


Reformulation Markers in Spanish and Korean: An Intercultural Rhetorical Study

Heejung KimJeonbuk National University <https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/clac.87387>

Recibido: 04 de marzo de 2023 • Aceptado: 29 de noviembre de 2023

ENG Abstract: The aim of this paper is to investigate the use of Spanish and Korean reformulation markers against the backdrop of a contrastive / intercultural rhetorical approach (Kaplan, 1966; Hinds, 1987; Clyne, 1994; Connor, 2008, 2011). In order to carry out the analysis, following a line of previous research papers in Murillo (2007, 2012, 2016), an empirical study using Spanish and Korean journalistic corpus was performed. The results obtained demonstrate a disparity between the use of Spanish and Korean RMs when approached from a linguistic-intercultural rhetoric perspective, more concretely, some discourse processes, such as 'identification', 'specification', 'definition', 'denomination', and 'conclusion', the use of double reformulation, the repetition of the Korean markers (*jeuk... jeuk... / got... got...*), certain rhetorical patterns of the Korean marker *got*, which denote its cultural idiosyncrasy, and the use of *sajaseongeo*, the idiomatic expressions originated from the Chinese language, utilizing the selected markers in the two languages.

Keywords: Reformulation markers, intercultural rhetoric, Spanish, Korean.

Contents: 1. Introduction. 2. Theoretical framework. 2.1. Intercultural rhetoric studies in Spanish and Korean. 2.2. Reformulation Markers (RMs) and their rhetorical conventions. 2.2.1. Reformulation and Reformulation Markers (RMs) in Spanish and Korean. 2.2.2. Rhetorical conventions of Spanish and Korean RMs. 3. Corpus and methodology. 4. Results and discussion. 4.1. General frequency. 4.2. Quantitative results. 4.3. Qualitative results. 5. Concluding remarks. Acknowledgements. References.

Cómo citar: Kim, H. (2024). Reformulation Markers in Spanish and Korean: An Intercultural Rhetorical Study. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación* 99 (2024) 93-107. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/clac.87387>

1. Introduction

Reformulation Markers (henceforth RMs) have been the subject of various cross-linguistic studies in Spanish and other Indo-European languages. In relation to Spanish, RMs in the following languages have previously been compared: English (Murillo, 2007, 2009), English and Catalan (Cuenca, 2003; Cuenca and Bach, 2007), Italian (Flores Acuña, 2003), French (Garcés Gómez and García Pérez, 2009), Icelandic (García Pérez, 2009), Portuguese (Pons and Macário Lopes, 2014), amongst others.

Although more recent studies have brought our attention to RMs in non-Indo-European languages, such as Basque (Barandiaran and Casado, 2011), Malaysian (Alias, 2018) and Korean (Kim, 2021), it should be pointed out that relatively little research has been devoted to RMs in such language families. Moreover, with regard to Spanish and Korean RMs, upon which this research paper is focused, it is necessary to consider a host of rhetorical conventions in order to look in more detail at the use of RMs in these two languages. Therefore, this paper sets out to respond to the question: "As to the use of Spanish and Korean reformulation and their markers, what linguistic and rhetorical features come to light?"

This paper is laid out as follows: The subsequent (second) section explores previous theoretical backgrounds when it comes to rhetorical considerations and reformulation studies in Spanish and Korean. The third deals with the corpus and choice of methodology for this research. The fourth presents the results and a discussion of the comparison of RMs in the Spanish and Korean journalistic corpora seen from a contrastive rhetoric perspective. Finally, the fifth section introduces the conclusion and highlights any further implications.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. Intercultural rhetoric studies in Spanish and Korean

Since Kaplan (1966) shed light on the concept of Contrastive Rhetoric, the expository discourse pattern of the English language has typically been described as linear, direct and deductive. On the other hand, Romance language writing styles, which include Spanish, have been recognized as non-linear and digressive; and those of East Asian languages' (mainly Chinese, Japanese, and Korean) as non-linear, indirect and inductive (Kaplan, 1966, 1972; Hinds, 1983, 1990). Since then, many scholarly works have been written on the topic of intercultural rhetoric studies between English and Spanish, or English and Korean, in particular in the context of ESL or EFL for students from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. By contrast, there is no evidence of a comparative study between Spanish and Korean in this regard (cf. Rubio, eds., 2018, for the comparison between Spanish and Japanese writing styles).

In the case of cross-cultural studies in English and Spanish, on the one hand, most studies have focused on exploring the discursive-rhetorical features of academic texts (Valero-Garcés, 1996; Álvarez, 2005; Murillo, 2012; Mur-Dueñas, 2021, amongst others), or more specifically the abstracts of articles (Martín-Martín, 2003; Lorés-Sanz, 2006, etc.) within the framework of English for Academic Purposes (EAP). According to the aforementioned works, what can generally be observed is that the academic texts in Spanish exhibit a more impersonal and reader-responsible writing style than those of English articles (Valero-Garcés, 1996; Moreno, 2004; Álvarez, 2005; Murillo, 2012). Moreover, articles written in Spanish present considerably fewer metadiscourse devices (code glosses, hedges, etc.) than in English ones, whereas the opposite is found to be the case in journalistic texts (cf. Murillo, 2012: 73-74, section 2.2.2. in this paper).

On the other hand, in English-Korean contrastive rhetoric studies, numerous research papers have attempted to demonstrate whether the textual / paragraph structure in Korean is inductive and indirect, as was argued by Kaplan (1966). His claim was supported, in principle, by other scholars (Eggington, 1987; Hinds, 1987, 1990; Choi, 1988; Kim, 1997). Nevertheless, there was also disagreement over Kaplan's argument (1966), some proposing that Korean students tend to use a more deductive style in developing their writings (Ryu, 2006; Huh and Lee, 2019). What these latter articles considered, however, were the cases of Korean students who received education in the United States, thus suggesting considerable interference in their writing styles.

Taking the above into account some researchers concluded that the marked difference between English and Korean writing styles originated from the contrast of individualism and collectivism (e.g. Hofstede, 2001). Accordingly, the thinking and developing writing pattern in Korean, i.e., the lack of authorial voice in their writings, is likely influenced by its culture. While others are convinced that the Korean (and other East Asian languages) writing style is heavily influenced by rhetorical patterns of expository writing in ancient Chinese: *qi-cheng-zhuan-he* (Chinese), *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* (Japanese) and *ki-seung-jeon-kyeol* (Korean) (Eggington, 1987; Hinds, 1983). The first sequence (*ki*) refers to an introduction which initiates the text, but does not present a main thesis; the second (*seung*) is where the writer develops his/her argument; the third (*jeon*) is the part in which the writer turns the development towards a subtopic that is not directly associated with the main theme; the final stage (*kyeol*) is the same as the conclusion in Western rhetoric patterns. It is the third part (*jeon*) that attributes features such as digression or indirection to the rhetorical style of East Asian languages.

2.2. Reformulation Markers (RMs) and their rhetorical conventions

2.2.1. Reformulation and Reformulation Markers (RMs) in Spanish and Korean

Formerly, the concept of reformulation was comprehended as a type of metadiscoursal operation in Romance languages, solving problems in communication and thus contributing to discourse organization (Antos, 1982; Gülich and Kotschi, 1983; Roulet, 1987; Rossari, 1994; Pons, 2006). In the Anglo-Saxon tradition, drawing on Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1995 [1986]), Blakemore (1993) considered reformulation as an example of interpretative resemblance. In Cuenca (2003: 1073), this process is described as a complex semantic category that in addition to paraphrase encompasses other meanings such as 'specification', 'explanation', 'summary' or 'denomination', and even includes non-paraphrase values expressing 'implication', 'conclusion' and 'contrast'.

