



Università
Ca'Foscari
Venezia

Master's Degree Programme
in Language Sciences

Double Degree in *Russian as a Foreign Language in Cross-
Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Perspective*
with the University Higher School of Economics of Moscow

Final Thesis

**Russian and Italian
Discourse Formulae of
Refusal: Structure and Usage**

Supervisor

Prof. Pavel V. Duryagin

Assistant supervisor

Prof. Ekaterina V. Rakhilina

Supervisor Thesis

Prof. Ekaterina V. Rakhilina, Higher School of Economics

Supervisor of the activities held abroad

Prof. Olga S. Eremina

Graduand

Sabrina Salvato
874082

Academic Year

2022 / 2023

Contents

<i>Автоморфемам</i>	3
<i>Introduction</i>	8
<i>Chapter 1. Theoretical Framework</i>	12
1.1 Construction Grammar	12
1.1.1 Cognitive Psychology	12
1.1.2 Construction Grammar	13
1.1.3 Grammaticalization and Pragmaticalization	16
1.2 Discourse Formulae	18
1.2.1 History of the Research	18
1.2.2 Characteristics of Discourse Formulae	20
1.2.3 Discourse Formulae of Refusal	25
1.3 Speech Act Theory	27
1.4 Interlanguage Pragmatics and Linguistic Politeness	28
<i>Chapter 2. The Study</i>	32
2.1 First Experiment: Elicitation of Italian Discourse Formulae	33
2.1.1 Participants	33
2.1.2 Discourse Completion Task	33
2.1.3 Results	36
2.2 Corpus Analysis	41
2.3 Second Experiment: Russian Equivalents to Italian Discourse Formulae	42
2.3.1 Methodology	42
2.3.2 Participants	44
2.3.3 Results	44
<i>Chapter 3. Italian Discourse Formulae</i>	45
3.1 <i>Sei matto?</i> [be.2SG.PRS crazy Q]	45
3.2 <i>Anche no</i> [also NEG]	49
3.3 <i>Non è il caso</i> [NEG is.3SG.PRS the case]	53
3.4 <i>Non esiste</i> [NEG exist-3SG.PRS]	56

3.5 Scherzi? [Joke-2SG.PRS Q]	60
3.6 Lascia stare [Leave-2SG.IMP stay-INF]	63
3.7 Lascia perdere [Leave-2SG.IMP lose-INF].....	67
3.8 Lasciami stare [Leave-2SG.IMP-PRON.1SG stay-INF]	69
3.9 Figurati [figure-2SG.IMP-REFL].....	73
3.10 Figuriamoci [figure-1PL.IMP-REFL]	76
3.11 Ma va' [but.CONJ go.2SG.IMP].....	79
3.12 Ti pare? [DAT.2SG seem-3SG.PRS Q]	83
3.13 Ma dai [but.CONJ give.2SG.IMP]	86
3.14 'Sto cazzo [this VULGAR].....	88
3.15 Col cazzo [with-the VULGAR].....	92
3.16 Col cavolo [with-the cabbage]	95
3.17 Toglitelo dalla testa [remove-2SG.IMP-REFL-PRON.3SG from-the head]	98
3.18 Per carità [for goodness].....	101
3.19 Vai tranquillo [go-2SG.IMP calm]	105
3.20 Neanche per sogno [NEG for dream]	107
Chapter 4. Discussion of the Results	111
Conclusion	116
References	118
Appendix A	123
Appendix B	133

Автореферат

В данной магистерской диссертации рассматриваются дискурсивные формулы отказа в перспективе сравнения русских и итальянских языковых выражений. Дискурсивные формулы представляют собой фраземы, выступающие в качестве положительной или отрицательной реакции на речевой акт собеседника и также выражающие позицию говорящего по отношению к прагматической ситуации. Примерами дискурсивных формул могут служить *да ну, еще чего, что ты* и т.д.

Концепция дискурсивных формул была разработана в рамках проекта «Русский Конструктикон» (Radovan et al., 2021), который возник в 2016 году и реализуется в сотрудничестве между Арктическим университетом Норвегии и Школы Лингвистики Высшей Школой Экономики Москвы. В этой базе данных собрано более чем 2200 неоднословных выражений на русском языке, имеющих в своем составе незаполненные слоты, с подробным семантико-синтаксическим описанием этих выражений.

С конструкциями связан особый класс фразем без слотов – дискурсивные формулы. Они, в свою очередь, были собраны в базе данных «Прагматикон» (Yaskevich et al., 2017), созданной в рамках исследовательского проекта Школы лингвистики НИУ ВШЭ, начатого в 2017 году. База данных включает более 700 формул, не считая вариантов.

Одной из целей данной работы можно считать выявление экспериментальным путем итальянских дискурсивных формул отказа и их возможных русских эквивалентов, в том числе с целью дополнения Прагматикона переводами формул на итальянский язык, чтобы улучшить возможности использования для итальянских изучающих русского языка как иностранный.

Данная работа состоит из четырех основных частей: теоретические основы исследования, методология экспериментов, результаты исследования и обсуждение результатов.

В первой главе анализируются теоретические основы изучения дискурсивных формул. В частности, в данном разделе работы говорится о Теории Грамматики конструкций, о Теории речевых актов, о понятии дискурсивных формул и о межъязыковой прагматике (Interlanguage Pragmatics).

Теория Грамматики конструкции (CxG) исходит из постулатов когнитивной лингвистики, рассматривающей язык как сложный способ взаимодействия с внеязыковой реальностью, во взаимодействии мозга человека, его тела с окружающей реальностью, включая социальную среду. Грамматика конструкций основывается также на представлении о языковых единицах как о сложной сети единиц, влияющих друг на друга. Каждая конструкция охватывает все уровни лингвистического анализа (семантика, прагматика, просодия, фонология, и т.д.) (Diessel, 2015). Это представление противостоит генеративной теории языка – так называемой Универсальной грамматике Хомского (Chomsky, 1986): согласно когнитивным лингвистам, грамматика не является врожденной для человека, а представляет собой продукт человеческого опыта, социальных взаимодействий и сенсорных впечатлений, и поэтому всегда подлежит обсуждению. Так как грамматика является более гибкой, чем принято считать, нельзя допускать существования так называемых «исключений» – конструкций, не подчиняющихся грамматическим правилам (Fried & Östman, 2005).

Филлмор, один из главных создателей теории CxG, предположил, что поскольку в зоне конструкций грамматика в принципе не является жестко predetermined, невозможно говорить об исключениях из грамматических правил, так что отличием одной конструкции от другой является различная степень идиоматичности. Идиоматичность определяется Филлмором как характеристика того, что можно не знать в языке, зная все остальное (Fillmore et al., 1988). В идиоматичных конструкциях сумма отдельных компонентов не дает общего смысла, поэтому они названы «некомпозиционными». Будучи связанными с

конструкциями структурно и / или исторически, дискурсивные формулы тоже являются некомпозиционными.

Затем исследуется понятие дискурсивной формулы. Этот тип языковых выражений, близкий конструкциям, отличается тремя основными признаками (Buchkova & Rakhilina, 2022):

- Они являются неоднословными некомпозиционными единицами;
- Они не содержат в себе пустые слоты;
- В диалоге они выполняют функцию реакции на речевой акт собеседника, которая в целом характеризуется как положительная или отрицательная.

В существующих исследованиях было выделено несколько подклассов дискурсивных формул, характеризующихся дополнительной информацией о прагматической функции формулы, которая также зависит от различных коммуникативных ситуаций и от интенций собеседника. Формулы, обозначающие положительный ответ, включают в себя подклассы подтверждения, согласия и разрешения, удивления и безразличия; а те, которые обозначают отрицательный ответ, включают формулы отрицания, отказа и запрета, недоверия (Buchkova, 2020b).

После этого кратко обсуждаются характеристики и особенности использования дискурсивных формул отказа, лежащих в центре нашего исследования.

Помимо этого, в данной главе также рассматривается Теория речевых актов (Searle, 1969; White et al., 1963), которая, в своей очередь, тоже служит основой для теории дискурсивных формул, так как область прагматики играет важнейшую роль в использовании данных выражений. Концепция речевых актов позволяет проанализировать формы взаимодействия между участниками различных типов диалога, принимая во внимание намерение говорящего и желаемое воздействие на адресата. Тут прослеживается различие между локутивными актами (= произнесение высказывания) и иллокутивными актами (= то, что говорящий хочет выразить, цель, прагматический компонент высказывания) (Verschueren, 1978).

В последней части данной главы обсуждается межъязыковая прагматика и лингвистическая вежливость. Эти темы актуальны для данного исследования, поскольку отказ является рискованным актом с точки зрения «сохранения лица», т.е. того публичного образа, который каждый человек обычно хочет сохранить. Действия, подвергающие риску лицо собеседника, называются «ликоугрожающими актами» (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Соответствующее обращение с ликоугрожающими актами связано с признанием трех факторов (дистанция и власть между собеседниками, и интенсивность иллокутивной силы речевого акта). В различных комбинациях эти факторы формируют различные условия, при которых может происходить общение, и которые требуют адаптации поведения с учетом статуса других лиц (Scollon et al., 2012).

Во второй главе описывается экспериментальная часть данного исследования, которая состоит из трех частей. В первой была предпринята попытка выявить итальянские дискурсивные формулы отказа при помощи анкеты с заданием на заполнение пропущенных фрагментов речевыми оборотами. Во второй описывается корпусный анализ, проведенный с целью расширения спектра контекстов, в которых могут быть использованы формулы. В третьей части речь идет о второй анкете, направленной на выявление русских эквивалентов итальянских дискурсивных формул.

В заполнении первой анкеты приняло участие 64 носителя итальянского языка. Им было предложено заполнить мини-диалоги реакциями отказа на разные речевые акты, чтобы обнаружить, как выражается отказ, и чтобы найти среди различных ответов итальянские дискурсивные формулы отказа. Все ответы на анкету были проанализированы, и 20 итальянских дискурсивных формул были идентифицированы на основе признаков, присущих данному классу единиц. В этом разделе главы приводятся две таблицы: в одной собраны диалоги из первой анкеты, а во второй указаны глоссы всех итальянских дискурсивных формул по Лейпцигской системе правил глоссирования (Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, 2015).

Затем, для корпусного анализа мы обратились к двум онлайн корпусам итальянского языка, оба они состоят из текстов, собранных из Интернета: ItTenTen20 (*ItTenTen – Italian Corpus from the Web*, 2022) и Paisà Corpus (Lyding et al., 2014). Таким образом предпринималась попытка найти примеры использования дискурсивных формул.

Следующим шагом стало создание контекстов для формирования второй анкеты, направленной на выявление русских эквивалентов итальянских формул. Данный опрос состоял из двух упражнений: discourse completion task и multiple-choice task. Вторая анкета была заполнена четырнадцатью носителями русского языка с хорошим уровнем итальянского языка. В первом упражнении респондентам было предложено переводить итальянские дискурсивные формулы на основе прагматического контекста, во втором их попросили выбрать самые подходящие альтернативы из списка дискурсивных формул, созданного в основе Прагматикона.

В третьей главе представлены результаты трех частей исследования. В каждом разделе описывается одна итальянская дискурсивная формула: её семантика и морфология, прагматические контексты ее употребления, смысловые нюансы и предлагаемые переводы на русский язык. Также обращается внимание на наличие или отсутствие данных дискурсивных формул в Прагматиконе.

В четвёртой главе представлена итоговая таблица, с наиболее подходящими переводами итальянских дискурсивных формул на русский язык. В дальнейшем они могут быть включены в онлайн-базу данных.

В заключении обсуждаются границы данного исследования и его дальнейшие перспективы.

Introduction

Language does not encompass merely spoken manifestations but also, and arguably more predominantly, the wide and intricate spectrum of societal and communicative actions within different sociocultural milieus. In other words, language is not only something we *say*, but also something we *do*, something that allows us to interact and act in a complex social environment. Consequently, the study of language must not be separated from the investigation of the context in which the language itself emerges, that is, pragmatics.

Some linguistic constructions more than others are tightly intertwined with the pragmatic context in which they are employed and would be meaningless except in relation to it: this is the case of discourse formulae, the focus of the present study. Discourse formulae are speech particles used as positive or negative responses to various speech acts. Simplifying, it could be said that discourse formulae are partially synonymous with the words 'yes' and 'no', but different formulae are employed in different situations depending on the specific pragmatic variables. For instance, we would never use the same type of negative response when talking to a good friend of ours during an argument and to a potential employer during an interview.

If the pragmatic aspects of language are less studied than other ones, it might also be linked to the fact that they are often more likely to go unnoticed than more overt and more easily describable linguistic features. Moreover, they are often culture-bound, which entails another difficulty, linked to language teaching and learning: the fact that the appropriate usage of these discourse formulae depends on the culturally determined pragmatic context makes it harder for a language learner in a region where the target language is not widespread to interpret them correctly, not to mention use them appropriately. This becomes even more relevant if we take into account the type of discourse formulae chosen for this study, the discourse formulae of refusal: refusals are indeed a risky communicative act, since they pose the chance of compromising the interlocutor's or one's own public image.

Given these facts, the significance of incorporating a comprehensive overview of such constructions and of their usage into the field of language instruction and acquisition must be underscored. This entails not only descriptive analysis but also strategic pedagogical planning, accompanied by the provision of accessible resources. The most prominent resource related to discourse formulae is the web-based repository identified as Pragmaticon. Within this database more than 700 Russian discourse formulae are catalogued, along with example of usage, translations in four distinct languages and contextual explanations in which these formulae may be encountered. The Pragmaticon was created as a result of the efforts of the School of Linguistics of the Higher School of Economics in Moscow.

The choice of the topic “Italian discourse formulae in comparative perspective” for my Master’s degree thesis was indeed mainly influenced by my academic contact with HSE Moscow during my exchange semester in the framework of a Double Degree program that took place within the School of Linguistics. There I had the opportunity to encounter some of the scholars who first started to work on this project, among which Professor E. V. Rakhilina should be named.

Both during this exchange period and throughout my regular study at Ca’ Foscari, in the pursuit of a Master's degree in Language Sciences, which is focused on language teaching, but even more so in my experience as a language learner, I was faced with the usefulness of expanding the repertoire of accessible resources aimed at making glottodidactics increasingly dynamic and close to diverse cultural and sociolinguistic realities.

With this goal in mind, the present study attempts to contribute to the research on discourse formulae by the identification and analysis of Italian discourse formulae of refusal. To supplement the scope of the Pragmaticon project, endeavors were made on an experimental basis to find translations and equivalents of the Italian discourse formulae into Russian, the main language present in the online database. Furthermore, the addition of some newly found Russian discourse formulae of refusal in the Pragmaticon will be proposed.

The present study begins with an overview of the theories and approaches that underpin the idea of discourse formulae: the first section covers cognitive psychology and the approach that stemmed from it in the field of linguistics, cognitive linguistics. The work of Fillmore, who was one of the major inspirators for the work on discourse formulae, will be introduced here. Then, Austin and Searle's (1969) speech acts theory will be briefly addressed, to move on to the topic of discourse formulae. The history of the research on the topic will be introduced, as well as their linguistic features. One more subsection will be devoted to the main focus of the study, the discourse formulae of refusal. Lastly, the issue of interlanguage pragmatics and of linguistic politeness will be introduced.

In the second chapter the methodology of the experimental part is discussed. To reach the objectives of the research we designed a three-steps study: first of all, Italian discourse formulae of refusal have been elicited from Italian native speaker by means of a questionnaire with a discourse completion task. In this section, these 20 Italian discourse formulae are glossed according to the Leipzig glossing rules.

Then, on the basis of the results of the first questionnaire, a corpus analysis has been carried out to better outline the usage of these discourse formulae and of the communicative situations in which they are used. The corpora that were employed are the *Paisà* corpus and the *ItTenTen20* corpus. Both of them collect examples of Italian text gathered from the Internet.

Lastly, another questionnaire was designed and administered to native speakers of Russian with a B2 or higher level of Italian. The goal was to try and find accurate Russian translations of the Italian discourse formulae via a discourse completion and a multiple-choice task.

In the third chapter the results of the study will be presented: a separate section will be dedicated to each discourse formula, where it will be morphologically, etymologically, semantically and pragmatically described. The most suitable translations from the second questionnaire will also be proposed.

The fourth chapter will be mainly devoted to the presentation of a summary of the translations for every Italian discourse formula of refusal, paying attention to the occurrence or the absence of certain formulas in the Pragmaticon.

In the conclusion the limitations and the future perspectives of this study will be outlined.

Chapter 1

Theoretical Framework

In the following section of this work, I will firstly outline the theoretical framework that lays the foundation for the concept of discourse formulae. It can be summarized basically by two approaches: Construction Grammar and Speech Act theory. I will also cover the concept of discourse formulae, the instruments used to study them and the main focus of this work, discourse formulae of refusal. The last section of this chapter will be devoted to the topics of interlanguage pragmatics and linguistic politeness.

1.1 Construction Grammar

Genealogically, the concept of discourse formulae stems from the broader field of Construction Grammar (CxG), which, in its turn, originates from the insights of Cognitive Psychology and Cognitive Linguistics.

1.1.1 Cognitive Psychology

The emergence of cognitive psychology is linked to the criticisms to Behaviorism that have been raised since the 1960s, when computational sciences and the reflection on artificial intelligence was beginning to rapidly develop (Mischel, 2023). Moving away from the behaviorist conception of language acquisition as a set of linguistic routines, these innovative insights led to the formulation of the metaphor that presents the human brain as a computational system that receives input from the environment, interprets and elaborates it, and produces output.

Over the decades this concept has been further refined and enriched by the formulation of four pivotal tenets, the so-called '4 E's' (Carney, 2020; Ellis, 2019), that expand the domain of cognition beyond the human mind to encompass the physicality and the surrounding environment: *embodied cognition*, *embeddedness*, *enactivism* and *extended mind*.

The 4 E's outline the ways in which human cognition interacts with outer reality, is shaped by it, and, in its turn, shapes it. The concept of *embodied cognition* acknowledges how our physicality determines the way in which we perceive reality and act in our surroundings. For instance, (Carney, 2020) highlights how the fact that humans normally have 10 fingers probably played a role in the choice of our numeration system.

The *embeddedness* describes the property of cognition as the “dependence of a phenomenon on its environment”, which can also be referred to as the “ecology of the mind” (Ellis, 2019): it means that we form concepts in our heads on the basis of the actions we can perform in our environment.

The *enactedness* of the cognition is connected to the relevance of the environmental elements to the individual, to the intention that is the driving force behind the action and the goal that motivates the person to act.

The last one of the 4 Es, *extended mind*, takes into account the socio-technical system in which the singular person operates, focusing on the concept that society, societal norms, cultural manifestations, etc. have a crucial role to play in the formation of cognition and are inextricably bound to it.

1.1.2 Construction Grammar

The holistic view on cognition offered by cognitive psychology paved the way for new thinking on language, brought forth by cognitive linguists such as Fillmore (1984): Cognitive Linguistics is a framework that focuses on the role that the human cognition plays in shaping linguistic structures and their use.

Cognitive linguists regard grammatical regularities as an “emergent phenomenon”, that is, they are not a precondition for the discourse, as they are commonly considered in the Generative Grammar framework, but they emerge from experience and usage, and they should be negotiated at every interaction between speakers of said language (Diessel, 2015; Hopper, 2014).

This conception of grammar contrasts the one that has been widely held for several decades, the generativist theory of Universal Grammar (UG). According to the generativist view, the human brain is said to possess an innate capacity, the Universal Grammar, to which the development of linguistic abilities and grammatical regularities can be ascribed. This “system of categories,

mechanisms and constraints shared by all human languages and considered to be innate” (Chomsky, 1986, p. 3) would ensure that human beings have a general and common pattern that enables them to acquire every language.

Despite the fact that this approach has been predominant among the community of linguists for several years, since the end of last century, various scholars have questioned the validity of generative arguments, stating that they are insufficient to prove the innateness of grammatical categories and that the concept of UG has not gained in any clarity since its first formulation (Dąbrowska, 2015; Tommasello, 2009).

The problem of language acquisition outside an innate grammatical framework, thus within positive experience and within the workings of human cognition, has consequently engaged several cognitive linguists, among whom Fillmore et al. (1988), who have theorized the possibility of language acquisition based on linguistic chunks, the constructions, which *emerge*, as mentioned before, from usage and social interaction.

In particular, the *Construction Grammar framework (CxG)* views language and language acquisition as an integrated process, in which cognition and the whole sociocultural context influence one another and are inextricably intertwined (Ellis, 2019). Similarly to other aspects of human cognitive workings, language is thus organized in interconnected and complex sets of symbols that encompass not merely the grammatical element, but also the other planes that concur in the formation of language, such as semantics, pragmatics, phonology, prosody, and so on (Diessel, 2015).

Given these premises, we move away from a generativist understanding of language in which two opposite poles are identified: proper grammatical constructions, which follow what are identified as the regularities of language (the grammatical rules), and the ones of which Fried & Östman (2005, pp. 1753-1754) say that lie at the “peripheries” of the language and that are problematic to explain based on the aforementioned grammatical regularities. Nonetheless, according to the principles of Construction Grammar, there would be no qualitative difference between these two types of linguistic constructions, since language acquisition would operate on the basis of ‘tokens’, the constructions, regardless

of whether they are perceived as highly regular or interpreted as exceptions to the grammatical rules.

However, this does not imply that no distinctions should be drawn between different classes of constructions: one can indeed observe a spectrum of features based on their *complexity* and *schematicity* (Wasserscheidt, 2019), which, on its part, contributes to the definition of the degree of idiomaticity of a construction (Fillmore et al., 1988).

Regarding the *complexity*, Wasserscheidt (2019) defines simplex (or lexical) constructions as single words or morphemes which, when combined, form complex constructions.

In terms of *schematicity*, the concept of *slots* is taken into consideration: slots are non-specified or underspecified elements within the constructions. There is no unanimous consensus among the scholar about how constructions are defined in relation to the presence of free slots within them: while some linguists consider all form-meaning pairings (words and morphs) as constructions, even the ones without any open slot; others exclude those from the definition of construction. One recent and fairly widely accepted definition that shares the latter point of view is proposed by Haspelmath (2023), where constructions are described as having at least one open slot.

The feature of schematicity can also be described considering its graduality, since there is not merely a polarity of schematicity degrees, but a spectrum that goes from non-schematic and completely schematic. In non-schematic form-meaning pairings there are no free slots, while entirely schematic constructions do not hold any fixed element. Among these entirely schematic constructions we can find some common and very productive ones, such as [NNOM V NACC], which can be filled with lexemes compatible to the specifications of each part and which carries the meaning of “someone acts on something” (Wasserscheidt, 2019, p. 9), for example ‘the man (NNOM) pets (V) the dog (NACC)’. Drawing another example on the basis of Wasserscheidt (2019, p. 3), it can be said that even simplex constructions such as the nominal construction [VERB-er; ‘someone who VERBS’] (a ‘reader’ is ‘someone who reads’) contain in themselves the semantically specified slot which can only be occupied by an

element that indicates an action and the phonologically defined element -er. It may be noticed, as the instances above illustrate, that these open slots are usually not completely 'free', meaning that they are specified at least at some degree in the linguistic analysis, i.e., semantically, morphologically, syntactically, etc.

As already anticipated, another aspect of schematicity concerns *idiomaticity*. In a language there are words and multi-word items that can be interpreted by combining the meanings of their various parts according to recurring grammatical rules: these are called 'compositional'. However, Construction Grammar holds a way of accounting also for those constructions that in the generative tradition are considered exceptions outside of the linguistic system. Those constructions, which apparently do not follow the language specific regularities, are regarded as 'idiomatic' or 'non-compositional'. Fillmore explains the concept of "idiomaticity" as the property of an expression or construction that "a language user could fail to know while knowing everything else in the language" (Fillmore et al., 1988, p. 504).

1.1.3 Grammaticalization and Pragmaticalization

The constructional view has important implications as for what we consider to be 'grammatical': since it is not something fixed, decided in advance, but constantly unfolding, recent research tends to consider it rather a process than a set of rules set in stone. The 'exceptional' constructions are thus incorporated in the language through the processes of *grammaticalization*. In this dynamic process content words are gradually emptied of their lexical meaning to the point of becoming function words and grammatical categories, thus deviating from what are considered classic grammatical rules (Dittmar, 1992; Heine, 2017; Traugott, 2017). It has also been argued (Trusdale, 2010) that grammaticalization corresponds to a lower degree of schematicity of the constructions (i.e., a construction with a prevalence of fixed elements). An example brought by Aaron Smith (2011) takes into consideration the phonetic realization *gonna* of the English *be going to* future. This structure undergoes a process of reanalysis as a complex auxiliary (be going to + VERB) that allows the

loss of the boundary between *going* and *to*, leading to the possibility of merging the two words and obtaining the phonetic realization *be gonna*.

While grammaticalization is considered the progressive crystallization of linguistic structures to the assumption of specific grammatical functions, some scholars describe a similar process called 'pragmaticalization', which is linked to the field of pragmatics. This phenomenon consists in the acquisition of an interactional meaning by a given construction.

There are different views on this issue, with some scholars considering it a phenomenon in its own right, others a subtype of grammaticalization, and others denying its existence (Heine, 2013). In the first group we can mention Frank-Job (2006, p. 361) as cited by Heine (2013, p. 1218), who defines pragmaticalization as "the process by which a syntagma or word form, in a given context, changes its propositional meaning in favor of an essentially metacommunicative, discourse interactional meaning", or, in other words, the incorporation of the speaker's attitude towards the interlocutor and of other pragmatical elements into a linguistic unit.

Diewald (2011) observes the phenomenon of pragmaticalization by taking into consideration some German modal particles. In German *aber* is an adversative conjunction (comparable to *but* in English) that is also used as a modal particle to express the speaker's attitude towards something that happened or has been said. In the sentence "*Das ist aber keine gute Idee*", that can be translated as "That is ABER not a good idea" (Diewald, 2011, p. 380), the modal particle *aber* conveys the point of view of the speaker, who thinks that the above is not a good idea, even though other people may believe otherwise. The adversative connotation of the modal particle illustrates how the pragmaticalization process modified the adversative conjunction, enriching it with a purely pragmatic meaning.

The core elements of this process can also be applied in the more complex case of constructions such as discursive formulas, as will be highlighted later in this work.

1.2 Discourse Formulae

The notions explored in the previous part of this work converge in the concept of discourse formulae, expressions that serve as direct replies to the interlocutor's linguistic stimulus and that are, therefore, closely embedded in the field of pragmatics.

1.2.1 History of the Research

As Rakhilina et al. (2021) report, the first mention of speech particles that perform a pragmatic function can be traced back to the article named *Remarks on contrastive pragmatics* by Fillmore (1984). In this work Fillmore focuses on the so-called *speech formulas*, in particular on the German modal particles like *doch*, *zwar*, *etwa*, etc. As we have already seen, they do not find an exact equivalent in English, but they carry major pragmatic significance, since they mark the speaker's relation to an act or a speech act.

