

Author's manuscript. A version in French ('Les locuteurs (auto)critiques: remarques sur le marqueur discursif de reformulation *adică* «c'est-à-dire»') was presented at Bucharest Workshop on *Attitude and Stance in Discourse*, (November 23-24, 2018), Bucharest, Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest. An English translation was published in Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu/ Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu/ Gabriela Stoica/ Șerban Hartular (eds.) *Attitude and Stance in Discourse*, Cambridge Scholars Publishers, 2022, 292-315.

A Self-Critical Speaker: The Romanian Reformulation Marker *Adică* "I Mean/Namely"

Adriana Costăchescu
University of Craiova

1. Introduction

Reformulation is a communication strategy that enables the speaker to rework his/her utterance, to find a different expression for the semantic information previously conveyed by a word, phrase, sentence, or set of sentences. Often the signal for this kind of repetition is a discourse marker named a 'reformulation marker' (henceforth RM), such as *I mean, namely, in other words, i.e., or even better, to be exact/precise, in plain English, specifically, strictly speaking, that is (to say), etc.*

Currently, the use of RMs is the manifestation of a subjective dissatisfaction with the verbal exchange on the part of at least one of the persons involved in the dialogue.¹ Accordingly, their study belongs both to the field of the subjective evaluative language, and semantic-pragmatic theories of conversation. Curiously enough, neither theoretical framework accommodates reformulation well. It is necessary to broaden some notions to adequately describe this type of linguistic manifestation, although particular forms of the reformulation phenomenon were studied in older research under the name of 'paraphrase'.²

In this paper, the preliminary theoretical section presents a classification of stances. We introduce a new subcategory of intrapersonal stances, to provide an adequate framework for the study of RMs. Next, we try to explain how pragmatic models, such as the conversational theory of Grice (1975) or the cognitive pragmatics of Sperber/ Wilson (1986), fail to account for reformulation, which involves the expenditure of additional mental and physical energy, both theories insisting on minimal effort in (verbal) communication. The corpus study in the following section describes the functions of the main Romanian RM *adică* "I mean", illustrated by excerpts from literary fiction (narrative or dramatic), dating from the late 19th to the early 21st centuries. This part of the paper illustrates the two main uses of this RM, the intrapersonal (section 3) and the interpersonal stances (section 4), uses that are quite common in Romance languages, e. g. Spanish RM *o sea* (Pons 2014), Portuguese RM *aliás* (Lopez 2014) or Italian RM *voglio dire* (Fiorentini/ Sansò 2017).

2. Theoretical Framework for the Study of RMs – A Proposal

The RMs have two main characteristics. As shown above, they often express the subjective dissatisfaction of at least one participant in the verbal exchange and the wish to clarify or improve his/her conversation using a rectification, a correction, or an explanation. This request is usually part of a real dialogue, if the interlocutor asks for the rectification, or the result of an inner dialogue if spontaneously offered by the sender. In both situations, speakers manifest a subjective attitude, a stance.

2.1. Some Considerations on 'Stance'

In the last thirty years, the study of the different ways speakers express their subjectivity in communication and the investigation of its main realisations (evaluation, opinion, or affect) has become a multidisciplinary enterprise, involving a variety of terms that describe similar linguistic manifestations. For

¹ According to the classical definition, reformulation occurs when one of the interlocutors considers that a previous formulation "was not an appropriate means of achieving communicative success" (Blakemore 1993: 101).

² For a synthesis of various studies that propose a distinction between a paraphrastic and a non-paraphrastic reformulation, see Eshkol-Taravella/ Grabar (2014) or Fiorentini/ Sansò (2017: 56).

instance, with regards to the scientific fields dealing with linguistic subjectivity, Benamara et al. (2017) mention philosophy, sociology and political sciences (their so-called ‘affective turn’), artificial intelligence (‘affective computing’), and linguistics. In linguistics, the phenomenon is examined within a wide variety of theoretical frames such as appraisal theory, stance, evaluation, and non-veridicity (see Benamara *et al.* 2017, 202, who also give bibliographical indications for each theoretical approach).

Curiously enough, this survey leaves outside an important linguistic-pragmatic field, that of discourse markers, i.e., those linguistic items that indicate discourse organisation, the speaker’s relationship with the interlocutor(s) as well as speaker’s attitude in communicative exchanges (Ghezzi/ Molinelli 2014, 1). This omission seems even more peculiar if we consider that the linguistic means expressing stances or those qualified as ‘discourse markers’ are roughly the same: adverbs or nouns expressing certainty, likelihood or doubt, complement clauses controlled by characteristic verbs (speech act or communication verbs), ability or willingness adjectives, interjections, etc.³

From a strictly linguistic point of view, RMs have two main characteristics. First, they have a clear metalinguistic character, the speaker rephrasing a previous utterance to make its meaning more understandable, and more accessible to the addressees. Second, the use of RMs is triggered by the judgment that a second utterance, more or less synonymous with the first, is necessary. This is a subjective decision by the speaker, since (s)he spontaneously decides to do it mainly because (s)he appreciates that the hearer needs more explanations. The use of a reworded utterance can also be the result of a request from the addressee, if (s)he explicitly asks for a clarification, frequently for subjective reasons.

Among the multifaceted expressions of the complex manifestations in the language of the speaker’s/hearer’s subjective evaluation, ‘stance’ is one that is frequently used, not only in linguistics but also in sociolinguistics (Jaffe 2009), psychology (Jones/ Harris 1967), anthropology (Silverstein 1976), discourse analysis (Silver 2003), etc. From the numerous definitions of the concept of ‘stance’⁴, the one most appropriate for our study of reformulation expressions is “a person’s expression of their relationship to their talk, and a person’s expression of their relationship to their interlocutors” (Kiesling 2009, 172). The first type of attitude, intrapersonal, is called “epistemic stance”, expressing the speaker’s judgment regarding the content of his/her utterance(s) (Biber et al. 1999, 854), while interpersonal stances characterise the spontaneous strategy employed by the speaker in the interaction with a person or a group of persons (Scherer 2005, 705–706).

