안해."

Daughter: "Mom. I got a grade, but it's not good. Sorry."

엄마: "아니야. 네가 열심히 하면 된 거야."

Mom: "It's ok as far as you did best."

딸: "알았어"

Daughter: "I know."

엄마: "다음 시험에 더 잘 보면 되는 거야. 괜찮아"

Mom: "It will be ok if you do better on the next exams."

딸: "응."

Daughter: "Yes."

Again, in this instance the daughter is sorry to her mom not just because she did not do good on the exams but because she feels indebtedness to her mom who believes in her and supports her in every ways. Thus, she told her mom 'mianhe', a variant of 'mianhapnida', reflecting her indebtedness to her mom. In thanks and apology, 'mianhapnida' is mostly used, not its equivalent 'joesonghapnida'.

(4) 'Joesonghapnida' as request initiator

Interestingly, 'mianhapnida' is rarely used here as a request initiator; instead, 'joesonghapnida' is mostly used as shown in the following instances:

- a. (at a theater while a movie is running)

"죄송합니다. 좀 지나갈게요."
"Excuse me. May I go out?"
- b. (at a restaurant, paying 1,000 won to the woman in charge)

"죄송하지만 밥 한 공기만 주시면 안돼요?"
"Excuse me. May I have a bowl of rice?"
- c. (at a restaurant)

"아줌마. 여기 죄송한데요. 반찬 좀 더 주세요."
"Excuse me. Please, give me more dishes."
- d. (at a dormitory)

"죄송한데 치약 좀 빌려주세요."
"Excuse me. Could I use your toothpaste?"

As the equivalent of 'mianhapnida', 'joesonghapnida' is used here as a request initiator, meaning 'excuse me' or 'sumimasen' (Ide, 1998, p. 515). As the term request initiator implies, 'joesonghapnida' is used at the beginning of making a request. This kind of request is usually made at short notice and needs not a prior conversation.

3.2. Remedial and supportive function

IFIDs in apology strategies in Korean have both remedial and supportive functions at the same time in some instances. In particular, when we need to get others' attention in order to do things which would follow, the use of 'joesonghapnida' usually elicits others' support in part while trying to redress the current situation.

(5) 'Joesonghapnida' as attention-getting device

In order to get others' attention, 'joesonghapnida' is used quite often in many instances as follows:

a. (in a meeting)

여자 1: "지난주에 게임 중독을 중심으로 하기로 했거든요."

Woman 1: "Last week we decided that game addiction was the key of the writing."

여자 2: "죄송하지만 제 생각은 게임중독은 어떤 결정을 해도 들어가는 내용이고 다른 소주제가 있어야 할 것 같아요."

Woman 2: "Excuse me. I think that game addiction must be included whatever we'd decide so that we need other minor topics."

b. (at a bus station)

아줌마: "버스가 이제 오는구만"

Woman: "The bus is coming, now."

남학생: "죄송한데요, 이 버스 어디로 가요?"

Male student: "Excuse me. Where is the bus going?"

Like a request initiator, 'joesonghapnida' is mostly used as an attention-getting device. 'Joesonghapnida' is interpreted here as 'Excuse me' or 'Hello' in English. In some instances such as *b* above, 'joesonghapnida' may look like a request initiator, but it is more oriented towards an attention-getting device. This sort of overlapping in function may occur in this field in nature.

3.3. Supportive function

If 'mianhapnida' loses its semantic meaning of 'I'm sorry' or 'Excuse me', in other words, its remedial function, it is often used in a supportive function instead in human relations (Goffman, 1971, p. 65). As Ide (1998, pp. 519-21) indicated, 'sumimasen' in Japanese can function in supportive ways when it is used as an affirmative or confirmational response to the other's utterance or as an acknowledgment marker of a reciprocal exchange between interlocutors.

(6) 'Mianhapnida' as personal relation improvement device

Unlike 'sumimasen', 'mianhapnida' is used in discourse somewhat differently in a supportive function. As a personal relation improvement device, 'mianhapnida' is often used 1) to mitigate the conflicts between interlocutors, 2) to give the others an impression of understanding them, and 3) to keep the personal relations with the others as indicated in the following instances:

- a. 여자 1: "넌 참 무심하구나"
 Woman 1: "You don't understand me much."
 여자 2: "미안하다. 내가 너를 좀 더 이해했어야 했는데."
 Woman 2: "I'm sorry. I should've understood you more."
- b. (after quarreling with a friend)
 여자 1: "어떻게 그런 말을 나에게 할 수 있니!"
 Woman 1: "How could you say that to me!"
 여자 2: "내가 그렇게 말한 것은 미안하다"
 Woman 2: "I'm sorry I have said that way."

