*Conclu** in English and Italian historical research articles

Silvia Cacchiani

University of Modena and Reggio Emilia

Abstract: This paper integrates the tools of corpus linguistics and a more genre-oriented perspective in order to explore the lemmatizations of *conclu** in the Conclusions of English and Italian research articles in history. Specifically, the main emphasis is placed on second-level Summarizers and concluders (Siepmann 2005) and the way they interact with other discourse markers and metadiscourse across moves. As will be seen, SLDMs represent a marked option, in that they add extra-meaning to their more general, more transparent, more frequent, and less specific counterparts. Whereas variation within the unit or pattern results from combinations with discourse markers from the same or other categories, variation across English and Italian is better accounted for within an interpersonal model of metadiscourse (Hyland 2004, 2008), in terms of different strategies on the interactional level.

1 Introduction

Research articles (RAs) have long been a major concern in research in English for Academic Purposes (for one, Swales 1990). Recent developments into corpus compilation and the development of query tools have increasingly enabled researchers to shift the focus on other genres and on cross-linguistic variation. Whereas EAP studies and register studies alike have chiefly looked at language variation across genres and disciplines (e.g. Hyland & Bondi (eds.) 2006), it is the purpose of this paper to concentrate on cross-linguistic and cross-cultural variation in English and Italian RAs of history and on the rhetorical features of the Conclusions section in particular. Specifically, the aim of this study is to look at the use of relatively

infrequent connectors signalling coherence relations in a small comparable corpus of English and Italian historical RAs.

The rationale behind this study is provided by research on the role played by local and disciplinary cultures and work on the rhetorical organization of the text. EAP research (Fløttum *et al*. 2006) suggests that what shapes identity within a genre are factors such as the author's national native language culture, the world of the academia - which provides the author with a general academic identity -, the author's discipline and disciplinary identity, features of the genre, and the discourse community. We can therefore expect cultural variation for the same genre in different languages.

Additionally, contrastive rhetoric and studies on L2 writing have shown that L2 writers tend to reproduce L1 patterns of text organization. Lexical research for translation has examined the treatment of specific words in monolingual learner's dictionaries and of their translation equivalents in bilingual dictionaries using corpus analysis to illustrate how meaning descriptions and other information provided in the dictionary do not always account for the differences in meaning and use of dictionary equivalents. Although many languages have similar connectors, they may be used differently across different languages and genres. Using dictionary equivalents may result in unusual writing, with particular connectors being over- or underrepresented. Whereas this is true of single words, it is all the more so for multi-word units with different degrees of fixedness. Connectors may indeed be characterized as a learning, translation, and writing problem. While phraseological competence is a feature of native speakers (Howarth 1996), fairly proficient non-native speakers transform, under-represent, over-generalize or extend specific L2 patterns, and their writing turns out to be less effective (see De Cock 1998, Granger 1998, Siepmann 2005, among others).

Turning to English-Italian cross-linguistic studies, in their reference grammar of modern Italian Maiden & Robustelli (2000) observe that the same connectors are used differently across

the two languages. Whereas frequent recourse to connectors such as *invece* [instead] and *infatti* [indeed, but, sure enough] is a feature of Italian, the underlying coherence relation is more often left implicit in English. Possibly as a consequence of the lack of large comparable and parallel corpora, contrastive and translation studies of English and Italian seem to have overlooked the issue. When connectors are taken into account, the main emphasis is placed on lexicalized and relatively frequent one-word connectors of the type listed in bilingual desk dictionaries (cf. Bruti 1999, Musacchio & Palumbo 2009).

In line with recent work in English for Academic Purposes and the first corpus-based studies which attempt to highlight (dis-)similarities across words and bundles in English and Italian academic genres (Bondi & Diani 2008, Bondi & Mazzi 2008), our analysis takes the first steps towards redressing the research imbalance between functionally equivalent one-word and multi-word connectors in English and Italian. To this purpose, we shall integrate the mainly qualitative results of a preliminary corpus-based and corpus-driven analysis with a more genre-oriented perspective on the Conclusions of English and Italian RAs in history.

Specifically, we address the issue of identifying a rationale behind the uses, functions and behaviour of 'second-level discourse markers' (SLDMs), i.e. cohesive devices which seem to be especially infrequent in the text (Siepmann 2005, see Section 2.1). The main emphasis lies into the way Summarizers and concluders interact with the partially overlapping category of Reformulators and resumers, and with Inferrers and other categories, within the concluding moves (Swales 1990, 2004) of English and Italian historical research articles. In doing so, we proceed on the assumption that SLDMs introduce more specialized and precise meanings than their more frequent counterparts (usually one-word or lexicalized units), and that these meanings point to an overlap between elements of interactive and interactional metadiscourse. This can be shown shifting the focus from an initial and much needed overview of the above-

mentioned categories, to *conclu**, its lemmatizations and their interplay with other metadiscourse.

The advantage of this integrated approach rests on the reflection it will offer on RA Conclusions, a section most often neglected in genre-based studies (though see Bondi & Mazzi 2008), and, secondly, on the contribution it gives to research into the whys and wherefores of English and Italian multi-word units as expressions of specific local and disciplinary cultures.

2. Methods and materials

The data for this study come from the *HEM-History_EN* and the *HEM-History_IT*. The *HEM-History_EN* was built and is currently held at the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia. It comprises approximately 2,700,000 tokens. The articles were downloaded electronically from academic journals addressing an international audience. They were nominated by disciplinary experts as among the leading publications in history. They span the years 1999-2000. The journals in the English corpus are: *American Historical Review (AHR), American Quarterly (AQ), Gender & History (GH), Historical Research (HR), Journal of European Ideas (JEI), Journal of Interdisciplinary History (JIH), Journal of Medieval History (JMH), Journal of Social History (JSH), Labour History Review (LHR), Studies in History (SH)*.

The Italian corpus obviously addresses a more restricted, national audience. All the journals are only available in paper format, which slowed down the compilation process. It is currently in its final stage of construction and covers a parallel range of disciplines in history for the years 1999-2001. The journals comprising the Italian corpus are: *Dimensioni e problemi della ricerca storica (DPRS), Il pensiero politico (PP), Intersezioni (INT), Meridiana (MER), Passato e presente (PeP), Quaderni medievali (QM), Società e storia (SES), Studi medievali (SM)*.

Since only approximately 1,000,000 tokens have already reached the final revision stage, the investigation is restricted to this initial sample, from the journals *Il pensiero politico (PP), Intersezioni (INT), Meridiana (MER), Passato e presente (PeP), Quaderni medievali (QM)*, and to their closest English counterparts: *Historical Research (HR), Journal of Interdisciplinary History (JIH), Journal of Social History (JSH), Journal of Medieval History (JMH), Labour History Review (LHR)*. The English and Italian used in the papers are taken to be representative of the language standard accepted for publication by leading journals in the relevant disciplines.