To accommodate the use of RMs within one of the proposed classifications of stances (for instance, Berman et al. 2002, 258–261), it is necessary to improve the categorization of intrapersonal stances. The only suitable realization for this type of stance found in the bibliography are so called “epistemic stances”. As their name suggests, epistemic stances are defined as expressing the speaker’s degree of certainty regarding his/her assertions (cf. Kiesling 2009, 172), for instance when the speaker’s utterance is part of an answer to a question. According to Kiesling, intrapersonal stances are often related to explanations, the speaker taking an additional role, that of an “explainer”, “teacher” or “trainer”. Depending on the higher or lower degree of certainty expressed by epistemic stances, speakers are more or less authoritative towards their interlocutors (Kiesling 2009, 179).

The very existence of RMs shows that speakers’ relationship with their own utterances, this self-reflexive attitude goes far beyond the certainty-uncertainty of the phrases, i.e., in logical terms, their ‘truth-value’. RMs indicate that senders permanently evaluate their language performance and sometimes explain their utterances, if their discontent is chiefly related to the accuracy of their thoughts’ “translation” into a string of words or if they appreciate the message as being too obscure for the receiver(s).

³ For bibliographical references see, for instance, Chindamo/ Allwood/ Ahlsen (2012) for stances, and Ghezzi/ Molinelli (2014) and Ghezzi (2014) for discourse (or pragmatic) markers. There is a striking similarity between the current delineations of discourse markers, usually focusing on the communicative and interactive side of linguistic exchanges and definitions of ‘stances’ such as “lexical and grammatical expression of attitudes, feelings, judgments, or commitment concerning the propositional content of a message” (Biber and Finegan 1989b, 93).

⁴ This concept has various definitions, more or less rigorous, varying not only from field to field and from author to author but also sometimes even between different studies by the same author. For instance, Chindamo/ Allwood/ Ahlsen (2012) showed that Biber considered one of the most influential researchers of stances, offered at least three different definitions (Biber/ Finegan 1989a; Biber et al. 1999; Biber 2004, 2006), including attitudes, feeling, and judgments, sometimes commitments. Some of these definitions contain the lexical and grammatical expressions conveying stances, while others leave aside the linguistic means (Chindamo/ Allwood/ Ahlsen 2012, 617–619). In the same article, the three authors cite various other definitions, provided by researchers such as Scherer (2005), Du Bois (2007), Precht (2003), Martin (1987), Kiesling (2009) (Chindamo/ Allwood/ Ahlsen 2012, 618–619). Given this variety of definitions, often vague and frequently covering a range of topics too wide to describe properly, we consider “stance” as a concept “éclaté”, as the French put it (i.e. exploded, split up) and in need of revision.

We call this second type of RMs ‘clarifying stances’, although ‘improving stances’ or ‘explanatory stances’ are credible alternative labels for these markers⁵. If the RM appears because the interlocutor asks the speaker for a reformulation of his/her utterance, we are dealing with a recipient-oriented stance, communicatively motivated by the fact that the addressee needs an ulterior explanation.

2.2. Pragmatic Theories and Their Limits

In the framework of Grice’s conversational theory (Grice 1975, 1989), reformulation is a manifestation of the speaker’s effort to improve his/her message, in the sense prescribed by the theory. The result is that the discourse complies better with the Conversational Maxims, especially the Maxim of Quality (“Try to make your contribution one that is true”) and the Maxim of Manner (“Avoid obscurity of expression”, “Avoid ambiguity”, Grice 1975, 45–46).

Reformulation is an act involving complex mental processes and has been studied by cognitive and lexical pragmatics, such as approximation, lexical narrowing or broadening, metaphorical extension, *ad hoc* meanings, etc. (Sperber and Wilson 2007, Rubio-Fernández 2008, Wilson/ Kolaiti 2017).

Nevertheless, reformulation contrasts with the general principle of communicational economy, because expressing the same information twice seems a waste of effort. The first consistent definition of the economy principle was proposed by André Martinet (1955, 1960), who studied the functional performance of the linguistic code and formulated it as “the principle of least effort”. In communication, speakers try to find a balance between the effort to verbalise their message (mainly efforts of memory and articulation) and the amount of information conveyed, attempting to transfer the maximum amount of information with the minimum amount of effort. This tendency manifests both in phonology and in syntax. The balance takes the form of a tension between cost and benefit.

In addition to the speaker’s conversational behaviour, the linguistic code also contributes to a good rendering: Martinet (1960) observed that all frequent words are short, and often made up of one syllable. If the usage of a word gains in frequency, e.g. because the object designated by it becomes more common, this word tends to become shorter. An example is the French word *métro* “subway”, which became shorter and shorter as the subway network in Paris developed and the number of passengers increased: *chemin de fer métropolitain* “urban railway” → *le métropolitain* → *le métro*. The same phenomenon explains words such as *vélo* (from *vélocipède* “velocopede”), *télé* (from *télévision* “television”), *ciné* (from *cinématographe* “cinema”), etc. (Martinet 1960, 178). Another manifestation of the linguistic trend toward economy is the use of abbreviations, very frequent in all European languages (*PC* for *personal computer*, *NATO* for *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, *EU* for *European Union*, *NBC* for *National Bus Company*, etc.).

The economy principle is involved in Grice’s Maxim of Quantity, which sets two boundaries, one inferior (“Make your contribution *as informative as* is required for the linguistic exchange”) and the other - superior (“Do not make your contribution *more informative than* is required”, Grice 1975, 45). If the speaker fails to respect the inferior boundary, his/her message is economical, the effort for its formulation and transmission is small, but it is not effective, as it does not convey all the necessary information. If the speaker does not respect the superior boundary, the outcome is the opposite: the message passes on a large amount of information (it is effective) but its formulation and interpretation impose an effort greater than necessary, therefore the transfer of information has poor productivity.

The economy principle also appears in the revised variant of the conversational maxims proposed by Laurence Horn (1984, 13), it is present in both his “norms”, the R-principle (“Say no more that you must (given Q)”) and the Q-principle (“Say as much as you can (given R)”). Therefore, both classical Gricean theory and the neo-Gricean approach, built up by Laurence Horn, prescribe that the effort of message formulation and articulation must be proportional to the amount of information necessary for the good functioning of verbal communication.