As shown above, 'mianhapnida' is used in a way to keeping or improving personal relations. This kind of 'mianhapnida' is usually made by someone in a supportive manner who wants the situation to go as smoothly as possible. There would be nothing to compensate for in this utterance of 'mianhapnida' because the semantic or denotational meaning of 'mianhapnida' (i.e., 'I'm sorry') is lost here. Thus, the meaning of 'mianhapnida' in a supportive function is not denotational but connotational. Interestingly, 'mianhapnida' is mostly used in this supportive way of improving personal relations.

3.4. Phatic function

(7) 'Joesonghapnida' as phatic apology

'Joesonghapnida' is mostly used in a phatic function. As the term phatic apology implies, a phatic apology is made formally in most instances right after the mistake becomes aware of. Because it is phatic, the meaning of 'joesonghapnida' here is not denotational, nor connotational either. In most cases, 'joesonghapnida' as a phatic apology comes last in discourse and signals the end of a verbal exchange. A phatic apology is usually made between the unknowns as follows:

a. (on the street)

남자: "아 죄송합니다. 친구인 줄 알았어요."

Man: "Ah. 'Joesonghapnida'. I thought you are my friend."

b. (on the phone)

여자 1: "아 여보세요"

Woman 1: "Ah. Hello."

여자 2: "네"

Woman 2: "Yes."

여자 1: "전화 잘 못한 것 같습니다. 죄송해요."

Woman 1: "I think I called a wrong number. I'm sorry."

여자 2: "네"

Woman 2: "Yes."

It is obvious that this kind of mistakes was not made intentionally. Since it is not intentional and causes no harm to the others, there would be no need to remedy. Simply mentioning 'joesonghapnida' would be sufficient to finish the verbal exchange. In this regard, the meaning of 'joesonghapnida' as a phatic apology is not denotational. It is not connotational either since there needs not any further thoughts on the mistake for the interlocutors.

3.5. Customary function

Unlike a phatic apology, the use of ‘mianhapnida’ in a customary function is quite intentional and sometimes not voluntary. It may reflect our deep emotion or feeling towards the others even though it is made customarily. Because it is made in most instances intentionally, the meaning of ‘mianhapnida’ here is highly connotational.

(8) ‘Mianhapnida’ as customary apology

‘Mianhapnida’ as a customary apology is usually used in order to avoid the imminent accusation or otherwise telling a lie. It is also used when we could not respond to the ways what the others would expect to hear from us. It is often used to cure the other’s hurt, too, as shown in the following instances:

- a. (The suspect of a child rape is speaking to the reporters before moving to a courtroom)

피의자: "죽고 싶다. 가족들에게 미안하다."

The suspect: "I want to die. I’m sorry for her family."

According to a police captain, Il-Yong Kweon, although the rape suspect "told the reporters that he was sorry to the victim and her family, it is a customary way to talk, not the way that he regrets the crime he committed or makes an apology sympathizing with the victim’s agony." (Kweon, 2012)

- b. (not to tell a lie)

여자: "요즈음 왜 날 피하는 건데?"

Woman: "Why you avoid me recently?"

남자: "누가 피한다고 그래. 바빠서 그렇지."

Man: "What? I’m just busy."

여자: "내가 이제 싫은 거지."

Woman: "Now you don’t like me."

남자: (한참 생각하다) "미안하다."

Man: (thinking for a while) "I’m sorry."

Simply saying ‘I’m sorry’ only in order not to tell a lie may connote a lot

of things. It is a customary way to hide one's deep feelings or thoughts if he is not willing to reveal what's in his mind towards her as shown above.

c. 여자: "우리 요즘 많이 변했네. 솔직히, 힘이 든다. 날 정말 사랑하긴 해?"

Woman: "We changed a lot recently. Frankly I had hard time.

Do you really love me?"