Fillmore reports on these formulaic expressions on the basis of several German jokes containing these formulae and which precisely because of them achieve the desired comic effect. Fillmore (1984, p. 132) submitted a series of jokes to his German respondents, among which the following:

Ein zum Tode Verurteilter wird morgens um fünf Uhr geweckt.

'Haben Sie noch einen Wunsch?'

'Ja. Ich möchte gern eine Tasse Kaffee trinken.'

'Und wieviel Zucker nehmen Sie?'

*'Zucker? Sind Sie verrückt? Ich bin **doch** Diabetiker.'*

A man sentenced to death is awakened at five in the morning.

'Do you have another wish?'

'Yes. I would like to have a cup of coffee.'

'And how much sugar do you take?'

'Sugar? Are you crazy? I'm DOCH diabetic'

The expression *doch* conveys the message that the speaker finds the interlocutor's question foolish or obvious. If instead of *doch* another speech formula is used, for example *nämlich*, the joke is no longer effective, since put

in this way the retort would imply that the speaker does not expect the interlocutor to be aware of his diabetic condition and configures the response as a simple explanation.

The example above illustrates how these formulae, despite their limited length, have a very relevant pragmatic force and can change the meaning of the sentence where they occur, particularly by highlighting the speaker's attitude towards the interlocutor and what has been said or done before (hence the fact that there are called 'modal particles').

Moreover, precisely because of their pragmatic dimension and the fact that this field of linguistics has been less explored than in other areas, it is difficult for a non-native speaker or a person who has not lived extensively in an environment where a certain language is spoken to have a full mastery, or even a full understanding, of these formulaic expressions.

The pragmatic force and the difficulties for learners and translators are commonalities between Fillmore's formulaic expressions and the discourse formulae.

The existence of discourse formulae has been hypothesized within the framework of the project of the Russian Constructicon (Endresen et al., 2020). This project was developed jointly by the Higher School of Economics of Moscow and the Arctic University of Tromsø and consists of an open-access online database of more than 2,000 constructions of the Russian language (Rakhilina et al., 2021). All the examples in the Constructicon are taken from the Russian National Corpus (2003).

While most of the constructions in the database incorporate free slots (e.g. "*у NP-Gen быль NP-Nom - у Паши есть кот*") (Radovan et al., 2021), others did not have any inside of them. This prompted scholars to identify a new class of constructions, namely the discourse formulae (Rakhilina et al., 2021). It has been possible to automatically extract more than 700 discourse formulae from 420 drama text from the XIX-XXI centuries, an endeavor facilitated by the fact that these formulae are usually found at the beginning of retorts and do not incorporate any free slots inside of them (Gerasimenko et al., 2019). As we will

illustrate in the following sections, the only open slot that these constructions have is their stimulus, that is pragmatically marked.

The resulting list of expressions has been collected in the online database for discourse formulae, the *Pragmaticon* (Yaskevich et al., 2017). As it will be further analyzed in the following section of this work, in the Pragmaticon the discourse formulae are listed and categorized according to their pragmatic function, to the stimuli to which they react, to the intonation in which they are usually pronounced and to the gestures that usually accompany them.

The Pragmaticon is an ongoing project that is currently being improved and enriched by different research projects, including the ones integrating the database with translations and equivalents of the discourse formulae in several languages, among which English, Slovene and Italian (Bychkova, 2020b, 2020a; Kozyuk & Badryzlova, 2021).

1.2.2 Characteristics of Discourse Formulae

Discourse formulae can be defined as multi-word non compositional expressions that do not incorporate any free slots inside of them. Taking into consideration their pragmatic meaning, it is possible to say that they serve approximately as positive or negative responses to a preceding speech act (Bychkova & Rakhilina, 2022).

As we have already seen, non-compositionality concerns those expressions that are normally not understood by the learner of the foreign language unless there has been specific instruction on them, since their meaning cannot be deduced from their individual parts in relation to each other (Fillmore, 1984). Non-compositionality is connected to the already mentioned process of pragmaticalization, that leads to the resemantization of the expression and the incorporation of a pragmatic element into a construction, potentially making it non-compositional (Bychkova, 2020b, p. 89).

An example of this pragmaticalization phenomenon is the one named by Bychkova (2020b), regarding the compositional origin of the non-compositional Russian discursive formula *ещё что* ('then what'), which expresses refusal and negation to something that has been said by the interlocutor.

The author of the article hypothesizes that this construction may be the result of the pragmaticalization process of another expression, the homologous question *ещё чего?*, which can be employed with the pragmatic meaning of *нужно ли ещё что-нибудь?* ('do you need anything else?'). *Ещё чего?* is composed of a partitive pronoun (*чего*): this construction has first undergone a process of constructionalization, where the construction with the partitive crystallized syntactically and assumed the aforementioned meaning. *Ещё чего* has then been subjected to a process of pragmaticalization, being enriched with a negative connotation and characterized by irony that has changed the pragmatic context in which it is used. The discourse formula *ещё чего* is indeed used in situations in which the speaker considers the offer, the request, or the suggestion of the interlocutor inappropriate and refuses to do as offered, suggested or requested (Yaskevich et al., 2017).

In the Pragmaticon it is possible to find examples of its usage:

1. *Чего тебе? – Выйди на минуточку, а. – Ещё чего!*

What do you want? – Come out for a minute, will you? – No way!

[Example from the Pragmaticon (Yaskevich et al., 2017)]

From the semantic and pragmatic point of view discourse formulae can be generally divided into two main categories: positive and negative discourse formulae or, in other words, the ones that replace a positive answer ('yes'), and the ones that replace a negative one ('no').

However, discourse formulae and the simple 'yes' and 'no' responses are not completely equivalent synonyms: discourse formulae have a specific pragmatic connotation, and they can also be categorized on the basis of their illocutionary force.

In regard to the discourse formulae with positive meaning, the types of illocutionary acts can be listed as follows: confirmation, surprise, consent, indifference, permission (Bychkova, 2020b; Kozyuk & Badryzlova, 2021).

Among many others, an example of discourse formula with positive meaning is *разумеется* ('you bet', 'it goes without saying', 'it stands to reason'),

whose basic semantic function is confirmation and implies that the question, the evaluation or the assumption made by the interlocutor is not only true from the point of view of the speaker, but also self-evident (Yaskevich et al., 2017). In the Pragmaticon it is possible to find the following example (2):

2. *А: Тебе нравится? – Б: Разумеется.*

A: Do you like him? – B: You bet.

[Example from the Pragmaticon (Yaskevich et al., 2017)]

The ones that express a negative illocutionary act are categorized by Bychkova (Bychkova, 2020b) into negation, prohibition and refusal. However, if we take into consideration the types of illocutionary force in the Pragmaticon, then it is possible to notice that also the discourse formulae expressing ‘proposals, advice and requests’ could fall into this category. Only the discourse formula *ещё чего* is listed under this category and, as we can see both from the example and the translation offered, it is a formula with negative meaning (3):

3. *Выбросьте его, Ксения! — Ещё чего! Сейчас я шоколадку ополосну, будет как новенькая!*

Throw it away, Xenia! - No way! Let me rinse the chocolate, it will be as good as new!

[Example from the Pragmaticon (Yaskevich et al., 2017)]

In the database some other categories are listed, which, depending on the context, can be considered both positive and negative. Those are evaluation, persuasion and question.

Regarding, for example, evaluation, it is indeed possible to encounter both a positive and a negative evaluation. The discourse formula *то, что надо* (‘as it should be’, translated by the author) can be considered an example of discourse formula that expresses positive evaluation (4), while the formula *иди ты* (‘no kidding’, ‘you don’t say’) conveys the meaning of a negative evaluation (5).

4. *У меня нет миски, но есть кастрюля. Подойдет? — То, что надо.*
I don't have a bowl, but I do have a pot. Will that do? - That's what I need.
[Example from the Pragmaticon (Yaskevich et al., 2017)]

5. *Верк, а Верк, — говорит Маша Калашкина, — да ты что? [...] — Влюбилась, — смеётся Абношкин. — Иди ты! — оборачивается к нему Маша.*
Verk, Verk – says Maša Kalaškina – what's the matter with you? [...] – I fell in love – laughs Abnoškin. – Get lost! – Maša turns to him.
[Example from the Pragmaticon (Yaskevich et al., 2017)]

It should be noted that these categories of illocutionary acts do not exhaust all the possible nuances of the pragmatic meaning of discourse formulae, for this reason another parameter that can be selected to improve research in the Pragmaticon is the so-called 'additional semantics'. The variants of this parameter that have been identified in the Pragmaticon number more than 40 and represent specifications of the basic functions listed above.

In the example above (2) the additional semantics of the discourse formula *разумеется* includes the categories of obviousness and expertise, meaning that the speaker believes to be better informed than the interlocutor (Bychkova & Rakhilina, 2022). This latter type of additional semantics can be juxtaposed with the 'non-expert', that is used when the speaker assumes to know less than the other and, therefore, makes hypotheses (6).

6. *Б: Она уже приехала?*

А: Не думаю.

B: Has she already arrived?

A: I don't think so.

[Example from the Pragmaticon (Yaskevich et al., 2017)]

As mentioned above, there is a large number of these types of additional semantics, among which another one is worth mentioning: the one concerning

politeness. It is indeed particularly important to recognize whether the expression used or intended to be used carries with it the possibility that it will be interpreted as an attack toward the interlocutor. In the Pragmaticon only 'polite' is listed as additional semantics (7), while its opposite, 'rude' (8) can be found in the database as a note next to the discourse formulae characterized as such.

7. Б: Тебе помочь?

А: Что ты!

В: Do you need any help?

А: Don't worry about that.

[Example from the Pragmaticon (Yaskevich et al., 2017)]

8. Б: Прекратите это!

А: Да пошел ты!

В: Stop it!

А: Go to hell!

[Example from the Pragmaticon (Yaskevich et al., 2017)]

In the left field we can find the speech act that serves as a stimulus for the discourse formula, i.e., what the interlocutor says that prompts the speaker's reply. In the Pragmaticon are listed 37 different types of stimuli that can be found in the left field. It has been said above that discourse formulae do not have any free slots within them, and this is true in the sense that they are not allowed inside the formula itself, but this statement needs to be clarified. As pointed out by (Puzhaeva et al., 2018, p. 7), the meaning of some discourse formulae depends on the type of speech act that precedes them.

Some discourse formulae are indeed polysemic, and the element that determines their illocutionary force is the preceding stimulus. In Bychkova et al. (2019) the author finds 8 different pragmatic meanings of the discourse formula *да ну*, that are in most cases determined by the type of the stimulus. For example, if the discourse formula follows a compliment, it would express the devaluation of

the preceding speech act, while if the stimulus communicates something new, then *da hy* could convey surprise, irony or distrust.

As we can see in the latter example, although analysis of the stimulus, the speech act in the left field and of the discourse formula illocutionary force give us most of the information we need for the classification of these constructions, other elements contribute to specifying its meaning. Those are *gestures* and *intonation*.

The gestures are classified in the Pragmaticon according to the body part that is usually activated when using a certain formula: for example, if the discourse formula *da hy* is used as a reaction of refusal to a proposal, the speaker may turn away from the interlocutor to underline the stance that is being expressed.

The different pragmatic meanings of the discourse formulae can also be highlighted by the intonation in which they are usually pronounced: for instance, when *da hy* acts as a devaluation to a compliment, is it usually pronounced with the intonational contour classified in Russian phonetics as *IK2*.

Not only the pitch, but also the duration of segments in a construction can provide meaningful pragmatic information: Duryagin (2022) observes how the crucial element in the listeners' interpretation of the discourse formula *da hy* in the continuum *acceptance – distrust – denial* is the length of the vowels in the prosodic nucleus.

1.2.3 Discourse Formulae of Refusal

In this work we have chosen to observe the *discourse formulae of refusal*.

As already mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, discourse formulae serve as a negative or positive reaction to a speech act of the interlocutor. The discourse formulae with negative meaning express negation, prohibition and refusal.

It is possible to categorize these three groups of discourse formulae with negative meaning into two main categories: *directive*, which include the formulae of prohibition and refusal, and the *non-directive* ones, i.e., those of negation. The difference between those two groups lies in the fact that the directive ones are speech acts that the speaker may use to change the course of events (e.g., by forbidding an action or by refusing to perform it), while non-directive discourse

formulae have no effect on real events, they just react to them (Kozyuk, 2020, p. 15). The following examples illustrate the difference between directive and non-directive discourse formulae and show how the same discourse formula, *ни в коем случае*, can have both the meaning of prohibition (9) and of negation (10), depending on the context.

9. Б: Я пойду?

А: Ни в коем случае.

В: Shall I go?

А: Not on your life.

[Example from the Pragmaticon (Yaskevich et al., 2017)]

10. Б: Они не захотят.

А: Ни в коем случае.

В: They won't want to.

А: No way.

[Example from the Pragmaticon (Yaskevich et al., 2017)]

As already mentioned, discourse formulae of prohibition express the desire of the speaker to prevent the interlocutor from performing an action, and the discourse formulae of refusal express the speaker's refusal to engage in one.

The distinction between the two contexts is not always sharp. In contexts where, for example, interlocutor A offers help to interlocutor B, and B refuses, the classification of B's illocutionary act is not unambiguous, according to the definition articulated above (11). In fact, if it is rigidly applied, it could be possible to say that B *prevents* A from performing the action of helping him with a speech act of refusal. If, on the other hand, we see B as the beneficiary of the action, then we can consider B's speech act as a refusal to be helped, where the focus is not on hampering A's action, but in B not being the beneficiary of any help. In the present work similar contexts of 'refusal to an offer of help' are classified and used as refusal contexts, not as prohibitions.

11. Б: *Хотите, я с ним поговорю!*

А: *Не стоит беспокоиться.*

В: Do you want me to talk to him?

А: Don't worry about that.

[Example from the Pragmaticon (Yaskevich et al., 2017)]

Since the Pragmaticon is still an ongoing project, it is not possible to formulate an exhaustive list of all the types of speech acts that might trigger the use of a discourse formula of refusal. At the present time the types of stimuli connected to discourse formulae of refusal that are listed in the online database are: assumption, question, proposal, advice, request, prohibition, demand, offer of help, decision, communication of intent, any type of response, reiterated question, agreement.

These categories of speech acts are not all equally represented, the most common ones being: *proposal*, *question* (different types of it: special or yes/no question, question of cause), *advice*, *request* and *demand*. These categories are also the ones selected for the second experiment in the present work.

1.3 Speech Act Theory

A further element that composes the theoretical background on which the concept of discourse formula has already been mentioned in the sections above, at least in terms of the practical repercussions on the field of interest of our study: the *Speech act theory*. The original field of application of this theoretical framework is the philosophy of language and owes its early development to the cycle of lectures by Austin *How to do things with words* (White et al., 1963). The theory was then further developed by Searle (1969).

The main focus of Speech Act Theory is pragmatics: as the title of Austin's lectures suggests, words are not just abstract linguistic emanations, but enable us to interact with the world, showing how we engage with it and allowing us to modify it. Similarly to Construction Grammar, Speech Act Theory also addresses how speech acts are perceived by the speakers of a language, who can

understand how sometimes what is actually meant by the use of certain words or phrases goes beyond their literal meaning. Speech Act Theory seeks to explore the 'actual' intentions behind speech acts, trying to explain, for example, why "when someone says, 'Why don't you call Bill?' [...] the addressee, instead of answering the question, calls Bill" (Pratt, 1986, p. 6).

The dichotomy between what is said and what is meant allowed scholars like Austin to hypothesize the existence of three levels of analysis in each speech act: namely locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts (Verschueren, 1978).

On the first level, locutionary acts are connected to the content of the speech act, to its literal meaning: if we say, 'Why don't you call Bill?', then the locutionary act is the inquiry of the reasons why the interlocutor does not call Bill. If we consider the same question as an illocutionary act, i.e., as a performative action that has an effect in the world, then we can take into account the intended meaning of the expression, its being a suggestion or a request to call Bill. The perlocutionary meaning of the expression is linked to the effect that is achieved through the speech act, so, the fact that the interlocutor is going to call Bill.

Illocutionary acts have an illocutionary force, which expresses the goal that the speaker is trying to achieve. Searle (1976) identified five categories of illocutionary acts, each corresponding to a different type of speaker's intention: representatives, commissives, directives, espressives, and declarations.

Speech Act Theory underlies the reflection on Discourse Formulae, which are related to pragmatics, and can be classified on the basis of their illocutionary force and the illocutionary force of the speech act that precedes them and to which they respond.

1.4 Interlanguage Pragmatics and Linguistic Politeness

The speech act of refusal has been the focus of several studies on linguistic pragmatics and politeness, especially from the point of view of L2 acquisition and teaching in the field of *interlanguage pragmatics*. Interlanguage pragmatics (IP) explores the ways in which L2 learners acquire pragmatic

knowledge, observing the development of intercultural competence paired with foreign language acquisition *per se* (Artoni & Rylova, 2021, p. 69). In fact, in cross-cultural interactions, the difficulties that the learner might encounter are not the only of linguistic nature: every culture has indeed particular ways of expressing the same communicative functions and holds different standards as to what is acceptable and what is considered inappropriate.

Such unwritten pragmatic rules are usually particularly challenging for L2 language learners, especially if they have not spent a sustained period in contact with native speakers of the target language cast in their cultural environment. Félix-Brasdefer (2004) reports how both a higher level of proficiency in the target language and a longer period spend in contact with the target community correlate with a more enhanced pragmatic competence, but the latter is the more relevant parameter between the two.

In a context of intercultural interactions, the speech act of refusal represents a “major cross-cultural ‘sticking point’ for many nonnative speakers” (Beebe et al., 1990). Indeed, since refusals involve the interlocutor being contradicted, the difficulties for the nonnative speaker are not only linguistic, but also pragmatic. In other words, speech acts of refusal can expose the speaker to the risk of performing a *face-threatening* act.

The concept of *face* was developed in the scope of the studies on linguistic politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Goffman, 1967 as cited in Schauer, 2009) and consists of the “positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line other assume he has taken during a particular contact” (Goffman, 1967, p. 5 as cited in Schauer, 2009). This definition entails that the face is something dynamic, constantly negotiated during the social interaction and that is not owned and defined only by the person to which it refers, but by the whole complex and interconnected system of social and communicative elements. Thus, face threatening acts are interactions that endanger the social stance and value of one’s self image.

Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 69 as cited in Félix-Brasdefer, 2006) identify two types of face: the *positive* one and the *negative* one. The positive face consists in one’s desire of being accepted and respected by other members of

the society, while the negative face comprises the pretense not to be bothered in one's private capacity and not to be subject to unwanted impositions.

Usually, participants in a communicative situation would try and avoid or defuse face threatening acts, both to the positive and negative face, and this can be accomplished through the correct interpretation of the dynamics of the interaction, the politeness system (Scollon et al., 2012, p. 52). The authors describe three parameters that determine the politeness system: power (the difference in social position between the interlocutors), distance (how close their relationship is) and weight of imposition (the pragmatic force with which the communicative intention is carried forward). Different combinations of these parameters create different communicative situations and expectations: the conversation between two friends (a situation that can be described as 'power -, distance -': the two interlocutors are one the same social level and have a close relationship) will be different from one between an employer and an employee (power +, distance +: the employer has power over the employee and they do not have a close relationship). A further layer of complications is caused by the cultural differences as to what is acceptable in the same politeness system.

As we have already seen, the speech act of refusal is especially susceptible to the risk of face threatening, chiefly to the interlocutor's face, and not the speaker's. For instance, the discourse formula of refusal *да пошёл ты* (which can be translated as 'go screw yourself') could not be used in a context where the speaker is concerned about not offending the interlocutor (12). The situation presented is indeed one characterized by violence, since it describes a theft, and the use of this discourse formula would usually not be deemed acceptable in a more mundane situation:

12.— *Чего там? — спросил водитель, сгоняя улыбку с лица и глядясь в Сашу. — Ты из молодых, что ли, эй? — Руки вверх! — сказал Саша, черт знает, откуда выпала у него эта глупая фраза, но ничего другого он придумать не смог. — Да пошел ты, — ответил водитель и кинул свое ловкое тело в салон — там у него что-то лежало, на заднем сиденье, автомат.*

- What is it? - The driver asked, wiping the smile off his face and looking at Sasha. - Are you one of the young ones, hey? - Hands up! - said Sasha, who knows where the hell he got that stupid phrase from, but he couldn't think of anything else. - "Screw you," replied the driver and threw his agile body into the cabin - he had something lying there, on the back seat, a machine gun.

[Example from Захар Прилепин. Санька. 2006 (*The Russian National Corpus*, 2003)]

Therefore, it is of particular importance that adequate linguistic instruction takes place in this regard for L2 learners.

Chapter 2

The Study

The Pragmaticon project contributed to the deepening of the knowledge about Russian discourse formulae and made the information about their usage and characteristic more conveniently available through a practical graphical interface. The present study aims at expanding this project by means of a cross-linguistic research that, on the one hand, begins to explore the Italian inventory of discourse formulae of refusal, and, on the other, attempts to find equivalents between these and the Russian expressions.

The results of this study will contribute to filling the current gap in reliable Italian-to-Russian translations of some discourse formulae of refusal, taking into consideration pragmatic, context-based correspondences. Given the relative novelty of the concept, no study about the equivalence between Russian and Italian discourse formulae has been carried out yet. This causes a lack of coverage in relation to this class of constructions in the teaching and learning of Russian for Italian learners, which could be bridged by the identification of Italian discourse formulae and the association between those and the already discovered Russian discourse formulae. The Pragmaticon, at present, is one of the most useful tool for the teaching of discourse formulae, but from the learner's perspective its use may be problematic in the absence of reliable, up-to-date translations of Russian constructions that take into account the pragmatic context in which these formulae are encountered. Given these premises, we have chosen not to rely only on corpus research for the accomplishment of our goals, but to proceed on an experimental basis, in order to find as accurate translations as possible.

This work is divided into three main sections: the first part consists of a questionnaire administered to native speakers of Italian aimed at identifying Italian discourse formulae of refusal; the second one involves a corpus analysis on the Italian discourse formulae that were found; the third section comprises a

questionnaire for Russian native speakers to match Russian formulae with the Italian ones.

This work can be characterized as an exploratory study, since the cross-linguistic research regarding discourse formulae is still at an early stage, and even more so if we consider Italian discourse formulae.

2.1 First Experiment: Elicitation of Italian Discourse Formulae

One of the goals of this study is the identification of some Italian discourse formulae of refusal. To achieve this, different communicative contexts were created on the basis of the study by Kozyuk et al. (2021). The respondents were asked to fill in the gaps in each context with Italian expressions of refusal.

2.1.1 Participants

The questionnaire was administered via Google Form. All the respondents were native speakers of Italian. In total, responses were collected from 64 Italian native speakers ranging in age from 22 to 67 years old. 74,6% were female, 25,4% were male and most of them came from the northern regions of Italy (77,8%), 4,8% from the central regions and 17,5% from the southern regions.

2.1.2 Discourse Completion Task

The questionnaire was structured as a discourse completion task: all the 13 items of the task consisted in mini dialogues composed of a stimulus and a reply, in which a space at the beginning is left blank to be filled with an expression of refusal (e.g. 13):

13. A: *Potresti darmi un passaggio?*

B: _____. *Sono già in ritardo per il lavoro*

A: Could you give me a lift?

B: _____. I'm already late for work.

[Example from the questionnaire]

Given the fact that, as we have seen in the previous chapter, the determinant element for discourse formulae is the preceding speech act, the variety of items in the questionnaire was established on the basis of the type of stimuli for each refusal. The types of stimuli included in the questionnaire were: request, advice, communication of intention, offer of help, demand and proposal.

Five distractors were also added to the questionnaire. Three of them required the completion of a speech act of *affirmation*. The two other distractors involved a speech act of *prohibition*: the responses collected in relation to these items were similar to the ones of refusal, which are the focus of the study. This was not unexpected, considering that studies such as the one by Kozyuk (2020) showed that the borders between the discourse formulae of negation and of refusal are blurred, and based on that it could also be supposed that the speech acts of prohibition and refusal overlap to some extent.

In *Table 1* every item of the questionnaire is reported, highlighting the type of each stimulus and whether the item is a distractor or not.

Table 1

Questionnaire for the elicitation of Italian discourse formulae

Questionnaire item		Type of stimulus
ID	Item in the questionnaire	English translation
1	A: Potresti darmi un passaggio? B: _____. Sono già in ritardo per il lavoro.	A: Could you give me a lift? B: _____. I'm already late for work
2	A: Dovresti lasciare questo lavoro, non ti fa bene. B: _____. Mi servono quei soldi!	A: You should quit that job, it's not good for you. B: _____. I need that money!
3	A: Adesso basta, chiamo il dottore. B: _____. Ora mi passa.	A: That's it, I'm calling the doctor. B: _____. I'll be fine.
4	A: Oggi offro io.	A: It's my treat!

	B: _____. Sono stato io a invitarti!	B: _____. It was me who invited you!	
5	A: Ho bisogno di una birra. B: _____. Stasera devi guidare tu!	A: I need a beer. B: _____. You have to drive tonight!	Communication of intention
6	A: E se stessimo a casa quest'anno durante le feste? B: _____. Ho proprio bisogno di prendermi una pausa da questo posto.	A: What if we stayed at home this year during the holidays? B: _____. I really need a break from this place.	Proposal
7	A: Guardiamo un film horror! B: _____. Poi non riuscirei più a dormire.	A: Let's watch a horror! B: _____. I wouldn't be able to sleep afterwards.	Proposal
8	A: Lascia che ti aiuti. B: _____. Ce la faccio da solo.	A: Let me help you. B: _____. I can do that myself.	Offer of help
9	A: Vuoi che rimanga qui e che ti aiuti? B: _____. In qualche modo ce la farò.	A: Do you want me to stay here and help you? B: _____. I'll manage.	Offer of help
10	A: Torna a fare i compiti! B: _____. Mi hanno stufato!	A: Go back to your homework! B: _____. I'm already sick of it!	Demand
Distractors			
11	A: Viste le circostanze, pensi che dovrei annullare la festa? B: _____. Tanto è troppo tardi.	A: Given the circumstances, do you think we should cancel the party? B: _____. It's too late anyways.	
12	A: Quando sarai a Londra, vai al Tate Modern. B: _____. É la prima cosa nella lista.	A: When you'll be in London, go to the Tate Modern. B: _____. It's the first thing on the list.	
13	A: Potrei usare il tuo computer? B: _____. Forse dopo.	A: Could I use your computer? B: _____. Maybe later.	
14	A: Mamma, posso andare a nuotare?	A: Mum, can I go swimming?	

	B: _____. Le onde sono troppo forti.	B: _____. The waves are too strong.
15	A: Domani passo a salutarti, se non hai niente in contrario. B: _____. Passa pure in mattinata.	A: Tomorrow I'll drop by and say hello, if you don't mind. B: _____. Stop by in the morning.
16	A: Non farne parola con nessuno, te ne prego. B: _____. Manterrò il segreto.	A: Don't tell anybody, please. B: _____. I'll keep the secret.

The respondents were asked to write a brief expression to complete the sentences appropriately, without specifying that the focus was on speech acts of refusal, given the presence of distractors. The participants to the study were also asked to avoid answering with *sì* and *no* ('yes' and 'no'), since those could have been the most obvious answer and the goal of the study was to try and elicit discourse formulae.