Cognitive pragmatics (Sperber/ Wilson 1986; Wilson/ Sperber 2004) is a theory that focuses on the inferential processes enabling a listener to identify the speaker’s communicative intention. The listener not only decodes the sentences that make up the message but also uses other types of knowledge, including what

⁵ The definition of epistemic stances is related, to a certain extent, to our clarifying stances, given that Kiesling speaks of epistemic stances “usually expressing that they are also very certain (epistemic stance) about what they are saying, but they are also expressing something about that knowledge vis-à-vis their interlocutor, namely, that the interlocutor does not have the same knowledge” (Kiesling 2009, 173). These stances can be also related with evaluation in a broad sense (Silver 2003), as “expression of the speaker or writer’s attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about” (Hunston/ Thompson 2000, 5).

the speaker may have implicated. The principle of economy appears also in cognitive pragmatics (called “relevance theory”) in the definition of its basic concept, relevance: the more notable the cognitive effects,⁶ the smaller the processing effort (to produce, understand, and interpret the utterance), and the more relevant the utterance (Sperber and Wilson 1986, 544). We can redefine the relevance of an utterance in André Martinet’s terms, as the relationship between effort and benefit: contextual effects should be as great as possible, and the effort should be as small as possible. Repeating an already communicated piece of information increases the processing effort (for the speaker to produce it and for the addressee to understand it), making the message more costly, and hence less relevant.

Sometimes the speaker makes it known that (s)he will employ a reformulation sequence using a reformulation marker and we consider that the examination of RM occurrences can help us understand the justification for the usage of such a high-cost procedure. The examination of a Romanian literary corpus containing its main RM, *adică* “namely, I mean” shows several motivations for the reformulation process. We classified the reasons into two main categories: the speaker’s (personal) motivations and the listener’s motivation (Eshkol-Taravella/ Grabar 2014, 2016), categories which largely overlap with those of intrapersonal and interpersonal stances.

3. Intrapersonal Clarifying Stances

The fact that sometimes the speaker rewords his/her previous utterances indicates that the cognitive framework of current pragmatics theories must be extended. Both Grice’s conversational theory and, following his path, relevance theory only studies the addressee’s deductive processes, that is how the addressee comes to understand the speaker’s communicative intentions, what was said explicitly (“explicatures”) and implicitly (“(conversational) implicatures”). The fact that an utterance introduced by an RM seldom refers to the truth-value of a previous statement, at least according to our corpus, seems to indicate the necessity of introducing a new intrapersonal stance – the clarifying stance, which aims at improving the verbal exchange.

The phenomenon of the speaker’s reformulation shows that the spokesperson, after uttering the message, becomes a kind of a second hearer, (s)he listens to what (s)he has said and, if (s)he is unhappy with the pronounced utterances, (s)he often changes them. Therefore, the deductive processes characterise both the speaker and the addressee, the former undertaking a subjective evaluation of his/her speech production.

3.1. Correction

Corrections appear when the speaker realises that (s)he has made a mistake or that (s)he has used a linguistic expression that does not give an appropriate description of the situation:

- (1) E o femeie rară, extrem de reușită, inteligentă, cultă și, ceea ce e mai important, cu mult caracter, *adică*... cu caracter! (Breban, *Bunavestire*)
“She is that rare, worthy woman, intelligent, very learned and, what is more important, with a strong character, *that is* ... she has character.”
- (2) Ne-am deșteptat pe la zece. *Adică*, am fost deșteptați. Bătea cineva la ușă, de credeam că s-a dispus demolarea hotelului. (Mușatescu, *De-a baba oarba*)
“We woke up around ten. *I mean*, we were wakened up. Somebody was banging on the door; it sounded like the hotel was slotted for demolition.”

The correction may involve not only the explicit meaning (the “explicatures”) but also the implicit significances (the “implicatures”). For instance, in the following example the second speaker, Farfuridi, realises that the verb *a face* “to do, to make”, which appears in a lot of set phrases, can mean not only “to become, to turn” (as in *a se face roșu* “to turn red”, *a se face profesor* “to become a teacher”) but also “to play” as in *a se face bolnav* “to play the invalid”. He corrects himself immediately:

⁶ In the relevance theory, cognitive effects measure the modifications made by the new information on the addressee’s cognitive environment. For a passenger, the observation that his/her train is a minute late makes little difference (a small cognitive effect). But “the sight of my train arriving late might confirm my impression that the service is deteriorating, or make me alter my plans to do some shopping on the way to work. According to relevance theory, an input is RELEVANT to an individual when, and only when, its processing yields such positive cognitive effects” (Wilson and Sperber 2004, 608).

- (3) TIPĂTESCU: Amice, d-le Farfuride, nu ți se pare d-tale că te faci mai catolic decât Papa?
 FARFURIDI (hotărât): Da, când e vorba de prințipuri, stimabile, *da, mă fac, adică nu, nu mă fac*, sunt când e vorba de asta, sunt mai catolic decât Papa... (Caragiale, *O scrisoare pierdută*)
 “TIPĂTESCU: Farfuridi, my friend, don’t you think that you are acting as if you were more Catholic than the Pope?
 FARFURIDI (very firm): *Yes*, when it comes to principles I do, *that is, no, I don’t*, I am, when principles come into play, I am more Catholic than the Pope.”

The RM *adică* introduces sometimes a radical revision of the message, which can go as far as saying the opposite:

- (4) E satul în care se găesc mai puțini români, *adică* deloc. (Bacalbașa, *Moș Teacă, În Dobrogea*)
 “It’s the village with fewer Romanians, *that is* to say, none.”
- (5) Voi mă întrebați mereu cum stau cu examenele: foarte bine – *adică* foarte prost. Nu vă faceți griji, se va rezolva și asta. (Breban, *Bunavestire*)
 “You keep asking me how my exams went: very well – *I mean* very badly. But don’t worry, I’ll solve this problem.”

Sometimes this type of correction is made because the speaker, after uttering his message, changes his/her opinion:

- (6) CETĂȚEANUL: Da! vom lupta contra... *adică* nu... Eu nu lupt contra guvernului! (Caragiale, *O scrisoare pierdută*)
 “ELECTOR: Yes, we’ll take on... *I mean*, no... I’m not taking on the government.”
- (7) PAMPON: Mi se pare, *adică* nu mi se pare... sunt aproape sigur că sunt tradus. (Caragiale, *De-ale Carnavalului*)
 “POMPON: I have a hunch, *I mean*, it is not a hunch. I am almost sure that my mistress is betraying me.”