남자: "그냥 좀 지쳐서 그래. 괜찮아지겠지. 왜 그런 걸 물어 봐."

Man: "I am too tired. That's it. It will be all right.

Why are you asking me such a thing."

여자: "왜 대답을 못하는데. 정말 날 사랑하고 있어?"

Woman: "How come you could not answer me.

Do you really love me?"

남자: "..... 왜 자꾸 그래.... 미안해."

Man: "..... Why you insist on asking me I'm sorry."

Here, 'mianhe', a variant of 'mianhapnida' is used to avoid exposing his inner feelings to her. He could not respond to the ways what she would expect to hear from him such as he still loves her. For her, his saying simply 'I'm sorry' in this context may not be enough to be an answer, although it is done for her, hiding the truth that he does not love her anymore.

d. 여자: "나는 너 아프다고 해서 걱정 많이 하고

전화도 안 받고 해서 많이 아프가보다 하고 걱정했는데

춤 연습하느라 정신없었다고?

진짜 황당하다. 그 동아리가 뭐 길래 그렇게 중요해?

진짜 너는 나를 여자 친구가 아니라 그냥 병신으로 생각하나 보다.

Woman: "I have been worried about you too much

because you said you were sick and didn't answer the phone, but you practiced dancing? It surely is nonsense.

Is that dancing club so important to you? You think I am not your girl friend but simply an idiot."

남자: "아 진짜? 나는 춤 연습하느라 몰랐지. 미안해."

Man: "What's the matter? I didn't know that.

I was doing practice. I'm sorry."

여자: "너 지금 네가 뭐가 미안한지도 모르고 그냥 미안하다고 하는 거잖아?"

Woman: "You're just saying you are sorry
without knowing what you are sorry about?"

남자: "너 요즘 왜 그래? 진짜 지친다. 미안하다고 했는데 또 무슨 말을 해?"

Man: "What's the matter with you in recent days? I really have no idea.
I said I'm sorry. What else I should say?"

여자: "... 이제 그만 헤어지자 ...
이래저래 너도 힘들고 나도 힘든 것 같아.
(사랑해서) 미안해."

Woman: "... Now is the time to break with...
I'm tired of with this and I think so are you.
I'm sorry that I loved you."

In this conversation, there are two instances in which 'mianhe' is used. One is the man's 'mianhe' which is phatic as clearly indicated by the woman that he says he's sorry without knowing what he's sorry about. The other is the woman's 'mianhe' at the end of the conversation which is customary because she is not ready to talk about the real breakup and not willing to accept the reality that their love ends. Particularly when we have to say something that might hurt the others such as the breakup in this case, we simply say 'I'm sorry' in a customary way, hiding a lot of its connotation. In this regard, 'mianhapnida' as a customary apology is not denotational, but highly connotational. As shown above, 'mianhapnida' is used in most cases as a customary apology.

Lately, the use of 'mianhapnida' as a customary apology was attested to be an aspect of normal discourse by Itsu, a social dating service, which conducted a survey for 1,012 singles asking what were the things they could not understand for their opposite sex about a quarrel (Online news team, 2013). According to the survey, 18.8% of men participated in the survey indicated that their partners urged them to say what they had gone wrong although they had said they were sorry and 20.3% of women indicated that their partners said they were sorry without knowing what they had gone wrong which clearly reveals a customary apology in the use of 'mianhapnida'.

3.6. Unsupportive function

As indicated in 3.3, 'mianhapnida' is used in a supportive function; however, quite interestingly, it is also used in Korean in an unsupportive function.

(9) 'Mianhapnida' as unfavorable apology

'Mianhapnida' is often used as an unfavorable apology as shown in the following:

- a. (a woman confessing to her boyfriend)

남자: "첫경험은 아닌 것 같은데"

Man: "Is this your first experience..."

여자: "미안하지만 처음은 아니거든요."

Woman: "I am sorry but this is not my first experience."

- b. (on small talk)

여자 1: "왜 그래. 너 오버하는 것 같다."

Woman 1: "What's the matter. It seems you're overreacting."

여자 2: "미안하지만 나 열등감 없거든요."

Woman 2: "I'm sorry but I have no inferiority complex."