2.1.3 Results

As could be expected, discourse formulae were not the only expressions that were entered by the respondents. The majority of the elicited responses could indeed not be considered discourse formulae either because they were compositional (e.g., 1) or because they consisted of 'no' with a 'no-modifier' (e.g., 15).

14. A: *Potresti darmi un passaggio?*

B: ***Mi dispiace ma non posso.*** Sono già in ritardo per il lavoro.

A: Could you give me a lift?

B: ***I'm sorry but I can't.*** I'm already late for work.

[Example from the questionnaire]

15. A: *Torna a fare i compiti!*

B: ***Assolutamente no.*** Mi hanno stufato!

A: Go back to your homework!

B: Absolutely not. I'm sick of it!
 [Example from the questionnaire]

Among all the responses, 20 expressions were found that could be considered discourse formulae. Given the non-compositionality of discourse formulae, their literal translation would only partially convey their meaning, therefore glosses were added to *Table 2* to better analyze their structure.

Table 2 shows the formulae with their variations and the corresponding glosses according to the Leipzig Glossing Rules (Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, 2015). These rules for interlinear glossing were developed by the University of Leipzig and the Department of Linguistics of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology to attempt to find a standard for the morphological, syntactic, and semantic description of words and parts of words. Along with ten rules, a list of abbreviated category labels was proposed. According to the authors, the list and the rules should be considered as a flexible guideline to be adapted depending on one's specific needs and goals. As regards this study, the following rules are the most relevant for the purpose of understanding the table: first of all, the words and the corresponding glosses are vertically aligned to the left, and a rough literal translation is provided above the glosses. Then it is also worth noticing that the separable morphemes in each word are divided by a hyphen: each section of the word is either described by one or more category label (in small capital letters), or by the semantic translation (in lowercase). Moreover, if the same word segment is to be described by several words or abbreviations, these elements are separated by a period.

Table 2

Italian discourse formulae

Discourse formula and variations	Glosses
Sei matto?	'Are you crazy?'
Ma sei matto?	sei matto ?

Sei pazzo?	be.2SG.PRS	crazy	Q	
Ma sei pazzo?	ma	sei	matto	?
[pazzo and matto are synonyms]	but.CONJ	be.2SG.PRS	crazy	Q
Anche no	'Also no'			
Ma anche no	Anche	no		
	also	NEG		
	Ma	anche	no	
	but.CONJ	also	NEG	
Non è il caso	'It is not the case' / 'It does not seem the case to me'			
Non mi sembra il caso	Non	è	il	caso
	NEG	is.3SG.PRS	the	case
	Non	mi	sembr-a	il caso
	NEG	1SG.DAT	seem.3SG.PRS	the case
Non esiste	'It does not exist'			
Ma non esiste	Non	esist-e		
	NEG	exist-3SG.PRS		
	Ma	non	esist-e	
	but.CONJ	NEG	exist-3SG.PRS	
Scherzi?	'Are you joking?'			
Ma scherzi?	Scherz-i	?		
	Joke-2SG.PRS	Q		
	Ma	scherz-i	?	
	but.CONJ	joke-2SG.PRS	Q	
Lascia stare	'Leave it'			
	Lasci-a	st-are		
	Leave-2SG.IMP	stay-INF		
Figurati	'Go figure'			
Ma figurati	Figur-a-ti			
	figure-2SG.IMP-REFL			
	Ma	figur-a-ti		
	but.CONJ	figure-2SG.IMP-REFL		
Ma va'	'But go'			
Ma va' là	Ma	va'		

	but.CONJ	go.2SG.IMP		
	Ma	va'	là	
	but.CONJ	go.2SG.IMP	there	
Ti pare?	'Do you think so?'			
Ma ti pare?	Ti	par-e	?	
	DAT.2SG	seem-3SG.PRS	Q	
	Ma	ti	par-e	?
	but.CONJ	DAT.2SG	seem-3SG.PRS	Q
Ma dai	'Oh come on'			
	Ma		dai	
	but.CONJ		give.2SG.IMP	
'Sto cazzo	'This [vulgarity]'			
	'sto		cazzo	
	this		VULGAR	
Col cavolo	'With the cabbage'			
	Co-l		cavolo	
	with-the		cabbage	
Col cazzo	'With the [vulgarity]'			
	Co-l		cazzo	
	with-the		VULGAR	
Toglietelo dalla testa	'Get it out of your head'			
	Togl-i-te-lo		dal-la	testa
	remove-2SG.IMP-REFL-PRON.3SG		from-the	head
Per carità	'For goodness' sake'			
	Per		carità	
	for		goodness	
Figuriamoci	'Let's figure'			
Ma figuriamoci	Figur-iamo-ci			
	figure-1PL.IMP-REFL			
	Ma		figur-iamo-ci	
	but.CONJ		figure- 1PL.IMP-REFL	
Lascia perdere	'Leave it'			
	Lasci-a		perd-ere	
	Leave-2SG.IMP		lose-INF	
Lasciami stare	'Leave me be'			
	Lasci-a-mi		st-are	

	Leave-2SG.IMP-PRON.1SG	stay-INF	
Vai tranquillo	'Go calm'		
Ma vai tranquillo	Va-i	tranquillo	
	go-2SG.IMP	calm	
	Ma	va-i	tranquillo
	but.CONJ	go-2SG.IMP	calm
Neanche per sogno	'Not even in a dream'		
	Neanche	per	sogno
Ma neanche per sogno	NEG	for	dream
Nemmeno per sogno			
Ma nemmeno per sogno			
[<i>neanche</i> and <i>nemmeno</i> are synonyms]			

Of the three criteria for recognizing discourse formulae two of them did not pose any problems during the task of identifying Italian discourse formulae of refusal among all the responses to the questionnaire: the features of non-compositionality and of the absence of free slots. At the same time, the requirement of being multi-words items did not always fit in the case of Italian formulae. In Italian the personal pronouns are indeed often incorporated into the verb they are linked to (e.g., the discourse formula *figuriamoci*, 'let's figure' see *Table 2*). Moreover, in another instance, *scherzi?* ('are you kidding?', see *Table 2*), the fact that the discourse formula only comprises one word is, on the one hand, not constant, because *scherzi?*, as many other Italian discourse formulae, can be found in its variation *ma scherzi?*, with the addition of *ma* ('but') without any significant change in pragmatical meaning, making it a multi-words expression. On the other hand, the fact that such formula is clearly non-compositional led me to include it into the list of Italian discourse formulae of refusal.

The following step of this study attempts to broaden the spectrum of contexts in which these discourse formulae are used through the analysis of search results in two corpora.

2.2 Corpus Analysis

The corpus analysis was carried out relying on two corpora: *ItTenTen20* (*ItTenTen – Italian Corpus from the Web*, 2022) and *Paisà* (Lyding et al., 2014).

ItTenTen20 is part of the *TenTen Corpus Family* (Jakubíček et al., 2013), a collection of corpora encompassing more than 40 languages and that can be accessed through the platform SketchEngine (Kilgarriff et al., 2014). The Italian corpus is composed of 12 billion words collected from web pages in Italian between November 2019 and December 2020.

The Italian corpus *Paisà* is a cooperative project of the Universities of Bologna and Trento, of the Accademia Europea di Bolzano (EURAC) and of the CNR of Pisa. This corpus contains about 250 million of tokens that were compiled from Italian web pages, similarly to the ItTenTen20 corpus.

As the difference in size might suggest, for the present study the research on ItTenTen20 has generally been more fruitful than the one on *Paisà*.

The choice of these corpora was not random selection: while it is true that the discourse formulae are found mainly in the spoken colloquial language, the colloquial Italian oral corpora available when this study was carried out were fewer and smaller in size. Therefore, I preferred to employ corpora containing texts taken from the Web, since the interaction between users in forums and other platforms often mimics colloquial spoken language.

The main difficulty that was encountered during the corpora analysis was the limited number of pertinent examples. Indeed, on top of the three basis requirements for an expression to be considered a discourse formula, when analyzing the corpora there were also other elements to be considered: the expression had to be found at the beginning of the reply to a speech act and had to be syntactically unrelated to the following sentence, otherwise the condition of non-compositionality would not be met.

2.3 Second Experiment: Russian Equivalents to Italian Discourse Formulae

While the first questionnaire and the corpus analysis were focused on the identification and the description of some Italian discourse formulae of refusal and their usage, the experiment discussed in this section is designed to seek Russian counterparts for the Italian discourse formulae of refusal.

The outcomes of this experiment can, on one hand, provide Italian translations for the Russian discourse formulae found within the Pragmaticon. On the other hand, they can contribute to the further expansion of the aforementioned project by identifying potential new Russian discourse formulae.

2.3.1 Methodology

Initially, twenty different mini-dialogues in Italian were created, accompanied by detailed descriptions of the contexts in which they are used. In each scenario a different Italian discourse formula of refusal was situated within a contextual framework, mostly by adapting the results from the corpora analysis. The contexts preceding the dialogues had the purpose of avoiding the possibility of misinterpretation of the situation for the respondents, since the correct interpretation of the pragmatic situation is the key element in the case of discourse formulae. Furthermore, these contexts were subsequently translated into Russian to ensure optimal participant comprehension. An example of this is example 16 (the English translation was not present in the questionnaire administered to the respondents):

16. *ITA: Lavori come segretario/segretaria per un capo che ti sgrida sempre e che ti fa fare straordinari non pagati ogni settimana. Un tuo amico vede che stai sempre peggio e ti consiglia di lasciare il lavoro perché è preoccupato per te. Tu però hai assolutamente bisogno di quei soldi, altrimenti non riesci più a pagare l'affitto.*
A: Dovresti lasciare quel lavoro, non ti fa bene.
B: Scherzi? Mi servono quei soldi.

RU: Ты работаешь секретарем/секретаршей у начальника, который постоянно кричит на тебя и заставляет каждую неделю работать неоплачиваемую сверхурочную работу. Твой друг видит, что тебе становится все хуже и хуже, и советует тебе бросить эту работу, потому что он беспокоится за тебя. Но тебе определенно нужны деньги, иначе ты не сможешь платить за квартиру.

A: Ты должна бросить эту работу, она тебе не подходит.

Б: ___ Мне нужны эти деньги.

You work as a secretary for a boss who is always yelling at you and making you work unpaid overtime every week. A friend of yours sees that you are getting worse and worse and advises you to quit your job because he is worried about you. You absolutely need that money, however, otherwise you can't pay your rent anymore.

A: You should quit that job, it's not good for you.

B: Are you kidding? I need that money.

[Example from the questionnaire]

The types of speech acts that served as stimuli for the discourse formula were similar to the ones chosen for the first questionnaire, since they are the ones linked to refusal. They were two speech acts of advice, two questions, nine proposals, two demands, one communication of intentions, one offer, one offer of help and two requests.

These contexts were used, unaltered, for both of the two main sections that compose the questionnaire: one discourse completion task and one multiple choice task. During the discourse completion task, the respondents were asked to read each item, which was presented both in Russian and in Italian. They were then prompted to fill in the only blank space located in the Russian response within the dialogue, corresponding to the Italian discourse formula. In this task, the participants were explicitly directed not to employ the word *нет*, meaning 'no', when translating the Italian expression.

With regards to the multiple-choice task, for each context I selected a pool of Russian discourse formulae of refusal from the Pragmaticon. They were chosen by taking into consideration mainly the type of stimulus, but also, in some cases, their additional semantics. Moreover, a few native speakers of Russian, who did not partake in the experiment, were asked to include or exclude some discourse formulae to find a balance between offering as many reasonable alternatives as possible and controlling the length of the lists, so as not to overwhelm the respondents (see Appendix B for the complete lists of options).

2.3.2 Participants

The respondents were selected on the basis of two main characteristics: they had to be Russian native speakers and proficient in Italian (as an indication, from B2 level according to the CEFR).

The participants to this part of the study were fourteen, all aged between 20 and 65. Just one of them is a Russian and Italian bilingual, and more than half have a C1 level or higher. They have been studying Italian in average for 9.3 years, in a range that goes from 1.5 to 25 years (excluding the bilingual speaker), and more than a half has lived or has been living in Italy for more than four years. Most of them have learnt Italian autonomously, in a university course or through private language lessons.

2.3.3 Results

As will be laid out in the following section, some of the expressions of refusal proposed by the respondents in the discourse completion task were absent from the online database of Russian discourse formulae, the Pragmaticon. Nevertheless, they will be documented and examined with the aim of stimulating further research to expand the existing repository of Russian discourse formulae.

In the Appendices the full questionnaire will be reported (Appendix A), along with the complete results of each task (Appendix B), whereas in the following sections only the most relevant insights will be discussed.

Chapter 3

Italian Discourse Formulae

In this section of the study, we will present the usage of each Italian discourse formula identified by means of the first questionnaire, drawing upon insights obtained from both the questionnaire for the elicitation of discourse formulae and corpora analysis results. Moreover, we will delve into the equivalents identified through the second questionnaire administered to native Russian speakers.

3.1 *Sei matto?* [be.2SG.PRS crazy Q]

The literal meaning of this discourse formula corresponds to the question ‘Are you crazy?’. The verbal form *sei* is the present, second person singular of the verb *essere* (‘to be’) and, since this person in Italian is a marker of informality, this formula can be considered informal.

This discourse formula and its variations (see *Table 2*) were entered in the questionnaire as a response to one speech act of proposal and to one of communication of intentions (respectively, items 7 and 5 from *Table 1*).

On the corpus ItTenTen20 the queries were entered as ‘*sei matt**’ and ‘*sei pazz**’: in Corpus Query Language, or CQL, the asterisk symbolizes an indefinite number of letters, and it was used to include both the feminine and the masculine alternative, since in Italian the adjectives are declined according to the gender, where *-o* is the typical ending for masculine nouns and adjectives, and *-a* is usually associated with the feminine ones. This will be applicable to many of the upcoming queries. Clearly, the fact that the conjunction *ma*, ‘but’ was not included in the search allowed its presence, nonetheless.

For the first query (‘*sei matt**’) 2620 examples were found on ItTenTen20, while for the second (‘*sei pazz**’) 3684 results were found. The first 300 results for each query were taken into account. The research on the Paisà corpus

resulted in 20 examples for the query 'sei matt*' and in 18 for the other one but did not lead to find any valid instance.

Some of the results could not be considered discourse formulae either because they were non-dialogical (17) or because they were dialogical but were not independent sentences (18).

17. *dall'altra parte del muro di camera mia il generale smette di cantare fausto leali a squarciagola solo per inveire contro la moglie. che [sic] ha la colpa gravissima di aver cucinato pollo anche oggi. l'hai [sic] fatto anche ieri, le dice. [sic] ma tu **sei matta** a farmi il pollo per due giorni di fila, io non me lo magno quello, te lo magni te*
on the other side of the wall in my room, the general stops singing fausto leali at the top of his lungs only to rail against his wife. who has the very serious fault of having cooked chicken again today. you did it yesterday too, he tells her. **you are crazy** if you make me chicken two days in a row, I don't eat that, you eat it yourself
[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

18. *se volessi vendere il pc quale sarebbe il suo valore? ho il modello col t7200.... da appena 1 anno – **Ma che sei matto a venderlo?***
if I wanted to sell the pc what would be its value? I have the model with the t7200.... from just 1 year - **Are you crazy enough to sell it?**
[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

Others could be considered discourse formulae, not of refusal, but rather of prohibition. Of this type of discourse formulae, most of them were replies to the speech act of 'communication of intention' (e.g., 19).

19. *"Che cosa vuoi fare?" Domandò Dario con tono già un po' allarmato. "Voglio andare nel bosco" "**Sei matta?** Papà e mamma hanno detto che non si può e che è pericoloso."*

"What do you want to do?" Dario asked in an already somewhat alarmed tone. "I want to go into the woods." " **Sei matta?** Father and mother said you can't and that it's dangerous."

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

Apart from those cases, 27 valid examples were found in ItTenTen20 (16 for 'sei matt*' and 11 for 'sei pazz*'). The majority of the discourse formulae in this research could be considered responses to a speech act of proposal, 10 for 'sei matt*' and 5 for 'sei pazz*' (e.g., 21). Other than that, the query 'sei matt*' was found to serve as a reply to questions in 5 cases (e.g., 20) and to commands in one case, and 'sei pazz*' also answered to questions in four instances and to speech acts of offer in two.

All the speech acts of proposal that serve as stimuli for the discourse formulae can be further classified as proposals of a joint activity between the interlocutors.

20. *FELA: Che meraviglia i giochi d'acqua! Secondo me l'acqua può essere un tesoro... pensi che possiamo fare il bagno nelle piscine? ANNA: **Sei matto?** Guarda che lo dico ai custodi!*

FELA: What a wonder are the waterworks! I think the water would be amazing... Do you think we can have a swim in the pools?

ANNA: **Are you crazy?** I'll tell the guards!

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

21. *"Dai, andiamo nei sotterranei". " **Sei pazza?** È spaventoso lì sotto". "Come on, let's go to the dungeon". "**Are you crazy?** It's so scary down there".*

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

From the examples found in the corpus it is noticeable that the discourse formula 'sei matt*' is only ever used when the distance between the interlocutors is not substantial. A reason for this might be that the phrasing of the discourse

formula implies that the person to which it is addressed may be crazy, out of his or her mind, and such an assumption, however metaphorical it may be, could strike as being rude. This could also be explained by the fact that, as we have seen above, this expression is commonly used to refuse to partake in a common activity, which may be more common among people close to one another or on the same social level.

The connotation of the refusal can be described thanks to the compositional meaning of the discourse formula ('are you crazy?'): the speaker refuses something and questions the interlocutor's sanity, because their proposition is considered illogical, dangerous, or disconnected from reality.

In the second questionnaire this discourse formula is presented as a reply to a question (22).

22. Sei un'adolescente e hai intenzione di partecipare a una festa. Un'amico ti chiede se tua madre ne è informata, ma tu non hai nessuna intenzione di dirle la verità, dato che ti impedirebbe di partecipare.

A: Dirai a tua mamma della festa di stasera?

*B: **Sei matto?** Lei pensa che vada in campeggio con la scuola.*

You are a teenager and plan to attend a party. A friend asks you if your mom knows about it, but you have no intention of telling her the truth, since she wouldn't allow you to attend.

A: Are you going to tell your mom about the party tonight?

B: Are you crazy? She thinks I'm going on a school camping trip.

[Example from the questionnaire]

As already mentioned, *sei matto?* means 'are you crazy?', and the Russian translations proposed in the first part of the second questionnaire mirror this meaning: the respondents selected five times *ты с ума сошёл* or *ты с ума сошла, что ли* ('have you gone mad?'), and two times each *ты в своём уме?* ('are you in your right mind?') and *спятил?* (or *с ума спятил?*, 'have you lost your mind?'). Another construction that makes a reference to the sanity of the

interlocutor was used once as a reply: *ты нормальный?*, which means ‘are you sane?’ Moreover, *прикальываешься?* (or *ты что, прикальываешься?*, ‘are you kidding me?’) was used twice. The following construction is similar in meaning to this last one: *шутить?* (‘are you kidding?’), chosen once. Both of these expressions cannot be found in the Pragmaticon as discourse formulae of refusal: *шутить?* (‘are you kidding?’) is classified as a discourse formula of surprise, while *прикальываешься?* (‘are you kidding me?’) has not been entered in the database yet. They may be integrated in the list of discourse formulae of refusal with a more accurate analysis.

In the second part of the questionnaire the discourse formula *ты что* (‘you what?’) was chosen 12 times, while the other options that were selected, *об этом нечего и думать* (‘there is nothing to think about that’), *и не скажу* (‘I won’t say anything’), *а ты подумай* (‘you just think’) and *да ну* (‘come on’) were each chosen once.

This marked difference between the two parts of the questionnaire may be due to the selection of the options for the multiple-choice task, which did not include the options preferred by the participants in the discourse completion task.

The following Russian discourse formulae may be proposed as the most adequate translation for *sei matto?*: *ты что* (‘you what?’), given the number of respondents who put their preference to it, and *ты с ума сошёл*, *ты с ума сошёл, что ли* (‘have you gone mad?’), *ты в своём уме?* (‘are you in your right mind?’) and *с ума спятил?* (‘have you lost your mind?’), for their semantic link to the Italian discourse formula.

3.2 Anche no [also NEG]

Anche no (‘also no’) is composed of the adverb *anche*, which means ‘also’, ‘as well’, ‘even and the negation *no*.

In the questionnaire this discourse formula is found in the same contexts as the previous one (five times for item 7 and four times for 5 of *Table 1*) and, in addition to that, it was also entered three times as a response to a proposal (item 6 from *Table 1*) and once to a request (item 1 from *Table 1*):

The research in the corpora could provide only three instances, and all of them were found among the first 300 examples (out of 13668) found on ItTenTen20. On the Paisà corpus 105 results were found but none of them could be considered a discourse formula of refusal. The main issues that hampered more fruitful research was the fact that this formula often appeared in non-dialogical contexts. Among these, it is worth noting that *anche no* was often used in non-dialogical rhetoric questions (23):

23. *Spiacevole episodio di cosa? Poro [sic] figlio, vogliamo fargli una colletta per pagare i 384 euro di multa? **MA ANCHE NO!** Vai in giro ubriaco [...]? Bene, ti ritiro la patente e altro che 384 di euro, visto che sei un calciatore ci aggiungo tre zeri davanti [...]*

What do you mean, unfortunate event? Poor lad, do we want to pass the hat to pay for his 384 euros fine? **NO WAY!** Do you want to drive around while drunk? Alright, you lose your driver's license and forget about the 384 euros, since you're a football player I'll add three zeros [...]

[Example from Paisà (Lyding et al., 2014)]

Apart from that, *anche no* could be found in contexts where it served as a discourse formula of negation, i.e., when the speaker contradicts the interlocutor's statement (24):

24. *E Ilana avrebbe dovuto essere la figlia di Jacob ma poi gli sceneggiatori non hanno avuto tempo per approfondire il personaggio. Io comunque non vedo male uno spinoff di approfondimento, magari sulla Dharma :-)* – **ma anche no eh....**

And Ilana should have been Jacob's daughter, but then the screenwriters didn't have enough time to develop the character. Anyways I wouldn't mind an in-depth spinoff, maybe about Dharma :-)

– **For me it's a no go...**

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

The discourse formula of refusal *anche no* was found in two contexts where the stimulus is a proposal (e.g., 25), and in one instance an advice (26).

25. *Sveglia all'alba?* – **Anche no.**

Should we wake up at dawn? – **No way.**

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

26. *...ora Alex ti manca solamente la moto da trial! ...e poi non avrai più nulla da scoprire!* – *Trial, ragazzi, anche no, ringrazio per il pensiero, ma ancora non mi sento pronto.*

...now, Alex, you only need a trial bike! ... And then you won't have anything else to discover – Trial bike, guys, **I'd say no**, thank you for your concern, but I don't feel ready yet.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

When *anche no* is employed as a discourse formula, the refusal seems to be linked to the possibility of accomplishing an alternative to what the interlocutor proposes: the speaker seems to imply that there are other, more sensible options to what the interlocutor brings forth. This may be connected to the fact that, as mentioned at the beginning of the section, *anche* can mean 'also', 'as well', which signalize an addition to what has been said before. In the case of this formula, the addition seems to be the possibility of not carrying out what the interlocutor proposes. Moreover, it is said in the Treccani dictionary that the adverb *anche* is sometimes also used to reinforce a statement (*Anche in Vocabolario - Treccani*, n.d.), making *anche no* also a reinforcement of the refusal, apart from the connotation described above.

In the second questionnaire *anche no* was presented as a reply to a proposal (27).

27. *Tu e un tuo amico state facendo un trekking di qualche giorno. Dopo una faticosissima giornata di cammino, ti propone di ricominciare*

domattina alle prime luci dell'alba. Tu però vuoi riposarti e ti sembra inutile iniziare così presto.

A: Alziamoci presto domani, per le 6.

B: Anche no. È troppo presto.

You and a friend of yours are trekking for a few days. After a very tiring day of walking, he suggests that you start again tomorrow morning at first light. You, however, want to rest and it seems unnecessary to start so early.

A: Let's get up early tomorrow, by 6 a.m.

B: No way. It's too early.

[Example from the questionnaire]

The translations found in the discourse completion task of the second questionnaire were various, but the most entered were *нет уж* ('nope') and its variant *ну уж нет*, chosen in total four times. Both are present in the Pragmaticon. There may be another version of *нет уж* that cannot be found in the online database of discourse formulae, which was used once in this questionnaire, *ну нѐ*. Also, other discourse formulae of refusal found in the Pragmaticon were used to fill in the gaps in this task: it is the case of *ни в коем случае* ('under no circumstances', used one time), *нетушки* ('nope', used one time), *да ты что* ('you what?', used twice), *да ну* ('come on', used once). Moreover, a discourse formula that in the Pragmaticon is classified as one of prohibition and negation, *лучше не надо* ('better not') and one of evaluation, *с ума сошёл* ('have you gone mad?') were chosen: it can be worth it to further explore whether they also belong to the class of discourse formulae of refusal, given the results of this experiment.

In the second part of the questionnaire, the multiple-choice task, the respondents chose *ну уж нет* ('nope') seven times, *ни за что* ('for nothing'), *и речи быть не может* ('it's out of the question') and the formulae *ты что* ('you what') were entered four times each; and *ещё чего* ('then what'), *да ну* ('come on'), *нет и нет* ('no and no') three times each.

By comparing the results of the first and the second task it appears that *ну уж нет* ('nope') could be the most convincing translation for *anche no*, even though also the other constructions can be taken into consideration.

3.3 *Non è il caso* [NEG is.3SG.PRS the case]

The literal translation of this expression is 'it is not the case' and it is usually understood with the meaning of 'it is not appropriate'.

This formula was also entered in the questionnaire as a response to the one speech act of proposal and to one of communication of intentions, respectively reported in the items 7 and 5 from *Table 1*.

In this case the corpus research did not offer many instances: even though on ItTenTen20 of the first 300 of 28086 results were analyzed, and on Paisà the first 100 of 1665, only two could be deemed suitable for the present study. Most of the times, *non è il caso* was used in non-dialogical sentences with a compositional meaning, which can be translated to 'there is no need to' or 'it is not appropriate' (e.g., 28).

28. *Visto che le guide normalmente costano attorno ai 10/12€, direi che non è il caso di porsi il problema, se si possiede un telefono made in Apple...*

Since the guides normally cost around 10/12€, I'd say **there's no need** to worry about that, if you own a phone by Apple...

[Example from Paisà (Lyding et al., 2014)]

The discourse formula of refusal itself seems to carry the same connotation of the compositional expression, and to express the absence of need to perform an action proposed by the interlocutor, or its suitability.

The examples found on ItTenTen20 only feature physical actions as stimuli, which bends slightly the definition of discourse formula, that involves the fact that it should be a verbal reaction to a speech act. Nonetheless, similar instances are sometimes found in the Pragmaticon (e.g., in the case of *что я*

вижу, 'what am I seeing', as an expression of surprise, 29), that is why we have chosen to include these examples from the corpus. They could be interpreted as a reply to an offer of help (30) and a gesture of gratitude (31).