The focus is on Summarizers and concluders, Inferrers, Reformulators and resumers, and on the way they are or may be found to interact in the text, within multi-word units or extended collocations. Whereas this amounts to taking into account variability within a string, the relatively small size of our corpus and the inflectional nature of Italian, a pro-drop language, do not make our data a sufficient basis for extensive generalization and practical applications (e.g. in bilingual lexicography and the teaching of L2 academic writing). At this initial stage of research we therefore set out to test whether and to what extent previous observations on the above categories can be extended from other genres and disciplines to historical RAs and from English to Italian.

Specifically, after introducing a working definition of the items under discussion against the background of current debate on phraseology (Section 2.1), we use Mike Scott's (1998) *WordSmith Tools*, and, based on a combination of corpus-based and corpus-driven procedures, we provide a list of Summarizers and concluders, Inferrers, Reformulators and resumers (Section 3). The second part of the study (Section 4) qualifies as a more genre-oriented investigation. Focussing on *conclu** and its lemmatizations within the relevant concordance lines and extended text in the Viewer, Summarizers and concluders, Reformulators and resumers, and Inferrers, are studied with a view to understanding the rationale behind their uses

and functions in the concluding moves (Swales 1990, 2004) of English and Italian historical RAs.

2.1 One-word and multi-word units

The context of this analysis is provided by previous work in contrastive rhetoric, phraseology and cultural and disciplinary variation in metadiscourse. More specifically, we bank heavily on Siepmann's (2005) corpus-based taxonomy of 'second-level discourse markers' (cf. Table 1), which also takes into account studies on metadiscourse (Vande Kopple 1985, Hyland 2005), the pragmatics of discourse markers (Fraser 1988), and work in rhetorical structure theory (Mann & Thompson 1998, Mann 1999).

1	Comparison and contrast markers	*The same can be said for*; *Analogously*; *It is one thing … It is another*
2	Concession markers	*It would be a mistake (+to inf.)*; *[Although] it could be argued …, it is also worth remembering that*
3	Exemplifiers	*as with*; *to paint an extreme example, consider*
4	Explainers	*This is because*; *The explanation seems*
5	Definers	*An X is a Y such that*; *Narrowly defined*
6	Enumerators	*(First) we should consider*; *Beyond this*
7	Summarizers and concluders	*A final point:*; *It remains for me (+to inf.)*
8	Inferrers	*So it turns out that*; *This is not to imply that*
9	Cause and reason markers	*A number of factors account for this.*; *There are two main reasons for this.*
10	Announcers	*I will now briefly describe*; *Consideration of … must be left until*
11	Topic initiators (or topic shifters)	*It is often said that*; *Now consider*

12	Excluders	*Space limitations preclude*; *This is not the place*
13	Digression markers	*It should be mentioned in passing that*; *Incidentally*
14	Question and answer markers	*The question then arises:*; *The next obvious question is*
15	Emphasizers	*It must be emphasized that*; *note that/Note NP*;
16	Informers	*It should be recognized that*; *A first point is that*
17	Clarification markers	*But that is not the point.*; *The key point is that*
18	Suggestors	*One thing is certain:*; *It will be readily seen that*
19	Hypothesis and model markers	*It is a fair guess that*; *Let us imagine that*
20	Restrictors	*To further confound the picture*; *A further problem is that*
21	Referrers and attributors	*[name] argues*; *it has been seen that*
22	Reformulators and resumers	*Put another way,*; *in other words*

Table 1. Siepmann's (2005) taxonomy of second-level discourse markers

Whereas 'first-level discourse markers' (FLDMs) are especially frequent units traditionally recorded in the dictionary, second-level discourse markers (SLDMs) are "medium-frequency fixed expressions or collocations composed of two or more printed words acting as a single unit. Their function is to facilitate the process of interpreting coherence relation(s) between elements, sequences or text segments and/or aspects of the communicative situation" (Siepmann 2005: 52). They are relatively infrequent fixed-expressions and collocations (less than 200 tokens per million words), and, we may want to add, combinations of one-word units. They allow for variation of at least one element within the recurring pattern, and they are 'cue phrases' in the sense of Knott & Dale (1994) and Knott & Sanders (1998). Although the units gathered from our corpora are highly infrequent and cannot be viewed as SLDMs at least in this respect, we still retain the label for lack of a better term.

SLDMs may result from accumulation of markers (*(First) we should consider*; *To paint an extreme example, consider*) and are not restricted to 'lexical bundles' (Scott 1997: 'clusters'), or word strings that appear in a genre more frequently than expected by chance, and occur in multiple texts in that genre (Biber *et al*. 1999, Biber 2006). Siepmann's (2005) work on SLDMs broadens the picture and shifts the focus from recurrent word strings to variability within the string itself, as in *To give/take/paint an (extreme) example, (let's) consider/take/turn to*. Table 1 also reveals that SLDMs can be realized as structurally complete set expressions (*But this is not the point.*) and structurally incomplete ones (*Put another way*), sentence fragments (anticipatory *It* + VP, as in *It has been seen that*), and sentence-integrated markers (*as with*). To put it with Granger & Paquot (2008), they are phraseological units which serve a textual function: complex conjuctions (*given that*), linking adverbials (*in other words*), textual sentence stems (*the final point is*). Communicative, attitudinal formulae can be found (*It is clear that*) and may interact with textual phrasemes.

The determining factor for distinguishing SLDMs is their textual function, which can be identified on the basis of the coherence relation(s) signalled by the corresponding FLDM(s). Within Hyland's (2005) interpersonal model of metadiscourse, signals of coherence relations typically belong to 'interactive metadiscourse', which helps orient the reader through the text. A second dimension, the 'interactional' one, concerns the way writers involve the reader in the text. SLDMs cross-cut both categories. Consider, in this respect, the Emphasizer *note that*, an 'engagement marker' in Hyland's (2004) model, which explicitly builds the writer's relationship with the reader, or *It is clear that*, which can categorize as an Inferrer, and a 'booster', which emphasizes certainty. *It is a fair guess that*, an Hypothesis marker, also qualifies as a 'hedge' in that it withholds complete commitment to a proposition. Likewise, 'self mentions', which refer to the degree of explicit author presence in the text measured by the use of first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives and pronouns, introduce a dimension of

variation in SLDMs (*(First) we should consider*; *it remains for me to*). Finally, 'attitude markers', which express the writer's attitude to the proposition, occur in diverse combinations with and within SLDMs, as in the Concession markers *It would be a mistake to*, or *it is also worth remembering that*.