'Mianhapnida' as an unfavorable apology is interpreted here as "I'm sorry (to say this but ...)," "regrettably," "sadly," or "contrary to your expectation" in English, all of which indicate one's unsupportiveness to the others in discourse. Interestingly, 'mianhapnida' is mostly used here to make an unfavorable apology.

(10) 'Mianhapnida' as not affirmative marker

'Mianhapnida' is used as a not affirmative marker in discourse. Literally, being not affirmative does not mean to disaffirm. It simply means not to acknowledge or admit something aforementioned. In this regard, being not affirmative is unsupportive in essence. In most cases, 'mianhapnida' as a not affirmative marker comes almost at the end of the discourse in order to finish

the wearisome discourse or just to vent one's anger as shown in the following instances:

- a. 언니: "넌 항상 네 생각만 하니?
그런 네 태도가 이기적이라고 생각해 본 적은 없니?"
An elder sister: "How come you do things always for your own?
Don't you ever think such an attitude is egocentric?"
- 동생: "그럼 언니는 잘한 것 있어?
항상 언니 말만 옳다고 하고 내 말은 제대로 들어준 적 없잖아!"
A younger sister: "Then, is there any thing you've done well?
You say you are always right and never heard of me as it is!"
- 언니: "제대로 들어준 적이 없다니, 무슨 말을 그렇게 해.
난 네 언니로서 할 수 있는 말과 행동을 한 것뿐인데
넌 계속 내 탓만 하고 있구나. 한번이라도 내 말에 전적으로 수긍했던 적이
있었니? 지금도 그래. 계속 네 입장만 생각해서 나를 이상한 사람으로 몰아
가고 있잖아!"
An elder sister: "Never heard of you as it is? How come you're talking
like that. As your elder sister I just do things I can,
but you keep complaining about me.
Is there a time you ever consent to me fully? Now is the same.
You are considering your own position and treating me as an
odd person!"
- 동생: "(귀찮다는 듯이) 그래. 내가 나쁜 동생이다. 이렇게밖에 행동할 수 없어서
미안하다. 이제 그만하자."
A younger sister: "(Irritatingly) You're right. I'm not a good sister.
I'm sorry I have to behave like this. Let's leave off now."

In this instance, a younger sister finished the conversation saying 'mianhada', a variant of 'mianhapnida', to her elder sister as she became tired of the dispute. In any denotational sense, she is not sorry for her sister. She just wants to stop wrangling with her sister, making an unsupportive apology toward her saying 'I'm sorry.' In this regard, the meaning of 'mianhapnida' in this context is not denotational, but highly connotational.

- b. 아내: "여보. 이걸 웬 차야? 설마 당신 거야?"
 Wife: "Honey. What's this car? Is it yours?"
 남편: "아 이거? 이번에 아는 사람이 싸게 판다고 하길래.
 값도 적당하고 차도 좋고 해서 바꿨어."
 Husband: "Ah, this car? I bought it from someone I knew who offered me cheap price. The price was reasonable and the car was good, so I changed the car."
 아내: "뭐라고? 어떻게 나랑 한마디도 상의 없이 차를 바꿀 수가 있어? 게다가 저번 차도 바꾼 지 얼마 안됐잖아! 무슨 차를 또 바꿔?!"
 Wife: "What? How come you changed the car without any mentioning it to me? In addition, it has not been long since you changed the car! Why you changed the car again?"
 남편: "아. 뭘 그렇게 화를 내고 그래. 바꿀 수도 있지. 그렇게 비싸게 주고 산 것도 아니라니깐 글썸."
 Husband: "How come you become so angry. I could change the car. It was not expensive."
 아내: "그럼 적어도 내게 미리 말이라도 해줘야 하는 거 아니야? 지금 우리가 차를 한 달에 한번 꼴로 바꿀 때냐고! 나갈 돈이 얼마데 돈을 마구 써! 응?!"
 Wife: "Well, don't you think you should have told me, do you? Is it the right time that we change a car once a month? Do you think you could spend money as you wish? Huh?"
 남편: "(짜증을 내며) 아. 그래. 알겠다. 알겠어! 미안해!!! 됐지?"
 Husband: "(Irritatingly) Ah. I know you're right. I'm sorry. Is that ok now?"
 아내: "(기가 막힌다는 듯이) 뭐? 미안해? 그게 지금 사과하는 사람의 태도야?!!!"
 Wife: "(Being dumfounded) What? Are you sorry? Is that the attitude you're making an apology?"