29. Б: [Кто-то пришёл].

A: Что я вижу.

B: [Someone comes in]

A: What am I seeing.

[Example from the Pragmaticon (Yaskevich et al., 2017)]

30. *Portato nel carrozzone, mi adagiò su un lettino mentre la moglie corse a munirsi di cotone, alcool e bende medicandomi con molta cura. A nulla valsero le mie proteste nellinsistere [sic] a dire: "Signora, **non è il caso!** Lasciate stare, mi sono solo sbucciato un Ginocchio!"*

Once I was carried into the caravan, I lay down on a table while the wife rushed to get cotton, alcohol, and bandages, carefully tending to my wound. My protests insisting, "Ma'am, **there is no need!** Leave it be, I just scraped my knee," were of no use.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

31. *Vide [...] [la] sua terra. [...] Se ne rallegrò molto e pensò: "Qui, forse, c'è un posto anche per me. "E bussò alla prima porta che trovò. Due signori sedevano dietro un grande tavolo. Lo fecero entrare e sentirono ciò che voleva. [...] dissero: "Sì, un posto ci sarebbe. Trentamila e un pasto al giorno. "Saruis Antonio toccò il cielo con un dito e disse: "Pronto!" E si gettò avanti per baciare la mano ai due signori. Ma i due signori si schermirono, benevoli, dicendo: " **Non è il caso.**"*

He saw [...] his homeland. [...] He felt joyful and thought, "Maybe there's a place for me here too." And he knocked on the first door he found. Two gentlemen were sitting behind a large table. They let

him in and listened to what he wanted. They [...] said, "Yes, there would be a place. Thirty thousand and one meal a day." Saruis Antonio touched the sky with a finger and said, "Ready!" And he leaned forward to kiss the hands of the two gentlemen. But the two gentlemen shielded themselves, kindly saying, "**There is no need.**" [Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

In the second questionnaire *non è il caso* was presented as the answer to a speech act of proposal (32).

32. *Un tuo amico ti propone di brindare per festeggiare la fine della sessione di esami universitaria. A te piacerebbe, ma rifiuti a malincuore perché il giorno dopo devi lavorare di mattina.*

A: Dai, beviamo qualcosa per la fine della sessione.

*B: **Non è il caso**, domani mattina devo alzarmi presto per lavorare.*

A friend of yours proposes a toast to celebrate the end of the university exam session. You would like to, but you reluctantly refuse because you have to work in the morning the next day.

A: Come on, let's have a drink to celebrate the end of the session.

B: It's not appropriate, I have to get up early tomorrow morning to work.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the discourse completion task, the majority of the responses could not be considered discourse formulae because they were compositional, referring to the fact that the speaker could not or did not want to engage in the proposed activity in that moment. They were: *не сегодня* ('not today'), *в другой раз* ('the next time'), *не в этот раз* ('not this time'), *извиняйте, я не могу никак* ('I'm sorry, I can't do this') and *мне нельзя* ('I can't').

The two other non-compositional answers were selected one time each: *увы и ах* ('alas') and *не может быть и речи* ('it's out of the question'). Both of these expressions are not listed among the discourse formulae of the

Pragmaticon, while the last can be considered a variation of *и речи быть не может* ('it's out of the question').

The construction *это не тот случай* ('it is not the case') was also employed once, but we think it may be a calque of the Italian expression: the search on the Russian National Corpus (2003) showed that *это не тот случай* is used in some cases, but always with the literal meaning of 'this situation is not like that'.

In the multiple-choice task the most chosen variants were *не стоим* ('it's not worth it'), selected by five participants, and *ничего не выйдет* ('it's not going to happen'), selected by four of them. *И речи быть не может* ('it's out of the question'), *нет и нет* ('no and no'), *нет уж* ('nope'), *нетушки* ('nope') were each chosen three times, while *да ну* ('come on), *ещё чего* ('then what') two times and *ни за что* ('for nothing'), *с меня хватит* ('that's enough for me'), *только не это* ('just not this') once.

Не стоим ('it's not worth it') and *и речи быть не может* ('it's out of the question') may be the most fitting translations, judging from the results of the two tasks.

3.4 *Non esiste* [NEG exist-3SG.PRS]

Non esiste appears to be a non-compositional discourse formula at a high degree: the expression means 'it does not exist', but, as we are about to see, it is often used to convey the meaning of 'no.'

In the questionnaire this formula was entered with a rather high frequency: it was found 5 times as a reply to an offer (item 4 from *Table 1*), four to a proposal (item 6 *Table 1*), once respectively to a command (item 10 from *Table 1*), to a proposal and to a communication of intentions (items 7 and 5 from *Table 1*).

Since *non esiste* is most used and interpreted as the negative form third person singular of the verb *esistere*, 'exist' (see *Table 2*), the vast majority of the results for the query "*non esiste*", both on ItTenTen20 and on Paisà were of that kind. Therefore the query had to be modified: on ItTenTen20 the search of [tag="F.*"][word="non"][word="esiste"][word="!"] (in CQL) gave 547 results. The

tag 'F.' at the beginning assured that there would be a punctuation mark before the possible discourse formula. I also tried the simple search “*non esiste !*”, which output 4161 instances, and also “*ma non esiste !*”, with 66 examples found in the corpus. For each query the first 300 results (where applicable) were observed.

On the Paisà corpus the search for “*non esiste !*” showed 31 results, and “*ma non esiste*” 94.

The only completely fitting example contains a refusal to a communication of intention (33). Here the interlocutor communicates the intention of performing an activity that involves the speaker as well, to which he expresses his refusal.

33. *Ma la cosa che mi preoccupa però è che oggi chiamiamo l'Assessore a venirci a dare spiegazioni del perché sta andando avanti un progetto di questo tipo. – **Ma non esiste!** Non esiste che glielo andiamo a chiedere oggi.*

But the thing that worries me, however, is that today we are calling the Assessor to come and give us explanations as to why he is going ahead with such a project. – **No way!** There is no way we are going to ask him today.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

Even though the example above is the only one in which *non esiste* can be considered unequivocally a discourse formula, other contexts as well can offer useful insights about the use of this expression. In fact, *non esiste* has been quite often found as a reply to a rhetorical question (34, 35).

34. *Il tubo dell'aria condizionata non si poteva saldare, e il ricambio nuovo costava €180,00!! cioè un tubo di alluminio a questa cifra?!? **non esiste!** per fortuna il mio meccanico è troppo avanti! me lo ha fatto riprodurre identico da un azienda del settore, oltretutto rinforzato per poter sostenere una pressione superiore ed evitare perdite di liquido refrigerante, e l'ho pagato 3 volte di meno!*

The air conditioning hose could not be welded, and the new replacement cost €180.00!! I mean, an aluminum hose at this price?!? **No way!** Luckily my mechanic is too far ahead! he had it reproduced identically for me by a company in the industry, moreover reinforced to be able to support higher pressure and avoid coolant leaks, and I paid 3 times less!

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

35. *40 carte [40000 lire, Italian currency before the adoption of the Euro] per quel concerto! **Non esiste!***

40 thousand lire for that concert! **No way!**

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

The stimulus in the instance 34 could be comparable to an offer, as if the speaker would have responded *non esiste* to the hose that was offered to him. Also, example 35 could be interpreted in that way (the refusal to the offer of a concert ticket). The fact that these situations are not fully-fledged dialogues, but are just reported, may be an indication of the fact that such responses would not have been given to the interlocutor face-to-face, since they might have come off as rude.

Indeed, as we have seen in the previous examples, where *non esiste* is actually a discourse formula, its pragmatic force is quite pronounced. It appears to still have a link to the compositional expression it stems from: by using it the speaker implies that their refusal is so strong, as if what they are refusing was not even a possibility of the reality, as if it did not exist as an option.

In the second questionnaire *non esiste* featured as a reply to a proposal (36).

36. *Un tuo collega insegnante ti chiede se non sia il caso di evitare di assegnare compiti per casa agli studenti. Tu la trovi un'idea assolutamente insensata, visto che sei convinto che i tuoi studenti*

non progredirebbero nelle loro conoscenze se non costretti ad esercitarsi.

A: *Non potremmo evitare di dare compiti per casa agli studenti?*

B: **Non esiste!** *Nessuno studierebbe!*

A fellow teacher of yours asks you whether you should avoid assigning homework to students. You find this a complete nonsense idea, since you are convinced that your students would not progress in their knowledge if not forced to practice.

A: Couldn't we avoid giving homework to students?

B: No way! No one would study!

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the discourse completion task *никак* (or *никак нельзя*, 'it's not possible anyhow') was used by four respondents. Moreover, *ни за что* ('for nothing') and *ни в коем случае* ('under no circumstances') were each entered twice. These last two discourse formulae are present in the Pragmaticon and classified as ways of expressing a refusal, while the first has not been included in the database yet. Other constructions entered once were: *исключено* ('it's excluded'), *никаким образом* ('in no way'), *да ты что?* ('you what?') and *серьёзно?* ('for real?').

The results of the second part of the experiment were relatively assorted: the variant that was chosen by the biggest number of respondents (six) was *и речи быть не может* ('it's out of the question'), followed by *ты серьёзно?* ('are you serious?'), selected by five people. *Нет уж* ('nope') and *ни за что* ('for nothing') were chosen three times each. *Ты что* ('you what?'), which has already been mentioned in the previous part of the questionnaire, was used twice, along with *вот ещё* ('here it is'), *ещё чего* ('then what?'), *нет и нет* ('no and no'), *только не это* ('just not this').

As we have seen, various Russian constructions can translate the Italian discourse formula *non esiste*, but to identify the most appropriate ones among these results, we can name the two most chosen in both tasks, *никак* (or *никак нельзя*, 'it's not possible anyhow') and *и речи быть не может* ('it's out of the question').

3.5 *Scherzi?* [Joke-2SG.PRS Q]

The discourse formula *scherzi?* can be literally translated as the question ‘are you joking?’. It is composed of a verb of the second person singular, which, as already said, marks informality. Nonetheless, we will see in this section that it can also be used as *scherza?*, its formal variation

In the questionnaire *scherzi?* and its variation *ma scherzi?* were entered three times as refusals to an offer (item 4 from *Table 1*), once to a communication of intention (item 5 from *Table 1*) and once to an advice (item 2 from *Table 1*).

The first query in ItTenTen20 has been [word=".*cherzi"] [tag="F.*"], to try and include as many responses in dialogues as possible, since they could be discourse formulae. This search output 29424 results, and the first 300 were taken into consideration. The same structure of the query was used to attempt to find the formal variant (*scherza?*), which was not present in the questionnaire. 15015 results were found, and the first 100 were examined.

To further refine the search, the query “ma scherzi ?” was entered, which gave 1205 results, 300 of which were analyzed.

The Paisà corpus did not offer any significant results.

As in the case of the previous formula, *non esiste*, the corpora search for this discourse formula has been complicated by the fact that *scherzi?* is usually understood as the present second person singular of the verb *scherzare*, ‘to joke’, or as the plural of the noun *scherzo*, ‘joke’. Moreover, in several instances, the examples found contained the construction *scherzi a parte*, ‘all kidding aside’. *Scherzi?* can also be used as a discourse formula of negation (37).

37. *Io ho letto la trama (di sicuro non lo vedrò!) e mi è sembrata la solita mielosa pellicola teen che tralatro [sic] si ispira a Romeo e Giulietta. Capisco che è tratto da un libro, ma anche qui: prima che fosse annunciato il film, chi conosceva sto [sic] benedettissimo libro??? – Ma scherzi? E un best seller in moltissimi paesi soprattutto Germania e USA.*

I read the synopsis (I'm definitely not going to see it!) and it sounded like the usual cheesy teen film that among other things is inspired by Romeo and Juliet. I understand that it is based on a book, but again: before the movie was announced, who knew this damn book??? – **Are you kidding?** It is a best seller in many countries especially Germany and the USA.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

The examples of use of *scherzi?* as a discourse formula of refusal in the corpus covered a wide range of stimuli: one assumption, three demands (e.g. 38), three requests (e.g., 39), two offers, two advice (e.g. 40), one communication of intention, one proposal.

38. *orsù, Hiei, deponi l'ascia di guerra – **Ma scherzi?** Così poi mi si arrugginisce tutta!*

Come on, Hiei, bury the hatchet – **Are you kidding me?** Then it'll get all rusty!

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

39. *[Ti chiedo di dirmi] Il nome ed una descrizione minuziosa sull'onda dei ricordi della prima persona della quale ti sei innamorato, a parte la mamma. - **Scherzi?** Mai.*

[I ask you to tell me] The name and a meticulous description on the wave of memories of the first person you fell in love with, other than your mom. - **Are you kidding?** Never.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

It is interesting that this discourse formula seems to be applicable also to contexts where there is a certain social distance between the interlocutors (e.g., 40). This seems to be made possible by the use of the formal variant *scherza?*

40. *"Deve assolutamente prendersi una vacanza!" il consulente: "Ma scherza? come faccio? sa che sono 5 anni che non stacco?"*

"You definitely need to take a vacation!" the consultant: "**Are you kidding?** how can I? do you know I haven't had time off in five years?"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

The pragmatic connotation that this discourse formula adds to the simple *no* is taken from the meaning of the verb that it stems from: the speaker wants to convey to the interlocutor that what he or she is saying is so improbable that it sounds like a joke.

In the questionnaire administered to the fourteen native speakers of Russian this Italian discourse formula was contextualized as a reply to an advice (41).

41. *Lavori come segretario/segretaria per un capo che ti sgrida sempre e che ti fa fare straordinari non pagati ogni settimana. Un tuo amico vede che stai sempre peggio e ti consiglia di lasciare il lavoro perché è preoccupato per te. Tu però hai assolutamente bisogno di quei soldi, altrimenti non riesci più a pagare l'affitto.*

A: Dovresti lasciare quel lavoro, non ti fa bene.

*B: **Scherzi?** Mi servono quei soldi.*

You work as a secretary for a boss who is always yelling at you and making you work unpaid overtime every week. A friend of yours sees that you are getting worse and worse and advises you to quit your job because he is worried about you. You absolutely need that money, however, otherwise you can't pay your rent anymore.

A: You should quit that job, it's not good for you.

B: Are you kidding? I need that money.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the discourse completion task of the questionnaire used to find the Russian equivalents of Italian discourse formulae half of the respondents entered variants of what appears to be a direct translation of *scherzi?: шутишь?* ('are you kidding?'), *ты шутишь, что ли?* ('what's that, are you kidding?'), *даже не шути на эту тему* ('don't even joke on this topic'). In the Pragmaticon *шутишь?* and some variations are only entered as discourse formulae of surprise, but it seems like this discourse formula could also be used to express a refusal. In three cases another similar translation was given as an option: *ты прикалываешься?* ('are you kidding me?'). This formula is absent from the Pragmaticon.

In the multiple-choice task the most chosen answers were *легко сказать* ('it's easy to talk') and *и речи быть не может* ('it's out of the question'). Each of them was chosen seven times. They are followed by *тебе легко говорить* ('it's easy for you to talk'), selected six times, *ещё чего* ('then what') and *вот ещё* ('here it is), entered respectively four and two times.

Given the semantic similarity, the Russian discourse formulae *шутишь?*, *ты шутишь, что ли?* ('are you kidding?'), *даже не шути на эту тему* ('don't even joke on this topic') may be proposed as the most fitting ones to translate *scherzi?*

3.6 *Lascia stare* [Leave-2SG.IMP stay-INF]

This discourse formula, if literally translated, means 'leave it' and can be described as the imperative second person singular of the verbal construction *lasciare stare*.

The discourse formula *lascia stare* was found in the questionnaire as the response to two commissive speech acts: four times to a communication of intentions (item 3 from *Table 1*) and two times to an offer (item 4 from *Table 1*).

On ItTenTen20 the query [word=".*ascia"] [word="stare"] [tag="F.*"] gave 3849 results, and the first 300 were analyzed. On the Paisà corpus 63 results were encountered. Moreover, as in the case of *scherzi?* I searched for the formal variation *lasci stare*.

13 examples with this discourse formula could be considered valid: 8 of them consisted of a speech act of question as the stimulus and of a refusal that can also be classified with the additional semantic of 'refusal to continue the conversation' (e.g. 42). In the other instances that were found the stimulus was an offer in 4 cases (e.g. 43), and a proposal in one (44).

42. *"Ma che ti è capitato?" ripeté premurosa Carmen "Sei tutto strappato, e quei calzoni..." Feci un gesto abrasivo. "Lascia stare, non è nulla."*

"What happened to you?" repeated Carmen thoughtfully, "You're all torn up, and those pants..." I made an abrasive gesture. "**Never mind**, it's nothing."

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

43. *BIONDA: Mi scusi, signore! Sì, lei. Può farmi il pieno di super, per favore? E dare una controllata all'olio? ELWOOD: Ah, certo. Vuole anche che le tolga i moscerini spiaccicati sul parabrezza? BIONDA: Oh, no, **lasci stare**. Avrei un po' di fretta.*

BLONDIE: Excuse me, sir! Yes, you. Can you fill me up with petrol, please? And check the oil? ELWOOD: Ah, sure. Would you also like me to remove the flies splattered on your windshield? BLONDIE: Oh, no, **never mind**. I'm in a bit of a hurry.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

44. *"Prendiamo un taxi" lui mi guarda "no, no, **lascia stare**, chiamiamo l'albergo che ci manda l'autista"*

"Let's take a cab" he looks at me "no, no, **never mind**, let's call the hotel, they'll send us the driver"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

In the present corpora analysis, the formal variants (*lasci stare*) were only found as replies to speech acts of offer, while the majority of the informal

alternatives (*lascia stare*) were responses to questions and expressed the refusal to continue the conversation. This might be linked with the fact that in a formal context the strategies employed to avoid a conversation might be more elaborated than a discourse formula. On the other hand, the discourse formula appears to be polite enough to decline a service, an offer, from the other interlocutor in a more formal context.

In the most common case of the ones presented here, the speaker wants to convey their refusal to continue the communication, encouraging the interlocutor to close the conversation.

In the questionnaire administered to the fourteen Russian native speakers *lascia stare* was presented as the response to a question (45).

45. *Tu e un tuo amico avete organizzato una festa, tuttavia le previsioni del tempo prevedono pioggia tutto il giorno e degli invitati hanno già disdetto la partecipazione. Il tuo amico ti chiede se non sia il caso di annullare del tutto la festa, ma voi avete già comprato cibo e bevande, oltre ad aver affittato il locale. Ritieni quindi che la festa vada fatta comunque.*

A: Viste le circostanze, pensi che dovremmo cancellare la festa?

*B: **Lascia stare.** Ormai abbiamo già comprato tutto.*

You and a friend of yours have planned a party, however, the weather forecast calls for rain all day, and some guests have already called off attending. Your friend asks you whether you should cancel the party altogether, but you have already bought food and drinks, as well as rented the venue. You therefore feel that the party should be held anyway.

A: Under the circumstances, do you think we should cancel the party?

B: Forget about it. We have already bought everything by now.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the first part of the questionnaire, the discourse completion task, the response what was chosen most frequently (three times) was probably a calque of the Italian discourse formula, *оставь как есть* ('leave it as it is'). Several Russian native speakers who double checked the results found this construction rather unnatural. Moreover, only three examples of *оставь как есть* were found in the main subcorpus of the Russian National Corpus (2003).

All of the other alternatives were entered only once. Two of them convey the attempt of the speaker to soothe the interlocutor's worries: *расслабься* ('take it easy'), *успокойся* ('calm down'). Other constructions encouraged the interlocutor not to worry too much or to stop worrying altogether: *не гони* ('cut it'), *не дури* ('don't be ridiculous'), *не парься* ('don't sweat it'), *забей* ('drop it'), *перестань* ('stop it'). More alternatives proposed by the participants are: *куда уж там* ('and what then?'), *да ну* ('come on), *ни за что* ('for nothing'). One of the alternatives, *всё будет ок* ('everything will be fine'), which was used by one respondent, can be considered compositional and is therefore not valid for our study. One of the proposed options, *будь спокойной* ('be quiet'), can be deemed agrammatical in Russian, and this is also confirmed by the search of the query *будь спокойной* on the Russian National Corpus (2003), which only offered no results.

In the multiple-choice task the discourse formula *а смысл* ('what's the point?') was selected by six participants, *да ну* ('come on) and *ты смеёшься* ('are you joking?') by five, *ещё чего* ('then what') and *нет уж* ('nope') by four. Less chosen were *и речи быть не может* ('it's out of the question), *вот ещё* ('here it is), *не стоит* ('it's not worth it'), *нет и нет* ('no and no'), *ни за что* ('for nothing'), *что это даст* ('what would that give'), *не пойдёт* ('it won't work').

Apart from the most chosen answers in the second part of the questionnaire, it may be worth it to add some discourse formulae to the Pragmaticon, since they could be deemed good translations of the Italian discourse formula *lascia stare*, for example *расслабься* ('take it easy'), *не гони* ('cut it'), *не дури* ('don't be ridiculous'), *не парься* ('don't sweat it') and *забей* ('drop it'). *Успокойся* ('calm down'), on the other hand, it listed in the

Pragmaticon, but as a discourse formula of negation: its usage could be widened to also include refusals.

3.7 *Lascia perdere* [Leave-2SG.IMP lose-INF]

The corpora search was comparable to the one carried out for the discourse formula *lascia stare*, since *lascia perdere* has a similar structure: the first verb of the construction, *lascia*, the imperative of second person singular, is indeed the same in both formulae. Moreover, to a native speaker the previous discourse formula, *lascia stare*, and this one, *lascia perdere*, sound almost synonymical.

The query entered on ItTenTen20, [word="*ascia"] [word="perdere"] [tag="F.*"], gave 6446 results. The examples found for the formal variant, *lasci perdere*, were 1495, but of the first 100 none could be considered valid. On the Paisà corpus the results were 119.

As we have seen in relation to the previous discourse formula, the majority of the contexts in which *lascia perdere* was a discourse formula of refusal were questions to which the discourse formula answered with a refusal to continue the conversation (in 5 instances. See example 46). The only other type of context featured an offer as the stimulus (47).

46. *Cosa sono i legami, quelli per legare lo zaino? - No, **lascia perdere**, li proverai da grande. - Ma io sono grande!*

What are the bonds, the ones to tie the backpack? - No, **never mind**, you'll try them when you grow up. - But I am grown up!

[Example from Paisà (Lyding et al., 2014)]

47. *Il Diavolo disse ad un automobilista: "Pensa a quante sono le vittime degli incidenti stradali: non sarebbe bello se tutte le auto fossero robuste e sicure come dei carri armati?". "Certo, puoi fare questo prodigio?". "Se tu vuoi, io posso rendere tutte le auto forti come dei carri armati, ma costeranno, peseranno, consumeranno,*

si parcheggeranno male di conseguenza, tutte quante, compresa la tua!". "Lascia perdere!"

The Devil said to a driver: "Think about how many people are killed in traffic accidents: wouldn't it be nice if all cars were as strong and safe as tanks?" "Sure, can you do this miracle?" "If you want, I can make all cars as strong as tanks, but they will cost, weigh, wear out, park badly as a result, all of them, including yours!" "**Never mind!**"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

The search of the formal variant did not offer any significant results, and, in general, less results were found for this discourse formula than for *lascia stare*. The differences between *lascia perdere* and *lascia stare*, despite the numerous similarities, seem to lie in the fact that the former appears to be used more often as a discourse formula of refusal, and for a wider range of stimuli.

In the questionnaire used to look for equivalents the speech act that triggered the use of *lascia perdere* was an offer (48).

48. *La tua macchina si è rotta e tu non hai i soldi per ripararla. Vai da un meccanico di tua conoscenza e lui ti dice che può aiutarti, ma che dovrai pagare molto per le riparazioni. Tu purtroppo non puoi assolutamente permettertelo.*

A: Lascia che ti aggiusti io la macchina, sarebbero 500 euro.

*B: **Lascia perdere.** Non ho tutti quei soldi al momento.*

Your car has broken down and you don't have the money to repair it. You go to a mechanic you know and he tells you that he can help you, but you will have to pay a lot for repairs. You unfortunately cannot afford it at all.

A: Let me fix your car, that would be 500 euros.

B: Forget about it. I don't have that kind of money right now.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the discourse completion task of the questionnaire used to find Russian equivalents, the most used variants were *забеу* ('drop it, entered three times) and *забудь* ('forget about that', also used three times). The meaning of these two expressions is almost the same, but the former is more colloquial and informal. Both of those answers are not present in the Pragmaticon, like another expression chosen once in the questionnaire that stems from the same verb as *забудь*, *забыть* ('to forget'): *забудем* ('let's forget about that').

Other answers were *обойдусь* ('I'll manage'), *не парься* ('don't sweat it'), *брось* ('leave it'), *не получится* ('it can't be'). All of them are not present in the Pragmaticon. Although some of them could not be considered discourse formulae in the form they assume here, since they appear to be one-word-items, they could be integrated in the database after having checked if they can be preceded by a particle such as *да*.

In the multiple-choice task *не стоим* ('it's not worth it') was chosen nine times, and *не пойдёт* ('it won't work') four times.

It seems like *не стоим* ('it's not worth it') shares with *lascia perdere* the desire of the speaker for the interlocutor to abandon their resolution, because it is not worth the effort, therefore *не стоим* may be considered a satisfactory translation for the Italian discourse formula. Other constructions, such as *забеу* ('drop it) and *забудь* ('forget about that') could also be deemed as such.

3.8 *Lasciami stare* [Leave-2SG.IMP-PRON.1SG stay-INF]

The construction *lasciami stare* is composed of the same verbal base as the already analyzed discourse formula *lascia stare*. The presence of the particle *-mi*, which is a pronominal particle of first person singular with the function of direct object makes the translation 'leave me alone' an accurate enough one for this discourse formula.

As in the case of the previous discourse formula, *lasciami stare* was entered as a response to an offer of help (item 9 from *Table 1*).

On ItTenTen20 the query "[word="lasciami|Lasciami"] [word="stare"] [tag="F.*"]" gave out 560 results (the first 300 were analyzed). The Paisà corpus

output 4 results, none of which could be used for this study. Moreover, since the formal version of this discourse formula is also used, another query line was entered on ItTenTen20 corpus, “mi lasci stare”, which is, indeed, the formal alternative. The results for that were 131, and all of them were taken into consideration.

A considerable number of examples (6 instances) with this discourse formula involves refusals to continue the conversation in reply to a question (e.g., 49). This could also be noticed in the case of the previous two discourse formulae, *lascia stare* and *lascia perdere*, with which *lasciami stare* shares semantic and syntactic features.

49. *Billy, perché piangi? – Joe, **lasciami stare**, Mary Jane se ne è andata [...]*

Billy, why are you crying? - Joe, **leave me alone**, Mary Jane is gone [...].

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

Apart from that, the usage of *lasciami stare* appears to have consistent differences compared to the two other similar constructions: apart from the already mentioned stimulus of question, other types of stimuli found in the corpus analysis were the four of demand (e.g., 50), three proposals (e.g., 51), two requests (e.g., 52) and one offer of help.