Sometimes this type of correction takes place because the speaker changes his/her discourse strategy, for instance (s)he wants to pay an implicit compliment to his/her interlocutor for possible future success. For instance, in example (8), the speaker, Trahanache, changes the status of the person whom he was introducing from a parliamentary candidate for the current elections (real situation) to an elected MP (future desirable situation):

- (8) TRAHANACHE: Dă-mi voie, Joițico, să-ți recomand pe d. Agamiță Dandanache! [...] Candidatul nostru!... *adică* ce mai candidat! alesul nostru. (Caragiale, *O scrisoare pierdută*)
 “TRAHANACHE: Zoe, my dear, let me introduce you to Mr. Agamiță Dandanache [...] Our candidate!... *that is to say*, our MP, practically.”

The RM *adică* can point out that the speaker wants to give more precise information, especially about time, place or quantities:

- (9) - Care ospătărie de la Suceava?
 - Este acolo o ospătărie. *Adică* era; acuma nu mai este. (Sadoveanu, *Frații Jderi*)
 “- Which inn in Suceava?
 - There is an inn there. *I mean*, there was. Not anymore.”
- (10) ... o mizerabilă leafă de trei sute de lei pe lună, *adică*, vorba vine, trei sute... în mână iei două sute cinzeci și șase și cinzeci de bani... (Caragiale, *Mici economii*)
 “... a miserly wage of three hundred lei per month, *I mean*, not even three hundred; you only take home two hundred fifty-six lei and fifty cents.”

Corrections can appear to adapt a set phrase or a metaphorical expression to the actual situation: if objects are crushed under the wheels of a car, the speaker can modify the phrase *to crush under heels* into *to crush under wheels*:

- (11) „Trabant”-ul pierde lăzile pe drum, de parc-ar semăna cartofi. Noi trecem peste ele, călcându-le-n picioare, *adică* în anvelope, și ne aflăm pe punctul de a-l ajunge din urmă. (Mușatescu, *De-a baba oarba*)
 “Crates are falling off the Trabant [a car], as though it were snowing the road with potatoes. We drive through, crushing them under our heels, *that is* tyres, and soon we’re catching up to it.”

3.2. Expansions: Definite Descriptions, Synonyms, and Explanations

If the speaker considers that a part of his message is not explicit enough, (s)he rephrases it by giving supplementary definitions, synonyms, explanations, definite descriptions, etc. We found in our corpus a large number of pragmatic synonyms, phrases almost equivalent in a certain context, sometimes adding an ironic distance:

- (12) Grozav, va face o impresie perfectă clubului (*adică* familiei) și asta era destul. (Breban, *Bunavestire*)
 “Amazing, she’ll make the perfect impression on the club (*I mean* the family) and that is enough.”
- (13) Am rămas să întocmesc actele tatălui meu, în timp ce el rezolva tot felul de treburi. *Adică* stătea la taifas cu directorul școlii, cu polițistul și cu medicul veterinar, jucând câte un șeptic în patru și degustând după anotimp. (Lungu, *Cinci, cinci și jumătate*)
 “I stayed in the office to write out the documents for my father, while he handled everyday businesses. *Meaning*, that he chatted about this and that with the school principal, the policeman and the veterinary, the four of them playing cards, and enjoying various alcoholic drinks, depending on the season.”

Often the reformulation contains additional information about encyclopaedic terms that might be unknown to the addressee. Usually, the reformulation takes the form of a definite description when it comes to geographic names or historical facts.

- (14) Dăm din sorginte autorizată știrea că în Bulgaria de răsărit, *adică* spre granița Dobrogei, și mai cu seamă în districtul Varna, a izbucnit revoluția printre țărani, din cauză că sunt amenințați a li se ridica dijma. (Caragiale, *Cum stăm*)
 “We inform you from a reliable source that in eastern Bulgaria, *i.e.* near the border with Dobrogea and especially in the district of Varna, a peasants’ revolt has broken out because of a threatened increase in their tithe.”
- (15) Prin anii 50, *adică* la cinci ani după moartea lui Stalin, sau mai precis după ce Hrușciov își dădu acordul ca trupele sovietice să se retragă de pe teritoriul nostru. (Preda, *Cel mai iubit dintre pământeni*, vol. 1)
 “In the fifties, *that is* five years after Stalin’s death or more precisely after Khrushchev agreed to pull Soviet troops out from Romania.”
- (16) [Autorul și-a făcut] studiile superioare la Iași, unde e și domiciliul actual, cartierul Tătărași, *adică* nu în zonă centrală. (Lungu, “Prezentare”, in *Antologia LiterNet*, vol. 1)
 “[The author pursued his] higher education in Jassy, where he resides at present, in the district of Tătărași, *that is* not in a downtown area.”

Sometimes the RM *adică* introduces definite descriptions, which add new information to the narrative universe created by the text:

- (17) E o cameră înaltă, văruiată în alb, cu un birou imens, câteva scaune și trei fișete metalice. Are o fereastră mare, chiar spre stradă. E camera secretarului primăriei, *adică* a tatălui meu. (Lungu, *Cinci, cinci și jumătate*)
 “It is a tall room, painted white, with a huge writing desk, several chairs and three metal-filling cabinets. There is a big window facing the street. It’s the town clerk’s room, *that is* my father’s.”
- (18) Șeful era la punctul silvic, *adică* la a treia casă. (Chiriță, *Cireșarii*, vol. 1)
 “The boss was at the forestry district office, *that is*, the third house down.”

3.3. Enumeration – Summary

A reformulation can consist of two opposite operations: either an enumeration of the elements forming a set or a summary resumption of a series of relatively similar elements by a collective noun:

- (19) Eu îi ofer un supeu — *adică* o porție de șuncă cu *pickles* englezești; o bucată de Camembert, două banane, o sticlută de vin Medoc, o cafea neagră și o cutie cu țigări egiptene. (Minulescu, *Corijent la limba română*)
 “I offer her supper – *i.e.*, a slice of ham with English pickles, a piece of Camembert cheese, two bananas, a small bottle of Medoc wine, a cup of black coffee, and a box of Egyptian cigarettes.”
- (20) Cele două domnișoare, un cavaler și bineînțeleș șoferul, *adică* toți pasagerii mașinii, făcură mare haz. (Chiriță, *Cireșarii*, vol. 1)

“The two young ladies, a young man and, of course, the driver, *that is* all the passengers of the car, had a good laugh about it.”