Expressing 'attitude' is clearly an expression of 'evaluation' on the part of the speaker. Following Hunston & Thompson (2000: 5), by evaluation we mean "the expression of the speaker's or writer's attitude or stance [(Conrad & Biber 2000)] towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about. That attitude may relate to certainty [(epistemic modality)], obligation", evaluation for relevance, and evaluation for good/bad (which can also include moral judgement). Evaluation has a threefold function: besides revealing the value system of the writer and his community and help compose a shared value-system with his/her reader, it may have a role in organizing the discourse, and, third, it may help construct and maintain writer-reader relations (Hunston & Thompson 2008). This brings us back to Hyland's (2005) interactive model of metadiscourse and the developing interest in 'participant-oriented metadiscourse' (next to 'research-oriented' and 'text-oriented' metadiscourse, cf. Hyland 2008). 'Participant-oriented metadiscourse' comprises both 'stance' features, which convey the writer's attitudes and evaluations (*are likely to be*), and 'engagement' features, which address readers directly (*note that*).

If, next to developing a sound argument and producing compelling evidence for one's claims, the persuasive force of an academic text also derives from the writer's ability to engage in a convincing dialogue with the reader, interactional metadiscourse and evaluation cannot be discounted from our treatment of SLDMs. While we adopt Siepmann's (2005) multilingual, corpus-based taxonomy, we thus integrate it with insights from Hyland's (2005, 2008) work on metadiscourse and studies on the transmission of evaluation.

3. Summarizers and concluders, Reformulators and resumers, Inferrers

Summarizers and concluders (Quirk *et al*. 1985: 'summatives') may signal the last element in a list (*finally*) or can be used to sum up (English: *altogether, then, therefore*, and more formal expressions like *to conclude, in conclusion*; Italian: *in breve, Allo scopo di sintetizzare*). Besides introducing the final point in an enumeration, they can introduce a short *summary* of the preceding text, often also serving what Siepmann (2005) calls a 'solutionhood' function. Summarizers and concluders partly overlap with Reformulators and resumers, which reword the lexical content of a text span while also providing additional illustrative, explanatory material. In their turn, both Summarizers and concluders and Reformulators and resumers tend to combine with Inferrers and also serve as Inferrers. Inferrers (Quirk *et al*. 1985: 'resultives') indicate that the truth of one statement follows from the truth of the former. The relevant FLDMs are English *thus, therefore* and Italian *dunque, pertanto.*

In this section we provide lists of functionally equivalent English and Italian Summarizers and concluders, Reformulators and resumers, and Inferrers. Tables 2, 3 and 4 summarize the results of a number of corpus-based and corpus-driven searches. After running five-, four-, three-, and two-token WordLists to get a preliminary list of items, we moved on to a manual selection of possible candidates for analysis on the basis of their concordances and, accordingly, of their functions in context. Whereas cross-linguistic equivalents are matched in the table on the basis of meaning, function and (where possible) structure, a closer investigation into their frequency of occurrence across the two corpora is matter for future research. As is only natural, the shorter the unit, the more frequent its use, and, similarly, the less variable the unit, the more frequent its use. Optional items are given in round brackets and alternative options are separated by a slash. They are more often FLDMs (English *so, thus, therefore*; Italian *dunque, quindi*) or stance features and speech act modifiers (cf. Searle & Vandervecken

1985, Merlini Barbaresi 1997), e.g. English *More specifically* and adjective selection (*It is clear/evident/obvious from*); Italian *Più in particolare*, or *con maggior precisione*.

HEM-History_EN	HEM-History_IT
We may conclude by -ing	*È possibile concludere che*
I'd like/I would like to conclude by -ing	*Come considerazione conclusiva*
This leads to a further conclusion.	X
(So) X provides us with grounds for concluding that	*Concludendo*
In conclusion,	*In conclusione*
A final point:	X
Let us now turn to our final point	*Veniamo ora alle conclusioni (che è possibile ricavare dal nostro lavoro).*
To conclude	*Per concludere*
To sum up	*In sintesi*
X	*Allo scopo di sintetizzare (con maggior precisione)*
What I conclude is that; *I conclude that*	*Come considerazione conclusiva*

Table 2. Summarizers and concluders

HEM-History_EN	HEM-History_IT
In a word,	*In breve*
(And) (More) specifically	*(Più/E più) in particolare*; *Con maggior precisione*
, to be specific,	*Mi riferisco, in particolare, a*
We might call this	*Si tratta di*
Another way … is to	*detto altrimenti:*

Also called	*Altrimenti definito*; *detto altrimenti:*
In another way	*In altre parole,*
To put it differently/another way	*In altri termini,*
Put another way,	*Altrimenti definito*; *detto altrimenti:*
As discussed above	*Come accennato sopra*
To conclude/To sum up	*Si può (quindi) concludere che* *Per concludere*; *Concludendo*; *In conclusione*
X can be summarized as follows	*Si può sintetizzare sottolineando*
X can be summarized by the following table	*La tavola riassume/sintetizza i dati*
To summarize; *Summarizing:*; *In summary*	*In (estrema) sintesi*; *Concludendo*; *In conclusione*
X	*Proviamo a riassumere*
X	*Se dovessimo riassumere schematicamente gli elementi salienti,* + present conditional

Table 3. Reformulators and resumers

HEM-History_EN	HEM-History_IT
The corollary (to such/to this/of this) was/is that	*Questo ha rilevanti implicazioni per*
(Clearly) the implication (here/of this) is that	*Ciò/esso implica che/N* *Le implicazioni di ciò/esso*
The (simplest) conclusion is (thus) that	*Si osserva chiaramente che*
From which/this it follows that	*Da X appare evidente che*
It follows from this (therefore) that …	*Da cui,*
It (therefore) comes as no surprise that	X
It is obvious/evident that; *What is obvious is that*	X

Hence, X are likely to affect	*Questi dati confermano che*
It (therefore) seems likely (therefore)/ appears that	*Ciò indica probabilmente che*
This is not, of course, to imply that	X
Adj by implication,	X
That this is the case is (further) suggested by; *That this is not the case is clear/evident/obvious from*	X
As a result/as a consequence	*Questi risultati indicano (dunque) che*

Table 4. Inferrers

3. 1 Why SLDMs?

In this section we address the issue of recourse to SLDMs where more frequent FLDMs are available for selection. Assessing their use against the parameters put forth within different approaches to markedness/unmarkedness suggests that they represent the marked member of the opposition.