50. *Ammanettato: Porci schifosi! Aspetta che ti metto le mani addosso! Poliziotto: Calmati! Ammanettato: **Lasciami stare** [...]*

Handcuffed man: Filthy pigs! Wait till I get my hands on you! Police: Calm down! Handcuffed man: **Let go of me** [...]

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

51. *"Senta, non si potrebbe andare da qualche parte a parlare... fare una partita..?" – "Mi lasci stare per favore: ho appena perso una partita importante e non sono nello stato d'animo adatto."*

"Look, couldn't we go somewhere to talk – play a match...?" -
"**Leave me alone** please: I just lost an important game and I'm not
in the right frame of mind."

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

52. "*Mi accompagni dal Capitano, la prego!*" – "**Mi lasci stare**. Devo
restare al mio posto. Ho una missione da compiere!"

"Take me to the captain, please!" – "**Leave me alone**. I must stay
at my place. I have a mission to complete!"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

Despite the fact that, compared to *lascia perdere* and *lascia stare*, more instances were found where the formal version was used, it seems like this discourse formula expresses a harsher refusal. The construction *lasciami stare* is also found in contexts where it expresses an imperative similar in meaning to 'don't bother me', 'leave me alone'. This usage also translates to the discourse formula, that also usually conveys a sense of annoyance with the other person or his or her speech act.

In the second questionnaire the stimulus that preceded the discourse formula was a request (53).

53. *Un tuo collega insegnante ti chiede se saresti disponibile a portare gli scolari in viaggio d'istruzione. Tu rifiuti categoricamente, visto che le responsabilità sono troppe rispetto al guadagno che ne ricaveresti.*

A: Porti tu i ragazzi in gita quest'anno?

*B: **Lasciami stare**. Guadagno troppo poco per prendermi anche questa responsabilità.*

A fellow teacher of yours asks if you would be willing to take pupils on an educational trip. You flatly refuse, as the responsibilities are too much compared to the payoff you would get.

A: Will you take the kids on a field trip this year?

B: Leave me alone. I earn too little to take this responsibility too.
[Example from the questionnaire]

In the discourse completion task half of the participants chose constructions that expressed the speaker's desire for the interlocutor to drop their request and to be left alone, such as *отстань* (or *отстань от меня*, 'get off of me', chosen three times), *перестань* ('stop it', chosen once), *оставь меня в покое* ('leave me alone', chosen three times). None of them are present in the Pragmaticon, but with a more accurate analysis of their usage, they could be added. Apart from that, other options were *даже не спрашивай, забудь* ('forget it'), *ни в коем случае* ('under no circumstances'), *увы* ('alas'), *будет перебор* ('it would be too much'. This could not be considered a discourse formula since it is compositional). They were all chosen once.

In the multiple-choice task almost all the seventeen proposed options were selected at least once. *И речи быть не может* ('it's out of the question') and *нет уж* ('nope') were selected four times; *ещё чего* ('then what'), *ни за что* ('for nothing'), *помилуйте* ('I beg your pardon'), *с какой стати* ('why in the world'), *побойся бога* ('fear God') were chosen three times each; *а смысл* ('what's the point'), *вот ещё* ('here again'), *только не это* ('just not this'), *ищи дурака* ('find yourself a fool') two times; and *я больше ничего не хочу услышать* ('I don't want to hear anything more') and *что ты* ('you what') once.

Since so many different options were proposed by the respondents, it is not possible to narrow down the spectrum too much. Anyways, it can be said that the most chosen answers from the first task (*отстань от меня*, 'get off of me'; *перестань*, 'stop it'; *оставь меня в покое*, 'leave me alone') could be added to the Pragmaticon, since they can be deemed fitting translations for the Italian discourse formula, given the semantic similarities.

3.9 *Figurati* [figure-2SG.IMP-REFL]

Figurati is the imperative, second person singular of the reflexive verb *figurarsi*, which can mean ‘to imagine’. In the compositional sense, *figurati* is usually understood as the imperative ‘imagine!’

The discourse formula of refusal *figurati* has been used in 5 mini dialogues of the questionnaire: the stimulus of two of them was an offer of help (8 and 9 from *Table 1*), of one an offer (item 4 from *Table 1*) and of two of them a communication of intention (items 3 and 5 from *Table 1*).

A substantial difficulty encountered especially in the Paisà corpus was the fact that *figurati* can also be used as a plural masculine adjective meaning ‘figurative’, and not only as a verb, as in *Table 2*. The Paisà corpus did not allow to filter for the desired part of speech, therefore I tried adding the conjunction *ma*, ‘but’, which, as we have already seen above, is commonly found before many discourse formulae, and entering the query “*ma figurati*”. This gave 16 results, none of which contained a discourse formula of refusal.

Also, the search on ItTenTen20 output a limited number of examples with the discourse formula of refusal *figurati*. The query [word=".igurati"] [tag="F.*"] gave 13771 results, and the first 300 were taken into account. Since it is possible to create the formal version of this discourse formula, *si figurati*, it was also entered as a search query. The results for this one were 897. Also, in this case the first 300 were examined.

It could be noticed that fairly often *figurati* was employed as a response to an expression of thankfulness (54) or as a discourse formula of negation (55).

54. “*Quali sono i vostri autori preferiti di questo genere?*” – “*Morozzi. Ho letto Cicatrici, ma ho visto recensioni ottime di Blackout.*” – “*Mai sentito! domani vado in biblioteca e provo, grazie ;D*” – [...] “*Di niente, figurati.*”
- “Who are your favorite authors in this genre?” - “Morozzi. I've read *Cicatrici*, but I've seen great reviews of *Blackout*.” - “Never

heard of it! I'll go to the library tomorrow and try it, thanks ;D" - [...]
"You're welcome."

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

55. "E tu vai a votare?" – "No, **figurati!**"

"And are you going to vote?" - "No, **not at all!**"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

In total 4 contexts in which *figurati* (or *si figuri*) could be considered discourse formulae of refusal were found: in two of them the stimulus was an offer (56) and in one it was a proposal (57).

56. "Prego, cavaliere, faccia pure lei" - "**Ma si figuri**, commendatore.
Non mi permetterei mai"

"Please, sir knight, go ahead" - "**Please**, commander. I would never dare"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

57. "Se debbo dir la verità invece [sic] di lavorare io [sic] mi divertomolto [sic] più a veder lavorare gli altri." – "Vuoi prendere il posto di mio cameriere?" – "**Si figuri!**"

"If I have to tell the truth instead of working I have much more fun watching others work." – "Do you want to take the place of my waiter?" – "**I would never**"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

The contrast between the relatively frequent use of the discourse formula of refusal *figurati* in the questionnaire and the small number of instances from the corpora could be explained by the fact that in the corpora not a lot of speech acts of offer and offer of help could be found. This might be linked to the nature of communication on the Internet and that it may be uncommon to offer help through this medium.

Taking into account the examples both from the questionnaire and the corpora and how the construction is used when it is not a discourse formula, especially as a response to an expression of thankfulness, it can be said that *figurati* and *si figuri* qualify as a (sometimes apparently, see example 57) polite refusal, conveying the nuance of the lack of need for the interlocutor to bother to help the speaker.

In the questionnaire for Russian native speakers *figurati* was used as an answer to a communication of intentions (58).

58. *Hai avuto per tutto il giorno un mal di testa molto intenso che ti ha costretto a letto. Verso sera il /la tuo/a partner si offre di chiamare il medico. Tu rifiuti perché pensi che sia eccessivo.*

A: Basta, adesso chiamo il dottore.

*B: **Figurati**, ora mi passa.*

You have had a very intense headache all day that has forced you to stay in bed. Around evening your partner offers to call the doctor. You refuse because you think it sounds excessive.

A: That's it, I'm calling the doctor now.

B: That's okay, I'll get over it now.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the discourse completion task of the second questionnaire the most given answer was *не надо* ('there is no need'), which was selected three times. *Забей* ('stop it') was entered by two respondents.

It is interesting to notice that in four cases the participants to the experiment preferred constructions similar in their meaning: *не переживай* ('don't worry'), *не беспокойся* ('don't worry'), *расслабься* ('take it easy'). None of them are present in the Pragmaticon, but, given the results of this questionnaire, it may be worth to consider their inclusion in the database.

Furthermore, the constructions *да ладно* ('oh well'), *не стоит* ('it's not worth it'), *пустяки* ('nonsense'), *да ну* ('come on'), *брось ты* ('stop it'), *зачем* ('what for?'), *отстань* ('drop it') were used one time each.

In the multiple-choice task eight respondents expressed their preference for the discourse formula *не стоит беспокоиться* ('it's not worth it to worry'), which seems to which seems to support, at least semantically, the preferences observed in the first part of the experiment with *не переживай* ('don't worry'), *не беспокойся* ('don't worry'), *расслабься* ('take it easy'). *Ни к чему* ('for nothing') was chosen seven times, *да ладно* ('alright') six and *не стоит* ('it's not worth it') five. Other options were chosen less, such as *да ну* ('come on', chosen three times), and *вот ещё* ('there again'), *ещё чего* ('then what'), *что ты* ('you what'), *а смысл* ('what's the point'), *нет уж* ('nope'), *только не это* ('just not that'), each selected once.

From the data collected through this questionnaire it appears that there is not one single possible translation of the discourse formula *figurati*. Constructions with a meaning similar to *не стоит беспокоиться* ('it's not worth it to worry') can be named, since formulae with similar meaning, despite the different form, were found in both sections of the questionnaire. Other constructions, such as *не надо* ('there is no need'), which in the Pragmaticon is only listed as a discourse formula of negation and prohibition, can also be deemed suitable translations of the discourse formula of refusal *figurati*. Moreover, *ни к чему* ('for nothing') and *да ладно* ('alright') can also be named.

3.10 *Figuriamoci* [figure-1PL.IMP-REFL]

This discourse formula has a similar root to the previous one, *figurati*, namely the verb *figurarsi*, 'figure' (see *Table 2*). It is, however, the imperative, first person plural of the verb, and this means that it can be considered as the exhortation 'let's imagine!'

Unlike the discourse formula above, *figuriamoci* was entered into the questionnaire only one time, as a reply to a speech act of proposal (see item 7 from *Table 1*).

On the ItTenTen20 corpus the query "[word="figuriamoci|Figuriamoci"] [tag="F.*"]" gave 7110 results, while with the addition of the conjunction *ma*, "[word="ma|Ma"] [word="figuriamoci"] [tag="F.*"]", 645 instances were found. The

first 300 results of both queries were taken into account. The search on the Paisà corpus output 109 results, none of which could be used for this study.

Of the examples from ItTenTen20 only two could be said to contain a discourse formula of refusal: in one the stimulus was a proposal (59) and in the other one a request (60).

59. *Qualcuno mi dice "ah ma tu dovresti metterti alla testa di qualche cosa"... **ma figuriamoci!***

Someone says to me, "ah you should put yourself at the head of something," ... **no way!**

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

60. *"No, no, aspetta, ho un'idea: perché non mi presti Mendolia, per le indagini? Così avrei uno straccio di copertura legale". "Ma tu sei scemo nella testa! **Ma figuriamoci**, imprestarti Mendolia! Manco fosse un cavallo! E poi, imprestartelo, vorrebbe dire essere spedito a Lampedusa rapido come il vento! Toglitalo dalla testa!"*

"No, no, wait, I have an idea: why don't you lend me Mendolia, for the investigation? Then I would have a shred of legal cover." "You are so dumb! **No way**, lending you Mendolia! As if he were a horse! Besides, to lend him to you would mean being sent to Lampedusa as fast as the wind! Get that out of your head!"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

In the corpora *figuriamoci* seems to be used more frequently as a discourse formula of negation (e.g., 61).

61. *"Sarai mica gelosa, Pansy?" chiese un'altra ragazza. "Gelosa di quella là? **Ma figuriamoci!**"*

"Are you going to be jealous, Pansy?" asked another girl. "Jealous of that one? **No way!**"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

Figurarsi as a verb could also be understood with the meaning of 'imagine' and, especially in the case of the discourse formulae of negation (i.e., the rejection of the truth in the interlocutor's words), this construction seems to convey the meaning that the speaker finds the interlocutor's sentence so absurd that it belongs to the realm of imagination. A similar connotation could also be found in the discourse formulae of refusal: they would express the refusal to an offer or proposal that the speaker finds foolish, unreasonable, or excessive.

The Italian discourse formula of refusal *figuriamoci* was presented in the questionnaire for Russian native speakers as a response to an advice (62).

62. *Ormai da mesi vorresti uscire con un tuo compagno di università ma non trovi il coraggio di chiederglielo. Una tua amica ti consiglia di fare una cosa semplice, come invitarlo a bere un caffè assieme dopo le lezioni, ma secondo te non c'è alcuna possibilità che il tuo collega accetti, visto che sembra che non abbia mai dimostrato il minimo interesse nei tuoi confronti.*

A: Magari potresti chiedergli di prendere un caffè dopo lezione.

*B: **Figuriamoci.** Non mi saluta nemmeno quando ci incrociamo per i corridoi, di sicuro non vorrà bere un caffè con me.*

For months now, you have been wanting to go out with one of your university colleagues but you can't find the courage to ask him. A friend of yours advises you to do something as simple as inviting him for coffee together after class, but according to you there is no chance your colleague will accept, since he never seems to have shown the slightest interest in you.

A: Maybe you could ask him to have coffee after class.

B: No way. He doesn't even greet me when we pass each other in the halls, he certainly won't want to have coffee with me.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the discourse completion task three respondents chose an ironic reply: *да конечно* ('yes, of course'). In the Pragmaticon this discourse formula is categorized as one of surprise, but, as we have seen, in some cases it could be aimed at conveying a refusal. Moreover, two participants entered the discourse formula of refusal *ещё чего* ('then what'). Other constructions were: *да ладно тебе* ('oh, come on'), *о чём ты говоришь* ('what are you talking about?'), *ни за что* ('for nothing'), *не пройдёт!* ('it won't work'). The first three constructions are present in the online database of discourse formulae, but only *ни за что* is categorized as a discourse formula of refusal.

Sixteen out of the seventeen options proposed in the multiple-choice task were selected at least once, that is why only the most chosen ones will be reported in Appendix B. *Какой смысл* ('what's the point') was chosen seven times, while *легко сказать* ('easy to say') six times. *А смысл* ('what's the point?'), *к чему* ('what for?'), *какой толк* ('what is the use?'), *ты издеваешься?* ('have you gone crazy?') were selected by four participants each.

Taking into account that they were the options that received the major number of preferences, the following discourse formulae may be proposed as the most adequate translations: *да конечно* ('yes, of course'), *ещё чего* ('then what'), *какой смысл* ('what's the point').

3.11 *Ma va'* [but.CONJ go.2SG.IMP]

Ma va' as a discourse formula is clearly non compositional: its literal translation would be 'but go', but, as we will see, it is often used in non-compositional sense as a discourse formula.

This discourse formula and its variation *ma va' là* were entered 5 times as answers to a speech act of offer (item 4 from *Table 1*), one time in reply to a communication of intentions (item 3 from *Table 1*) and once also to an offer of help (see item 9 from *Table 1*).

The Paisà corpus search with the query "*ma va' là*" output 27 results, none of which could be used as an example of discourse formula of refusal. When this expression is found as a discourse formula, it is often a discourse formula of

negation (in the case of example 63, to an evaluation which is indirectly reported, i.e., that the right-wing politicians did not know how to lead a country).

63. *Matteo Colanninno ha citato l'articolo di ieri del Wall Street Journal segnalato anche qui. Osservava che secondo le analisi dell'autorevole giornale finanziario [sic], la destra e il suo leader non hanno dimostrato di saper governare l'economia. La risposta della Brambilla: "Ma va là, ma va lààà".*

Matteo Colanninno cited yesterday's Wall Street Journal article that was also reported here. He observed that, according to the authoritative financial newspaper's analysis, the right wing and its leader have not demonstrated that they know how to manage the economy. Brambilla's response, "Oh, **come on**, come onnn."

[Example from Paisà (Lyding et al., 2014)]

Also the 143 results from ItTenTen20 linked to the query “[word=".a"] [word="va"] [tag="F.*"] [word="là"]” could not be considered relevant for the present study. The query “[word=".a"] [word="va"] [tag="F.*"]”, that was aimed at searching for the shorter variant of this construction, allowed the finding of only one discourse formula of refusal. This is the reply to an offer, albeit implicit: Jesus asks how much money the devil wants for the purchase of souls, and the devil refuses the transaction (64).

64. *"Sì, Signore, ho appena catturato l'intera umanità. [...] Gli insegnerò come sposarsi e divorziare, come odiare e farsi male a vicenda, come bere e fumare e bestemmiare. Gli insegnerò a fabbricare armi da guerra, fucili e bombe e ad ammazzarsi fra di loro. Mi divertirò un mondo!" "E poi, quando avrai finito di giocare con loro, cosa ne farai?" chiese Gesù. "Oh, li ucciderò, esclamò Satana con superbia." "Quanto vuoi per loro?" chiese Gesù " **Ma va**, non la vuoi questa gente. Non sono per niente buoni, sono cattivi."*

"Yes, Lord, I just caught the whole of humanity. [...] I will teach them how to marry and divorce, how to hate and hurt each other, how to drink and smoke and curse. I will teach them how to make weapons of war, rifles and bombs, and how to kill each other. I'm going to have a lot of fun!" "And then, when you have finished playing with them, what will you do with them?" asked Jesus. "Oh, I will kill them, exclaimed Satan haughtily." "How much do you want for them?" asked Jesus " **Come on**, you don't want these people. They are not good at all, they are bad."

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

Another example of *ma va'* used as a discourse formula of negation can help understand its connotation when employed as a discourse formula of refusal (65).

65. *"Può essere determinante questo accordo?" "Ma va! È ininfluente"*
"Can this agreement be decisive?" "**Come on!** It is irrelevant."

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

We can see how the speaker dismisses the interlocutor's speech act as something not relevant in the specific situation and which is, therefore, not worth taking into consideration. The devaluation of the interlocutor's instance may be considered one of the main features of *ma va'* as a discourse formula of refusal.

Ma va' was used as a response to a question in the questionnaire used to find Russian translations of Italian discourse formulae (66).

66. *La madre di Marco si preoccupa molto del fatto che il figlio debba tornare a casa in macchina durante una nevicata forte. Chiede quindi preoccupata al marito se sia il caso di raccomandare al figlio di guidare con attenzione, ma l'uomo è sicuro che Marco sia un guidatore esperto e che l'avvertimento non sia necessario.*

A: *Dovremmo dire a Marco di guidare con attenzione, dato che nevicherà tutta la notte?*

B: *Ma va'. Ha la patente da molti anni e ha guidato in ogni condizione climatica. Andrà tutto bene.*

Marco's mother is very concerned about her son having to drive home during a heavy snowfall. She then anxiously asks her husband whether they should recommend that her son drive carefully, but the man is sure that Marco is an experienced driver and that the warning is unnecessary.

A: Should we tell Marco to drive carefully since it will snow all night?

B: Come on. He has had his license for many years and has driven in all weather conditions. He'll be fine.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the discourse completion task of the questionnaire administered to Russian native speakers, the discourse formula *да ладно* (or its variation *да ладно тебе*, 'oh well') was entered six times, and *да ну* ('come on') three. They are followed by *да успокойся ты* ('calm down'), used two times and *перестань* ('stop it'), *не надо* ('there is no need'), each selected once. *Да успокойся ты* is presented in the Pragmaticon as a discourse formula of negation or agreement, but we can see here that it could also be used to express a refusal.

In the second exercise of the questionnaire the respondents seem to confirm the preference for *да ладно тебе*, which was selected 10 times. Other options were chosen significantly less: *сам подумай* ('just think about it', selected three times), *так уж получилось* ('it so happens'), *да уж всё* ('well'), *не думаю* ('I don't think so'), the last three being chosen once. Among the options I did not include *да ну* ('come on'), but, judging from the first part of the questionnaire, it is safe to assume that if it had been present, some participants would have chosen that.

We can say that the preferred translations for *ma va'* were *да ладно тебе*, *да ладно* ('oh well') and *да ну* ('come on'). We can notice how the presence of

an adversative particle, *ma* in Italian and *da* in Russian may have influenced the choice of the respondents to the questionnaire.

3.12 *Ti pare?* [DAT.2SG seem-3SG.PRS Q]

When this construction is used in the compositional sense it can be translated as ‘do you think so?’

In the questionnaire *ti pare* was used twice as the reply to an offer (see item 4 from *Table 1*) and once as a communication of intentions (see item 5 from *Table 1*).

The corpus search, both on ItTenTen20 and on the Paisà corpus, did not give any significant results. The query “[word="Ti|ti"] [word="pare"] [tag="F.*"]” (13161 results, the first 300 were taken into consideration) on ItTenTen20 showed too many instances in which *ti pare* was used compositionally with the meaning of ‘think’.

The examples similar to the one above were often characterized by the presence of a comma before the construction, which also indicated that *ti pare* was probably not the beginning of a reply in a dialog, so to try and avert this issue the following CQL query was entered: “[tag="F.*" & !word=","] [word="ti"] [word="pare"] [tag="F.*"]”. It excluded the comma before the construction (138 results), but also here, no useful instances were found. As yet a further attempt I entered the query “[tag="F.*" & !word=","] [word="Ma|ma"] [word="ti"] [word="pare"] [tag="F.*"]”, which also excludes the constructions introduced by a comma. The examples found through this query were 317 and three of them could be considered discourse formulae of refusal.

In one instance *ma ti pare* was employed as a response to a proposal of joint activity (67), in one as a reply to a request (68) and in one to an offer of help (69).

67. “Allora Elisa vuoi venire con me questa sera al concerto tributo dei Pink Floyd?” E' l'ultima laconica richiesta a mia figlia. “**Ma ti pare?**”

Ahahahah” E' la sua triste risposta ormai del tutto persa in ascolti che mi piace definire “pattume musicale”.

“So Elisa, do you want to come with me tonight to the Pink Floyd tribute concert?” That's the last laconic request to my daughter. “**What do you think?** ahahahah.” That's her grim response, she's now totally lost in listening to what I like to call “musical garbage.”
[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

68. *Arriva, e si taglia la testa, e poi se la riappiccica, e se la riappiccica col davanti di dietro [...] Eccoti che arriva alla casa dello zio, e lo zio a vederlo così: " Che cos' hai?" - " 'Un [Non, dial.] vede ! io ho visto una cosa che 'un avea visto mai ! Son morto!" - "Ma 'un lo vedi che hai la testa di dietro?" - "Allora tagliatemela, e riappiccicatemela, con questo vasetto, davanti." - "Ma ti pare, figliolo!"*

He arrives, and he cuts off his head, and then he hangs it up, and he hangs it up with his back to the front [...] There he is arriving at his uncle's house, and the uncle seeing him like this: " What's the matter with you?" - "Don't you see! I've seen something I've never seen before! I'm dead!" - "But can't you see that your head is in the back?" - "Then cut it off and stick it back on me, with this jar in front of it." - "**No way**, son!"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

69. *DIDA: Sai che ti dico, Gengè? Sono passati altri quattro giorni. Non c'è piú dubbio: Anna Rosa dev'esser malata. Andrò io a vederla. GENGÉ: Dida mia, che dici? Ma ti pare! Con questo tempaccio?"*
DIDA: You know what, Gengé? It's been four more days. There is no longer any doubt: Anna Rosa must be sick. I will go and see her.
GENGÉ: Dida, my dear, what are you saying? **No way!** In this weather?"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

Taking into consideration the compositional meaning of this expression, 'do you think so?', if *ti pare* is a discourse formula of refusal, it may mean that the speaker expresses his or her refusal implying that the interlocutor should already know that what they are suggesting or proposing is not appropriate or possible, as if the formula was a rhetoric question by the lines of 'do you think what you are saying is appropriate?'

In the questionnaire employed to find the equivalent of the Italian discourse formulae the stimulus for *ti pare?* was a proposal (70).

70. *Tu e un tuo amico siete al mare. L'amico ti propone di andare a nuotare, ma tu non hai assolutamente intenzione di entrare in acqua, visto che le onde sembrano troppo alte.*

A: *Andiamo a nuotare?*

B: ***Ma ti pare? Guarda che onde!***

You and a friend are at the beach. The friend suggests you go swimming, but you have absolutely no intention of going into the water, as the waves seem too high.

A: Shall we go swimming?

B: Do you think so? Look at those waves!

[Example from the questionnaire]

Ты что ('you what?') was selected three times in the discourse completion task, and *серьёзно?* ('are you serious?') two. The former is included in the Pragmaticon as a discourse formula of refusal, while the latter, or, it is better to say, a variation of the latter (*ты серьёзно?*) as a discourse formula of negation. The other constructions found in this task were selected one time each: *спятил?* ('are you out of your mind?'), *думаешь?* ('do you think so?'), *с ума сошёл?* ('have you gone mad?'), *ты издеваешься?* ('are you kidding me?'), *ты вообще?* ('are you even...'), *совсем что ли?* ('what's the matter?').

In the second part of the questionnaire seven respondents expressed their preference for the discourse formula *ещё чего* ('then what'), five for *нет уж* ('nope') and four for *ни за что* ('for nothing').

Among the options of the multiple-choice task *ты что* was not included, but it could be said, judging from the results of the first task, that it could have been chosen by several respondents. So, *ты что* ('you what?') may be one of the most feasible translations, along with others, like *ещё чего* ('then what'), *нет уж* ('nope') and *ни за что* ('for nothing').

3.13 *Ma dai* [but.CONJ give.2SG.IMP]

The literal translation of *ma dai* would be 'but give', but in modern Italian *dai* is, in most cases, no longer understood as the imperative, second person singular of the verb *dare*, 'give.' Fedriani and Ghezzi (2023 as cited in Fedriani & Molinelli, 2019) suggest that *dare*, 'give' is the quintessential verb of exchange, which would help to explain its use in a context of negotiation such as a refusal.

In the questionnaire *ma dai* was found only once as a reply to an offer (see item 4 from *Table 1*).

The first 300 results out of 11974 that were output on ItTenTen20 with the query "[word="ma|Ma"] [word="dai"] [tag="F.*"]" showed three examples of *ma dai* used as a discourse formula of refusal: one was a reply to an advice (71), one to a request (72) and one to a demand (73).

71. Henry: *C'è un motivo se hanno creato la mia posizione; qui ti sei fatto terra bruciata, hai commesso un sacco di errori. Dovrai riconquistarti la tua posizione.* Shawn: Ah, **ma dai**, non lo trovo giusto.

Henry: There's a reason they created my position; you made scorched earth here, you made a lot of mistakes. You will have to regain your position. Shawn: Ah, **come on**, I don't think that's fair.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

72. Il Piero, giovane industrialotto, incontra due suoi amici: Luca e Valter: "Uhe raga', venite come con me a fare un giro sul nuovo Ferrarino che mi sono fatto!". Tutti d'accordo, salgono sull'auto che

parte lasciando mezzo chilo di pneumatici sull'asfalto. Pieno centro citta': 100, 120 km/h. Il Luca: "Dai, Piero, rallenta un po'!". "Ma dai, questa e' una macchina sicura e poi abbiamo sant' Ambrogio che ci protegge!"