In terms of RMs, Murillo (2007, 2012, 2016), taking the view of Relevance Theory and discourse studies in French, developed the concept of these items as procedural units that cause interlocutors to achieve a relevant interpretation of the discourse by assigning referents ('identification', 'specification'), by clarifying or restating the utterance ('explanation'), by adding background information ('definition', 'denomination'), or by making conclusions explicit ('conclusion', 'mathematics operation'), etc. On the other hand, Hyland (2005, 2007) viewed the RMs differently, claiming that these items are included in 'code glosses' with exemplification markers in his metadiscourse model, mainly serving to provide additional information by explaining or specifying in order to help the interlocutors' understanding.

In Korean, in accordance with Li's proposal on paraphrase and paraphrasing markers (2013), a paraphrastic sentence is defined as "a sentence that constitutes a paraphrase relation, in which the words, phrases, clauses, sentences or texts written in different forms with semantic equivalence are connected back and forth around the paraphrasing marker" (Li, 2013: 220; the translation is my own). Bearing in mind that research on RMs in Korean is still in its early stages, the term 'reformulation' in this language has not been addressed elsewhere.

With respect to the markers which are said to undergo the above mentioned process, several items have been considered as (explicatory) reformulation markers: *es decir*, *o sea*, *esto es*, *a saber*, and other less

grammaticalized elements such as *dicho de otra manera*, *dicho de otra forma*, etc. in Spanish (Martín Zorraqino and Portolés, 1999; Portolés, 2016); *that is*, *that is to say*, *in other words*, *namely*, and less grammaticalized units such as *(to put it) another way*, *(to put it) simply* in English (Murillo, 2007, 2012, 2016); *jeuk*, *got*, *geureonikka* and *malhajamyeon*, and non-grammaticalized markers such as *bakkwo malhajamyeon* (*to put it another way*), *dasi malhajamyeon* (*to put it in a repeated way*), *yoyakhamyeon* (*in summary*), etc. in Korean (Seo, 1995; Li, 2013).

2.2.2. Rhetorical conventions of Spanish and Korean RMs

As some studies have already pointed out (Hyland, 2007; Murillo, 2012, 2018), RMs could be employed to identify certain rhetorical conventions of the languages addressed (Murillo, 2012: 69). Given this consideration, it appears likely that the frequency and use of RMs are closely related to the rhetorical features of each language, for example, whether the given language is part of a form or content-oriented culture (Cuenca, 2003; Murillo, 2007), or instead is a writer-responsible / reader-responsible writing (Hinds, 1987; Clyne, 1994). More exactly, a lower frequency of RMs in English, especially the high use of simple grammatical RMs, is linked to a form-oriented culture characterized by more linearity in one's writing style. Conversely, the high use of RMs in Spanish, in particular, complex variable forms of RMs, is associated with content-oriented culture, which implies more possibility of digressions and the inclusion of content (Cuenca, 2003; Cuenca and Bach, 2007). At this point and as clearly demonstrated in Murillo (2007), the frequency of RMs in the Spanish journalistic corpus (2823 examples) differs to a large extent from that of the RMs in English (797 cases).

As for the rhetorical conventions of Korean RMs, as noted earlier in section 2.2.1, they have never before been examined in detail in the given language. However, Li's study of paraphrastic sentences in Korean (2013) provides some relevant information as to reformulation and its markers, as well as to their rhetorical conventions. In his research four functional types of paraphrastic structures were studied (Li, 2013: 229-239): (i) summary, (ii) annotation, (iii) exemplification and (iv) semantic connection (induction and deduction). Here, 'annotation', as its name suggests, refers to the adding of an explanation of technical vocabulary or of expressions used in the previous segment. Four subtypes are distinguished in this process: 'translation of the meaning of words', 'explanation of the metaphorical meaning', 'explicitation through enumeration' and 'explicitation of the reference'.

3. Corpus and methodology

In this study, in line with previous research by Murillo (2007, 2012, 2016), an empirical study was performed in order to examine the frequency and linguistic-rhetorical features of RMs in Spanish and Korean journalistic corpus. The reason for this particular choice of corpora is that the language of journalism can represent a use between the colloquial and the formal within the written language (cf. Murillo, 2007: 195).

For Spanish, a journalistic corpus was collected with the cases found in the years 1997, and 2000-2004 in CREA (Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual), corresponding to a total of 12 314 564 words. Whereas, for the Korean examples, the corpus from the journalistic texts in SEJONG (National Corpus of South Korea) from 2001 to 2003 was employed, and a total of 7 284 733 words were utilized. The Spanish corpus of the years 1998-1999 was not selected in order to obtain a proportion similar to that of the Korean corpus (see Table 1).

For the number of words used in the Spanish and Korean journalistic corpora, the agglutinative features and the lexical composition of the Korean language were taken into consideration. As an agglutinative language, Korean is expressed with far fewer words in comparison with Spanish. Besides, more than 80 % of the vocabulary of the Korean language originated from Chinese (Sino-Korean), which also triggers using fewer words than Spanish due to the logographic features of the Chinese language. Consequently, in order to achieve a more comparable proportion between the Spanish and Korean corpora, seven novels translated from Korean to Spanish were also observed (Shin, 2011 [2008], *Por favor, cuida de mamá*; Gong, 2012 [2005], *Nuestros tiempos felices*; Park, 2013 [1992], *Memorias de una niña de la guerra*; Hwang, 2014 [2003], *Shim Cheong: la niña vendida*; Hwang, 2015 [2007], *Bari, la princesa abandonada*; Choi, 2016 [1963], *El hombre gris*; and Han, 2017 [2007], *La vegetariana*). These works were written by well-known Korean authors and gained great popularity when published in Korea, so they can be regarded as representing a general use of this language.

Table 1 shows the total number of words found in these novels. The result indicates that the total number of words in Spanish (B) should have an approximate proportion of 1.67 in relation to that of Korean (A):

Table 1. Total number of words in the selected Korean novels and the translated versions in Spanish

N.º	Korean novels (A)	Translated versions in Spanish (B)	Proportion (B:A, %)
1	103 180	142 697	1.38:1
2	43 924	66 286	1.51:1
3	49 298	74 882	1.52:1
4	30 434	49 931	1.64:1

N.º	Korean novels (A)	Translated versions in Spanish (B)	Proportion (B:A, %)
5	63 268	115 659	1.83:1
6	54 724	83 815	1.84:1
7	24 779	49 058	1.98:1
Average of total number of words			1.67:1

As already mentioned at the beginning of chapter 3, with the journalistic corpus of Spanish from the years 1997, 2000–2004 and that of Korean from the years 2001–2003, 12 314 564 words were obtained for the first language, and 7 284 733 words for the second, yielding a ratio of 1.69:1. Hence, the Korean corpus was formed with an amount adjusted to its characteristics of agglutinative language in relation to Spanish, as well as to comparable periods and sources for both languages.

In terms of the methodology selected, Murillo (2007, 2012, 2016) considers the functions of RMs within the framework of Relevance Theory (Blakemore, 1987; Sperber and Wilson, 1995 [1986]; Carston, 2002, 2004), integrating the classifications suggested by Charolles and Coltier (1986), Fløttum (1994), Gülich and Kotschi (1983, 1987, 1995), Murât and Cartier-Bresson (1987) and Quirk *et al.* (1985). From a Relevance Theory perspective, RMs have a procedural meaning, defined as a set of instructions guiding the inferential process of utterance interpretation of the listener/reader, and at the same time contributing to the process of explicatures, which is related to the interpretation of the explicit meaning. Thus, the elements considered act at all the inferential phases, either with explicit or implicit content (Murillo, 2016: 241–244; adapted in Kim, 2021): the process associated with the logical forms (identification, specification and orientation), with the explicatures (explanation, correction, translation and metaphorical expressions), with the implied premises (definition and denomination) and with the implied conclusions (conclusion and mathematical operation).