First, SLDMs show medium to low frequency of use. This is perfectly in line with Greenberg's (1966) 'principle of distribution', according to which the number of unmarked members is always greater than that of marked members. To put it with Battistella (1990), the unmarked member of an opposition is the dominant and most common one, whereas the marked member shows higher specificity and complexity in many respects, thus occurring less frequently. Specificity must therefore play a role in motivating recourse to SLDMs. The other way round (Waugh & Lafford 1996: 'principle of dependency'), the unmarked element has an enveloping general meaning (set) while the marked one depends on it (subset). If the unmarked category is always presupposed, then the unmarked member remains the only representative of one category when some specific features of the other members are neutralised (Trubetzkoy 1939, Jakobson 1936/71, Lyons 1977: 'principle of neutralization'). What this argument boils

down to is the marked nature of SLDMs. Turning now to Tables 3-5 above, the data suggest that SLDMs can be variously realized as set expressions, sentence fragments and sentence-integrated markers. Highly infrequent one-word items or lexicalized units have also been included. Third, it is clear that variation within the units can result from introducing a second function or a metadiscursive feature within a unit. Some examples here are: English *further*, a Summarizer, in *That this is the case is further suggested by*, altogether an Inferrer, or *of course*, a Suggestor which clearly marks speaker's stance, in *This is not, of course, to imply that*, which serves as an Inferrer. By the same token, Italian *probabilmente* modulates – or, better, downgrades - degree of certainty in *Ciò indica probabilmente che* (as against, e.g., *Ciò/Esso implica che/N*). Another example is *Si può sintetizzare sottolineando*, which comprises a Resumer and an Emphasizer.

Second, SLDMs may also combine with and interact with their FLDMs, e.g. English *therefore* in *It (therefore) comes as no surprise that*, or Italian *quindi* in *Si può quindi concludere che*, or *dunque* in *Questi risultati indicano dunque che*. In this case SLDMs specify the meaning and function of FLDMs, most often giving a more precise meaning (e.g. Italian *In estrema sintesi*). Together with the FLDM, they can be seen as a special type of lexical focus markers (in the sense of König 1991), which contribute communicative dynamism and point to new/relevant information in the sentence.

4. *Conclu** and its lemmatizations

To better characterize the role played by Summarizers and concluders and the way they overlap and interact with both Reformulators and resumers and Inferrers, we now turn to the more genre-oriented part of our investigation and concentrate on the use of *conclu** and its lemmatizations (English *conclu**: *conclude, conclusion*; Italian *conclu**: *conclusivo, conclusioni, concludere*) in the rhetorical-argumentative structure of the text and in its

concluding ‘moves’, or the “discoursal and rhetorical unit[s] that perform a coherent communicative function in […] discourse” (Swales 2004: 228).

To address this issue, for each corpus we proceed as follows: as a first step, we download the concordances for *conclu** and its lemmatizations. Using the Viewer tool and the Concordancer, we then take a closer comparative look at its uses in the Conclusions. After dealing with sections introduced by an illocution signal (*Conclusions; Conclusioni*), the remaining part of the analysis is devoted to *conclu** and its lemmatizations in the Conclusions. Our starting point is Bondi & Mazzi’s (2008: 164) characterization of historical RAs conclusions as “inferential conclusions”. Though the Conclusions are not always nor exclusively labelled as such, Bondi & Mazzi’s (2008) point out, they encapsulate (Sinclair 1993: ‘encapsulation’), re-state and evaluate (previous) findings. Four moves can be identified: a. Re-stating findings; b. Signalling inferential conclusions; c. Establishing links between writer’s contribution and broad disciplinary debate; d. Speculating about future/practical implications.

If SLDMs add extra-meaning to more general, more frequent, and less specific options, their use can be accounted for in terms of different choices with respect to types and degrees of evaluation and interactional elements. Our final analysis thus regards: a. how *conclu** interacts with other discourse markers to mark coherence relations; b. how it assist the writer interact with the reader; c. how it combines with evaluation across rhetorical moves. To enter more specifically into the analysis, within the examples selected we adopt the following conventions: single underlining is used for discourse markers and italics to signal participant-oriented metadiscourse. Square brackets are used to label the category of the discourse marker and to add comments on dialogic/monologic positioning, epistemic commitment and evaluation, and move structure.

Excluded from the investigation are: a. examples which situate *conclu** and its lemmatizations in the Introduction, where they indicate research article structure (cf. Swales 1990), as shown in (1a) and (1b); b. examples which situate the lemmatizations of *conclu** in the Results section, in which the author details sequences of events (2a, 2b); c. instances in which *conclu** signals Reference and attribution (3a, 3b):

(1a) 179 ense or cosmological in a dualist one. **In conclusion** [Concluder; *narrative discourse*], *I* shall address [Announcer] some of thes [10.116 c:\hem-hi~1\jomh\264(20~1.txt 62]

(1b) 116 un forte sfondo comune. *Proveremo* dunque [Inferrer] **in conclusione** [Concluder/Enumerator; *narrative discourse*] a ipotizzare [Annoucer, Concluder] - in modo assolutam [5.988 c:\rastor~1\mer\37(200~3.txt 69]

(2a) 82 de deux reiterating the warnings. It **concluded** [*narrative discourse*] with Senator Humphrey asking [4.028 c:\hem-hi~1\josh\332(19~1.txt 39]

(2b) 24 79 Antonio di Bernardo de' Medici, **a conclusione di** una lunga lettera invi [*narrative discourse*] [167 c:\rastor~1\qm\47(199~4.txt 2]

(3a) 90 degenerate hybrids." "Who" Stout **concluded** [Referrer and attributor], "shall form the families of the [3.745 c:\hem-hi~1\josh\336b6b~1.txt 44]

(3b) 267 umanesimo. In sintesi [Summarizer], **conclude** [Referrer and attributor] Garin, Gentile [11.640 c:\rastor~1\pep\51(200~2.txt 96]

4.1 *conclu** in English RAs

The corpus returns 277 concordance lines for *conclu** and its lemmatizations. Only 70 instances, however, are relevant to our investigation. As a heading, *Conclu** serves a prospective function (Sinclair 1993: 'prospection') in sections labelled *Conclusions/Conclusion* (3 hits each), *Conclusions and implications* (1 hit). *Conclu** is an illocution marker which

signals the underlying speech act. It serves as a general noun which indicates the communicative goal of the immediately following paragraphs.

In the first example we examine (4), the writer starts off introducing his counterargument, based on *variable attestation* as against conventional assumptions (4: §96, §102). The writer then links his conclusions to the interpretation of historical events and thus to argumentative discourse (*It would be unrealistic to conclude, for example, that*), and introduces his inferential conclusions, in which Inferrers represent the most frequent discourse marker. When embedded in this type of Conclusions, *conclude* links up to the argumentative discourse, *As just noted* jumps back along the narrative discourse line to briefly summarize events, and a particular line of reasoning is recommended (*should be used very cautiously, if at all*).

(4) 96 **Conclusion** The conventional assumption that women's identity (unlike that of men) is intrinsically defined in terms of marital status, together with the corollary 'rule of thumb' that the omission of identifying appositives next to a woman's name in the documentary record implies single or widowed status, flows logically from the assumption that women are either customarily or legally under the guardianship of men.

102 But **[**FLDM: Restrictor**]** the variable attestation of other types of appositives upsets this logic **[***Re-stating principal findings and introducing counterargument***]**.

103 *It would be unrealistic to* **[**Concession marker**]** **conclude**, for example **[**FLDM: Exemplifier**]**, that **[**Concluder/Informer/Inferrer**]** a woman who lacks any appositive specifications was not a citizen or did not work for a living **[***Inferential conclusions; Interpreting events***]**.