(21) Meritam cu toții, și Penke și corpul expediționar (*adică* eu și tanti Ralița), masa pe care o admir, întinsă în sufragerie. Mai corect, cele ce se află pe masă. (Mușatescu, *De-a baba oarba*)
 „We, Penke and the expeditionary force (*that is* aunt Ralița and I) deserve the table I’m admiring, laid out in the dining room. Or, to be exact, what is on this table.”

The clarifying intrapersonal stances seem to have two essential forms of manifestations, correction and (some forms of) explanation. Corrections deal with the exact transposition in words of the speaker’s thoughts or with a (more) accurate description of the topic of the conversation (examples 1–5). On other occasions, the second utterance introduced by the RM indicates the fact that the speaker has changed his/her opinion (examples 6–7), so the second utterance transmits a form of correction-actualisation. All the other occurrences of the intrapersonal *adică* (definitions, synonyms, information about encyclopaedic terms, enumeration, summary, etc.) express the speaker’s attempt to make the listener better understand what was said.

4. Interpersonal Stances

In other situations, the speaker rewords his/her message to help the listener(s), if (s)he realises or supposes that at least a part of his/her utterance was not understood. (S)he then adds new information, to bring it in line with the prescriptions of Grice’s Maxim of Manner (“Avoid obscurity of expression. Avoid ambiguity”), despite the additional effort involved.

The occurrence of RMs introducing interpersonal stances indicates the speaker’s determination to ensure the best possible transmission of information, an attitude that is consistent with Grice’s conversational theory. It is another side of the ‘normal’ human behaviour, which is rational and cooperative.

4.1. Definitions

If the speaker uses a word or a phrase that is complicated, difficult to understand or too technical, (s)he can give its definition:

(22) Am învățat diferite opus, *adică* chipuri de așezare a cărămizilor în structura [zidului] (Călinescu, *Un arhitect*, interview in *Contemporanul*, no. 45, 6.11.1964, reprinted in *Enigma Otiliei*)

“I learned about various opus, *that is* manners of arranging bricks in masonry construction.”

(23) A apărut întâi un volum timid de „postume” – *adică* poezii definitive care nu au fost publicate de poet în timpul vieții lui... (Topîrceanu, *Eminescu și epigonii lui*).

“First, they published a modest little volume of ‘posthumous’ poems – *that is* finished poems that the poet did not publish during his lifetime.”

In his/her attempt to make his message clearer, occasionally the speaker gives approximate which (s)he considers more comprehensible and more suitable to the encyclopaedic knowledge of the addressees (Sperber and Wilson 1986), generally exact in the genus but inaccurate in the distinguishing characteristic:

(24) Aici la noi, în Bagdad, fiecare mahala își are geamia ei, cu câte un imam, *adică* popă, care e dator să facă rugăciunile la orele hotărâte după lege. (Caragiale, *Abu Hassan*)

„Here, in Bagdad, each neighbourhood has its mosque with an imam, *that is* a priest, who has the duty of saying the prayers at the hours established in the ritual.

(25) Măria sa Ștefan-Vodă [...] luase cu sine trei mii de lefegii nemți, *adică* pașiri, și alte patru mii de călărime ușoară, cu căpitanii lor. (Sadoveanu, *Frații Jderi*)

“His majesty Stefan Voivode [...] was accompanied by three thousand German mercenaries, *i.e.*, horsemen, and another four thousand light cavalries with their captains.”

4.2. Narrowing and Broadening (*Ad Hoc* Concepts)

Linguistic expressions, even used in their literal sense, often have a more or less wide range of meanings. It is another manifestation of the economic organisation of the linguistic code because having a (relatively) small number of lexical units implies less effort of memory. Usually, the (linguistic and/or situational) context provides precise enough information to allow listeners to realise what the utterer intended to say. However, if the contextual information is not sufficient, a reformulation can help narrow down the set of possible meanings and bring more precision as to the particular significance of the phrase used.

The phenomenon of widening and, especially, that of narrowing (two concepts proposed by cognitive pragmatics, Sperber and Wilson 1986, 2004, 2007) are put about a psychological phenomenon discussed by psychologists like Barsalou (1983): the *ad hoc* concepts.

Relevance theory holds that all lexical conceptual units have a corresponding concept in the mental language (the so-called “mentalese”). The relationship between words and concepts is expressed originally in the linguistic code. This correspondence is another manifestation of the economical organisation of language, and it is what every speaker (child or adult) learns first. Nevertheless, in actual communication words can express concepts that are not codified, a phenomenon studied by “lexical pragmatics”, which borrowed the idea of *ad hoc* concepts from psychology (Barsalou 1983; Wilson 2003; Kida 2015).

During the process of communication, concepts are often “adjusted”, modified, and modulated by the context. There are fundamentally two types of semantic approximation: the new concept can convey a more specific sense than the codified meaning (*narrowing*) or on the contrary, the word can be used to give a larger, more general sense, so that its linguistically-specified denotation is wider (*broadening*) (cf. Wilson 2003, 274).

In her discussion of narrowing, Wilson (2003) cites various examples. For instance, *this coat cost 1,000 dollars* can signify “about 1,000 dollars”. In *all doctors drink*, the verb *to drink* may signify, as normally in its encoded sense, “drink liquid” but also, more especially, “drink alcohol (in excess)”. The sentence *I have a temperature* does not convey the obvious information that the speaker has some temperature, but that this temperature is higher than usual, higher enough to be a fever, a medical sign (Wilson 2003, 274).

Broadening is also called “category extension”: in *brown is the new black*, the adjective *black* means “fashionable colour”, *the water is boiling* conveys an approximate meaning if the water is sufficiently close to the boiling point, or is hyperbole if the water is simply hotter than expected (Wilson 2003, 275).