At this point, one of the most recent issues in the field of reformulation between Murillo (2007, 2016) and Pons (2013, 2017) should be referred to. Murillo (2007, 2016) argues the need to analyze some specific linguistic units in order to characterize their reformulation function (cf. Casado, 1991: 95–96; Martín Zorraquino, 2006: 46–49; Murillo, 2016: 240). On the other hand, Pons (2013, 2017) suggests that the functional scope of each RM ought to be considered primarily, and that they should be grouped depending on the functions they perform in the discourse (cf. Borreguero Zuloaga and López Serena, 2011; Salameh, 2021). In other words, Murillo (2007, 2016) approaches it from a semasiological-onomasiological perspective for studying reformulation and its markers, whereas Pons (2013, 2017) proposes a functional or strictly onomasiological approach (Pons, 2017: 156).

Although the semasiological and onomasiological have different starting points, they also complement each other due to their methodological needs (Schourup, 1999: 252–253; Martín Zorraquino, 2006: 46–49). However, discourse markers (and RMs) are characterized, fundamentally, by their semantic-pragmatic poly-functionality and heterogeneous morphological features. Furthermore, as the comparison of the markers in this paper is realized from typologically different languages (Spanish and Korean), and as the research on RMs in Korean is still at an embryonic stage, it seems more suitable for the present study to choose the semasiological-onomasiological approach in accordance with Murillo (2007, 2012, 2016).

Finally, the selected RMs are four items for each language: *es decir, o sea, esto es* and *a saber* (Spanish), *jeuk, got, geureonikka* and *malhajamyeon* (Korean). These markers have already been considered as RMs in the references addressed in both languages (Martín Zorraquino and Portolés, 1999; Murillo, 2007; Portolés, 2016; Seo, 1995; Li, 2013). Searches were not made for non-grammaticalized and complex reformulation marker, as this research constitutes a first approach to the study of RMs in Spanish and Korean.

4. Results and discussion

Based on the corpus and the methodology selected in chapter 3, this chapter reveals the results of quantitative and qualitative analysis of the RMs in Spanish and Korean. Firstly, the total number of cases of RMs, as well as the general frequency according to the types of RMs in both languages are highlighted (section 4.1). Secondly, the results of the quantitative analysis on the markers are presented using the selected methodology, Murillo (2007, 2012, 2016) (section 4.2). Lastly, the results of the qualitative analysis of the RMs are shown (section 4.3). For both sections, 4.2 and 4.3, special attention is given to noteworthy examples from the intercultural rhetorical perspective using RMs.

4.1. General frequency

Table 2 below refers to the frequency of RMs in the Spanish and Korean journalistic corpora. In total, 2698 cases of Spanish and 2144 examples of Korean RMs were found:

Table 2. General frequency of the RMs in Spanish and Korean

Language	Total
Spanish	2698
Korean	2144
Total	4842

In these results, although there is no significant difference in the total number of cases for both languages in comparison with those obtained in Murillo (2007) (2823 examples of Spanish and 797 occurrences of English RMs were found in her journalistic corpora), it seems that one reason behind the relatively smaller number of Korean RMs is likely because other connective elements, such as verbal connective endings (between verbal phrases) or conjunctive particles (between nominal phrases), also can be used in the given language instead of RMs. In fact, Ahn (2000: 130-131) and Yu (2005: 98) indicate that the most commonly used connective items in Korean are verbal connective endings, as the connections beyond the level of sentences are seldom made grammatically explicit in this language.

In terms of the individual markers, as indicated in Tables 3 and 4, the cases obtained from *es decir* (78.3 %) and *jeuk* (65.9 %) occupy more than two thirds of the RMs of each language. In fact, both the sum of the rest of the RMs of Spanish (*o sea*, *esto es* and *a saber*) and that of Korean (*got*, *geureonikka* and *malhajamyeon*) do not reach the total number of cases of *es decir* and *jeuk*.

Table 3. Types of Spanish RMs and their frequency in the journalistic corpus

Language	Marker	Frequency	(%) within each language
Spanish	<i>es decir</i>	2113	78.3 %
	<i>o sea</i>	298	11.0 %
	<i>esto es</i>	242	9.0 %
	<i>a saber</i>	45	1.7 %
Subtotal		2698	100.0 %

Table 4. Types of Korean RMs and their frequency in the journalistic corpus

Language	Marker	Frequency	(%) within each language
Korean	<i>jeuk</i>	1412	65.9 %
	<i>got</i>	384	17.9 %
	<i>geureonikka</i>	225	10.5 %
	<i>malhajamyeon</i>	123	5.7 %
Subtotal		2144	100.0 %

4.2. Quantitative results

In this section, the results of the quantitative analysis of the RMs in the journalistic texts in Spanish and Korean are provided by means of the tables which include all the inferential processes of the utterance interpretation, as well as the proportions of each marker regarding those processes. In addition, the notable differences between the markers of the two languages, in particular related to the function of 'identification', 'specification', 'definition', 'denomination', and 'conclusion', are illustrated with corresponding examples.

Firstly, the occurrences and the percentage of each subcorpus of the processes associated with the logical forms are observed in Tables 5, 6 and 7:

Table 5. The frequency of the RMs in the processes associated with the logical forms in the two corpora

	Identification		Specification		Orientation		Total cases and % of each language
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	
Spanish	139	5.2 %	342	12.7 %	19	0.7 %	500 / 2698 (18.6 % / 100 %)
Korean	202	9.4 %	251	11.7 %	5	0.2 %	458 / 2144 (21.3 % / 100 %)

Table 6. Types of Spanish RMs and their frequency in the processes associated with the logical forms

	Identification		Specification		Orientation		Total cases and % of each marker
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	
<i>es decir</i>	93	4.4 %	246	11.6 %	15	0.7 %	354 / 2113 (16.7 % / 100 %)
<i>o sea</i>	29	9.7 %	22	7.4 %	4	1.3 %	55 / 298 (18.4 % / 100 %)
<i>esto es</i>	16	6.6 %	34	14.0 %	-	-	50 / 242 (20.6 % / 100 %)
<i>a saber</i>	1	2.2 %	40	88.9 %	-	-	41 / 45 (91.1 % / 100 %)

Table 7. Types of Korean RMs and their frequency in the processes associated with the logical forms

	Identification		Specification		Orientation		Total cases and % of each marker
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	
<i>jeuk</i>	134	9.5 %	199	14.1 %	1	0.1 %	334 / 1412 (33.2 % / 100 %)
<i>got</i>	56	14.6 %	31	8.1 %	1	0.3 %	88 / 384 (23.0 % / 100 %)
<i>geureoni-kka</i>	9	4.0 %	13	5.8 %	3	1.3 %	25 / 225 (11.1 % / 100 %)
<i>malhaja-myeon</i>	3	2.4 %	8	6.5 %	-	-	11 / 123 (8.9 % / 100 %)

In the above tables, 'identification' and 'specification' are linked to the assignment of referential expressions, and 'orientation', with pragmatic enrichment of non-articulated constituents. As to the identification process, the Korean RMs were found with a frequency of 9.4 %, compared to 5.2 % of those of Spanish (Table 5). While the most commonly used Spanish marker *o sea* records a frequency of 9.7 % in this function (Table 6), the most highly employed Korean marker *got* registered 14.6 % (Table 7). Examples 1 and 2 are cases of identification:

- (1) Los dos enemigos del hombre murciélago en Batman y Robin son el hielo de Mr. Freeze, con el que congela a sus enemigos (**o sea**, todo el planeta), y la hiedra venenosa de Poison Ivy, una mujer-enredadora que besa y mata. (*El País*, 27/06/1997)
The two enemies of Batman and Robin are Mr. Freeze's ice, with which he freezes his enemies (**o sea**, the entire planet), and Poison Ivy, a creeper-woman who kisses and kills.
- (2) 예컨대 일본의 히로히토 왕은 패전 직후인 1945년 9월 열두 살 된 아들에게 보낸 편지에서 일본이 패망한 이유로 과학기술을 경시한 것을 지적했다. 따라서 일본 왕을 비롯한 정치 지도자들은 정복자, 곧 미국이 보유한 기술을 이용해 나라를 재건하는 쪽으로 방향을 잡았다. (*Dong-A Ilbo*, 2003, Theme: Science)
For example, the emperor of Japan, Hirohito, pointed out in a letter to his 12-year-old son in September 1945, immediately after the defeat of Japan, that the disregard for the science and technology of Japan was the reason for its defeat. Thus, the Japanese emperor and other political leaders turned to rebuilding the country using technology developed by the conqueror, **got** the United States.