104 As just noted **[**Summarizer**]**, it is only in the case of designations of high social rank that the absence of a relevant epithet invariably signifies that the person in question was indeed not invested with that social status **[***Restating findings***]**.

105 The great variety of phrases used to identify women in Douai **[***Restating findings***]** *suggests* that **[**Inferrer; *Inferential conclusions***]** this particular piece of

conventional wisdom *should be used very cautiously, if at all* **[**Concession marker; *recommendation; argumentative discourse***]**.

106 The diversity in phrases which are appended to personal names of women **[***Restating findings***]** (what we have called **[**Reformulator; *Narrative discourse***]** 'appositives') *implies* that **[**Inferrer**]** family status was not a rigid standard in terms of which Douaisian society was customarily organized.

107 The combination of this variety in appositives with the high incidence of women's names unaccompanied by any identifying information at all **[***Restating findings***]** not only *indicates* **[**Inferrer**]** that formulas for identification were unstable, but also **[**FLDM: Contrast marker/Enumerator**]** *suggests* **[**Inferrer**]** that the nature of women's identity itself was in flux and not yet fully socially determined. [253(19~4] **[**§ 103- §107: *Restating findings in inferential conclusions***]**

In a similar manner, Inferrers play a major role in (5), where Inferential conclusions overlap at various points in the text with links to the broad disciplinary debate via Attribution markers (*as William of Poitiers notes […], 'he was[…]'*) and Suggestors (*It is well established that*):

(5) 74 were so prominent in their support for Eustace, for *as William of Poitiers notes* in an apparent reference to the skirmish of 1051, *'he was æformerly their bitter enemy'* **[**Reference and attribution marker; *Establishing link between writer's contribution and broad disciplinary debate***]** (*the use of the word æformerly'* *should be noted* **[**Emphasizer**]**) and Kent was traditionally a stronghold of the Godwin family. *The importance of the unlikely* Anglo-Boulonnais alliance of 1067 *should not be missed* **[**Emphasizer; *lexically and styntactically signalled evaluation for relevance***]**. It *would be consistent with the evidence to* suppose *that* **[**Suggestor**]** Eustace was the patron of the Tapestry but **[**FLDM: Contrast marker; *Introducing counterargument***]** that it was designed and made on his behalf by English elements who had been favourable to his attack on Dover and who remained favourable to his cause. Eustace's relations with certain English elements in Kent *were at any rate more complex and less easy to pin down than might at first be supposed*. These considerations **[***Link to findings***]** *lead me* **[***Link to findings; Signalling writer's contribution***]** *to*

conclude *that* [Concluder/Inferrer] Eustace *cannot be dismissed as a less likely candidate than* Odo purely on the basis of the political content of the Tapestry and *he may well* [Suggestor] *be a more likely one* [*Hedge*]. *I have also* [FLDM: Enumerator] *suggested that* [Resumer; *Highlighting and pointing to writer's contribution*] the Tapestry was intended as a gift to Odo. *The view* of the Conquest represented in the Tapestry *must have been judged* by its patron and designer as being, for Odo, within a broad spectrum of views which, coupled with the Tapestry's implicit flattery, would not have been unacceptable to him. The point *I wish to make* [Informer; Concluder], however [FLDM: Restrictor; *Introducing counterargument; Highlighting and pointing to writer's contribution*], *is that* [Concluder/Enumerator; Emphasizer] the content of the Tapestry *does not obviously* [*Booster*] *suggest* [Inferrer] that Odo had a directive or guiding influence over its design and that, conversely [Contrast marker], *no such relative implausibility is thrown up by the suggestion that* Eustace was the patron, given [Cause and reason marker] his alliance with significant English elements in 1067. 11. English design and manufacture. *It is well established that* [Suggestor; *Link to broad disciplinary debate*] certain spellings and word [9.986 c:\docume~1\hem-hi~1\jomh\253(19~1.txt 79]

Examples (4) and (5) illustrate distinctive features of English historical RAs and allow us to move to a broad discussion of discourse markers, metadiscourse and evaluation. A first point to be made is that SLDMs can be ambiguous between different readings, as in *These considerations lead me to conclude that* (5). Here, *conclude* serves as an Inferrer rather than a Concluder, which would simply introduce the last item in a list. This is apparent when *conclusion(s)* combines with first level Inferrers such as *hence* or *thus* (examples 6 and 7):

(6) 1 also not going to be correlated with R1) [*Re-stating findings*]. Hence [FLDM: Inferrer], *that* no *substantive* **conclusions** *ought to be drawn* from the result that T and R1 are not correlated follows *immediately* from the *procedure* [Concluder/Inferrer] [1.219c:\hem-hi~1\joih\1(1999~4.txt 69]

(7) 1 The *simplest* **conclusion** is ***thus*** [FLDM: Inferrer] that [Concluder/Inferrer] the idea of the Four Highways *is nothing more than a twelfth-century myth*: it was invented by Henry of Huntingdon around 1130 and ***thus*** had no Anglo-Saxon origins. Those who, like Pollock, try to derive legal principles from it, *fall into error*. Nevertheless [FLDM: Restrictor], no matter how [Concession marker] fanciful the development of the story, the inclusion of the Four Highways in law codes implies that [Summarizer/Inferrer] they *should* play a part in *our understanding* of the legal culture of the twelfth century [*Speculating about practical implications*]; *only unreconstructed Whiggism would lead one to think otherwise*. [4.358 c:\hem-hi~1\jomh\264(20~2.txt 72]

Conclusion is frequent in the '*One/the* Adj/(superlative degree of) Adj *conclusion is that*' pattern, where the adjective points to the conclusiveness of the argument (*clear*, *categorical*, *inescapable*, *substantive*), or characterizes the conclusions as legitimate and logically compelling (*minimal*, *general*, *simple*, *correct*, *safe*), as in *The simplest conclusion is thus that* (7), and *One simple, though correct conclusion is that* (8). One exception is (9), where the adjective expresses evaluation for relevance, and the strength of the conclusions is highlighted bringing to the fore the logical link to the *evidence*:

(8) 10 olitical terms. One *simple, though correct,* **conclusion** is that this represents a degree o
[5.152 c:\docume~1\hem-hi~1\lhr\1(2000~2.txt 64]

(9) 24 […] *The most important* **conclusions** to be drawn from the evidence relating to vagabondage concern land . Land was […]
[1.484 c:\docume~1\hem-hi~1\hr\18c016~1.txt 31]

(9) can be seen as an 'elegant variation' (Siepmann 2005) of SLDMs of the type 'General noun *shows/demonstrates/implies that*', which, however, was not found in the Conclusions, where it is replaced by 'Re-statement of findings *indicates/shows/demonstrates/implies that*'.