Piero, a young factory worker, meets two of his friends, Luca and Valter: " Hey guys, come like with me and take a ride in the new Ferrari I got!" They all agree, they get into the car, which takes off, leaving half a kilo of tires on the asphalt. Downtown full: 100, 120 km/h. The Luca: "Come on, Piero, slow down a little!" "**Come on**, this is a safe car and then we have Saint Ambrose to protect us!"
[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

73. *Il Valter non ce la fa piu': "Fammi scendere, fammi scendere!". " Ma dai, non fare il pirla, la domino benissimo questa macchinetta e poi figurati col sant' Ambrogio che ci protegge!"*

Valter can't take it anymore, "Let me off, let me off!" "**Come on**, don't be an idiot, I tame this little car just fine, and besides we have Saint Ambrose protecting us!"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

The Paisà corpus output 133 results, but they were not significant for the present study.

We can see from the examples found in the corpus and in the first questionnaire that this discourse formula of refusal carries with it the connotation of devaluation of the interlocutor's objection.

In the questionnaire administered to Russian native speakers the speech act that triggered *ma dai* was a proposal (74).

74. *Tu e un tuo collega avete commesso un errore che potrebbe causare una perdita economica considerevole all'azienda. Il collega vorrebbe dire la verità, ma tu temi che potreste essere licenziati se si venisse a sapere che siete stati voi.*

A: *La faccenda è seria. Propongo di segnalarlo alla direzione.*

B: **Ma dai.** *Ci licenzierebbero subito.*

You and a coworker have made a mistake that could cause considerable financial loss to the company. The colleague would like to tell the truth, but you fear that you could be fired if it became known that you did it.

A: The matter is serious. I propose to report it to management.

B: Come on. We would be fired immediately.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the first section of the questionnaire for Russian native speakers the most chosen translation of *ma dai* was *ты что?* (and the variations *что ты?* *Ты чего?* *Ты чё?* It means: ‘you what?’). This discourse formula, which is also listed in the Pragmaticon among the discourse formulae of refusal, was chosen five times. The discourse formula *ни за что* (‘for nothing’) was entered two times. Other constructions were chosen only once: *да конечно* (‘yes, of course’), *ещё чего* (‘then what’), *не надо* (‘there is no need’), *ну нет* (‘nope’), *ты серьёзно* (‘are you serious?’), *свихнулся?* (‘have you gone nuts?’).

The most chosen variants in the second section of the questionnaire are *и речи быть не может* (‘it’s out of the question’) and *ещё чего* (‘then what’), respectively selected six and five times. *Ни за что* (‘for nothing’) was selected four times, while *нет уж* (‘nope’) and *а смысл* (‘what’s the point’) three.

The identification of the most feasible translation here is not as clear as in other cases, but comparing both of the exercises, it can be said that *ты что?* (‘you what?’), which was not present among the options of the multiple-choice task, *и речи быть не может* (‘it’s out of the question’) and *ещё чего* (‘then what’) could be proposed as such.

3.14 ‘Sto cazzo [this VULGAR]

This discourse formula and the following one can be considered particularly rude mainly because of the presence of the word *cazzo*, which refers

to male genitalia. In the questionnaire it was entered two times, one time as a response to an advice (see item 2 from *Table 1*), the other to an offer (see item 4 from *Table 1*).

There are some variations in the way this construction is written, for example the apostrophe is omitted (*sto cazzo*), even though 'sto can be interpreted as the elision of the syllable "que" from the word *questo*, 'this'.

The search on the Paisà corpus only offered 2 results, none of which could be considered a discourse formula, while through the query "[word="sto|Sto"] [word="cazzo"] [tag="F.*"]" on ItTenTen20 380 instances could be found. All of them were taken into consideration. Of those, in two instances the construction was a discourse formula of refusal: one answered to a demand (75), and one to a request (76).

75. Nel frattempo gli animatori ci intimano a non scendere dalla nave e di non ascoltare gli annunci della nave, perché saremo le ultime persone a sbarcare dopo gli altri passeggeri. Rispondendo con un gentilissimo "Sto cazzo, adesso facciamo quello che vogliamo" decidiamo di fare esattamente il contrario di quello che ci dicono gli animatori.

In the meantime, the entertainers instruct us not to get off the ship or listen to the ship's announcements, because we will be the last people to disembark after the other passengers. Responding with a very polite "**Screw it**, we do what we want now" we decide to do exactly the opposite of what the animators tell us.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

76. Lascia perdere sti miscredenti che già perduti sono, che prendono per il culo GIRO perfino lu Papa, che poi li voglio vedere quando saranno stiantati e precipiteranno nella Geenna e cadendo vedranno li Gesù Banbine e gli diranno "Salvacì, A Gesù Banbine" e lui: "Sto cazzo. [sic]

Forget about these non-believers who are already lost, who are even making fun of the Pope, who then I want to see them when they are crashed and plummet into the Gehenna and falling they see there Baby Jesus and say to him, "Save us, for Baby Jesus' sake," and he'll reply: "**Screw you.**"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

In some cases, *'sto cazzo* is used to express a strong denial even in cases where it is not a discourse formula either of negation or refusal (77).

77. *Jesus. "Sai, è un uomo che se la tira un casino, appena lo conosci"
E lei: "Ma perché è timido". [timido 'sto cazzo] "Però ha molto
carisma"*

Jesus. "You know, he likes to show off, as you get to know him" And she's like, "But because he's shy." [shy **my ass**] "He has a lot of charisma, though."

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

It is possible to say that this discourse formula conveys an intense pragmatic force and is usually considered rude. That could be the reason why in the corpus it was encountered as the reaction to impositions (see examples 75, 76), and, in the questionnaire, as a strong reaction to what could have been an advice or an offer from a friend, that means someone close to the speaker and on the same hierarchical level.

In the second questionnaire, *'sto cazzo* answered to a speech act of demand (78).

78. *II/La vostra partner trova che tu spendi una parte troppo grande del tuo stipendio per comprare videogiochi e ti intima in continuazione di smettere. Tu non hai assolutamente intenzione di ascoltare*

questa richiesta, visto che spendi i soldi che guadagni con il tuo lavoro.

A: Non osare comprare ancora videogiochi.

*B: **Sto cazzo.** Sono i miei soldi e ci faccio quello che voglio.*

Your partner finds that you spend too large a portion of your salary on buying video games and constantly urges you to stop. You have absolutely no intention of listening to this demand as you spend the money you earn from your own job.

A: Don't you dare buy video games again.

B: Screw you. It's my money and I do what I want with it.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the discourse completion task of the questionnaire for Russian native speakers most of the proposed translations may be understood as rude: *ни хрена* ('no fucking way'), *твою мать* ('you mother'), *чёрта с два* ('hell no'), *иди ты* ('screw you'), *да пошёл ты* ('go screw yourself'), *фиг тебе* ('up yours'), *иди нахуй* ('go fuck yourself'). Only *ни хрена* was entered twice, the others once.

In the multiple-choice task the two most selected options were *да пошёл ты* ('go screw yourself') and *с какой стати* ('why in the world'), each chosen seven times. *Что ты пристал* ('why are you bugging me?') follows with four entries, and *как бы не так* ('I don't think so'), *и не подумаю* ('I don't even think about that'), *ишь чего захотел* ('you would like it') were used three times each.

It seems like that, among the discourse formulae that are already present in the Pragmaticon, the most fitting translation for '*sto cazzo*' may be *да пошёл ты* ('go screw yourself'), but it could also be considered adding other formulae, such as *чёрта с два* ('hell no') and *ни хрена* ('no fucking way'), since the respondents have shown a preference for those in the first part of the questionnaire.

3.15 *Col cazzo* [with-the VULGAR]

This discourse formula, as the previous one, can be classified as rude because of the presence of the vulgar word *cazzo*. *Col* is a complex preposition composed of *con*, meaning ‘with’, and *il*, the masculine determinative article.

In the questionnaire it was entered two times, one as a response to a communication of intentions (see item 5 from *Table 1*), the other as a reply to a proposal (item 6 from *Table 1*).

The search on the Paisà corpus was not fruitful, while the first 300 results of the query “[word="col|Col"] [word="cazzo"] [tag="F.*"]” on ItTenTen20 (663 instances found in total) offered 12 valid examples of *col cazzo* used as a discourse formula of refusal. As for the previous one, it was often encountered in reaction to a speech act of demand (5 times, for example 79), or of request (twice, for example 80). Moreover, it was found 5 times in relation to a proposal (for instance see example 81).

79. *Nel mezzo della discussione, O'Brian tirò fuori qualcosa da dietro la schiena. Puntò le cesoie contro la pancia di Redfoot. "Toglimi quella pistola dalla faccia!". "Col cazzo! Ti sparo O'Brian! TI SPARO!"*

In the midst of the discussion, O'Brian pulled something out from behind his back. He pointed the shears at Redfoot's belly. "Get that gun out of my face!" "Hell no! I'll shoot you O'Brian! I SHOOT YOU!"
[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

80. *Quagmire: Oh Stewie, grazie a Dio. La donna delle pulizie mi ha ripulito, sono rimasto al verde! Senti, fammi un favore, prendimi quelle chiavi. Stewie [prendendo le chiavi]: Quali, queste qui? Eh? Qu, queste qui? eh? Queste chiavi qui? Eh? Col cazzo!*

Quagmire: Oh, Stewie. Thank God. That cleaning lady cleaned me out. She took all my money. Grab those keys over there, will ya?

Stewie [grabbing the keys]: What, these keys. These keys here?
These the ones you want? Hmm? **Up yours!**

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

81. *Michael: Potremmo annullare la missione. Scott: **Col cazzo**, Mike!*

Michael: We could abort the mission. Scott: **Hell no**, Mike!

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

Also in the case of this discourse formula, as it was for *'sto cazzo*, it seems like it is often used in contexts where there is some kind of imposition or, at least, where the interlocutor's instance is perceived as unjust and absolutely unacceptable by the speaker. Its impoliteness reinforces the pragmatic force of the refusal, making it only suitable for contexts in which the speaker intends to be rude and where the two participants to the dialogue are in a close relationship and on the same hierarchical level.

In the questionnaire for Russian native speakers the trigger for the discourse formula *'sto cazzo* was a request (82).

82. *La tua collega, Maria, è molto poco produttiva perché sta sempre sui social durante il lavoro. Ti viene chiesto per l'ennesima volta da un altro collega, con il quale sei molto in confidenza, di aiutarla perché non sarà in grado di portare a termine la sua parte di lavoro entro le scadenze prestabilite, ma tu sei indignato, arrabbiato per la richiesta e rifiuti assolutamente.*

A: Maria non riesce a fare la sua parte di lavoro perché è troppo impegnata. Non riusciresti a fartene carico tu?

*B: **Col cazzo**. Non è un mio problema se non sa organizzarsi.*

Your colleague, Maria, is very unproductive because she is always on social media during work. You are asked for the umpteenth time by another colleague, with whom you are very close, to help her because she won't be able to complete her part of the work within

the given deadlines, but you are outraged, angry at the request and absolutely refuse.

A: Maria cannot do her part of the work because she is too busy. Couldn't you take it on?

B: No fucking way. It's not my problem if she can't organize her time.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the discourse completion task a relatively large number of variants were proposed. *Ещё чего* ('then what'), *чёрта с два* ('hell no'), *ага, щас!* ('yeah, now!') were chosen two times each. The first is included in the Pragmaticon as a discourse formula of refusal, while the other two are not. The last expression, *ага, щас!*, can be considered ironic.

Other constructions that were entered only once are: *хрен ей* ('screw her'), *с какого фига* ('why the hell?'), *ни за что* ('for nothing'), *ну нафиг* ('screw it'), *очумели?* ('are you out of your mind?'), *в смысле?* ('what do you mean?'). The construction *да разве!* ('of course') was also entered, but, in a second check with several Russian native speakers, it appears to be inconsistent with the given context. It could therefore be considered a misunderstanding on part of the respondent.

In the second part of the questionnaire ten respondents chose *с какой стати* ('why in the world?') as their preferred translations. Seven participants put their preference on *и не подумаю* ('I don't even think about that') and five on *ищи дурака* ('find yourself a fool'). Several other constructions were entered, such as *ни за что* and *ещё чего* chosen by four respondents. The rest of them can be found on Appendix B.

Given how much *с какой стати* ('why in the world?') has been selected in the multiple-choice task, it may be proposed as one of the most fitting translations of the Italian discourse formula *col cazzo*. Since *col cazzo* can be perceived as rude, also less polite Russian discourse formulae can be taken into consideration, such as *чёрта с два* ('hell no'), *хрен ей* ('screw her'), *с какого фига* ('why the hell?') and *ну нафиг* ('screw it').

3.16 *Col cavolo* [with-the cabbage]

Col cavolo ('with the cabbage') is often understood as a euphemistic variation of *col cazzo*, given the fact that the beginning of both words is similar, but it is still possible to consider it unpolite, as illustrate an example found on the ItTenTen20 corpus (83).

83. *Rifiuta un invito educatamente. Se qualcuno ti chiede di fare qualcosa, dovrai trovare il modo di declinare educatamente, anche se dentro di te stai gridando: " Col cavolo!"*.

You should decline an invitation politely. If someone asks you to do something, you will have to find a way to politely decline, even if inside you are shouting, " **Screw that!**"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

This discourse formula was employed once in the questionnaire in response to a communication of intention (item 5 from *Table 1*).

The query "[word="col|Col"] [word="cavolo"] [tag="F.*"]" on ItTenTen20 output 866 results. Among the first 300, 8 were suitable to the description of discourse formulae of refusal. Three of them are proposals, but it can be noticed that all of them do not presented as direct questions or exhortations, which is often the case for proposals, but as hypotheses for future actions that involve both participants to the dialogue and that the one who uses the discourse formula refuses to comply with (e.g., 84).

84. *Al terzo tentativo fallito di cercare un bar aperto, dico: "Pazienza. Sarà destino". Risposta: "Col cavolo. Io sono un pagano. Niente destino"*.

On the third failed attempt to look for an open bar, I say, " Whatever. We'll call it fate." My answer, "**Hell no**. I am a pagan. There's no fate."

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

Other speech acts found on ItTenTen20 that work as a stimulus for the discourse formula of refusal *col cavolo* were two requests (for instance see 85), two offers (for example see 86) and one demand (87).

85. *Amanda Seyfried: "Hollywood mi ha chiesto il botox" [...] La dichiarazione shock è stata rilasciata dalla stessa Seyfried, in copertina su Elle di aprile. [...] 'Ho risposto: col cavolo!' ha raccontato Amanda al mensile.*

Amanda Seyfried: 'Hollywood has been asking me to have botox' [...] The startling statement was made by Seyfried herself, on the cover of April's Elle. [...] 'I replied: **hell no!**' Amanda told the monthly magazine.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

86. *Un tizio entra in un hotel e chiede una camera alla reception. Il receptionist chiede: - "La vuole con vista"? Il tipo risponde: - "Col cavolo! XP o niente!"*

A guy enters a hotel and asks the receptionist for a room. The receptionist asks, - "Do you want it with a view?" The guy replies, - "**No way!** XP or nothing!"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

87. *"Sta' zitta!" gridò Ron, più che rosso ormai quasi marrone. "Col cavolo!" strillò Ginny, fuori di sé.*

"Shut up!" shouted Ron, more than red now almost brown. "**Hell no!**" shrieked Ginny, beside herself.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

The connotation of this discourse formula seems to be similar to the one attributed to *col cazzo*, but, as we have already said, the level of rudeness

appears to be lower. It can therefore be used in less informal contexts (such as 85) or to mitigate the rudeness (see 84).

Col cavolo was presented in the second questionnaire as a response to a demand (88).

88. Il tuo partner/La tua partner torna a casa dopo aver passato tutto il pomeriggio a sbrigare commissioni. Quando è uscito/uscita tu stavi giocando al tuo videogioco preferito, e hai continuato fino a questo momento. Il/la partner si è arrabbiato/a e ti chiede di spegnere la console, ma tu non ci pensi proprio, stai per vincere!

A: Finiscila con quel videogame, stai giocando da ore!

*B: **Col cavolo!** Sto per vincere!*

Your partner comes home after spending all afternoon running errands. When he/she went out you were playing your favorite video game, and you have continued up to this moment. Your partner got angry and demands that you turn off the console, but you don't even think about it, you are about to win!

A: Cut it out with that video game, you've been playing for hours!

B: No way! I'm about to win!

[Example from the questionnaire]

The translations proposed in the discourse completion task of the second questionnaire were numerous: they amount to sixteen different answers, and only three of them were repeated twice. These were *чёрта с два* ('hell no!'), *ещё чего* ('what again'), *ни за что* ('for nothing'). The first construction is not present in the Pragmaticon, but could be added, after some research, because it appears to be surely non compositional. The other two are present as discourse formulae of refusal in the Pragmaticon.

Other alternatives that were entered only once are: *ты спятила?* ('are you crazy?'), *нифига* ('nothing!' vulgar), *с хуя ли* ('why the fuck?' vulgar), *твою мать* ('your mum' vulgar), *да чёрт* ('what the hell'), *фиг тебе* ('screw you'),

хрен тебе ('fuck you' vulgar). All of them have not been entered in the Pragmaticon yet.

On the other hand, other responses that have been given in the questionnaire are present on the database as discourse formulae, like *нетушки* ('nope'), *да пошёл ты* ('screw you' vulgar), *ну нет* ('nope'), *даже не думаю* ('I don't even think about that').

Some other options could not be considered discourse formulae, since they are compositional: *зас* ('now'), *секунду* ('one second').

In general, it is possible to notice that most of the Russian discourse formulae that have been proposed and selected match the Italian one for the level of rudeness.

In the multiple-choice task the most chosen alternative was *да пошёл ты* ('screw you' vulgar), which was entered eight times. It was followed by *и не подумаю* ('and I don't even think about that') and *вот ещё* ('here it is'), both selected four times each. *С какой стати* ('why in the world') was selected two times.

Overall, it seems like that *да пошёл ты* ('screw you') and *чёрта с два* ('hell no!') might be the most fitting translation, given the slight rudeness that they carry.

3.17 *Toglitelo dalla testa* [remove-2SG.IMP-REFL-PRON.3SG from-the head]

This discourse formula is an imperative of second person singular that can be translated as 'get it out of your head', usually meaning an idea or proposition.

Toglitelo dalla testa as a discourse formula of refusal was entered in the questionnaire once, in reply to a communication of intentions (see item 5 from *Table 1*).

The results of the corpus search were not numerous: the Paisà corpus did not offer any results, while on the ItTenTen20 50 results were encountered with the query "[word="toglitol|Toglietelo"] []{0,3} [word="dalla"] [word="testa"] [tag="F.*"]". Between the words *toglitelo* and *dalla* the possibility of the insertion

of up to three words was allowed, since in some cases an adverb can be found in this position (e.g., *toglitelo subito dalla testa*, ‘get it out of your head **right now**’).

The three valid results that were found all involved as the stimulus a speech act of proposal (e.g., 89).

89. *Zoe il nome zoe si pronuncia come si scrive da tutte le parti tranne in gracia , [sic] dove il nome è zoy e si pronuncia zoy [...] Tempo fa l'avevo proposto a mio marito per una nostra ipotetica figlia.....me l'ha fatto cadere subito...mi ha guardata e mi ha detto: **toglitelo dalla testa**.*

Zoe the name zoe is pronounced the way it is spelled everywhere except in Greece, where the name is zoy and pronounced zoy [...] Some time ago I proposed it to my husband for a hypothetical daughter of ours.....me he dropped it right away...he looked at me and said: **get it out of your head**.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

As the compositional meaning of this construction may suggest (see *Table 2*, ‘get it out of your head’), the use of *toglitelo dalla testa* seems to imply that from the point of view of the speaker, the interlocutor’s proposal should not even be thought of, and the interlocutor should avoid taking it into consideration and talking about it.

In the questionnaire administered to Russian native speakers to find equivalents of the Italian discourse formula, this was the context proposed for *toglitelo dalla testa* (90). The stimulus here is a speech act of proposal.

90. *Un tuo conoscente, follemente innamorato di te, compie l'ennesimo tentativo di avere una relazione con te. Tu però non vuoi, e anzi, gli ripeti di nuovo che non ami lui, ma Pietro.*

A: *Mi vuoi sposare?*

B: ***Toglitelo dalla testa***. *Sai che amo un altro.*

An acquaintance of yours, madly in love with you, makes yet another attempt to have a relationship with you. You, however, do not want to, and indeed, you tell him again that you do not love him, but Peter.

A: Will you marry me?

B: Put it out of your mind. You know I love someone else.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the discourse completion task *забудь* or *забудь об этом* ('forget about that') were the most chosen answers, along with a literal translation of *toglitelo dalla testa*, *выбрось это из головы* or *выкинь это из головы* (both can be translated as 'get it out of your mind'). These constructions were entered respectively by five and four respondents and neither of them are listed in the Pragmaticon as discourse formulae. Other answers were *и не надейся* ('don't get your hope up'), *даже не думай* ('don't even think about that'), *не неси чушь* ('don't be ridiculous'), *ты что?* ('you what?'), *оглянись вокруг* ('look around you'). Each of them was chosen once.

In the multiple-choice task *и речи быть не может* ('it's out of the question') was the most chosen answer, with six preferences. It was followed by *что ты пристал* ('why are you bugging me?'), with five, and *об этом нечего и думать* ('there is nothing to think about that'), with four. *Сам подумай* ('you think about that') and *ишь чего захотел* ('you would like it') were chosen by two participants each, while *ещё чего* ('then what'), *нет уж* ('nope'), *ни за что* ('for nothing'), *с меня хватит* ('that's enough for me'), *да уж всё* ('oh well'), *я больше ничего не хочу услышать* ('I don't want to hear anything else') by one of them each.

If *забудь об этом* ('forget about that'), *выбрось это из головы* ('get it out of your mind') and *выкинь это из головы* ('get it out of your mind') were added to the Pragmaticon, they would probably be deemed good translations for *toglitelo dalla testa*. *И речи быть не может* ('it's out of the question'), *что ты пристал* ('why are you bugging me?') and *об этом нечего и думать* ('there is nothing to think about that') may also be considered suitable ones.

3.18 *Per carità* [for goodness]

According to the Treccani dictionary definition of “*per carità*” (“Carità,” n.d.) in general, this construction is reported to be used to appeal to other’s compassion, to implore, recommend, refuse, or brush an offer or a compliment aside. A possible translation would be ‘for goodness’s sake.’

Per carità was entered twice in the questionnaire as a response to a proposal (see item 7 from *Table 1*).

The first query entered on ItTenTen20 was “[tag=“F.*”] []{0,1} [word=“per|Per”] [word=“carità”] [tag=“F.*”]”. It attempted to find uses of this construction as a reply in a dialogue also allowing for the possible presence of the conjunction *ma* or the negation *no*. The total number of results was 45030, but only the first 300 were analyzed for the present study. Although no instances were found where *per carità* was a discourse formula of refusal, as it can also be said in relation to the Paisà corpus, in this search other uses of this construction were encountered, and they could help clarify the meaning of the discourse formula. It is interesting to note that *per carità* can be used, as it is the case for other formulae in this study, as a discourse formula of negation (91), but also as one with positive meaning, for example of permission (92).

91. *Chiede il Biondo: "Che vuo'?", che vuoi? Divento apprensivo. [...] "Ho bisogno di un letto e basta". Silenzio. "Tieni i precedenti?", (sei incensurato?), fa improvviso il Biondo. "No, per carità" rispondo stupidamente, da poliziotto.*

The Blond asks, "What do you want?" I become apprehensive. [...] "I just need a bed." Silence. "Do you have a record?", (do you have a criminal record?), suddenly asks the Blond. "No, **for goodness’s sake**," I reply stupidly, cop-like.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

92. *Insomma, - disse il bandito - il bicchierino me lo offre, o no? - Per carità, - fece il dottor Verucci, - avanti, si accomodi, faccia come se fosse a casa sua.*

So, - said the bandit, - are you offering me the drink, or not? – **Of course, for goodness's sake,** - did Dr. Verucci, - go ahead, make yourself at home.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

After this first search, yet another query was entered on the ItTenTen20 corpus, “[tag="F.*"] [word="Per"] [word="carità"] [tag="F.*"]”, which excluded the possible presence of *ma* or *no*, but made the research even narrower to try and find more discourse formulae, hopefully of refusal.

Among the first 300 results of the total 12494, two valid discourse formulae of refusal were found. One of them answers to an evaluation and can be classified as a refusal to continue the conversation (93), while the other replies to an offer (94).

93. *Se non sbaglio ILMANGIONE è fatto per la gente comune non per i big. - Per carità, non apriamo anche qui una polemica. Il Mangione è un sito per dilettanti, magari allo sbaraglio, e tale resta.*

If I am not mistaken ILMANGIONE is made for ordinary people not for celebrities. - **For goodness's sake,** let's not open a controversy here too. The Mangione is a site for amateurs, and it remains so.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

94.- *...ricominciamo con la discografia completa Deep Purple? - Ancora? Ma è la quarta volta... - Lo sai che cosa succede se non fai come ti dico... - Sì, lo so, lo so. - E allora ricominciamo daccapo. - Uff... - E' l'unico modo per non sentire la macchina in montagna. Dai, poche balle. Ricominciamo. O vuoi che ti racconti una barzelletta? - Per carità!*

- ...do we start again with the complete Deep Purple discography?
- Again? But it's the fourth time... - You know what happens if you don't do as I say.... - Yes, I know, I know. - Then we start over again.
- Phew... - It's the only way not to feel carsick in the mountains. Come on, cut the nonsense. Let's start over. Or do you want me to tell you a joke? - **No, for goodness sake!**

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

The variety of meanings that this construction can have seems particularly wide, but they all appear to be at least partially described by the above-mentioned Treccani dictionary definition of “*per carità*” (“Carità,” n.d.). The examples of *per carità* as a discourse formula of refusal that have been displayed in this section all refer to the first meaning reported in the dictionary, the appeal to the interlocutor’s compassion, as to implore them not to insist in wanting to see a horror movie (*Table 1*, item 7), talk about the website (93) and telling a joke (94). It is nonetheless possible to imagine cases in which *per carità* is used to deflect an offer considered too generous.

The speech act that serves as a trigger for the discourse formula *per carità* in the questionnaire administered to Russian native speakers is a proposal (95).

95. *Tu e un tuo collega state realizzando un progetto, ma vi rendete conto che le vostre competenze non sono sufficienti. Michele, un altro collega, è molto più esperto di voi e sempre molto disponibile. Il tuo collega propone di chiedere a Michele di svolgere la vostra parte di lavoro, visto che per lui sarebbe molto semplice, ma tu rifiuti, dato che ti vergogneresti troppo.*

A: Chiediamo a Michele se può fare anche la nostra parte di lavoro?

*B: **Per carità.** Mi vergognerei tantissimo a chiederglielo.*

You and one of your colleagues are doing a project, but you realize that your skills are not enough. Michele, another colleague, is much more experienced than you and always very helpful. Your colleague proposes to ask Michele to do your part of the work, since it would

be very easy for him, but you refuse, since you would be too ashamed.