The value of the specification involves the thematic advance or progression of the discourse, and is often expressed in the form of an indefinite noun phrase in the reformulated member (cf. Murât and Cartier-Bres-

son, 1987; Meyer, 1992; Murillo, 2012). With respect to its frequency in our corpora, in Table 5, both the RMs of Spanish and those of Korean reveal a similar frequency (Sp. 12.7 %, Kor. 11.7 %). Particularly, as seen in Table 6, the marker *a saber* acts as a specialized element for this function (88.9 %). In examples 3 and 4 the numerical expressions are specified using the enumeration:

- (3) La estructura interna de los cabildos era jerárquica. El cabildo lo componían dignidades y canónigos, así como beneficiados y capellanes. Las dignidades se subdividían a su vez en: deán, arcediano, chantre y maestrescuela. Existían además cuatro canonjías llamadas de oficio, **a saber**: magistral, doctoral, lectoral y penitenciario. (*Hispania Nova. Revista de Historia Contemporánea*, n.º 3, 2003)
The internal structure of the councils was hierarchical. The council was made up of dignitaries and canons, as well as beneficiaries and chaplains. Furthermore, the dignitaries were subdivided into: dean, archdeacon, musical director, and teacher. There were also four canonships known as lay positions, **a saber**: magistral, doctoral, lectoral and penitentiary.
- (4) 그리스인의 평행선 개념에서부터 최근의 물리학 초끈이론 (Superstring Theory) 에 이르기까지 기하학의 역사와 그 사이에 있었던 다섯 번의 기하학 혁명, 즉 유클리드, 데카르트, 가우스, 아인슈타인, 위튼 등이 이룬 기하학의 업적 이야기 등을 흥미진진하게 풀어낸 수학사 입문서 (*Chosun Ilbo*, 2002, Theme: culture)
This is an interesting introduction to the history of Mathematics. The history of geometry is explained from the concept of the Parallel Lines of the Greeks to the Superstring Theory in Physics, as well as five geometric revolutions, **jeuk** those of Euclid, Descartes, Gauss, Einstein, Witten, among others.

In terms of the functions which are carried out at the level of the explicatures, ‘explanation’, ‘correction’, ‘translation’, and ‘metaphorical expressions’ are included. As can be observed in Table 8 the total frequency of occurrences at this stage is analogous, in Spanish 35.5 % and in Korean 32.3 %. However, the RMs in the two languages differ in the frequency of their subvalues: explanation (Sp. 34.5 %, Kor. 27.1 %), correction (Sp. 0.1 %, Kor. 0.3 %), translation (Sp. 0.6 %, Kor. 3.6 %), and metaphorical expressions (Sp. 0.3 %, Kor. 1.3 %). Regarding the individual markers in Tables 9 and 10, the most frequent RMs in the processes related to the explicatures are *esto es* (46.7 %), and *es decir* (36.1 %) in Spanish, and *got* (36.5 %), and *jeuk* (32.8 %) in Korean.

Table 8. The frequency of the RMs in the processes associated with the explicatures in the two corpora

	Explanation		Correction		Translation		Metaphorical expressions		Total cases and % of each language
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	
Spanish	931	34.5 %	3	0.1 %	17	0.6 %	7	0.3 %	958 / 2698 (35.5 % / 100 %)
Korean	580	27.1 %	6	0.3 %	78	3.6 %	28	1.3 %	692 / 2144 (32.3 % / 100 %)

Table 9. Types of Spanish RMs and their frequency in the processes associated with the explicatures

	Explanation		Correction		Translation		Metaphorical expressions		Total cases and % of each marker
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	
<i>es decir</i>	745	35.3 %	1	0.0 %	13	0.6 %	5	0.2 %	764 / 2113 (36.1 % / 100 %)
<i>o sea</i>	72	24.2 %	1	0.3 %	3	1.0 %	2	0.7 %	78 / 298 (26.2 % / 100 %)
<i>esto es</i>	111	45.9 %	1	0.4 %	1	0.4 %	-	-	113 / 242 (46.7 % / 100 %)
<i>a saber</i>	3	6.7 %	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 / 45 (6.7 % / 100 %)

Table 10. Types of Korean RMs and their frequency in the processes associated with the explicatures

	Explanation		Correction		Translation		Metaphorical expressions		Total cases and % of each marker
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	
<i>jeuk</i>	380	26.9 %	6	0.4 %	68	4.8 %	10	0.7 %	464 / 1412 (32.8 % / 100 %)
<i>got</i>	122	31.8 %	-	-	10	2.6 %	8	2.1 %	140 / 384 (36.5 % / 100 %)
<i>geureo-nikka</i>	45	20.0 %	-	-	-	-	4	1.8 %	49 / 225 (21.8 % / 100 %)
<i>malhaja-myeon</i>	33	26.8 %	-	-	-	-	6	4.9 %	39 / 123 (31.7 % / 100 %)

As indicated in the tables, the processes associated with the level of explicatures also contain the function of translation and that of metaphorical expressions, since they could be considered as a particular type of paraphrase or explanation between an expression written in one language or another (DRAE, 2014), or *ad hoc* concepts such as an extension of the linguistically codified meaning of a word or concept, etc. (Carston, 2002, 2004). These functions are observed more frequently in Korean than in Spanish, particularly in case of the metaphorical expressions with the marker *malhajameon* (4.9 %) (Table 10). In example 5, a metaphorical explanation is offered about the behavior of *chlamydia* in the reformulating member:

- (5) 성병을 일으키는 클라미디아는 백혈구 안에 들어간 다음 자신을 소화시키지 못하도록 방벽을 쌓는다. 말하자면 도둑이 경찰서 안에 둥지를 트는 격. (*Dong-A Ilbo*, 2001, Theme: Science)
Chlamydia which causes the sexual disease gets inside the white blood cell, and there it builds a wall so as not to digest itself. **Malhajameon** the same thief makes its nest within the police station.

Following on, the processes of ‘definition’ and ‘denomination’ are associated with the implicatures, in particular, with the implicated premises in Relevance Theory, in which the encyclopedic or contextual value of the reformulated segments is revealed (Murillo, 2007, 2012, 2016). In terms of their semantics, as pointed out in Cuenca and Bach (2007) (cf. Gülich and Kotschi, 1995), definition is a semantic expansion of the reformulated segment, whereas denomination is perceived as a type of reduction. In Tables 11, 12 and 13 the frequency observed for each function reveals some divergences in Spanish and Korean RMs:

Table 11. The frequency of the RMs in the processes associated with the implicated premises

	Definition		Denomination		Total cases and % of each language
	Cases	%	Cases	%	
Spanish	262	9.7 %	33	1.2 %	295 / 2698 (10.9 % / 100 %)
Korean	126	5.9 %	104	4.9 %	230 / 2144 (10.8 % / 100 %)

Table 12. Types of Spanish RMs and their frequency in the processes associated with the implicated premises

	Definition		Denomination		Total cases and % of each language
	Cases	%	Cases	%	
<i>es decir</i>	219	10.4 %	28	1.3 %	247 / 2113 (11.7 % / 100 %)
<i>o sea</i>	13	4.4 %	4	1.3 %	17 / 298 (5.7 % / 100 %)
<i>esto es</i>	30	12.4 %	1	0.4 %	31 / 242 (12.8 % / 100 %)
<i>a saber</i>	-	-	-	-	0 / 45 (0.0 % / 100 %)

Table 13. Types of Korean RMs and their frequency in the processes associated with the implicated premises

	Definition		Denomination		Total cases and % of each language
	Cases	%	Cases	%	
<i>jeuk</i>	100	71 %	76	5.4 %	176 / 1412 (12.5 % / 100 %)
<i>got</i>	16	4.2 %	27	7.0 %	43 / 384 (11.2 % / 100 %)
<i>geureonikka</i>	4	1.8 %	1	0.4 %	5 / 225 (2.2 % / 100 %)
<i>malhajamyeon</i>	6	4.9 %	-	-	6 / 123 (4.9 % / 100 %)

As shown in these Tables, the sum of the two discourse functions appears with a similar frequency in both languages (Spanish 10.9 %, Korean 10.8 %). However, the definition value in Spanish is displayed with a higher frequency (9.7 %) than in Korean (5.9 %), whereas that of denomination is observed more in Korean (4.9 %) than in Spanish (1.2 %) (Table 11). The definition cases are found more frequently in the case of *es decir* (10.4 %) and *esto es* (12.4 %), whereas those of denomination are observed more in *jeuk* (5.4 %) and *got* (7.0 %) (Tables 12 and 13).