One example is: *The diversity of phrases […] implies that* (4), where *implies* points to the logical strength of the conclusions and, by implication, boosts the writer's commitment to the truth proposition, certainty, and thus intensifies the underlying speech act. Also consider *The combination of this variety […] not only indicates […] but also suggests that* (4), where *indicate* and *suggest*, though weaker, can be interpreted along the same lines. Inanimate subjects, re-statements of findings and discourse-oriented verbs help characterize the conclusions as a logical consequence of the research. This is perfectly in line with the writer's withdrawal from the text and with the selection of boosting adjectives which point to the legitimate and conclusive nature of the research. The writer's conclusions are presented as true and consensually given, e.g. *The point I wish to make, however, is that the content of the Tapestry does not obviously suggest* (5), where *obviously* signals the assumption of pre-existing shared knowledge.

While suggesting the efficacy of the relationship between data analysis, interpretation of events, and writers claims, however, the writer may recur to self-mention, thus pointing to his interpretation and his contribution, as in *These considerations lead me to conclude that* (5). This seems to be a feature of the type of conclusions in which the writer summarizes his counterargument against widely-accepted claims or conventional assumptions (10). If this is the case, the writer is more likely to also recur to hedges, which mark a statement as plausible rather than certain e.g. *would*, as in *It would be unrealistic to conclude* (4), or *Perhaps the safest conclusion would be to say that* (11), where *perhaps* and *would* clearly downgrade the writer's commitment to his proposition, and *say* is not used as a strong assertive:

(10) *I* **conclude** by *suggesting* that, even if

[16.496 c:\hem-hi~1\jomh\264(20~1.txt 100]

(11) 46 cline would be ill-judged. *Perhaps the safest* **conclusion** *would be to say* that Brockworth

[3.960 c:\docume~1\hem-hi~1\hr\177(19~2.txt 97]

4.2 *conclu** in Italian RAs

*Conclu** can be used as a heading and serve as an illocution marker in sections labelled *Conclusioni* (15 hits), *Conclusione*, (1 hit), *Conclusioni miste* (1 hit), *Considerazioni conclusive* (1 hit), *Osservazioni conclusive* (1 hit), *Qualche riflessione conclusiva* (1 hit). Although the overall move structure of the concluding sections (be they identified as such or not) does not radically differ from the English conclusions, Italian Conclusions unfold in slightly different manners. Specifically, Italian conclusions do not seem to establish links between the writer's contribution and the disciplinary debate. Instead, they highlight the writer's interpretation of the findings and, at times, speculate about future applications. Though discourse markers are found to variously interact in longer units, there seems to be a pronounced preference for Inferrers over Concluders or other markers (*Conclusioni. Da queste considerazioni risulta che*), and frequent recurrence to discourse markers with dual functions (e.g. Informer/Summarizer, Inferrer/Definer or Concluder/Definer), which help the writer restate and evaluate findings (examples 12 and 13):

(12) 67 **Conclusioni** Da queste considerazioni *risulta* che **[**Inferrer/Concluder**]** i monasteri che *con certezza* sono da ascrivere all'opera fondatrice di Domenico sono San Salvatore di Scandriglia, San Pietro a Lago, San Bartolomeo di Trisulti e Santa Maria a Sora, mentre la fondazione di Sant'Angelo sul monte Caccume riguarda *probabilmente* una ecclesia castri.

68 L'esistenza dei monasteri di Santa Maria e Santissima Trinità sul monte Pizi e l'intervento di Domenico nella fondazione di San Pietro di Avellana rimangono invece incerti. All'origine di queste istituzioni *si è potuto verificare* **[**Informer/Summarizer**]** l'intervento di famiglie aristocratiche come i conti di Sabina o quelli di Valva e quelle di personaggi come Pietro Raineri, impegnati nella costruzione di un potere signorile.

72 Considerando [Topic intiator], infine [FLDM: Summarizer and concluder/Enumerator] le famiglie di maggiore rilievo facevano accogliere i loro membri nel monastero o cercavano di entrare nella clientela vassallatica dell'abate, *si può constatare* [Suggestor/Informer] l'emergere di una gerarchia al vertice della quale vi era la famiglia fondatrice.

Il monastero di San Bartolomeo di Trisulti solleva altre problematiche [Restrictor].

73 Da un lato [Comparison and constrast marker] si presenta come [Definer] una fondazione privata, sul tipo di quelle analizzate, per la presenza di personaggi esterni alla realtà monastica che se ne fanno promotori e finanziatori e che si riservano diritti su questa, dall'altro *non si può parlare* di [Definer] una famiglia in cerca di affermazione all'interno di un determinato territorio. *Appare chiaro che* [Inferrer/Informer] le modalità dell'Eigenkloster vengono fatte proprie dai ceti emergenti di una realtà cittadina, sopravvissuta al crollo delle istituzioni romane e in qualche modo in espansione.

76 *Si può* inoltre [FLDM: Enumerator] *attribuire* [Summarizer and concluder] a questa fondazione un valore simbolico *e vedere* in essa [Summarizer and concluder/Definer] il tentativo da parte di cittadini eminenti di sacralizzare attraverso il patrocinio di un'istituzione religiosa il potere economico e politico raggiunto e di accattivarsi in questo modo il sostegno popolare. Sant'Angelo sul monte Caccume *è* invece [FLDM: Contrast marker] *strettamente* collegato ad [Definer] un altro fenomeno, quello della chiesa castrense. [ssc594~1.txt]

(13) 75 **Conclusioni**: Cosa c'entra il Mezzogiorno? [Question marker] *Proviamo* a tirare le fila dei ragionamenti sviluppati nelle pagine precedenti [Concluder], e a trarre qualche *utile* implicazione [Inferrer] per l'economia del Mezzogiorno. […]

77 *Sembra* [Informer] invece [FLDM: Contrast marker] *utile* richiamare [Announcer/Emphasizer] le maggiori difficoltà che emergono […] .

78 Rinunciare al metodo individualista non significa [Inferrer/Definer] soltanto [Comparison and constrast marker] allontanarsi dal recinto della democrazia, vuole anche dire che [Inferrer/Definer/Informer] *si aggrava* il rischio di inseguire obiettivi irraggiungibili. […]

81 È, infatti [FLDM: Explainer], *evidente* che [Inferrer], nel calcolo complessivo sarà - a parità di altre condizioni - più rilevante il peso di coloro che, disponendo di redditi e ricchezze più elevate, daranno una valutazione maggiore ai danni subiti o ai benefici ottenuti [*Speculating about practical implications*].

82 A questi limiti *è possibile* porre rimedio.

83 In particolare [FLDM: Emphasizer/Restrictor], nel testo *si è sostenuto* che [Summarizer] […][*Re-stating findings*] Ecco [Topic initiator], dunque [FLDM: Inferrer], in che senso quanto precede è *particolarmente rilevante* per il Mezzogiorno [*Speculating about practical implications*].