The use of the RM emphasises another aspect of the formation of *ad hoc* concepts. The same phrase can have several meanings, depending not only on the context but also on the speaker’s “mental universe” (Fr. “l’univers mental”) described by Robert Martin (1987). For instance, the phrase *carte de valoare* “valuable book” can have various intended senses: “very well-written book (by a famous writer)”, “book containing valuable information”, “well-printed book (on glossy paper)”, “book in leather/Morocco binding”, “book from a limited, precious first edition”, etc. This situation explains the necessity of introducing an explanation, to make the information conveyed explicit:

(26) [Se distrug] cărți de valoare, *adică* ilustrate de pictori și gravori celebri. (Preda, *Cel mai iubit dintre pământeni*, vol. 1)

“-[They are destroying] valuable books, *that is* illustrated by famous painters and engravers.”

A large number of phrases have multiple meanings, which often causes the speaker to add a narrowing piece of information to be clearer. This is the case of expressions having a vague meaning (example 27) or a metaphorical one (example 28). Sometimes, as in (27), it is the addressee who requests this narrowing:

(27) MIȚA: Cum este amanta dumitale?

PAMPON: Cum să fie *adică*?

MIȚA: De roșu, de ghindă, de tobă, ori de verde?

PAMPON: De verde... (Caragiale, *De-ale carnavalului*)

“MIȚA: What kind of queen is your mistress?

PAMPON: What do you *mean*?

MIȚA: Of hearts, of clubs, of diamonds, of spades?

PAMPON: Of spades.”

(28) – Să ne-ntoarcem la oile noastre, *adică* la mine și la Mamarița. (Mușatescu, *De-a puia-gaia*)

“- Let us return to our mutttons, *or rather* to me and Mamarița.”

The opposite phenomenon, that of broadening, is less frequent. In our corpus, we found an example offered by the word *acasă* “at (one’s own) home”, which can be used also to designate an accommodation rented for a relatively short period, for instance, to spend a holiday:

(29) - Ce cauți aici?

- Nimic. Sunt la mine acasă, *adică* la gazda mea... (Mușatescu, *De-a baba oarba*)
- “- What are you doing here?
- Nothing. I am at home; *I mean* at my landlady’s.”

Words belonging to the basic vocabulary, which are very frequent, develop various meanings that, sometimes, lead to real short circuits in communication. In the following fragment, the two interlocutors fail to understand each other because they use the verb *a merge* “to go” in three different senses:

(i) “to walk, to move forward” (as in *bătrâna merge cu pași mici* “the old woman is moving forward in small steps”),

(ii) for a device, “to work, to run” (as in *telegraful/ televizorul merge cu electricitate* “the telegraph/ the TV set work on electricity”), and lastly

(iii) “be possible” as in *asta nu merge* “this is impossible, this cannot/ won’t work”:

(30) - Sergent, na tabachera asta, să mi-o trimiți acasă. [...] Trimite-o cu tiligrafu!

- Nu merge, trăiți, don căpitan... telegraful nu duce decât idei...
- Cum nu merge, rătane?
- *Adică* merge... [...] Dați-mi voie să vă spui...
- Vorbește!
- Telegrafu ăsta nu merge...
- Bine-bine, nu merge... Știu eu că nu merge, că nu-i o bătrână să meargă...
- *Adică* merge...
- Firește că merge, că de-aia-i tiligraf! (Anton Bacalbașa, *Moș Teacă – Telegraful regimentului*)
- “- Sergeant, take this snuffbox and send it to my address [...] Send it by telegraph.
- That won’t work, with all due respect, sir, the telegraph only carries ideas...
- What do you mean ‘it won’t work’, soldier?
- *I mean*, it works. If I may...
- Speak up!
- This telegraph does not work.
- All right, agreed. I know it doesn’t work; it’s got no hand to work with...
- *I mean*, it works...
- Of course, it works! That’s what it’s for, the telegraph!”

4.3. Anaphora Resolution

The speaker may use a different turn of phrase to resolve an anaphora, the new, reformulated sentence accomplishing a sort of ‘binding’, i.e., making the connection between a pronoun (deictic or not) or another nominal element needing a semantic completion and its antecedent:

(31) E o datorie sfântă, pentru familie! spunea el, soțul meu *adică*. (Breban, *Bunavestire*)

“It is a sacred duty, for the family” he used to say, my husband, *I mean*.”

(32) Minutele trecură și, ca și pe peronul gării Brașov, ea păru că uitase că e cu cineva, cu el, *adică*. (Breban, *Bunavestire*)

“The minutes went by and, just like when she was on the station platform in Brașov, she seemed to forget that she was with someone, *that is*, with him.”

Explanations are often needed if the speaker switches between direct and indirect speech as in the following fragment where the speaker, Trahanache, reads out a letter to his listener, Tipătescu, who is his wife’s lover and the author of the letter:

(33) [...] vino tu (*adică* nevastă-mea, Joițica), la cocoșelul tău (*adică* tu) care te adoră. (Caragiale, *O scrisoare pierdută*)

“[...] so why don’t you (*that is*, my wife, Zoe) come here quickly to your loving rooster (*that is*, you), who adores you.”

An RM introduces sometimes a nominal anaphora, that is bound to a preceding expression:

- (34) Toate ar fi mers bine, dacă ar fi fost de părerea noastră și ‘Turcu’, *adică* unchiul Costică, cum era poreclit tatăl respectivei Juliete. (Băjenaru, *Cișmigiu*)
 “Everything would have worked out, if our opinion had been shared by ‘the Turk’, *meaning* Uncle Costică (‘the Turk’ being the nickname of this Juliet’s father).”
- (35) Iară verii, *adică* feciorii craiului și fetele împăratului, nu se văzuse niciodată de când erau ei. (Creangă, *Povestea lui Harap Alb*)
 “And the cousins, *meaning* the king’s sons and the emperor’s daughters, had never met before.”

4.4. Translations

Reformulations may be in the form of translations, which, in our corpus, are of two sorts: semiotic (non-verbal) or cross-languages. When non-verbal communication is ambiguous the speaker/ author can give a verbal “translation” of the described action:

- (36) - Ce facultate urmezi, băiete?
 - Arheologia. Clipi cu subînțeles:
 - *Adică* sap! (Ojog-Brașoveanu, *Minerva se dezlănțuie*)
 “- What faculty do you attend, Sonny?
 - Archaeology. He winked ironically.
 - *Meaning*, I dig.”
- (37) - Când a plecat? Mitică amestecă cu mâna dreaptă și arată cu cea stângă spre ușă, *adică*: acușic-a plecat. (Caragiale, *Inspecțiune*)
 “- When did he leave? Mitică stirs his drink with his right hand and shows the door with his left, *meaning*: he just left.”