Taking this into account, it could be argued that Spanish RMs are characterized by expanding the content of the reformulated member, developing ideas, or the complexity of reasoning through reformulation ('definition'). In contrast, those of Korean are mainly employed to introduce the reduction or condensing of the semantic content of the reformulated member ('denomination') (cf. Gülich and Kotschi, 1995; Cuenca and Bach, 2007). See the following examples of definition (6, 7):

- (6) España, como los demás países europeos, ha asumido el Protocolo de Kyoto, **es decir**, la limitación en el crecimiento de sus emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero (*Física y Sociedad*, n.º 13, 2002) Spain, like other European countries, has participated in the Kyoto Protocol, **es decir**, the limitation on the growth of its greenhouse gas emissions.
- (7) 이코투어리즘이란 무엇인가. 지난 세기 관광이 자연을 파괴했다는 데 대한 자성에서 비롯된 것으로 '자연 보호하는 관광'을 말한다. 즉 관광을 통해 자연보호 의식을 높여 환경을 보호하도록 한다는 적극적인 개념이다 (*Dong-A Ilbo*, 2001, Theme: science)
What is ecotourism. It refers to 'tourism that protects nature', which stems from the self-awareness of human beings that the tourism of the last century destroyed nature. **Jeuk** it is a concept that advocates raising awareness of the protection of nature through tourism.

The denomination process consists in presenting a concept that corresponds to a lexical group in the reformulating member. In examples 8 and 9 such function is introduced in professional or technical terms:

- (8) Los accidentes laborales cuestan en España cerca del 4 por ciento de la riqueza generada en un año, **es decir**, de PIB (Producto Interior Bruto), según se desprende de un informe de CCOO, (...). (*Diario de Jerez Digital*, 27/01/2004)
Work-related accidents in Spain cost about 4 percent of the wealth generated in a year, **es decir**, of GDP (Gross Domestic Product), according to a CCOO report, (...).
- (9) 파두의 '운명'은 저항이 아니라 수용이다. 파두의 주된 가사인 배신당한 사람, 죽음과 절망을 모두 받아들이는 정서, 갈망을 머금은 포용이 곧 사우다데다. (*Dong-A Daily*, 2003, Theme: culture)
The 'destiny' of Fado is not a resistance, but rather an acceptance. The main lyrics of Fado speak of men being betrayed, of the feeling of death and despair, as well as of the acceptance of a burning desire **got** Saudade.

With the high frequency of use of Korean RMs in denomination process, it should be remembered that it is relatively easy to create words in the given language because approximately 80 % of the lexical units originated from Chinese. Each Chinese character or morpheme usually has its own meaning, which makes the process of lexical composition and the expansion of the word field far easier in Korean.

Finally, in the functions associated with the implicated conclusions of the RMs of Spanish and Korean, as seen in Table 14, almost 5 % of the examples of the conclusive value are found more commonly with Korean RMs (34.1 %) than with Spanish RMs (29.2 %). On the other hand, with respect to mathematical operations, a higher frequency is observed in Spanish (5.9 %) than in Korean (1.5 %). Therefore, the total percentage of the processes related to the implicated conclusions is similar in both languages (Sp. 35.1 %, Kor. 35.6 %). Regarding the individual markers, as shown in Tables 15 and 16, *o sea* (44.6 %), *geureonikka* (62.7 %) and *malhajamyeon* (54.5 %) are observed with the highest percentages in the conclusive value:

Table 14. The frequency of the RMs in the processes associated with the implicated conclusions

	Conclusion		Mathematical operations		Total cases and % of each language
	Cases	%	Cases	%	
Spanish	787	29.2 %	158	5.9 %	945 / 2698 (35.1 % / 100 %)
Korean	732	34.1 %	32	1.5 %	764 / 2144 (35.6 % / 100 %)

Table 15. Types of Spanish RMs and their frequency in the processes associated with the implicated conclusions

	Conclusion		Mathematical operations		Total cases and % of each language
	Cases	%	Cases	%	
<i>es decir</i>	614	29.1 %	134	6.3 %	748 / 2113 (35.4 % / 100 %)
<i>o sea</i>	133	44.6 %	15	5.0 %	148 / 298 (49.6 % / 100 %)
<i>esto es</i>	39	16.1 %	9	3.7 %	48 / 242 (19.8 % / 100 %)
<i>a saber</i>	1	2.2 %	-	-	1 / 45 (2.2 % / 100 %)

Table 16. Types of Korean RMs and their frequency in the processes associated with the implicated conclusions

	Conclusion		Mathematical operations		Total cases and % of each language
	Cases	%	Cases	%	
<i>Jeuk</i>	413	29.2 %	25	1.8 %	438 / 1412 (31.0 % / 100 %)
<i>Got</i>	111	28.9 %	2	0.5 %	113 / 384 (29.4 % / 100 %)
<i>geureonikka</i>	141	62.7 %	5	2.2 %	146 / 225 (64.9 % / 100 %)
<i>malhaja-myeon</i>	67	54.5 %	-	-	67 / 123 (54.5 % / 100 %)

It seems that the high use of the conclusive function in Korean RMs relates to their lexicalized forms. The RMs *jeuk* and *geureonikka* display, to a great extent, conclusive and consecutive values (Kim, 2021). On the other hand, Spanish RMs, such as *es decir*, *o sea*, *esto es*, in connection with the copulative structure in their syntactic and lexical forms, tend to present more explicatory values (Casado, 1996; Herrero Ingelmo, 2007). Examples 10 and 11 are cases of conclusion introduced by *es decir* and *jeuk*:

- (10) En otro apartado, Del Olmo dice que El Haski utilizaba un sistema de comunicación vía Internet, consistente en facilitar un correo electrónico y una contraseña para abrirlo. Cuando el destinatario lo abre, lee los mensajes en el apartado “grabar” y responde con su mensaje en el apartado “borrador”, evitando así el tráfico de mensajes de una cuenta a otra, “**es decir**, no existe correo electrónico entre los comunicantes”. (*El País*, 22/12/2004)

In another section, Del Olmo says that El Haski used a communication system via the internet, consisting in providing an email and a password to open it. When the receiver opens it, she reads the messages in the section “record” and replies with her message in the “draft” section, thus avoiding the traffic of messages from one account to another, “**es decir**, there is no email between the communicators”.

- (11) 연구결과 사람 환자에게는 히포크레틴 수용체의 돌연변이가 없었다. 그러나 환자의 뇌나 척수액 중 히포크레틴이 정상인에 비해 분명히 적다는 것이 밝혀졌다. 즉 인간 환자에게 있어 유전적 이상은 없지만 히포크레틴의 절대량 부족은 역시 문제가 되는 것이다 (*Dong-A Daily*, 2003, Theme: science)

The results of the study showed that there were no hypocretin receptor mutations in human patients. However, it was found that hypocretin in the brain or the spinal fluid of the patient was clearly lower

than that of a normal person. **jeuk**, there is no genetic abnormality in human patients, but an absolute deficiency of hypoprotein is also a problem.