A: Shall we ask Michele if he can do our part of the work as well?

B: For goodness sake. I would be so ashamed to ask him.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the discourse completion task of the second questionnaire *per carità* was often translated with discourse formulae that made mention of 'God', which is coherent with the origin of the Italian discourse formula, since *carità*, 'grace', is often etymologically understood with a religious connotation: *боже упаси* (or *упаси боже*, 'God forbid') was entered three times, *еў богу* ('by God', used once) and *бог с тобою* ('God be with you', also used once). All of those constructions are present in the Pragmaticon, but none of them is categorized as a discourse formula of refusal. On the basis of the data collected with this task, they could be added into the list of the discourse formulae of refusal after a more in-depth study.

Other expressions proposed to translate *per carità* were: *нет уж* ('nope'), *не надо* ('there is no need'), *ни за что* ('for nothing'). They were all entered once. The discourse formula *ради бога* ('for God's sake', entered two times) was also proposed, but its use may be due to a misunderstanding of the context of the questionnaire on part of the respondents, since it usually expresses an assent.

In the second part of the questionnaire *ни в коем случае* ('in no case') was the most chosen option, with eight preferences. *Не стоит* ('under no circumstances) was employed five times, while *ни за что* ('for nothing') and *только не это* ('just not this') four times each.

It is important to highlight that the preferred translations of the first task were not included in the list of the options of the second, that probably explains their absence among the results of the second part. In general, the discourse formulae *боже упаси* ('God forbid'), *еў богу* ('by God'), *бог с тобою* ('God be with you') may be deemed feasible translations for the Italian discourse formula *per carità*.

3.19 *Vai tranquillo* [go-2SG.IMP calm]

Vai tranquillo ('go calmly') is composed of the verb *vai*, the imperative, second person singular of *andare*, 'go', and the adjective *tranquillo*, which means 'calm', 'relaxed.' It is an exhortation not to worry, to take the necessary time.

In the questionnaire the discourse formula *vai tranquillo* was chosen as a response to two offers of help: five times in relation to item 9, twice in relation to item 8 (*Table 1*).

The search on both on ItTenTen20 and on Paisà did not allow to find any instances of the construction *vai tranquillo* used as a discourse formula of refusal. The queries that have been entered on ItTenTen20 were "[word="vai|Vai"] [word="tranquillo"] [tag="F.*"]" (3382 results), "[tag="F.*"] [word="vai|Vai"] [word="tranquillo"] [tag="F.*"]" (1724 results), "[tag="F.*"] [word="ma|Ma"] [word="vai"] [word="tranquillo"] [tag="F.*"]" (29 results).

They were all aimed at progressively narrowing down the scope of the research, but most of the instances that were found *vai tranquillo* carries the meaning of 'don't worry' and appears to be rarely used as a discourse formula, but rather as part of a sentence (for example 96).

96. *Il cavallino si avvicinò e gli chiese: "Zio, posso attraversare il fiume?" "Certo, l'acqua non è profonda, mi arriva appena a ginocchio, vai tranquillo".*

The little horse came up to him and asked, "Uncle, can I cross the river?" "Sure, the water is not deep, it barely reaches my knee, **go easy.**"

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

In general, the use of *vai tranquillo* is usually aimed at reassuring the interlocutor, at encouraging them not to worry about the topic of the discussion. In the case of the discourse formulae of refusal, this means that *vai tranquillo* is prone to be employed to react to commissive speech acts, such as the two instances of offers of help that were present in the questionnaire.

As already mentioned in the section about the discourse formula 3.9 *Figurati*, it is possible to hypothesize that the small number of examples found in the corpora may be linked to the nature of communication on the Internet, where offers of help may not be as used as in real life.

In the second questionnaire this Italian discourse formula answered to an offer of help (97).

97. *Dopo una festa la tua casa è in condizioni disastrose. Un tuo amico si offre di rimanere ad aiutarti a sistemare, ma tu rifiuti perché non vuoi richiedergli un impegno così grande.*

A: *Vuoi che rimanga e che ti aiuti?*

B: ***Vai tranquillo. Ce la farò da solo.***

After a party your house is in a wretched condition. A friend of yours offers to stay and help you tidy up, but you refuse because you don't want to ask him to make such a big effort.

A: Do you want him to stay and help you?

B: No worries. I'll manage on my own.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the first section of the second questionnaire the most employed construction was *не волнуйся* ('don't worry'), entered three times. Other formulae of similar meaning were also used: *не парься* (used twice), *не переживай*, *не беспокойся* (both of them used once). They all mean 'don't worry', 'don't sweat it' and, while they are not present in the Pragmaticon, they could be further studied and added into the database. Other constructions that were offered as alternatives were: *да ладно* ('alright then'), *всё в порядке* ('everything is fine'), *забей* ('drop it'), *спокойно* ('be calm').

In the second section of the questionnaire, the most chosen option was *не стоит беспокоиться* ('it's not worth it to worry'), which shares the semantic meaning with the most frequent answers of the previous part of the experiment. It was selected by nine respondents. The discourse formula *да ладно* ('alright then') was chosen seven times, while *что ты* ('you what') six times. *Ну к чему*

(‘for nothing’) was a choice for four participants, *и речи быть не может* (‘it’s out of the question’), *да ну* (‘come on’) for two, and *вот ещё* (‘here it is’) and *ещё чего* (‘then what’) for one.

Comparing both tasks, it seems like some of the most feasible translations for *vai tranquillo* may be *не стоит беспокоиться* (‘it’s not worth it to worry’), *не волнуйся* (‘don’t worry’), *не парься* (‘don’t sweat it’), *не переживай* (‘don’t worry’) or *не беспокойся* (‘don’t worry’). Moreover, also *да ладно* (‘alright then’) can be considered a fitting option.

3.20 *Neanche per sogno* [NEG for dream]

The literal translation of *neanche per sogno* is ‘not even in a dream.’ It usually refers to the impossibility of something, that, namely, could not happen, not even in a dream.

The discourse formula *neanche per sogno* was entered as a response in five items of the questionnaire. It was used once as a response to one demand (see item 10 from *Table 1*), twice to a proposal (see item 7 from *Table 1*), once to a communication of intentions (see item 5 from *Table 1*), one time to an offer (see item 4 from *Table 1*).

The query that was entered on ItTenTen20, “[word="neanche|Neanche|nemmeno|Nemmeno|neppure|Neppure"] [word="per"] [word="sogno"] [tag="F.*"]”, included in the search not only the adverb *neanche*, but also its synonyms *nemmeno* and *neppure*.

The search gave 3427 results and, among the first 300, four examples of usage of *neanche per sogno* as a discourse formula of refusal were found. Three of them involved as stimuli speech acts of demand (e.g., 98), the other a proposal (99). The corpus search on Paisà with the query “*neanche per sogno*” gave 23 results, and in one of them a discourse formula of refusal was used as a reply to a request (100).

98. *L'apostolo Pietro, che custodisce le chiavi del Paradiso, udì il fracasso e si affacciò alla porta. "Chi è là?". "Io". "E chi sei tu?". "Un*

ladro. Fammi entrare in Cielo". "Neanche per sogno. Qui non c'è posto per un ladro".

The Apostle Peter, who guards the keys to Heaven, heard the commotion and looked out the door. "Who is there?" "Me." "And who are you?" "A thief. Let me into Heaven." "**No way**. There is no place for a thief here."

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

99. *Quando il Perucci mi disse: "E' necessario segnalare la villa e farla bombardare", risposi subito: "Ma neanche per sogno!" Quello che dovevo fare l'avrei fatto lo stesso senza fare saltare per aria chiesa e paese.*

When Perucci told me, "We need to report the villa and have it bombed," I immediately replied, "**No way!**" I would have done what I had to do without blowing up church and village.

[Example from ItTenTen20 – Italian corpus from the web (2022)]

100. *La saldatura tra il terrorismo islamico e internazionale è documentata nel video, mai diffuso in pubblico, dell' esecuzione di Fabrizio Quattrocchi il 14 aprile scorso. [...] quando Quattrocchi fu consapevole della sua imminente esecuzione, disse: «Ora vi faccio vedere io come muore un italiano». A questo punto Quattrocchi tentò di togliersi il cappuccio che gli copriva la testa chiedendo: «Posso?». Ebbene, uno dei sequestratori, in perfetto italiano, gli rispose: «Neanche per sogno».*

The connection between Islamic and international terrorism is documented in the video, which has never been released publicly, of Fabrizio Quattrocchi's execution on April 14. [...] when Quattrocchi was aware of his impending execution, he said, "Now I will show you how an Italian dies." At this point Quattrocchi attempted to remove the hood covering his head, asking, "May I?" Well, one of the captors, in perfect Italian, answered him, "**No way.**"

[Example from Paisà (Lyding et al., 2014)]

Apart from these examples, in the corpora several instances have also been found where the *neanche per sogno* (or one of its variations) was used in rhetorical questions and as a discourse formula of negation. In general, it appears to be used to sternly refuse something, implying that the speaker protests so strongly against it that it is not even something to be dreamt of.

In the second questionnaire the discourse formula was contextualized as a response to a proposal (101):

101. *Una sera un tuo amico suggerisce di guardare un film horror, ma tu rifiuti la proposta, dato che sei facilmente impressionabile.*

A: Guardiamo un film horror!

*B: **Neanche per sogno.** Poi non riuscirei a dormire.*

One night a friend of yours suggests watching a horror movie, but you decline the proposal, since you are easily impressed.

A: Let's watch a horror movie!

B: No way. I wouldn't be able to sleep then.

[Example from the questionnaire]

In the first task half of the respondents (seven of them) proposed *ни за что* ('for nothing') or *ни за что на свете* ('for nothing in the world') as a translation of *neanche per sogno*. Both of these discourse formulae are present in the Pragmaticon and classified as refusals. *Даже не мечтай* ('don't even dream about that') was chosen by two respondents. Other respondents preferred *с ума сошёл?* ('have you gone mad?'), *да ну* ('come on), *ни в коем случае* ('under no circumstances').

In the second part of the questionnaire, the most chosen option was also *ни за что* ('for nothing'), which was selected by seven participants. *И речи быть не может* ('it's out of the question') was selected six times and *ещё чего* ('then what') five times. *Нет и нет* ('no and no'), *нет уж* ('nope'), *только не это* ('just

not this'), *нетушки* ('nope') were selected three times each, *да ну* ('come on) twice and *вот ещѐ* ('here it is) once.

The results of both of these tasks have shown that *ни за что* ('for nothing') and *ни за что на свете* ('for nothing in the world') may qualify to be the most fitting translation of *neanche per sogno* as a discourse formula of refusal, even though other constructions as well can be considered adequate equivalents.

Chapter 4

Discussion of the Results

In this concluding section, we will provide a summary of the findings using a table that presents the most appropriate Russian equivalents for the Italian discourse formulae discussed earlier. This table will be divided into two main parts: the equivalents of a given Italian discourse formula that are already present in the Pragmaticon (including the ones that are not specifically listed as discourse formulae of refusal at the present moment), and the ones that could be added to the online database of discourse formulae after an in-depth analysis of their usage and linguistic features.

Generally, discourse formulas that received less than three preferences in the multiple-choice task will be excluded, while those entered even once in the discourse completion task might be included. Based on reasons of semantic, morphological, or pragmatic similarity outlined in the section on each formula in the previous chapter, translations that stand out as more appropriate (but not the only possible ones!) will be written in bold.

Table 3

Russian equivalents of Italian discourse formulae of refusal

Italian discourse formula	Russian translations present in the Pragmaticon	Russian translations not present in the Pragmaticon
<i>Sei matto?</i>	Ты с ума сошёл / ты с ума сошёл, что ли Ты в своём уме? Ты что <i>Шутишь?</i>	Прикалываешься? / ты что, прикалываешься? спятил? / с ума спятил? <i>Ты нормальный?</i>
<i>Anche no</i>	Нет уж / ну уж нет <i>Да ну</i> <i>Ни за что</i>	Ну не

	<i>И речи быть не может</i> <i>Ты что / да ты что</i>	
<i>Non è il caso</i>	<i>И речи быть не может / Увы и ах</i> <i>Не может быть и речи</i> <i>Не стоит</i> <i>Ничего не выйдет</i> <i>Нет и нет</i> <i>Нет уж</i> <i>Нетушки</i>	
<i>Non esiste</i>	<i>И речи быть не может</i> <i>Ты серьёзно? / серьёзно?</i> <i>Да ты что? / ты что?</i> <i>Ни за что</i> <i>Нет уж</i> <i>Ни в коем случае</i>	<i>Никак / никак нельзя</i>
<i>Scherzi?</i>	<i>Шутишь? / ты шутишь, Ты прикалываешься?</i> <i>Что ли?</i> <i>Даже не шути на эту тему</i> <i>Легко сказать</i> <i>И речи быть не может</i> <i>Тебе легко говорить</i> <i>Ещё чего</i>	
<i>Lascia stare</i>	<i>Успокойся</i> <i>Не дури</i> <i>Куда уж там</i> <i>Да ну</i> <i>Ни за что</i> <i>А смысл</i> <i>Ты смеёшься</i> <i>Ещё чего</i> <i>Нет уж</i>	<i>Расслабься</i> <i>Не гони</i> <i>Не парься</i> <i>Забей</i> <i>Перестань</i>
<i>Lascia perdere</i>	<i>Не стоит</i> <i>Не пойдёт</i>	<i>Забей</i> <i>Забудь</i> <i>Забудем</i>

		Обойдусь Не парься Брось Не получится
<i>Lasciami stare</i>	Даже не спрашивай Ни в коем случае И речи быть не может Нет уж	Отстань / отстань от меня Перестань Оставь меня в покое Забудь
<i>Figurati</i>	Не стоит беспокоиться Не надо Да ладно Ни к чему Не стоит Да ну	Не переживай Не беспокойся Расслабься Брось ты Отстань Забей
<i>Figuriamoci</i>	Да конечно Ещё чего Какой смысл Да ладно тебе О чём ты говоришь Ни за что Не пройдёт! Легко сказать А смысл К чему Какой толк Ты издеваешься?	
<i>Ma va'</i>	Да ладно / да ладно тебе Да ну Да успокойся ты Не надо Сам подумай	Перестань
<i>Ti pare?</i>	Ты что	Спятил?

	Ещё чего	<i>Думаешь?</i>
	Нет уж	<i>Ты вообще?</i>
	Ни за что	<i>Совсем что ли?</i>
	<i>Серьёзно?</i>	
	<i>С ума сошёл?</i>	
	<i>Ты издеваешься?</i>	
<i>Ma dai</i>	Ты что? / что ты? / ты	
	Чего? / ты чё?	
	Ещё чего	
	И речи быть не может	
	<i>Ни за что</i>	
	<i>Ну нет / нет уж</i>	
<i>'Sto cazzo</i>	Да пошёл ты	Ни хрена
	<i>Иди ты</i>	Чёрта с два
	<i>С какой стати</i>	<i>Фиг тебе</i>
	<i>Что ты пристал</i>	<i>Иди нахуй</i>
<i>Col cazzo</i>	С какой стати	Чёрта с два
	<i>Ещё чего</i>	Хрен ей
	<i>Ни за что</i>	С какого фига
	<i>И не подумаю</i>	Ну нафиг
	<i>Ищи дурака</i>	<i>Ага, щас!</i>
		<i>В смысле?</i>
		<i>Очумели?</i>
<i>Col cavolo</i>	Да пошёл ты	Чёрта с два
	<i>Ещё чего</i>	<i>Ты спятила?</i>
	<i>Ни за что</i>	<i>Нифига</i>
	<i>Ну нет</i>	<i>С хуя ли</i>
	<i>Даже не думаю</i>	<i>Да чёрт</i>
	<i>И не подумаю</i>	<i>Фиг тебе</i>
	<i>Вот ещё</i>	<i>Хрен тебе</i>
<i>Toglitelo dalla testa</i>	И речи быть не может	Забудь / забудь об этом
	Что ты пристал	Выбрось это из головы
	Об этом нечего и думать	Выкинь это из головы
	<i>Даже не думай</i>	<i>И не надейся</i>

	<i>Ты что?</i>	<i>Не носи чушь</i>
<i>Per carità</i>	Боже упаси Ей богу Бог с тобой <i>Ни за что</i> <i>Ни в коем случае</i> <i>Не стоит</i>	
<i>Vai tranquillo</i>	Не стоит беспокоиться <i>Да ладно</i> <i>Что ты</i> <i>Ни к чему</i>	Не волнуйся Не парься Не переживай Не беспокойся <i>Забей</i>
<i>Neanche per sogno</i>	Ни за что / ни за что на свете <i>И речи быть не может</i> <i>Ещё чего</i>	<i>Даже не мечтай</i>

Conclusion

The current research aimed at identifying some of the Italian discourse formulae of refusal and their equivalents in Russian. A further goal of the study was to attempt to give input for a possible expansion of the existing repository of Russian discourse formulae.

To reach these goals the research was conceived as divided into three parts: initially, a discourse completion task employed to elicit Italian discourse formulae of refusal from Italian native speakers was created. Then, a corpus analysis was carried out to better define in which pragmatic contexts each one of them is used. Finally, by means of a second questionnaire consisting of a discourse completion task and a multiple-choice task, which was filled in by Russian native speakers proficient in Italian, a series of Russian translation of the Italian discourse formulae were found. Some of those equivalents are already present in the online database for discourse formulae, the Pragmaticon, while others could not be found there.

Thanks to the research endeavors that were undertaken, the relevance of the class of discourse formulae, developed on the Russian material, has been confirmed for the Italian language. Moreover, it has been possible to compile a list of suitable translations for each Italian discourse formula of refusal, both among the constructions already entered in the Pragmaticon and among the ones that are not yet present in the database.

It is essential to acknowledge some limitations of this study. One of them is the relatively small sample size, especially in relation to the second questionnaire. The specificity of the target participants (Russian native speaker with a B2+ level of Italian) has probably been a key factor in this.

Furthermore, the precision of the Russian translations may have been partially influenced by the fact that in the multiple-choice task of the second questionnaire the lists of discourse formulae to choose from were, in some cases, slightly inaccurate. Some of these were completely inconsistent with the given context, but issues were mainly found in the fact that discourse formulae that

would have been good translations were not included. A more precise choice of options could have resulted in a more insightful range of equivalents for some Italian discourse formulae of refusal.

It should have also be considered that the translations proposed for the Italian discourse formulae may not be generalizable to all their possible contexts of usage. This is due to the fact that, because of the limited time and sample size, we had to select only one communicative situation for each Italian discourse formulae, despite the fact that this class of constructions is intrinsically polysemantic.

Despite these limitations, it may be said that our study achieved the objectives that were set. Its contribution to the field is linked with the facts that it addresses the previously unexplored field of Italian discourse formulae, opening the way for more in-depth studies and the identification of new constructions. In addition to that, this and similar future studies have the potential to improve the practice of the didactic of Russian as a foreign language, especially for Italian-speaking learners.

Future research can contribute to the expansion of the pool of Italian discourse formulae and to the refinement of our understanding about their usage. We also believe that our experience can be reproduced on the material of other languages to broaden the understanding of the semantics, syntax and lexical composition of the discourse formulae in a cross-cultural and cross-linguistic perspective.

References

- Aaron Smith, K. (2011). Grammaticalization. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 5(6), 367–380.
- anche in *Vocabolario - Treccani*. (n.d.). Retrieved August 28, 2023, from <https://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/anche/>
- Artoni, D., & Rylova, A. (2021). L1 Interference in Interlanguage Pragmatics A Study on Requesting in Russian L2 and Italian L2. *Annali Di Ca' Foscari. Serie Occidentale*, 55.
- Beebe, L., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Wetz, R. (1990). Pragmatic Transfer in ESL Refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language* (pp. 55–73). Newbury House.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bychkova, P. (2020a). Diskursivnye formuly podtverzhenija v tipologičeskoj perspektive. *Jezikoslovni Zapiski*, 26(2), 111–128.
- Bychkova, P. (2020b). Istočniki pragmatikalizacii diskursivnyh formul otricanija v tipologičeskom osveščeenii: russkij i slovenskij. *Filologičeskie Zametki*, 2(18), 187–211.
- Bychkova, P., & Rakhilina, E. (2022). Towards pragmatic construction typology: The case of discourse formulae. In A. Barotto & S. Mattiolo (Eds.), *Discourse phenomena in typological perspective* (pp. 35–63). John Benjamins. <https://publications.hse.ru/en/chapters/523234078>
- Bychkova, P., Rakhilina, E., & Slepak, E. (2019). Diskursivnye formuly, polisemija i žestovoe markirovanie. *Proceedings of the V.V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute*, 21, 256–284.
- carità. (n.d.). In *Treccani*. Retrieved August 19, 2023, from <https://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/carita/>
- Carney, J. (2020). Thinking avant la lettre: A Review of 4E Cognition. *Evolutionary Studies in Imaginative Culture*, 4(1), 77–90.

- Chomsky, N. (1986). Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use. In *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*.
- Dąbrowska, E. (2015). What exactly is Universal Grammar, and has anyone seen it? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6.
- Diessel, H. (2015). Usage-based construction grammar. *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, 39, 296–322.
- Diewald, G. (2011). Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions. *Linguistics*, 49(2), 365–390.
- Dittmar, N. (1992). Grammaticalization in Second Language Acquisition: Introduction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14(3), 249–257.
- Duryagin, P. V. (2022). Prosody and polysemy in Russian discourse formulae. *Komp'juternaja Lingvistika i Intellektual'nye Tehnologii*, 2022(21), 150–158.
- Ellis, N. C. (2019). Essentials of a Theory of Language Cognition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103, 39–60.
- Endresen, A., Zhukova, V., Mordashova, D., Rakhilina, E., & Lyashevskaya, O. (2020). The Russian constructicon: A new linguistic resource, its design and key characteristics. *Komp'juternaja Lingvistika i Intellektual'nye Tehnologii*, 2020-June(19), 241–255.
- Fedriani, C., & Ghezzi, C. (2023). The pragmaticalization of verbs of movement and exchange in Latin and Italian: paths of development from lexicon to pragmatics. *Uniwersytet Śląski*, 7(1), 116–139.
- Fedriani, C., & Molinelli, P. (2019). Italian *ma* 'but' in deverbal pragmatic markers: Forms, functions, and productivity of a pragma-dyad. *Cuadernos de Filología Italiana*, 26, 29–55.
- Félix Brasdefer, J. C. (2004). Interlanguage Refusals: Linguistic Politeness and Length of Residence in the Target Community. *Language Learning*, 54(4), 587–653.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2006). Linguistic politeness in Mexico: Refusal strategies among male speakers of Mexican Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(12), 2158–2187.

- Fillmore, C. J. (1984). Remarks on contrastive pragmatics. *Contrastive Linguistics: Prospects and Problems*, 119–142.
- Fillmore, C. J., Kay, P., & O'Connor, M. C. (1988). Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of let alone. *Language*, 64(3), 501–538.
- Frank-Job, B. (2006). A dynamic-interactional approach to discourse markers. In K. Fischer (Ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles* (Vol. 1, pp. 395–413). Elsevier.
- Fried, M., & Östman, J. O. (2005). Construction Grammar and spoken language: The case of pragmatic particles. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(11), 1752–1778.
- Gerasimenko, E., Puzhaeva, S., Zakharova, E., & Rakhilina, E. (2019). Defining discourse formulae: computational approach. *Proceedings of Third Workshop "Computational Linguistics and Language Science,"* 4, 61–69.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual. Essays on face-to-face behaviour*. Doubleday Anchor.
- Haspelmath, M. (2023). On what a construction is. *Constructions*, 15(1).
- Heine, B. (2013). On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics*, 51(6), 1205–1247.
- Heine, B. (2017). Grammaticalization. In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics Pragmatico-Semantic Change* (pp. 573–601). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Hopper, P. J. (2014). Emergent grammar. *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure, Volume I Classic Edition*, 143–161.
- itTenTen – Italian corpus from the web*. (2022). <https://www.sketchengine.eu/ittenten-italian-corpus/>
- Jakubíček, M., Kilgarriff, A., Kovář, V., & Rychlý, P. (2013). The TenTen Corpus Family. *7th International Corpus Linguistics Conference CL*, 125–127. <http://www.sketchengine.co.uk>
- Kilgarriff, A., Baisa, V., Bušta, J., Jakubíček, M., Kovář, V., Michelfeit, J., Rychlý, P., & Suchomel, V. (2014). The Sketch Engine: ten years on. *Lexicography*, 1, 7–36. <https://www.sketchengine.eu/>

- Kozyuk, E. (2020). *Sravnitel'noe opisanie diskursivnykh formul otkaza i otricanija v rusском i anglijskom jazykach*. National Research University Higher School of Economics.
- Kozyuk, E., & Badryzlova, Y. (2021). 'No way!' Discourse formulae of disagreement in Russian and English: a comparative study. *Komp'juternaja Lingvistika i Intellektual'nye Tehnologii, 2021-June(20)*, 445–455.
- Lyding, V., Stemle, E., Borghetti, C., Brunello, M., Castagnoli, S., Dell'Orletta, F., Dittmann, H., Lenci, A., & Pirelli, V. (2014). The PAISÀ Corpus of Italian Web Texts. *Proceedings of the 9th Web as Corpus Workshop (WaC-9), Association for Computational Linguistics*, 36–43. <https://www.corpusitaliano.it/it/index.html>
- Max-Planck-Gesellschaft. (2015). *The Leipzig Glossing Rules: Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses*.
- Mischel, D. (2023). *Psychology | Definition, History, Fields, Methods, & Facts | Britannica*. Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/science/psychology>
- Pratt, M. L. (1986). Ideology and Speech-Act Theory. *Poetics Today*, 7(1), 59–72.
- Puzhaeva, S. Yu., Gerasimenko, E. A., Zakharova, E. S., & Rakhilina, E. V. (2018). Automatic Extraction of Formulaic Expressions from Russian Texts. *Vestnik NSU. Series: Linguistics and Intercultural Communication*, 16(2), 5–18.
- Radovan, B., Endresen, A., Janda, L. A., Lund, M., Lyashevskaya, O., Mordashova, D., Nessel, T., Rakhilina, E., Tyers, F. M., & Zhukova, V. (2021). *The Russian Constructicon. An electronic database of the Russian grammatical constructions*. <https://constructicon.github.io/russian/>
- Rakhilina, E., Bychkova, P., & Zhukova, S. (2021). Speech acts as a linguistic category: The case of discourse formulae. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, 2, 7–27.
- Schauer, G. A. (2009). *Interlanguage pragmatic development: the study abroad context*. 255.
- Scollon, R., Scollon, S. B. K., & Jones, R. H. (2012). *Intercultural Communication*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1–23.
- The Russian National Corpus*. (2003). <https://ruscorpora.ru/>
- Tommasello, M. (2009). Universal grammar is dead. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32(5), 470–471.
- Traugott, E. C. (2017). Constructions in Grammaticalization. In B. D. Joseph & R. D. Janda (Eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics Pragmatico-Semantic Change* (pp. 623–647). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Trousdale, G. (2010). Issues in constructional approaches to grammaticalization in English. In K. Stathi, E. Gehweiler, & E. König (Eds.), *Grammaticalization: Current views and issues* (pp. 51–72). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Verschueren, J. (1978). Some Basic Notions in Speech Act Theory. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 28(1/2), 69–90.
- Wasserscheidt, P. (2019). Construction Grammar: Basic Principles and Concepts. *Ukrainian Linguistics*, 49, 94–116.
- White, A. R., Austin, J. L., & Urmson, J. O. (1963). How to Do Things with Words. *Analysis*, 23, 58.
- Yaskevich, A., Bychkova, P., Kozyuk, E., Rakhilina, E., Slepak, E., Utkina, A., Zhukova, S., & Zotova, T. (2017). *The Russian Pragmaticon. An electronic database of the Russian pragmatic constructions*. <https://pragmaticon.ruscorpora.ru/>

Appendix A

Items of the second questionnaire

Item	Italian	Russian	English
1	<p>Lavori come segretario/segretaria per un capo che ti sgrida sempre e che ti fa fare straordinari non pagati ogni settimana. Un tuo amico vede che stai sempre peggio e ti consiglia di lasciare il lavoro perché è preoccupato per te. Tu però hai assolutamente bisogno di quei soldi, altrimenti non riesci più a pagare l'affitto.</p> <p>A: Dovresti lasciare quel lavoro, non ti fa bene.</p> <p>B: Scherzi? Mi servono quei soldi.</p>	<p>Ты работаешь секретарем/секретаршей у начальника, который постоянно кричит на тебя и заставляет каждую неделю работать неоплачиваемую сверхурочную работу. Твой друг видит, что тебе становится все хуже и хуже, и советует тебе бросить эту работу, потому что он беспокоится за тебя. Но тебе определенно нужны деньги, иначе ты не сможешь платить за квартиру.</p> <p>А: Ты должна бросить эту работу, она тебе не подходит.</p> <p>Б: ___ Мне нужны эти деньги.</p>	<p>You work as a secretary for a boss who is always yelling at you and making you work unpaid overtime every week. A friend of yours sees that you are getting worse and worse and advises you to quit your job because he is worried about you. You absolutely need that money, however, otherwise you can't pay your rent anymore.</p> <p>A: You should quit that job, it's not good for you.</p> <p>B: Are you kidding? I need that money.</p>
2	<p>Il tuo partner/La tua partner torna a casa dopo aver passato tutto il pomeriggio a sbrigare commissioni. Quando è uscito/uscita tu stavi giocando al tuo videogioco preferito, e hai continuato fino a questo momento. Il/la partner si è</p>	<p>Твой партнер возвращается домой после того, как провел/провела весь день за делами. Когда он вышел/она вышла, ты играл/играла в свою любимую видеоигру, и ты продолжал/продолжала</p>	<p>Your partner comes home after spending all afternoon running errands. When he/she went out you were playing your favorite video game, and you have continued up to this moment. Your partner got angry and demands that</p>

arrabbiato/a e ti chiede di spegnere la console, ma tu non ci pensi proprio, stai per vincere!