In the cross-language translation, the speaker who used an expression in a foreign language translates it into Romanian:

- (38) “Halt”, zise neamțul. *Adică*, pe românește, “stai pe loc”. (Mușatescu, *De-a baba orba*)
 “Halt” said the German. *That is*, in Romanian “*stai pe loc*” “don’t move!”
- (39) A fost vorba că merg *à la fortune du pot* (*adică*, pe românește, să te mulțumești cu ce s-o găsi). (Caragiale, *Mici economii*)
 “He invited me to dine *à la fortune du pot* (*that is*, in Romanian, a potluck dinner, be happy with what can be found.)”

5. Conclusions

Reformulated sentences (with or without a specific RM) express the speaker’s attempt to make his/her message as understandable as possible, even at the price of increased effort. This attitude contradicts the principle of minimum effort. It follows that speakers often prefer to use further energy to be sure that their message will be better understood, a fact in line with Grice’s cooperative principle (Grice 1975). In our opinion, the mere existence of RMs shows that the minimum effort principle and what we can call the “clearer communication” principle are not equal, despite what the current pragmatic theories seem to suggest. The “clearer message” principle often supplants the minimum effort principle, sometimes as the spontaneous choice of a self-critical speaker, occasionally at the explicit request of the addressee.

The fact that the speaker corrects himself spontaneously clearly shows that after pronouncing the utterance, new mental processes take place both in the speaker’s and the addressee’s mind. The speaker’s reformulation is a manifestation of his/ her (negative) estimation of the accuracy and/ or the accessibility of what was said and of his/her effort to make adjustments.

The examination of RMs also reveals types of *ad hoc* concepts, beyond those proposed by current lexical pragmatics studies: when it comes to phrases, it is difficult to associate them with a unique “encoded meaning”. Phrases, more than isolated words, often express a bundle of meanings, a situation that often requires reformulations and explanations.

Sources

- Bacalbaşa, Anton (1893), *Moş Teacă*; Wikisource⁷
- Băjenaru, Grigore (1942), *Çişmigiu et Comp.*; <https://docs.google.com/leaf?id...sort=name&layout=list&pid>.
- Breban, Nicolae (1977), *Bunavestire*; <https://www.uploady.com#!/download/4uK8xxctvwy/swYKzC3CeNivHLL>.
- Caragiale, Ion Luca (1884), *O scrisoare pierdută*; Wikisource.
- Caragiale, Ion Luca (1885), *De-ale carnavalului*; Wikisource
- Caragiale, Ion Luca (1901), *Momente și schițe*; Wikisource.
- Caragiale, Ion Luca (1908), *Nuvele și povestiri*; Wikisource.
- Călinescu, George (1938), *Enigma Otiliei*, vol. 1; <http://www.bp-soroca.md/pdf/Calinescu%20George%20-%20Enigma%20Otiliei%20>.
- Chiriță, Constantin (1956), *Cireșarii*, vol. 1: *Cavalerii florii de cireș*; <http://www.youblisher.com/p/605250-Constantin-Chirita-Ciresarii>.
- Creangă, Ion (1877), *Povești și povestiri*; Wikisource.
- Lungu, Dan (2002) “Cinci, cinci și jumătate.” In *Antologia LiterNet2002*, vol. 1, 133–138; <http://editura.liternet.ro/>.
- Minulescu, Ion (1929), *Corigent la limba română*; <https://bvbiblioteca.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/minulescu-ion-corigent-la-limba-romana-carte.pdf>.
- Mușatescu, Vlad (1975), *De-a puia gaia*, ebook Editura LiterNet (2005); <http://editura.liternet.ro/>.
- Mușatescu, Vlad (1976), *De-a baba oarba*, ebook, Editura LiterNet (2010); <http://editura.liternet.ro/>.
- Ojog-Brașoveanu, Rodica (1974), *Minerva se dezlănțuie*; <https://www.scribd.com/doc/278046255/5/>.
- Preda, Marin (1980), *Cel mai iubit dintre pământeni*, vol. 1; <https://www.google.ro/#q=marin+preda+cel+mai+iubit+dintre+pamanteni+pdf>
- Sadoveanu, Mihail (1935-1942) *Frații Jderi*, vol. 1-3; <https://bookspot.ro/carte-online/fratii-jderimihail-sadoveanu-download>.
- Topîrceanu, George (1911), *Articole, cronici, recenzii*; Wikisource.

References

- Barsalou, Lawrence W. (1983), “Ad Hoc Categories.” *Memory and Cognition* 11: 211–227.
- Benamara, Farah/ Maite Taboada/ Yannick Mathieu (2017), “Evaluative Language beyond Bags of Words: Linguistic Insights and Computational Applications”, *Computational Linguistics* 43 (1): 201–264; available also at DOI: [10.1162/COLI_a_00278](https://doi.org/10.1162/COLI_a_00278)
- Berman, Rut/ Hrafnhildur Ragnardóttir/ Sven Strömqvist (2002), “Discourse Stance: Written and Spoken Language”, *Written Language & Literacy* 5 (2): 255–289; available also at DOI: [10.1075/wll.5.2.06ber](https://doi.org/10.1075/wll.5.2.06ber)
- Biber, Douglas (2004), “Historical Patterns for the Grammatical Marking of Stance. A Cross-Register Comparison.” *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 5 (1): 107–136.
- Biber, Douglas (2006), “Stance in Spoken and Written University Register.” *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 5: 97–116.
- Biber Douglas/ Edward Finegan (1989a), “Adverbial Stance Types in English.” *Discourse Processes* 11: 1–34; available also at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01638538809544689>
- Biber Douglas/ Edward Finegan (1989b), “Styles of Stance in English: Lexical and Grammatical Marking of Evidentiality and Affect.” *Text* 9 (1): 99–124.
- Biber, Douglas/ Stig Johansson/ Geoffrey Leech/ Susan Conrad/ Edward Finegan (1999), *The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, London: Longman.
- Blakemore, Diane (1993), “The Relevance of Reformulations”, *Language and Literature* 2: 101–120.
- Chindamo, Massimo/ Jens Allwood/ Elisabeth Ahlsén (2012), “Some Suggestions for the Study of Stance in Communication.” In *2012 International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust and 2012 International Conference on Social Computing*, 617–622. Amsterdam: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE); available also at DOI: [10.1109/SocialCom-PASSAT.2012.89](https://doi.org/10.1109/SocialCom-PASSAT.2012.89).
- Du Bois, John (2007), “The stance triangle”, in Robert Englebretson (ed.) *Stancetaking in Discourse. Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 139–182
- Eshkol-Taravella, Iris/ Natalia Grabar (2014), “Repérage et analyse de la reformulation paraphrastique dans les corpus oraux.” In *Le 21^{ème} Traitement Automatique des Langues Naturelles*, Marseille; available at <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/F14-1027>.
- Eshkol-Taravella, Iris/ Natalia Grabar (2016), “Reformulation à l’oral et dans le forum Web”, in *Congrès mondial de Linguistique Française*, available at DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20184611003>.
- Fiorentini, Ilaria/ Andrea Sansò (2017), “Reformulation Markers and Their Functions: Two Case Studies from Italian”, *Journal of Pragmatics* 120 (1), 54–72.