In this instance, the husband made an unsupportive apology to the wife, saying 'mianhe' ('I'm sorry') in a not affirmative way. As the wife indicated, the husband's attitude of saying 'I'm sorry' to the wife is not the way she would expect. He just wants to stop quarrelling with the wife, saying 'mianhe' although he doesn't mean it. He simply vents his anger on the wife. In this

respect, the meaning of 'mianhapnida' as a not affirmative marker is not denotational but connotational. Again, 'mianhapnida' is used in most instances in an unsupportive function. 'Joesonghapnida' is never used here.

4. Findings and Discussion

For the first time in apology studies in Korean, the study examined the multiple functions of IFIDs in apology strategies in Korean, in particular 'mianhapnida' and its variants 'mian', 'mianhe', 'mianheyo', and its equivalent 'joesonghapnida' in actual discourse and classified them into the six different categories and gave them names such as remedial, remedial and supportive, supportive, phatic, customary, and unsupportive functions. The study took the former three remedial, remedial and supportive, and supportive functions from the previous studies such as Ide (1998) in Japanese and the latter three phatic, customary, and unsupportive functions were newly added to the analysis of IFIDs in apology in Korean in the study. What it means is that IFIDs in Korean apology, particularly 'mianhapnida' as the cover term of IFIDs in apology in Korean, show much more diverse functions than any other languages including English and Japanese. As manifested, 'I'm sorry' or 'excuse me' in English is used in the very limited apology functions, namely remedial and supportive functions but 'sumimasen' in Japanese is used in more complicated manners than English, showing a wider range of functions in apology as indicated in Fig. 1. Compared with the apology functions of 'I'm sorry' in English or sumimasen in Japanese, 'mianhapnida' in Korean shows far more complex apology functions in apology strategies.

The study also provided each function of 'mianhapnida' with at least more than one specific term of apology which reflect the specific function when making an apology. There are ten such terms of apology in the study which include sincere apology, simple apology, thanks and apology, request initiator, attention-getting device, personal relation improvement device, phatic apology, customary apology, unfavorable apology, and not affirmative marker, as shown in Fig. 2 below:

‘mianhapnida’ in Korean

‘Denotational’, ‘Semantic’

Remedial	Sincere apology (‘mianhapnida’) (+denotational, -connotational)
	Simple apology (‘mianhapnida’) (+denotational, -connotational)
	Thanks and apology (‘mianhapnida’) (+denotational, -connotational)
	Request initiator (‘joesonghapnida’) (+denotational, -connotational)
Remedial and Supportive	Attention-getting device (‘joesonghapnida’) (+denotational, -connotational)
Supportive	Personal relation improvement device (‘mianhapnida’) (-denotational, +connotational)
Phatic	Phatic apology (‘joesonghapnida’) (-denotational, -connotational)
Customary	Customary apology (‘mianhapnida’) (-denotational, +connotational)
Unsupportive	Unfavorable apology (‘mianhapnida’) (-denotational, +connotational)
	Not affirmative marker (‘mianhapnida’) (-denotational, +connotational)

‘Connotational’

Fig. 2. Multiple functions of ‘mianhapnida’ in Korean

In Fig. 2, the cover term of IFIDs and its meaning are given to each apology in parentheses such as (‘mianhapnida’) and (-denotational, +connotational).

As indicated in Fig. 2 above, ‘mianhapnida’ in Korean is used in a variety of functions in apology in which phatic, customary, and unsupportive functions are newly added to the analysis of apology in Korean in the present study. What this means is that ‘mianhapnida’ in Korean is used and interpreted in much more complicated and diverse ways than ‘I’m sorry’ in English or ‘sumimasen’

in Japanese when making an apology. In English, 'I'm sorry' is mostly used as a sincere apology in a remedial function and 'Excuse me' as a request initiator and an attention-getting device. In this regard, the meaning of 'I'm sorry' or 'Excuse me' in English is denotational, not connotational.