84 […] l'urgenza di assicurarsi immediatamente livelli di benessere adeguati *può* portare ad [Inferrer] attribuire valori bassissimi all'uso dell'ambiente, alla sua esistenza e - a maggior ragione - all'opzione di poter*, per così dire* [Definer], decidere meglio in futuro sul da farsi.

85 Dunque [FLDM: Inferrer], essa *può* contribuire a tenere basse tutte le componenti del valore dell'ambiente. [*Speculating about practical implications*]

86 *Ciò può rendere particolarmente* forte la tendenza «paternalistica», […]

87 Il problema *menzionato in precedenza* [*narrative discourse*] rischia, dunque [FLDM: Inferrer], di [Inferrer] essere *particolarmente severo* nel Mezzogiorno [*Speculating about practical implications*].

88 L'alternativa *sta* nel [Definer; Contrast marker] complesso rafforzamento istituzionale *di cui si è detto* [*narrative discourse*] e che, non soltanto per questioni legate all'ambiente, *appare necessario* […] [Conclusion]

89 Invocare forme di federalismo […], *non appare sufficiente* [Informer]. […][§ 88-89: *Speculating about future/practical implications; recommending for action*] [379f73~1.txt]

Within the Conclusions, *conclu** is found to be used as a Concluder and summarizer in 78 out of 288 concordance lines, its most frequent lemmatization being *In/in conclusione* (17 hits). Examples (14) to (16) illustrate how it may combine with first-level Inferrers (*quindi*, *sicché*), which seem to bring to the fore its dual use as a Concluder and an Inferrer:

(14) preponderanza femminile». *Si può* quindi [FLDM: Inferrer] **concludere** [*Impersonal form*] che nel Croce dei primi anni
[5.436 c:\docume~1\rastor~1\pep\47(199~4.txt 62]

(15) 39 lcuni nodi irrisolti - ha prodotto conseguenze disastrose. Sicché [FLDM: Inferrer], **in conclusione**, senza lasciarsi andare per questo [Cause and reason marker] a fuorvianti profezie apocalittiche, *c'è da supporre che* [Inferrer; *Impersonal form*]
[12.308 c:\rastor~1\mer\382dab~1.txt 95]

(16) 11 Dunque [FLDM: Inferrer], se [Hypothesis marker] prestiamo fede ai testimoni, *non possiamo che* **concludere** che [Inferrer, Concluder] Trencavelli aveva una buona cultura ed era in grado di leggere e commentare l'Olivi in latino e in volgare.
[4.738 c:\docume~1\rastor~1\qm\47(199~3.txt 75]

Though present, content disjuncts which specify degree of truth (Quirk *et al*. 1985) and adjectives which express different degrees of certainty in dummy-*it* constructions and copular constructions, are not a favourite choice (e.g. *con certezza* (12), or *chiaro* in *appare chiaro che* (13), and *evidente*, meaning 'which does not leave room for doubts and alternative interpretations', as in *È infatti evidente che* (13)). Moreover, when signalling practical and future implications of his research in the relevant move, pointing to that move as part of the conclusions, or recommending for action, we observe a tendency to express evaluations along dimensions such as social sanction (*non sufficiente*) and capacity (*utile, rilevante*): *Proviamo a trarre qualche utile implicazione per l'economia del Mezzogiorno. […] Ecco, dunque, in che senso quanto precede è particolarmente rilevante per il Mezzogiorno. […] complesso rinnovamento che […] appare necessario. […] non è sufficiente* (13).

Signalling the conclusiveness of the results is more often the job of other types of comments on the validity of the propositions, and, specifically, of directives and impersonalization strategies, modals and discourse-oriented verbs. Some examples here are *risulta*, as in *Risulta che* (12), where is a discourse-oriented verb meaning 'to be shown that, to be obvious/clear

that' (DISC: Dizionario Italiano Sabatini Coletti), or *appare* (e.g. *appare necessario* and *non appare sufficiente* (13)), where copular uses of *appare* with 3rd person inanimate subjects *appare* are synonymous with 'to be shown to be' (DISC). The claims appear to rise from the data/events themselves, which do not leave room for alternative interpretations: *si può constatare che* (12), *c'è da supporre che* (15), *non possiamo che concludere* (16).

Impersonal '*si* + Verb' means 'one/you + Verb, and also lends itself to be interpreted as a passive' (DISC). '*Si può* + Infinitive' as in *Si può dunque attribuire* (12), means 'It is shown/evident that; there is evidence for', while deontic modals such as '*c'è da* + Infinitive' or *non possiamo che* + Infinitive' clearly indicate an obligation, which arises from the data themselves. Directives are also engagement signals. Along with inclusive *we*, they are used to stress shared ground with the readers. Writers and readers follow the same line of reasoning and thus come to the same conclusions. They ask themselves the same questions, e.g. *Cosa c'entra il Mezzogiorno?* (13), coming to the only logically possible answer and to conclusions which are presented as consensually given (*L'obbligatoria risposta*) (17). In the rare instances of conditional prediction and recommendation for future action based on empirical findings, the writer introduces hedges to turn his claims into plausible assertions. Some examples are: the adjective *rapide*, which downgrades the generalizability of *valide considerazioni*; *would*, which introduces a recommendation for future action and deos not realize a string directive speech act; 'diminisher' (Quirk *et al*. 1985) *un po'*, which indicates that a quality is present to a low degree, and 'compromiser' (Quirk *et al*. 1985) *piuttosto*, with a slightly lowering effect (17):

(17) 3 Potrebbe mai aversi sviluppo economico in un'area senza il contributo di almeno qualche risorsa proveniente da quell'area? **[**Question answer pattern; *rhetorical question*]. L'*obbligatoria* risposta negativa a questa domanda *spinge* a **concludere** che **[**Concluder**]** lo sviluppo è sempre, almeno un po', locale. D'altro canto **[**Comparison and contrast marker**]**, se **[**Hypothesis**]** in un'area lo sviluppo manca *viene da*

pensare che [Suggestor] la causa sia il difetto, in quell'area, di almeno qualcuna delle risorse (intese in senso lato) necessarie. Dunque [FLDM: Inferrer], lo sviluppo è anche, almeno un po', non-locale. Se queste *rapide* [*Hedge*] considerazioni sono fondate *viene da* **concludere** che [Concluder/Inferrer] l'espressione «sviluppo locale» *dovrebbe* [*Hedge*] essere abbandonata perché [Cause and reason marker] *un po'* vaga [*Hedge*] e *piuttosto* [*Hedge*] sovraccarica. [*Conditional prediction based on empirical hypothesis*;] [94 c:\rastor~1\mer\34-35(~7.txt 2]

5. Conclusions

In this paper we concentrated on the lemmatizations of *conclu**, their uses as Summarizers and concluders, the way they interact with the partially overlapping categories of both Reformulators and resumers and Inferrers, and, third, their combination with other categories and, more generally, other metadiscourse in the Conclusions of English and Italian historical research articles. This enabled us to look into the reasons behind their use while also offering some reflections on the move structure of RA Conclusions.