4.3. Qualitative results

In this section some interesting examples of the use of RMs in the Spanish and Korean journalistic texts are highlighted. In the corpora collected, the use of double reformulation, the repetition of the Korean markers (*jeuk... jeuk... / got... got...*), some particular rhetorical patterns of the Korean marker *got* denoting its cultural idiosyncrasy, and the use of *sajaseongeo*, the idiomatic expressions originated from Chinese, are observed.

The basic structure of reformulation is 'reformulated member (A) + RM + reformulating member (B)'. Nevertheless, different forms of paraphrase (reformulation) with Korean RMs are reported in Li (2013), which for the purpose of this paper will be called 'double reformulations'. According to this author, a total of four types are distinguished: (i) A(a1 + RM1 + a2) + RM2 + B; (ii) A + RM1 + B(b1 + RM2 + b2); (iii) A(a1 + RM 1 + a2) + B(b1 + RM2 + b2); and (iv) A + RM1 + B + RM2 + C. Examples of the double reformulation (iii), A(a1 + RM 1 + a2) + B(b1 + RM2 + b2), can be seen below:

- (12) El instrumento inventado por Pouillet transforma la energía radiante en calorífica, que puede medirse mediante técnicas termométricas. Esto permite calcular la radiación solar de manera directa, **es decir**, no dispersada por la atmósfera terrestre y establecer a partir de ello el valor constante de la estrella, **o sea**, la cantidad de energía que incide en el límite superior de la atmósfera de forma perpendicular considerada por unidad de tiempo y superficie así como para la distancia media que separa la Tierra del Sol. (*Pléyades*, n.º 52, 07-08-09/2000)

The instrument invented by Pouillet transforms radiant energy into heat, which can be measured using thermometric techniques. This makes it possible to calculate the solar radiation directly, **es decir**, not dispersed by the Earth's atmosphere, and to establish from this the constant value of the star, **o sea**, the amount of energy that falls on the upper limit of the atmosphere in a direct way considered per unit of time and surface as well as for the average distance that separates the Earth from the Sun.

- (13) 나라를 바로 세우려면 최소한 두 가지 일을 바로 해야 한다. 첫째는 시민들이 모두 사회인으로서의 기본 소양을 갖추도록 기르는 일, 즉 교육이고 또 하나는 사람의 자질을 엄격히 가려서 합당한 일을 하도록 맡기는 일, 즉 정치이다. (*Chosun Ilbo*, 2002, Opinion)

To build a nation, you have to do at least two jobs well. One is directing citizens so that they can have basic knowledge, **jeuk** education, and the other is entrusting them with work in a suitable way according to their ability, **jeuk** politics.

Interestingly, as seen in example 13, the two RMs used in Korean can be the same (*jeuk... jeuk...*), unlike in Spanish writing, in which the immediate repetition of the same lexical elements is typically frowned upon. Repetition in Korean language is frequently presented with an emphasis value (or with a rhythmic value). So, the repetition of the same RMs, although often negatively evaluated by Spanish authors, in contrast, is appreciated by Korean ones (for insights on repetition in the Japanese language, see Hinds, 1983).

This structure of double reformulation is also observed with the Korean marker *got* in examples 14 and 15. As shown, the sequence organization is also marked with the repetition of the marker (*got... got... got...*):

- (14) 지역이 곧 열린 학교이고, 학교는 곧 지역의 한 부분이기 때문에...
Because the town is **got** an open school, and the school is **got** a part of the town...
(*Greenreview*, n.º 41, 2001)
- (15) 누구를 미워한다. 그것은 곧 자기자신을 미워하는 것이죠.
누구를 해친다. 그것은 곧 자기 생명을 해친다는 얘기죠.
누구를 제거한다. 그것은 곧 자기 생명을 제거하는 일이죠.
You hate someone. That is **got** you hate yourself.
You hurt someone. That is **got** you will end up destroying your own life.
You kill someone. That is **got** you would be killing your own life.
(*Greenreview*, n.º 41, 2001)

Example (14) refers to the pattern A(a1 + *got* + b2) + B(b1 + *got* + a2), and (15) presents A(a1 + *got* + a2) + B(b1 + *got* + b2) + C(c1 + *got* + c2). These structures only appear with *got* and not with any other item observed in this paper. In these types of examples, it is speculated that there is the development of topic through 'correlative thinking' (dialectical view) (Mao, 2006), that is to say, a kind of spontaneous thinking grounded in an informal and ad hoc analogical processes presupposing both association and differentiation (Hall and Ames, 1998). Thus, although there is no direct relationship between the linked segments by RMs, the connection is carried out through 'resemblance' or 'contingency'.

The following examples of the marker *got* denote another Korean cultural idiosyncrasy:

- (16) a. 아내의 어머니가 곧 내 어머니 (...)
The mother of my wife is **got** my mum (...)
(*Hankyoreh*, 2002, opinion)
- b. 자식의 행복이 곧 나의 행복 (...)
The happiness of my son is **got** my happiness (...)
(*Joongang Ilbo*, 2002, theme: daily life)

c. 현대건설의 부도위기는 곧 국내 건설업의 부도위기 (...)

The bankruptcy crisis of Hyundai E&C is **got** the bankruptcy crisis of the domestic construction industry. (...) (*Chosun Daily*, 2001, theme: economy)

In examples 16a - 16c, the expressions of the reformulated member (*the mother of my wife, the happiness of my son, the bankruptcy crisis of Hyundai E&C*) are instead described in the text by the reformulating member (*my mum, my happiness, the bankruptcy crisis of the domestic construction industry*), indicating, thus, the collective, inclusive or supportive sense of the writer. These examples disclose very important features of Korean culture such as unity, empathy and responsibility, but, often serve to highlight collective opinions more than individual ones.

Finally, there are examples of Korean reformulation which were expressed through *sajaseongeo* 사자성어 四字成語, made up of four Chinese characters. This kind of expression has an idiomatic meaning that cannot be inferred from the meaning of each character that compose it. In the following example 17, the reformulated member is explained by a *sajaseongeo* expression, *dongbyungsangryeon* 동병상련 同病相憐, which means 'Misery likes company':

- (17) 여기까지만 보면 SK 그룹과 채권단 사이의 관계는 “동상이몽”인 듯하다. 그러나 놀랍게도 최근 SK 그룹과 채권단은 이해관계가 점점 일치하는, 즉 동병상련(同病相憐) 내지는 공생관계의 모습을 보여주고 있다. (*Chosun Ilbo*, 2003, Theme: opinion)

If we look up to here, the relationship between the firm SK and the creditors seems to be “dreaming different dreams while in the same bed”. But recently the SK group and the creditors are showing more agreement about common interests, **jeuk** *dongbyungsangryeon* (同病相憐) or a symbiotic relationship.

5. Concluding remarks

This research paper set out to analyze Spanish and Korean reformulation markers from a linguistic and intercultural rhetorical view. Considered useful devices to signal the rhetorical indications of the writer in texts, the comparison of the use of RMs in Spanish and Korean journalistic corpora provides a wider perspective with regard to the discourse organizations of the given languages; moreover, it is hoped that this study might provide valuable groundwork to the further study of reformulation markers in non-Indo-European languages, other than Korean.

Based on the empirical data acquired, some disparity between the total number of Spanish and Korean units (Spanish: 2698, Korean: 2144) was recorded, which leads us to consider the difference in discourse structures in the two languages. In this sense, and as mentioned in section 4.1, the connection in Korean is mainly manifested by means of the verbal connective endings between verb phrases and not usually through the use of (conjunctive) adverbs.

Regarding the quantitative analysis (4.2), it seems apparent that the discourse processes used with RMs are different, to a certain extent, in Spanish and in Korean journalistic texts. There were slight differences in the frequency of several markers in the identification and specification values, with the highest percentages of *o sea* (9.7 %), and *got* (14.6 %) in identification, and *a saber* (88.9 %) in specification. Likewise, the most frequent RMs in the processes associated with the level of explicatures were *esto es* (46.7 %), and *es decir* (36.1 %) in Spanish, and *got* (36.5 %), and *jeuk* (32.8 %) in Korean. The definition value in Spanish (9.7 %) was observed with a higher frequency than in Korean (5.9 %), while that of denomination is displayed more in Korean (4.9 %) than in Spanish (1.2 %). Moreover, a higher conclusive value was found in Korean markers (34.1 %), compared with those of Spanish (29.2 %).