Compared with 'sumimasen' in Fig. 1, 'mianhapnida' in Korean in Fig. 2 clearly shows many differences in its use in apology. First, in remedial function, 'sumimasen' is interpreted as quasi-thanks and apology, but 'mianhapnida' is interpreted as thanks and apology. There is no quasi-thanks in Korean. We hear quite often that Koreans say "고마워서 미안합니다" ("Thank you so much, so that I'm sorry."), which indicates thanks, not quasi-thanks as 'sumimasen' implies. Second, unlike 'sumimasen', 'mianhapnida' is not used as a leave-taking device, an affirmative or confirmational response, and an acknowledgment marker in public discourse as described in Ide (1998). In other words, 'mianhapnida' is hardly used as ritualistic as 'sumimasen' in public discourse in Japanese society. Third, 'mianhapnida' is used in Korean as a personal relation improvement device in a supportive function. Fourth, unlike 'sumimasen', 'mianhapnida' is used in phatic, customary, and unsupportive functions. In particular, it is quite amazing that 'mianhapnida' is used both as supportive and unsupportive functions in apology. It seems contradictory first but it is understandable when we realize that 'mianhapnida' is interpreted quite differently in different apology functions as having different connotations as shown in Fig. 2.

The meaning of 'sumimasen' in a remedial function is denotational or semantic but connotational or ritualistic in a supportive function as indicated in Fig. 1, which shows a clear complementary distribution. The meaning of 'mianhapnida' in Korean follows the same pattern as that of 'sumimasen' as far as remedial and supportive functions are considered only. Thus, the meaning of 'mianhapnida' in a remedial function is denotational but connotational in a supportive function. The meaning of 'mianhapnida' in customary and unsupportive functions is not denotational but connotational. Unlike 'sumimasen', 'mianhapnida' is not in a complementary distribution because of a phatic function which is not denotational nor connotational. It means that the meaning of 'mianhapnida' in Korean is in antonymic distribution, allowing the middle position between denotational and connotational. That's why the meaning of 'mianhapnida' in a phatic function is written as -denotational and

-connotational, using +/- binary symbols as shown in Fig. 2.

'Mianhapnida' was used in the study as the cover term of IFIDs in apology in Korean which has a number of its variants such as 'mian', 'mianhe', and 'mianheyo' and its equivalent 'joesonghapnida'. Quite interestingly, the study found out that there is a complementary distribution in the use of 'mianhapnida' and 'joesonghapnida' in apology as clearly shown in Fig. 2. 'Joesonghapnida' is used in the very limited categories in apology which include a request initiator, an attention-getting device, and a phatic apology. In contrast, 'mianhapnida' is mostly used in other categories in apology which include sincere apology, simple apology, thanks and apology, personal relation improvement device, customary apology, unfavorable apology, and not affirmative marker. This complementary distribution of 'mianhapnida' and 'joesonghapnida' in apology in Korean is new, taking some previous studies into account which only indicate that 'joesonghapnida' is mostly used toward someone who is older than the apologizer himself but 'mianhapnida' toward someone who is of the same age or younger than the apologizer himself (Jeong, 2011; Moriya, 2001). This complementary distribution of 'mianhapnida' and 'joesonghapnida' in apology, however, simply indicates a general tendency, not an absolute division, of course. In addition, the interpretation of 'mianhapnida' or 'joesonghapnida' may be overlapping in some cases. Take "Excuse me. Where is the bus going?" for instance. Here 'Excuse me' may be used as an attention-getting device or as a request initiator.

In conclusion, the study may contribute to the apology studies in Korean in such a way that it examined the multiple functions of 'mianhapnida' in apology in Korean and classified them into the six different functions and provided the functions with the specific terms of apology for the first time in apology studies in Korean, while comparing with 'I'm sorry' in English and 'sumimasen' in Japanese. Knowing that there are multiple functions in the use of 'mianhapnida' in apology, we should consider the context in which 'mianhapnida' is used in more details in order to comprehend its denotation or connotation precisely.

