

Discourse markers such as *that is*, *that is to say*, *i.e.*, etc. have been grouped under the term reformulation markers. Reformulation is to be interpreted as the process of reinterpretation, where the contents of an utterance are expressed in a different way through a re-elaboration. This is done to facilitate the understanding, and/or to narrow the specificity of an utterance. Reformulation ensures cohesion and facilitates discourse by reducing any possible communicative defects of a text.

Scholars seem to agree that there are different types of reformulation. Fuchs (1982) argues that there are three types of reformulation: designation, denomination, and exemplification. On the other hand, Flottum (1993) argues in favour of either horizontal (including definition, denomination, and substitution) or vertical (including generalization, specification, and summary) reformulation. Gülich and Kotschi (1995) divides the classification of reformulation markers into paraphrastic, where the marker establishes a relationship between two connected utterances, and non-paraphrastic, where the marker dissociates two utterances by showing that the content of one is crucial in order to continue discourse. Others (Cuenca (2003), Cuenca and Bach (2007), Rubio (2008)) argue for four different types of reformulation: explanation, rectification, conclusion, and summary. Finally, Relevance Theory (Bataller (2002), Murillo (2004), Blakemore (2007), Bordería (2008), among others) argue that some reformulation encode a procedure, while other encode a concept.

I intend to describe reformulation markers employing Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (Pollard and Sag (1994), Ginzburg and Sag (2000)) as a syntactic approach. This approach is relevant in a theory of discourse because it provides a framework in which all levels of grammar can be integrated. Since reformulation markers operate at discourse level, a well developed discourse theory is required, in this case, I employ Segmented Discourse Representation Theory (Asher and Lascarides (2003)). In previous Discourse structure theories (Mann and Thompson (1987), and Knott and Dale (1994), among others), reformulation markers are considered to generate only one type of rhetorical relation. We are going to review this approach in light of previous literature.

I will argue that syntactically these items function as other discourse markers, with grammatical properties similar to expressions like *however* and *for example* in that they are modifiers of whole sentences. Semantically, they resemble two place predicate terms in the sense that they require two arguments: the preceding and the following utterance. The analysis will be supported by a discussion of examples drawn from previous literature discussions, and websites in general. An explicit comparison with the analyses presented in RT and other approaches will be provided.

References

- Nicholas Asher and Alex Lascarides. *Logics of Conversation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- Sergio Maruenda Bataller. *Reformulations and relevance theory pragmatics: the case of TV news interviews*. Universitat de Valencia, Valencia, 2002.
- Diane Blakemore. *Or-* parenthicals, *that is-* parenthicals and the pragmatics of reformulation. *Journal of Linguistics*, 43:311–339, 2007.
- Salvador Pons Bordería. Do discourse markers exist? on the treatment of discourse markers in Relevance Theory. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40:1411–1434, 2008.
- Maria Josep Cuenca. Two ways to reformulate: a contrastive analysis of reformulation markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35:1069–1093, 2003.
- Maria Josep Cuenca and Carme Bach. Contrasting the form and use of reformulation markers. *Discourse Studies*, 9(2):149–175, 2007.
- K Flottum. A propos de *c'est-à-dire* et ses correspondants norvégiens. *Cahiers de Linguistique Française*, (15):109–130, 1993.
- Catherine Fuchs. *La paraphrase*. PUF, Paris, 1982.
- Elisabeth Gülich and Thomas Kotschi. Discourse production in oral communication. In Uta M. Quasthoff, editor, *Aspects of oral communication*, pages 30–66. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 1995.
- Jonathan Ginzburg and Ivan A. Sag. *Interrogative Investigations: the form, meaning, and use of English interrogatives*. CSLI Publications, Stanford, 2000.
- Alistair Knott and Robert Dale. Using linguistic phenomena to motivate a set of coherence relations. *Discourse Processes*, 18:35–62, 1994.
- William Mann and Sandra Thompson. Rhetorical structure theory: description and construction of text structures. In Gerard Kempen, editor, *Natural Language Generation*, pages 85–97. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Dordrecht, 1987.
- Silvia Murillo. A relevance reassessment of reformulation markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36: 2059–2068, 2004.

Carl Pollard and Ivan A. Sag. *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. CSLI, Stanford, 1994.

Maria Milagros Del Saz Rubio. *English Discourse Markers of Reformulation*, volume 60 of *Linguistic Insights. Studies in Language and Communication*. Peter Lang AG, Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, Frankfurt am Main, New York, Oxford, Wien, 2008.