In qualitative analysis (4.3), examples worth highlighting include the observation of the use of double reformulation, especially the repetition of the Korean markers (*jeuk... jeuk.../ got... got...*), some particular rhetorical patterns of the RM *got*, denoting Korean cultural idiosyncrasy, and the use of *sajaseongeo*, the idiomatic expressions composed with four Chinese characters.

Finally, the results of this intercultural rhetoric study call attention to several topics in need of future investigation. Firstly, the performance of linguistic and rhetorical comparison of RMs in non-Indo-European languages; in addition more genre-driven or cross-disciplinary research of RMs would be useful, and furthermore this would serve to confirm certain aspects addressed in the study. Finally, diachronic studies of RMs in non-Indo-European languages should be carried out with the purpose of observing reformulation and other discourse functions more in depth.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to express her gratitude to Professors José Portolés (*in memoriam*), Rosario González Pérez and Silvia Murillo Ornat for their insightful remarks and suggestions, and to Andy Bradshaw for his comments on style.

References

- Ahn, Joo Hoh. (2000). On the process of grammaticalization of *geureo*- type's connectives in Korean. *Journal of Korean Linguistics*, 35, 113-141.
- Alias, Norhayati Binti. (2018). *Contribución al estudio de las partículas reformuladoras de explicación en español y en malayo actuales. (Con referencia especial a sendos corpus de textos escritos de lenguajes*

- especializados). PhD dissertation, Universidad de Zaragoza. <https://zaguan.unizar.es/record/70726/files/TESIS-2018-042.pdf>
- Álvarez, Susana. (2005). Contrastive rhetoric and ESP: metatext in Spanish-English medical texts. *Revista de filología inglesa*, 26, 7-22. <http://uvadoc.uva.es/handle/10324/17309>
- Antos, Gerd. (1982). *Grundlagen einer theorie des formulierens*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111371078>
- Barandiaran, Asier and Casado, Manuel. (2011). Marcadores discursivos: calas contrastivas en los reformuladores del español y el euskera. In Heidi Aschenberg and Óscar Loureda (Eds.), *Marcadores del discurso: de la descripción a la definición* (pp. 375-395). Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert. <https://doi.org/10.31819/9783865278760-014>
- Blakemore, Diane. (1987). *Semantic constraints on relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blakemore, Diane. (1993). The relevance of reformulations. *Language and Literature*, 2, 101-120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/096394709300200202>
- Borreguero Zuloaga, Margarita and López Serena, Araceli. (2011). Marcadores discursivos, valores semánticos y articulación informativa del texto: el peligro del enfoque lexicocentrista. In Heidi Aschenberg and Óscar Loureda (Eds.), pp. 169-212. <https://doi.org/10.31819/9783865278760-007>
- Carston, Robyn. (2002). *Thoughts and utterances: The pragmatics of explicit communication*. Oxford: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470754603>
- Carston, Robyn. (2004). Relevance theory and the saying / implicating distinction. In Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 633-656). Oxford: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756959.ch28>
- Casado, Manuel. (1991). Los operadores discursivos *es decir, esto es, o sea y a saber* en español actual: Valores de lengua y funciones textuales. *LEA: Lingüística Española Actual*, XIII, 87-116.
- Casado, Manuel. (1996). Notas sobre la historia de los marcadores textuales de explicación *es decir y o sea*. In Manuel Casado (Eds.), *Scripta philologica in memoriam Manuel Taboada Cid I* (pp. 321-328). A Coruña: Universidade da Coruña.
- Charolles, Michel and Coltier, Danielle. (1986). Le contrôle de la compréhension dans une activité rédactionnelle: Éléments pour l'analyse des reformulations paraphrastiques. *Pratiques*, 49, 51-61.
- Choi, In-Hun. (2016 [1963]). 회색인. Seoul: Moonji [Spanish Version. *El hombre gris* (2016). Madrid: Verbum].
- Choi, Yeon Hee. (1988). Text structure of Korean speakers' argumentative essays in English. *World Englishes*, 7(2), 129-142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-971X.1988.TB00226.X>
- Clyne, Michael. (1994). *Intercultural communication at work. Cultural values in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, Ulla. (2011). *Intercultural rhetoric in the writing classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.3488851>
- Connor, Ulla, Nagelhout, Ed and Rozycki, William (Eds.). (2008). *Contrastive rhetoric: reaching to intercultural rhetoric*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.169>
- Cuenca, Maria-Josep. (2003). Two ways to reformulate: A contrastive analysis of reformulation markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(7), 1069-1093. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(03\)00004-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(03)00004-3)
- Cuenca, Maria-Josep and Bach, Carme. (2007). Contrasting the form and use of reformulation markers. *Discourse Studies*, 9(2), 149-175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607075347>
- Eggington, William G. (1987). Written Academic Discourse in Korean: Implications for Effective Communication. In Ulla Connor and Robert B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across Languages: Analysis of L2 Text* (pp. 153-168). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Flores Acuña, Estefanía. (2003). *Los marcadores de reformulación: análisis aplicado a la traducción español/italiano, de en fin y de hecho*. PhD dissertation. Universidad de Málaga.
- Fløttum, Kjersti. (1994). À propos de *c'est-à-dire* et ses correspondants norvégiens. *Cahiers de Linguistique Française*, 15, 109-130.
- Garcés Gómez, M.ª Pilar and García Pérez, Rafael. (2009). La reformulación del discurso en español en comparación con el francés. Estudio contrastivo de los marcadores de reformulación. In M.ª Pilar Garcés Gómez (dir.), *La reformulación del discurso en español en comparación con otras lenguas (catalán, francés, italiano, inglés, alemán e islandés)* (pp. 67-92). Madrid: Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Boletín Oficial del Estado, Colección Monografías, n. 58.
- García Pérez, Rafael. (2009). La reformulación del discurso en español en comparación con el islandés. Estudio contrastivo de los marcadores de reformulación. In M.ª Pilar Garcés Gómez (dir.), pp. 203-223.
- Gong, Ji-young. (2012 [2005]). 우리들의 행복한 시간. Paju: Prunsoop [Spanish Version. Lee Hyekyung (2012). *Nuestros tiempos felices*. Madrid: La Esfera de los Libros].
- Güllich, Elisabeth and Kotschi, Thomas. (1983). Les marqueurs de la réformulation paraphrastique. Connecteurs pragmatiques et structure du discours. *Cahiers de Linguistique Française*, 5, 305-351.
- Güllich, Elisabeth and Kotschi, Thomas. (1987). Les actes de reformulations dans la consultation: *La dame, de Caluire*. In Pierre Bangé (Eds.), *Science pour la communication* (pp. 15-81). Bern: Université Lyon 2.
- Güllich, Elisabeth and Kotschi, Thomas. (1995). Discourse production in oral communication. In Uta M. Quasthoff (Eds.), *Aspects of oral communication* (pp. 30-66). Walter de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110879032.30>
- Hall, David L. and Ames, Roger T. (1998). Chinese philosophy - The dominance of correlative thinking. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780415249126-G001-1>