⁷ The texts marked ‘Wikisource’ are available at <https://ro.wikisource.org/wiki/>.

- Ghezzi, Chiara (2014), “The Development of Discourse and Pragmatic Markers”, in Chiara Ghezzi/ Piera Molinelli (eds.) *Discourse and Pragmatic Markers from Latin to the Romance Languages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 10 - 28.
- Ghezzi, Chiara/ Piera Molinelli (2014), “Discourse and Pragmatic Markers from Latin to Romance Languages: New Insights”, in Chiara Ghezzi/ Piera Molinelli (eds.) *Discourse and Pragmatic Markers from Latin to the Romance Languages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1- 9.
- Grice, Paul. (1975), “Logic and Conversation”, in Peter Cole/ J. L. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics, vol. 3: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, 41-58..
- Grice, Paul (ed.) (1989), *Studies in the Way of Words*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Horn, Laurence (1984), “Toward a New Taxonomy for Pragmatic Inference: Q-based and R-based implicature”, in Deborah Schiffrin (ed.) *Meaning, Form and Use in Context*, Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 1- 42.
- Hunston Susan/ Geoffrey Thompson (2000), *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Jaffe, Alexandra (ed.) (2009), *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, Edward/ Victor Harris (1967), “The Attribution of Attitudes.” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 3 (1): 1-24.
- Kida, Kohreu (2015), “Prédicat argumentatif et concept *ad hoc*”, *Travaux de linguistique*, 1, 121–137; available also at <https://www.cairn.info/revue-travaux-de-linguistique-2015-1-page-121.html>.
- Kiesling, Scott F. (2009), “Style as Stance; Stance as the Explanation for Patterns of Sociolinguistic Variation”, in Alexandra Jaffe (ed.) *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 171-193.
- Lopez Macário, Ana Cristina (2014), “*Aliás*: A Contribution to the Study of a Portuguese Discourse Marker”, in Chiara Ghezzi/ Piera Molinelli (eds.) *Discourse and Pragmatic Markers from Latin to the Romance Languages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 211- 221.
- Martin, Robert (1987), *Langage et croyance: les « univers de croyance » dans la théorie sémantique*. Liège: Pierre Mardaga.
- Martinet, André, (1955), *Économie des changements phonétiques*, Berna: A. Francke.
- Martinet, André, (1960), *Éléments de linguistique générale*, Paris, Armand Colin.
- Pons Borderia, Salvador (2014), “Path of Grammaticalisation in Spanish: *o sea*”, in Chiara Ghezzi/ Piera Molinelli (eds.) *Discourse and Pragmatic Markers from Latin to the Romance Languages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 109-136.
- Precht, Kristen (2003). “Stance moods in spoken English: Evidentiality and affect in British and American conversation”, *Text* 23, 239-257.
- Rubio-Fernández, Paola (2008), “Concept Narrowing: The Role of Context-independent Information”, *Journal of Semantics* 25: 381–409; available also at DOI: [10.1093/jos/ffn004](https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffn004).
- Scherer, Klaus (2005), “What Are Emotions? And How Can They Be Measured?” *Social Science Information* 44 (4): 695 - 729.
- Sperber, Dan/ Deirdre Wilson (1986), *Relevance Communication and Cognition*, Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Sperber, Dan/ Deirdre Wilson (2004), “Relevance Theory”, in Laurence Horn/ Gregory Ward (eds.) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 607-632.
- Silver, Marc (2003), “The Stance of Stance: A Critical Look at Ways Stance is Expressed and Modelled in Academic Discourse”, *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 2: 359–374. DOI: [10.1016/S1475-1585\(03\)00051-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(03)00051-1).
- Silverstein, Michael (1976), “Shifters, Linguistic Categories, and Cultural Description”, in Keith H. Basso/ Henry A. Selby (eds.), *Meaning in Anthropology*, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 11- 55.
- Sperber, Dan/ Wilson, Deirdre (2005), “Pragmatics”, in Frank Jackson/ Michael Smith (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Contemporary Philosophy*, 468–501, DOI: [10.1098/oxfordhb/9780199234769.003.0018](https://doi.org/10.1098/oxfordhb/9780199234769.003.0018).
- Wilson, Deirdre (2003), “Relevance and Lexical Pragmatics”, in *Rivista di Linguistica* 15 (2): 273–291; available also at <http://www.italian-journal-linguistics.com/wp-content/uploads/03.Wilson.pdf>.
- Wilson, Deirdre/ Dan Sperber (2004), “Relevance Theory”, in Laurence Horn/ Gregory Ward (eds.) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 607- 632.
- Wilson, Deirdre/ Patricia Kolaiti (2017), “Lexical Pragmatics and Implicit Communication”, in Piotr Cap/ Marta Dynel (eds.) *Implicitness: From Lexis to Discourse*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 147-175.