It is apparent from the analysis that SLDMs are marked options, which add extra meaning to their less specific and more general, transparent, and frequent counterparts. Variation within the unit results from the insertion of FLDMs and from combinations within the extended concordance line with discourse markers from other categories. Within the Conclusions, both English *Conclusions* and Italian *Conclusioni* take on a dual reading – both as Concluders and as Inferrers -, which is brought to the fore in combinations with first-level Inferrers (*The simplest conclusion is thus; Sicché, in conclusione*).

Cross-linguistically, a major mismatch concerns different interactional concerns across discourse moves. English *Conclusion* is frequent in the '*One/the* Adj/(superlative degree of) Adj *conclusion is that*' pattern, where the adjective points to the conclusiveness of the argument (*clear, categorical, inescapable, substantive*), or characterizes the conclusions as legitimate and logically compelling (*minimal, general, simple, correct, safe*). Altogether, inanimate subjects,

restatements of findings and discourse-oriented verbs help characterize the conclusions as the logical consequence of the research ('Restatement of findings *indicates/shows/demonstrates/implies that*'). Turning to Italian, *conclusioni* it is not found to combine frequently with epistemic adjectives. Suggesting the conclusiveness of the results is more often the job of inclusive *si* in *si può* (*si può constatare che*) and deontic modals combining with discourse-oriented verbs signalling hypothesis or inference (*c'è da supporre che, non possiamo che concludere*). Whereas the writer does not take responsibility for his own claims, he engages the reader using directives, via recourse to Question-answer markers, or using the 1st person plural inclusive pronoun and adjective, which enables the writer to construct the conclusions as shared knowledge.

This study can thus be seen not only as a contribution to the vast area of studies in the rhetorical organization of the text, but also to the growing literature on local and disciplinary cultures. Although we have only sought to shed some light into the uses and internal variability of a restricted set of discourse markers, it is clear that future research must consistently take into account the quantitative dimension and concentrate on (dis-)similarities in the lexicalization of coherence relations across English and Italian. This amounts to concentrating on position and frequency of syndetic and asyndetic coordination and subordination within specific moves, as well as variability in the lexicalization of coherence relations, within an interpersonal model of metadiscourse.

References

Battistella, E. L. (1990). *Markedness: The Evaluative Superstructure of Language.* Albany: NY: State University of New York Press.

Biber, D. (2006). *University Language. A Corpus-based Study of Spoken and Written Registers*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad and E. Finegan (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.

Bondi, M. and G. Diani (2008). "Forms of metadiscourse in English academic writing: a cross-disciplinary and cross-generic analysis of-meta-argumentative phraseology". In M. Bertuccelli Papi, A. Bertacca and S. Bruti (eds) *Threads in the Complex Fabric of Language. Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honour of Lavinia Merlini*. Pisa: Felici Editore, 69-84.

Bondi, M. and D. Mazzi (2008). "*Per concludere veramente*. Signalling conclusions in historical research articles in Italian and English", *La Torre di Babele. Rivista di letteratura e linguistica*, 5, 159-171.

Bruti, S. (1999). "*In fact* and *infatti*: same, similar or different?", *Pragmatics*, 9, 4, 519-534.

Conrad S. and D. Biber. (2000). "Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing". In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-27.

De Cock, S. (1998). "A recurrent word combination approach to the study of formulae in the speech of native and non-native speakers of English", *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 3, 59-80.

DISC: Sabatini F. and V. Coletti (1999). *Dizionario Italiano Sabatini Coletti*. Firenze: Giunti (2nd ed.).

Fraser, B. (1988). "Types of English discourse markers", *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 38, 19-33.

Fløttum, K., T. Dahl and T. Kinn (2006). *Academic Voices across Languages and Disciplines.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Granger, S. (1998). "Prefabricated patterns in advanced EFL writing: collocations and formulae". In A. P. Cowie (ed.) *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 145-160.

Granger S. and M. Paquot (2008). " Disentangling the phraseological web". In S. Granger and F. Meunier (eds) *Phraseology. An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 27-50.

Greenberg, J. (1966). *Language Universals*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Howarth, P. (1996). *Phraseology in English Academic Writing*. Tübingen: Niemeyer Verlag.

Hunston S. and G. Thompson (2000). *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse*. *Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2008). "*As can be seen*. Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation", *English for Specific Purposes*, 27, 4-21.

Hyland, K. and M. Bondi (eds) (2006). *Academic Discourse across Disciplines*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Knott, A. and R. Dale (1994). "Using linguistic phenomena to motivate a set of coherence relations", *Discourse Processes*, 18, 1, 35-62.

Knott, A. and T. Sanders (1998). "The classification of coherence relations and their linguistic markers: An exploration of two languages", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30, 135-175.

König, E. (1991). *The Meaning of Focus Particles: A Comparative Perspective*. London: Routledge.

Jakobson, R. (1936/1971). “Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre: Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus.”. In *R. Jakobson, Selected Writings*, Vol. I. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter, 23-71.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maiden, M. and C. Robustelli (2000). *A Reference Grammar of Modern Italian*. London: Arnold.

Mann, W. C. (1999). “Introduction to Rhetorical Structure Theory”. Available at: http://www.sil.org/linguistics/RST/rintro99.htm (accessed: 1 June 2010)

Merlini Barbaresi, L. (1997). “Modification of speech acts. Aggravation and mitigation.” In *Proceedings of the 16th International Congress of Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon. Paper No 0353.

Musacchio, M. T., G. Palumbo (2009). “‘To connect or not to connect’: Game-theory approaches and translators’ decisions in specialist translation. A corpus-based study”. In S. Cavagnoli, E. Di Giovanni and R. Merlini (eds) *La Ricerca nella Comunicazione Interlinguistica. Modelli Teorici e Metodologici.* Milano: Franco Angeli, 217-234.

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Syntax*. London: Longman.Scott, M. (1998). *WordSmith Tools 3.0.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Searle, J. R. and D. Vandervecken (1985) *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siepmann, D. (2005). *Discourse Markers across Languages*. London: Routledge.

Sinclair, J. M. (1993). “Written discourse structure”. In J. M. Sinclair, M. Hoey and G. Fox (eds) *Techniques of Description: Spoken and Written Discourse. A Festschrift for Malcolm Coulthard*. London: Routledge, 6-31.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis*. *English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. (2004). *Research Genres. Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trubetzkoy, N. (1939). *Grundzüge der Phonologie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Vande Kopple, W. J. (1985). "Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse", *College Composition and Communication*, 36, 1, 82-93.

Waugh, L. R. and B. A: Lafford (1996). "Markedness". In *The Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 5. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 2378-2383.