- Han, Kang. (2017 [2007]). *채식주의자*. Seoul: Moonji [Spanish Version. Sunme Yoon (2017). *La vegetariana*. Barcelona: Editorial Rata].
- Herrero Ingelmo, José Luis. (2007). Cómo surgen los conectores: los reformuladores *id est, esto es, es decir*. *Revista de lexicografía*, 13, 45-54. <https://doi.org/10.17979/rlex.2007.13.0.4784>
- Hinds, John. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 3(2), 183-196. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1983.3.2.183>
- Hinds, John. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In Ulla Connor and Robert B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 texts* (pp.141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hinds, John. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In Ulla Connor and Ann M. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 87-109). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Hofstede, Geert. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*. Sage Publications.
- Huh, Myung-Hye and Inhwan, Lee. (2019). A Search for EFL College Students' Culture-Related Rhetorical Templates of Argumentative Writing. *English Teaching*, 74(3), 55-77. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.74.3.201909.55>
- Hwang, Sok Yong. (2014 [2003]). *심청, 연꽃의 길*. Paju: Munhakdongne [Spanish Version. Blanca Riestra (2014). *Shim Chong: la niña vendida*. Madrid: Alianza].
- Hwang, Sok Yong. (2015 [2007]). *바리테기*. Paju: Changbi [Spanish Version. Luis Alfredo de los Frailes Álvaro (2015). *Bari, la princesa abandonada*. Madrid: Alianza].
- Hyland, Ken. (2005). *Metadiscourse*. London: Continuum.
- Hyland, Ken. (2007). Applying a gloss: Exemplifying and reformulating in academic discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 28, 266-285. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm011>
- Kaplan, Robert B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1966.tb00804.x>
- Kaplan, Robert B. (1972). *The Anatomy of Rhetoric: Prolegomena to a Functional Theory of Rhetoric*. Philadelphia: The Center for Curriculum Development.
- Kim, Heejung. (2021). *Estudio comparativo de los marcadores discursivos de reformulación explicativa en español y en coreano*. PhD dissertation. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. <https://repositorio.uam.es/handle/10486/694917>
- Kim, Kyeongja. (1997). A comparison of rhetorical styles in Korean and American student writing. *Intercultural Communication Studies* VI:1, 115-150.
- Li, Hong-mei. (2013). A study on Korean paraphrasing sentences. *Korean Semantics*, 40, 219-248.
- Lorés-Sanz, Rosa. (2006). *I will argue that*: first person pronouns as metadiscoursal devices in research article abstracts in English and Spanish. *ESP Across Cultures*, 3, 23-40.
- Mao, Luming. (2006). *Reading Chinese fortune cookie: The making of Chinese American rhetoric*. Logan, UT: Utah State UP. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt4cggqt>
- Martín-Martín, Pedro. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22, 25-43. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(01\)00033-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(01)00033-3)
- Martín Zorraquino, M.^a Antonia. (2006). Los marcadores del discurso en español: balance y perspectivas para su estudio. In Manuel Casado (Eds.), *Análisis del discurso: lengua, cultura, valores: Actas del I Congreso Internacional*, vol. 1 (pp. 43-64). Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Martín Zorraquino, M.^a Antonia and Portolés Lázaro, José. (1999). Los marcadores del discurso. In Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte (Eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española* (pp. 4051-4213), Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Meyer, Charles F. (1992). *Apposition in contemporary English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511597824>
- Moreno, Ana I. (2004). Retrospective labelling in premise-conclusion metatext: an English-Spanish contrastive study of research articles on business and economics. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3(4), 321-339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2004.07.005>
- Mur-Dueñas, Pilar. (2021). There may be differences: analysing the use of hedges in English and Spanish research articles. *Lingua: International review of general linguistics*, 260, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103131>
- Murât, Michel and Cartier-Bresson, Bernard. (1987). *C'est-à-dire* ou la reprise interpretative. *Langue Française*, 73, 5-15.
- Murillo, Silvia. (2007). *A contribution to the pragmatolinguistic contrastive study of explicatory reformulative discourse markers in contemporary journalistic written English and Spanish*. PhD dissertation. Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Murillo, Silvia. (2009). Los marcadores de reformulación explicativa en español y en inglés: Estudio contrastivo de 'o sea' y sus traducciones 'that is (to say)' e 'in other words'. In M.^a Pilar Garcés Gómez (dir.), pp. 137-161.
- Murillo, Silvia. (2012). The use of reformulation markers in Business Management research articles. An intercultural analysis. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 17(1), 64-90. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.17.1.03mur>
- Murillo, Silvia. (2016). Sobre la reformulación y sus marcadores. *Cuadernos AISPI*, 8, 237-258. <https://doi.org/10.14672/8.2016.1335>

- Murillo, Silvia. (2018). Not the same, but how different? Comparing the use of reformulation markers in ELF and in ENL research articles. In Pilar Mur-Dueñas and Jolanta Šinkūnienė (Eds.), *Intercultural Perspectives on Research Writing* (pp. 237-253). <https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.18.11mur>
- Park, Wan-Seo. (2013 [1992]). 그 많던 싱아는 누가 다 먹었을까. Seoul: Segyesa [Spanish Version. Sang-Wan Shim (2013). *Memorias de una niña de la Guerra*. Madrid: Verbum].
- Pons, Salvador. (2006). A functional approach to the study of discourse markers. In Kerstin Fischer (Eds.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles* (pp. 77-99). https://doi.org/10.1163/9780080461588_006
- Pons, Salvador. (2013). Un solo tipo de reformulación. *Cuadernos AISPI*, 2, 151-170. <https://doi.org/10.14672/2.2013.1068>
- Pons, Salvador. (2017). Volviendo sobre *Un solo tipo de reformulación*: una respuesta a Silvia Murillo. *Cuadernos AISPI*, 10, 153-172. <https://doi.org/10.14672/10.2017.1327>
- Pons, Salvador and Macário Lopes, Ana Cristina. (2014). *Ou seja* vs. *O sea*: formal identity and functional diversity. *Revista de Estudos Linguísticos da Universidade do Porto*, 9, 103-128. <https://ler.letras.up.pt/uploads/ficheiros/13103.pdf>
- Portolés, José. (2016). Los marcadores del discurso. In Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach (Eds.), *Enciclopedia Lingüística Hispánica* 1 (pp. 689-699), London/New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315713441>
- Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Svartvik, Jan and Leech, Geoffrey. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Rossari, Corinne. (1994). *Les opérations de reformulation: analyse du processus et des marques dans une perspective contrastive française-italien*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang
- Roulet, Eddy. (1987). Complétude interactive et connecteurs reformulatifs. *Cahiers de Linguistique Française*, 8, 111-140.
- Rubio, Raquel, Muñoz, Édinson, Perelló, Juan Luis and Hevia, Pablo. (2018). El resumen en japonés y en español de artículos de investigación en medicina. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 79, 323-342. <https://doi.org/10.5209/CLAC.65661>
- Ryu, Hoyeol. (2006). Rhetoric Patterns in Korean College Students' English Expository Writings. *English Teaching*, 61(3), 273-292. http://journal.kate.or.kr/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/kate_61_3_14.pdf
- Salameh, Shima. (2021). *Reframing Reformulation: A Theoretical-Experimental Approach: Evidence from the Spanish Discourse Marker "o sea"*. Berlin: Peter Lang. <https://doi.org/10.3726/b18378>
- Schourup, Lawrence. (1999). Tutorial overview - Discourse markers. *Lingua*, 107, 227-265. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841\(96\)90026-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(96)90026-1)
- Seo, Jung Soo. (1995). *Korean Grammar*. Seoul: Hanyang University Press.
- Shin, Kyung-Sook. (2011 [2008]). *엄마를 부탁해*. Paju: Changbi Publishers [Spanish Version. Aurora Echevarría (2011). *Por favor, cuida de mamá*. Barcelona: Grijalbo].
- Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deirdre. (1995 [1986]). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Valero Garcés, Carmen. (1996). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: metatext in Spanish-English economics texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 15(4), 279-294. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(96\)00013-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(96)00013-0)
- Yu, Hye Ryung. (2005). A study on the function of the connective endings. *Grammar Education*, 3(3), 87-105.

Web pages

- Real Academia Española, Banco de datos (CREA). Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual. <http://corpus.rae.es/creanet.html>
- Real Academia Española, Diccionario de la lengua española, 23.ª ed. (DRAE, 2014). <https://dle.rae.es>
- Corpus Sejong. <https://ithub.korean.go.kr/user/corpus/corpusSearchManager.do>