References

- Ahn, J. (2011). Cross-cultural variations of apology realization in Korean. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea*, 19(2), 261-285.
- Ahn, J. (2012). Why do Koreans explain a lot when making an apology?. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 20(3), 1-15.
- Bergman, L., & Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and performance in native and nonnative apology. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 82-107). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coulmas, F. (1981). Poison to your soul: Thanks and apologies contrastively viewed. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* (pp. 69-91). The Hague: Mouton.
- Fitzgerald, E. (2013). *Contrastive analysis of apologetic speech acts in Australian English and Korean*. Unpublished master's thesis, Cheongju University, Cheongju, Korea.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. New York: Basic Books.
- Guan, X., Park, H., & Lee, H. (2009). Cross-cultural differences in apology. *International journal of intercultural relations*, 33(1), 32-45.
- Ide, R. (1998). 'Sorry for your kindness': Japanese interactional ritual in public discourse. *Journal of pragmatics*, 29, 509-529.
- Jang, M. (2011). *Cross-cultural comparison of apologies by Korean EFL learners and American English native speakers*. Unpublished master's thesis, Korea University, Seoul, Korea.
- Jeon, J. (2006). A study on aspects of apologizing speech act. *Discourse and Cognition*, 13(3), 167-187.
- Jeong, B. (2011). *A study focused on gratitude and apologies of linguistic behaviors of Koreans and Japanese students*. Unpublished master's thesis, Chonnam National University, Kwangju, Korea.
- Kang, H. (2011). An analysis on politeness in Koreans' request realization. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 17(1), 53-80.
- Kim, J. (2012). *Japan-South Korea contrastive study by apology: From a viewpoint of a mode of expression and feelings*. Unpublished master's thesis, Daegu

- Catholic University, Daegu, Korea.
- Kweon, Il-Yong. (2012. 09. 02). *Naju child molester's lie*. Retrieved July 5, 2013, from <http://www.hankooki.com>.
- Kwon, Y. (2000). Cross cultural differences of apology between Korean and American. *The Journal of English Language and Literature*, 19(1), 209-224.
- Lebra, T. (1976). *Japanese patterns of behavior*. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.
- Lee, H. (2007). *Research of apology speech acts through protocol analysis - with Japanese who learned to speak Korean language*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ewha Womans University, Seoul, Korea.
- Lee, H., & Park, H. (2011). Why Koreans are more likely to favor apology, while Americans are more likely to favor thank you. *Human Communication Research*, 37(1), 125-146.
- Lee, Y. (2008). *A study on apology speech act in Korean*. Unpublished master's thesis, Inje University, Kimhe, Korea.
- Long, C. (2010). Apology in Japanese gratitude situations: The negotiation of interlocutor role-relations. *Journal of pragmatics*, 42(4), 1060-1075.
- Moriya, M. (2001). Apology strategies of Korean and Japanese. *The Journal of Japanese Language Education*, 18(1), 13-26.
- Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, H. Juliane, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies* (pp. 155-173). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Online news team. (2013. 05. 21). *The partner's most not understandable behavior*. Retrieved July 5, 2013, from <http://www.fnnews.com>.
- Park, E. (2005). *A comparison of apologetic speech acts between Korean and American speakers*. Unpublished master's thesis, Chonnam National University, Kwangju, Korea.
- Shim, J. (2011). A study on social distance between apology strategies of Korean college learners. *English21*, 24(2), 275-297.
- Son, S. (2012). A contrast on expressions of apology in Korean and Chinese. *Korean Language and Literature in International Context*, 55, 183-249.
- Sugimoto, N. (1997). A Japan-U.S. comparison of apology styles. *Communication Research*, 24(4), 349-369.
- Vollmer, H., & Olshtain, E. (1989). The language of apologies in German. In S.

- Blum-Kulka, H. Juliane, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 197-218). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Whang, H. (2009). *A Study of Korean high school students' on English apology speech acts*. Unpublished master's thesis, Kangwon National University, Chuncheon, Korea.
- Wolfson, N., Marmor, T., & Jones, S. (1989). Problems in the comparison of speech acts across cultures. In S. Blum-Kulka, H. Juliane, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies* (pp. 174-196). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Yim, Y., & Kim, Y. (2010). Sociolinguistic approach on refusal expressions in Korea and Japan. *Japanese Studies*, 43, 525-540.

Jeong Khn Ahn
Department of English
Chonbuk National University
Jeonju, Korea 561-756
Phone: 82-63-270-3213
Email: jkahn@jbnu.ac.kr

Received on June 28, 2013

Revised version received on August 23, 2013

Accepted on September 5, 2013