до этого момента. Твой партнер злится и просит тебя выключить приставку, но ты даже и не думаешь об этом, ведь ты вот-вот выиграешь!

you turn off the console, but you don't even think about it, you are about to win!

A: Finiscila con quel videogame, stai giocando da ore!

A: Завязывай с этой видеоигрой, ты уже часами играешь!

A: Cut it out with that video game, you've been playing for hours!

B: Col cavolo! Sto per vincere!

Б: ___ Я сейчас выиграю!

B: No way! I'm about to win!

3 La tua macchina si è rotta e tu non hai i soldi per ripararla. Vai da un meccanico di tua conoscenza e lui ti dice che può aiutarti, ma che dovrai pagare molto per le riparazioni. Tu purtroppo non puoi assolutamente permettertelo.

Твоя машина сломалась, и у тебя нет денег на ее ремонт. Ты обращаешься к знакомому механику, и он говорит тебе, что может помочь, но за ремонт придется заплатить много. К сожалению, ты не можешь себе этого позволить.

Your car has broken down and you don't have the money to repair it. You go to a mechanic you know and he tells you that he can help you, but you will have to pay a lot for repairs. You unfortunately cannot afford it at all.

A: Lascia che ti aggiusti io la macchina, sarebbero 500 euro.

A: Давай я сам все отремонтирую – с тебя 500 баксов.

A: Let me fix your car, that would be 500 euros.

B: Lascia perdere. Non ho tutti quei soldi al momento.

Б: ___ У меня сейчас нет таких денег.

B: Forget about it. I don't have that kind of money right now.

4 Tu e un tuo amico state facendo un trekking di qualche giorno. Dopo una faticosissima giornata di cammino, ti propone di ricominciare domattina alle prime luci dell'alba. Tu però vuoi riposarti e ti sembra inutile iniziare così presto.

Ты и твой друг отправляетесь в поход на несколько дней. После утомительного дня ходьбы он предлагает тебе снова отправиться в путь завтра утром с первыми лучами солнца. Ты хочешь отдохнуть и чувствуешь, вставать так

You and a friend of yours are trekking for a few days. After a very tiring day of walking, he suggests that you start again tomorrow morning at first light. You, however, want to rest and it seems unnecessary to start so early.

	рано	совершенно	A: Let's get up early tomorrow, by 6 a.m.
A: Alziamoci presto domani, per le 6.	бессмысленно.		B: No way. It's too early.
B: Anche presto.	A: Давай встанем завтра пораньше, часов в 6.		
	B: ___ Слишком рано.		

5 La madre di Marco di preoccupa molto del fatto che il figlio debba tornare a casa in macchina durante una nevicata forte. Chiede quindi preoccupata al marito se sia il caso di raccomandare al figlio di guidare con attenzione, ma l'uomo è sicuro che Marco sia un guidatore esperto e che l'avvertimento non sia necessario.

Mать Марко очень обеспокоена тем, что ее сыну придется ехать домой во время сильного снегопада. Она с тревогой спрашивает мужа, не следует ли им посоветовать сыну вести машину осторожно, но тот уверен, что Марко - опытный водитель и что предупреждение излишне.

Marco's mother is very concerned about her son having to drive home during a heavy snowfall. She then anxiously asks her husband whether they should recommend that her son drive carefully, but the man is sure that Marco is an experienced driver and that the warning is unnecessary.

A: Dovremmo dire a Marco di guidare con attenzione, dato che nevicherà tutta la notte?	A: Должны ли мы сказать Марко, чтобы он ехал потише, тут всю ночь будет идти снег?	A: Should we tell Marco to drive carefully since it will snow all night?
B: Ma va'. Ha la patente da molti anni e ha guidato in ogni condizione climatica. Andrà tutto bene.	B: ___ У него права уже много лет, и он ездит в любую погоду. С ним все будет в порядке.	B: Come on. He has had his license for many years and has driven in all weather conditions. He'll be fine.

6 Sei un'adolescente e hai intenzione di partecipare a una festa. Un'amico ti chiede se tua madre ne sia informata, ma tu non hai nessuna intenzione di dirle la verità, dato che ti impedirebbe di partecipare.

Ты подросток и собираешься пойти на вечеринку. Друг спрашивает тебя, знает ли об этом твоя мама, но ты не собираешься говорить ей правду, так как она не позволит тебе пойти на вечеринку.

You are a teenager and plan to attend a party. A friend asks you if your mom knows about it, but you have no intention of telling her the truth, since she wouldn't allow you to attend.

A: Dirai a tua mamma della festa di stasera?

B: Sei matto? Lei pensa che vada in campeggio con la scuola

A: Ты маме скажешь о сегодняшней вечеринке?

B: ___ Она думает, что я иду в школьный поход.

A: Are you going to tell your mom about the party tonight?

B: Are you crazy? She thinks I'm going on a school camping trip.

- 7** Tu e un tuo collega avete commesso un errore che potrebbe causare una perdita economica considerevole all'azienda. Il collega vorrebbe dire la verità, ma tu temi che potreste essere licenziati se si venisse a sapere che siete stati voi.
- A: La faccenda è seria. Propongo di segnalarlo alla direzione.
- B: Ma dai. Ci licenzierebbero subito.
- Вместе с коллегой вы совершили ошибку, которая может привести к значительным финансовым потерям для компании. Коллега хотел бы рассказать правду, но ты боишься, что вас могут уволить, если станет известно, что это сделали вы.
- A: Дело серьезное. Предлагаю сообщить об этом руководству.
- B: ___ Они нас же и уволят.
- You and a coworker have made a mistake that could cause considerable financial loss to the company. The colleague would like to tell the truth, but you fear that you could be fired if it became known that you did it.
- A: The matter is serious. I propose to report it to management.
- B: Come on. We would be fired immediately.
- 8** Il tuo/la tua partner trova che tu spendi una parte troppo grande del tuo stipendio per comprare videogiochi e ti intima costantemente di smettere. Tu non hai assolutamente intenzione di ascoltare questa richiesta, visto che spendi i soldi che guadagni con il tuo lavoro.
- Твой партнер считает, что ты тратишь слишком большую часть своей зарплаты на видеоигры, и постоянно просит тебя прекратить это делать. Но у тебя нет ни малейшего желания слушать эту просьбу, так как ты тратишь твои деньги, которые ты зарабатываешь на своей работе.
- Your partner finds that you spend too large a portion of your salary on buying video games and constantly urges you to stop. You have absolutely no intention of listening to this demand as you spend the money you earn from your own job.
- A: Don't you dare buy video games again.

A: Non osare comprare ancora videogiochi. A: Даже не думай больше покупать видеоигры. B: Screw you. It's my money and I do what I want with it.
 B: Sto cazzo. Sono i miei soldi e ci faccio quello che voglio. B: ___ Это мои деньги, и я делаю с ними, что хочу.

9 Hai avuto per tutto il giorno un mal di testa molto intenso che ti ha costretto a letto. Verso sera il /la tuo/a partner si offre di chiamare il medico. Tu rifiuti perché pensi che sia eccessivo. You have had a very intense headache all day that has forced you to stay in bed. Around evening your partner offers to call the doctor. You refuse because you think it sounds excessive.
 A: Basta, adesso chiamo il dottore. A: That's it, I'm calling the doctor now.
 B: Figurati, ora mi passa. B: That's okay, I'll get over it now.
 A: Ну все, я позвоню врачу. B: Само пройдет.

10 Dopo una festa la tua casa è in condizioni disastrose. Un tuo amico si offre di rimanere ad aiutarti a sistemare, ma tu rifiuti perché non vuoi richiedergli un impegno così grande. После вечеринки твой дом находится в ужасном состоянии. Друг предлагает тебе остаться и помочь в уборке, но ты отказываешься, потому что тебе неудобно просить о таком. After a party your house is in a wretched condition. A friend of yours offers to stay and help you tidy up, but you refuse because you don't want to ask him to make such a big effort.
 A: Vuoi che rimanga e che ti aiuti? A: Хочешь, я останусь и помогу тебе? B: No worries. I'll manage on my own.
 B: Vai tranquillo. Ce la farò da solo. B: ___ Сам справлюсь.

11 Tu e un tuo collega state realizzando un progetto, ma vi rendete conto che le vostre competenze non sono sufficienti. Michele, Michele, another

un altro collega, è molto più esperto di voi e sempre molto disponibile. Il tuo collega propone di chiedere a Michele di svolgere la vostra parte di lavoro, visto che per lui sarebbe molto semplice, ma tu rifiuti, dato che ti vergogneresti troppo.

гораздо опытнее вас и всегда готов помочь. Твой коллега предлагает попросить Михаила выполнить вашу часть работы, так как это будет очень легко для него, но ты отказываешься, поскольку тебе было бы слишком стыдно.

colleague, is much more experienced than you and always very helpful. Your colleague proposes to ask Michele to do your part of the work, since it would be very easy for him, but you refuse, since you would be too ashamed.

A: Chiediamo a Michele se può fare anche la nostra parte di lavoro?

B: Per carità. Mi vergognerei tantissimo a chiederglielo.

A: Может, спросим Михаила, может ли он сделать и нашу часть работы?

Б: ___ Мне так стыдно просить его об этом.

A: Shall we ask Michele if he can do our part of the work as well?

B: For goodness sake. I would be so ashamed to ask him.

12 Un tuo conoscente, follemente innamorato di te, compie l'ennesimo tentativo di avere una relazione con te. Tu però non vuoi, e anzi, gli ripeti di nuovo che non ami lui, ma Pietro.

A: Mi vuoi sposare?

B: Toglitalo dalla testa. Sai che amo un altro.

Твой знакомый, безумно влюбленный в тебя, делает очередную попытку вступить с тобой в отношения. Ты, однако, не хочешь этого и, более того, в очередной раз говоришь ему, что любишь не его, а Петра.

A: Ты выйдешь за меня замуж?

Б: ___ Ты знаешь, что я люблю другого.

An acquaintance of yours, madly in love with you, makes yet another attempt to have a relationship with you. You, however, do not want to, and indeed, you tell him again that you do not love him, but Peter.

A: Will you marry me?

B: Put it out of your mind. You know I love someone else.

13 Una sera un tuo amico suggerisce di guardare un film horror, ma tu rifiuti la proposta, dato che sei facilmente impressionabile.

Однажды вечером друг предлагает тебе посмотреть фильм ужасов, но ты отказываешься от этого

One night a friend of yours suggests watching a horror movie, but you decline the proposal, since you are easily impressed.

		предложения, так как легко пугаешься.	A: Let's watch a horror movie! B: No way. I wouldn't be able to sleep then.
	A: Guardiamo un film horror! B: Neanche per sogno. Poi non riuscirei a dormire.	A: Давай посмотрим фильм ужасов! B: ___ Я точно не засну.	
14	Un tuo amico ti propone di brindare per festeggiare la fine della sessione di esami universitaria. A te piacerebbe, ma rifiuti a malincuore perché il giorno dopo devi lavorare di mattina. A: Dai, beviamo qualcosa per la fine della sessione. B: Non è il caso, domani mattina devo alzarmi presto per lavorare.	Твой друг предлагает тебе отменить конец сессии в университете. Ты бы хотел, но с неохотой отказываешься, потому что завтра утром тебе надо рано вставать на работу. A: Давай выпьем, отметим конец сессии. B: ___ мне завтра рано утром на работу вставать.	A friend of yours proposes a toast to celebrate the end of the university exam session. You would like to, but you reluctantly refuse because you have to work in the morning the next day. A: Come on, let's have a drink to celebrate the end of the session. B: It's not appropriate, I have to get up early tomorrow morning to work.
15	La tua collega, Maria, è molto poco produttiva perché sta sempre sui social durante il lavoro. Ti viene chiesto per l'ennesima volta da un altro collega, con il quale sei molto in confidenza, di aiutarla perché non sarà in grado di portare a termine la sua parte di lavoro entro le scadenze prestabilite, ma tu sei indignato, arrabbiato per la richiesta e rifiuti assolutamente.	Твоя коллега, Мария, очень непродуктивна, потому что во время работы постоянно сидит в социальных сетях. Другой коллега, с которым ты хорошо знаком, просит в десятый раз тебя помочь ей, потому что она не сможет выполнить свою часть работы к сроку, но ты возмущаешься, сердисься и категорически отказываешься.	Your colleague, Maria, is very unproductive because she is always on social media during work. You are asked for the umpteenth time by another colleague, with whom you are very close, to help her because she won't be able to complete her part of the work within the given deadlines, but you are outraged, angry at the request and absolutely refuse. A: Maria cannot do her part of the work because she is

<p>A: Maria non riesce a fare la sua parte di lavoro perché è troppo impegnata. Non riusciresti a fartene carico tu?</p> <p>B: Col cazzo. Non è un mio problema se non sa organizzarsi.</p>	<p>A: Мария не может выполнить свою часть работы, потому что она слишком занята. Не мог бы ты взять ее работу на себя?</p> <p>Б: ____ Это не моя проблема, если она не может организовать себя.</p>	<p>too busy. Couldn't you take it on?</p> <p>B: No fucking way. It's not my problem if she can't organize her time.</p>
<p>16 Un tuo collega insegnante ti chiede se saresti disponibile a portare gli scolari in viaggio d'istruzione. Tu rifiuti categoricamente, visto che le responsabilità sono troppe rispetto al guadagno che ne ricaveresti.</p> <p>A: Porti tu i ragazzi in gita quest'anno?</p> <p>B: Lasciami stare. Guadagno troppo poco per prendermi anche questa responsabilità.</p>	<p>Коллега-учитель спрашивает тебя, не согласишься ли ты взять учеников в школьную поездку. Ты категорически отказываешься, потому что ответственность слишком велика по сравнению с финансовой выгодой, которую ты от этого получишь.</p> <p>А: Возьмешь мальчиков в поездку в этом году?</p> <p>Б: ____ Я слишком мало зарабатываю, чтобы брать на себя еще и эту ответственность.</p>	<p>A fellow teacher of yours asks if you would be willing to take pupils on an educational trip. You flatly refuse, as the responsibilities are too much compared to the payoff you would get.</p> <p>A: Will you take the kids on a field trip this year?</p> <p>B: Leave me alone. I earn too little to take this responsibility too.</p>
<p>17 Tu e un tuo amico siete al mare. L'amico ti propone di andare a nuotare, ma tu non hai assolutamente intenzione di entrare in acqua, visto che le onde sembrano troppo alte.</p> <p>A: Andiamo a nuotare?</p>	<p>Ты и твой друг находитесь на берегу моря. Друг предлагает искупаться, но ты совершенно не хочешь заходить в воду, так как волны слишком высокие.</p> <p>А: Пойдем купаться?</p>	<p>You and a friend are at the beach. The friend suggests you go swimming, but you have absolutely no intention of going into the water, as the waves seem too high.</p> <p>A: Shall we go swimming?</p>

	B: Ma ti pare? Guarda che onde!	Б: ___ Вон какие волны!	B: Do you think so? Look at those waves!
18	Tu e un tuo amico avete organizzato una festa, tuttavia le previsioni del tempo prevedono pioggia tutto il giorno e alcuni invitati hanno già disdetto la partecipazione. Il tuo amico ti chiede se non sia il caso di annullare del tutto la festa, ma voi avete già comprato cibo e bevande, oltre ad aver affittato il locale. Ritieni quindi che la festa vada fatta comunque.	Ты с другом организовал вечеринку, но по прогнозу погоды весь день будет идти дождь, и некоторые гости уже сказали, что не придут. Друг спрашивает тебя, не стоит ли вообще отменить вечеринку, но вы уже купили еду и напитки и арендовали помещение. Поэтому ты считаешь, что вечеринку все равно следует провести.	You and a friend of yours have planned a party, however, the weather forecast calls for rain all day, and some guests have already called off attending. Your friend asks you whether you should cancel the party altogether, but you have already bought food and drinks, as well as rented the venue. You therefore feel that the party should be held anyway.
	A: Viste le circostanze, pensi che dovremmo cancellare la festa?	A: Раз так, не стоит ли нам все отменить, как думаешь?	A: Under the circumstances, do you think we should cancel the party?
	B: Lascia stare. Ormai abbiamo già comprato tutto.	Б: ___ Все куплено.	B: Forget about it. We have already bought everything by now.
19	Un tuo collega insegnante ti chiede se non sia il caso di evitare di assegnare compiti per casa agli studenti. Tu la trovi un'idea assolutamente insensata, visto che sei convinto che i tuoi studenti non progredirebbero nelle loro conoscenze se non costretti a studiare.	Твой коллега-преподаватель предлагает переставать задавать студентам домашние задания. Ты считаешь это совершенно бессмысленной идеей, так как уверен, что студенты не усвоят материал, если не заставлять заниматься.	A fellow teacher of yours asks you whether you should avoid assigning homework to students. You find this a complete nonsense idea, since you are convinced that your students would not progress in their knowledge if not forced to practice.
			A: Couldn't we avoid giving homework to students?

A: Non potremmo evitare di dare compiti per casa agli studenti?

B: Non esiste! Nessuno studierebbe!

A: А без домашних заданий нельзя?

Б: ____ Учиться же вообще никто не будет.

B: No way! No one would study!

20

Ormai da mesi vorresti uscire con un tuo compagno di università ma non trovi il coraggio di chiederglielo. Una tua amica ti consiglia di fare una cosa semplice, come invitarlo a bere un caffè assieme dopo le lezioni, ma secondo te non c'è alcuna possibilità che il tuo collega accetti, visto che sembra che non abbia mai dimostrato il minimo interesse nei tuoi confronti.

A: Magari potresti chiedergli di prendere un caffè dopo lezione.

B: Figuriamoci. Non mi saluta nemmeno quando ci incrociamo per i corridoi, di sicuro non vorrà bere un caffè con me.

Ты уже несколько месяцев хочешь пойти на свидание со своим коллегой, но не можешь найти в себе смелости пригласить его. Твой друг советует тебе сделать что-нибудь простое, например, пригласить его на кофе после занятий, но, по твоему мнению, нет никаких шансов, что коллега согласится, поскольку он никогда не проявлял к тебе ни малейшего интереса.

A: Так предложи ему выпить кофе после занятий.

Б: ____ . Он даже не замечает меня, когда мы встречаемся в коридоре, и уж точно не захочет выпить со мной кофе.

For months now, you have been wanting to go out with one of your university colleagues but you can't find the courage to ask him. A friend of yours advises you to do something as simple as inviting him for coffee together after class, but according to you there is no chance your colleague will accept, since he never seems to have shown the slightest interest in you.

A: Maybe you could ask him to have coffee after class.

B: Of course. He doesn't even greet me when we pass each other in the halls, he certainly won't want to have coffee with me.

Appendix B

Results of the second questionnaire

Item Results from discourse completion Results from multiple-choice task
(see task
App.
A)

1	Да ты что! Ты смеешься/ шутишь что ли Издеваешься? Шутишь?/ты серьезно? Прикалываешься? Даже не шути на эту тему. Мне нужны деньги. Шутишь (что ли)? Ты прикалываешься? Шутишь? Ты прикалываешься? Ты шутишь?/ Не до шуток! Non posso laschiare questo lavoro О чем ты? Шутишь	Discourse formula	Number of preferences
		Ещё чего	4
		И речи быть не может	7
		Ни за что	1
		Легко сказать	7
		Тебе легко говорить	6
		А смысл?	0
		Вот ещё	2
		Только не это	1
		Это моё дело	1
2	Ты спятила? Черта с два Черта с два! Ещё чего! Нифига/ нетушки/ ну нет Да черт! Даже не думаю. Я сейчас выиграю. Фиг тебе!/ Щас! Хрен тебе! Ещё чего! Да ни за что/Схуяли? Да пошел ты!/Твою мать!	Discourse formula	Number of preferences
		Да пошёл ты	8
		Ни за что	1
		Только не это	0
		С какой стати	2
		Я протестую	1
		И не подумаю	4
		Как бы не так	1
		Больно надо	0
		Вот ещё!	4

Un attimo

Ни за что!

Секунду

3		Discourse formula	Number of preferences
Обойдусь!		Ну уж нет	2
Да забей/ не парься		Не стоит	9
Забей!		Да ну	2
Забудь/ не надо/ перебьюсь/ обойдусь		Ещё чего	1
Забудь		Только не это	1
Ладно оставь в покое на данный момент. У меня сейчас нет таких денег.		Больно надо	0
Брось!		А смысл	1
Забей!		Вот ещё	0
Забудь (или оставь)		И речи быть не может	2
Не получится		Нет и нет	0
Забьем пока/Ты что?!!		Ни за что	0
Posso pagare a rate		С меня хватит	0
Забудем.		Очень надо	0
Извини		Ищи дурака	0
		Нетушки	0
		Что это даст	0
		Не пойдёт	4
4		Discourse formula	Number of preferences
Да ты что!		Ну уж нет	7
Ну уж нет		Ещё чего	3
Да ну!		Да ну	3
Ну нет/ зачем/		Нетушки	1
Ну уж нет		Ни за что	4
Ни в каком случае.		Вот ещё	3
Ну уж нет./Нет уж.		А смысл	1
Нетушки.		И речи быть не может	4
Лучше не надо		Не стоит	0
Ну не			
Ты что?!!/Да уж!!!/А может, прямо сейчас пойдём?			

	Siamo pazzi ad alzarci così presto	Нет и нет	3
	Сдурел?	С меня хватит	1
	Сума сошло	Только не это	2
		Очень надо	0
		Ищи дурака	2
		Что это даст	0
		Ты что?	4
5	Да ладно тебе!	Discourse	Number of
	Перестань	formula	preferences
	Да ну!	Об этом нечего	0
	Да ладно тебе/ не нужно/ не стоит/ тише/ успокойся	и думать	
	Да ладно	Так уж	1
	Да успокойся ты.	получилось	
	Да ну!	И не скажу	0
	Да ладно.	А то ты не	0
	Да ладно,	знаешь	
	Да ну	Сам подумай	3
	Не беспокойся!/Расслабься!	Увидишь	0
	Guida lentamente e mantieni le distanze	А ты подумай	0
	Да ладно тебе.	Не спрашивай	0
	Не надо	Не твоё дело	0
		Тебе какое дело	0
		Тебе-то что	0
		Что тут	0
		говорить	
		Так уж	0
		повелось	
		Да уж всё	1
		Какая разница	0
		Тебя не	0
		касается	
		Это моё дело	0
		Это не имеет	0
		значения	
		Да ладно тебе	10

		Ты что?	0	
		Не думаю!	1	
6	Ты что? /Ты чё?	Discourse	Number	of
	С ума сошел что ли	formula	preferences	
	Спятил?	Об этом нечего	1	
	Шутишь?/ ни за что/ прикалываешься/ ты в своём уме	и думать		
	С ума сошел?	Так уж	0	
	Ты что, прикалываешься чтоли ?	получилось		
	С ума сошёл?!	И не скажу	1	
	Ты с ума сошёл?/Ты в своём уме?	Сам подумай	0	
	Ты с ума сошел?	Увидишь	0	
	Сбрэндил?/ Ты нормальный?	А ты подумай	1	
	С ума спятил?/Крыша едет?	Как тебе сказать	0	
	Сerchero di convincerla	Не спрашивай	0	
	Ни в коем случае	Не твоё дело	0	
	Офигел	Тебе какое дело	0	
		Тебе-то что	0	
		Что тут	0	
		говорить		
		Так уж	0	
		повелось		
		Да уж всё	0	
		Какая разница	0	
		Тебя не	0	
		касается		
		Это не имеет	0	
		значения		
		Да ну	1	
		Ты что?	12	
7	Ни за что!	Discourse	Number	of
	Да конечно	formula	preferences	
	Ещё чего!	А смысл	3	
	Не надо/ ну нет/ не за что	Вот ещё	2	
	Ты что?	Да ну	2	
	Ты серьёзно ?	Ещё чего	5	

	Что ты?!	И речи быть не может	6
	Ты чё, совсем уже?	Не стоит	2
	Подожди,	Нет и нет	1
	Ты чего	Нет уж	3
	Ты что?/Очнись!!!	Ни за что	4
	Se fosse cosa peggiore,saremo licenziati	С меня хватит	0
	Свихнулся?	Только не это	2
	Ну давай	Очень надо	0
		Ищи дурака	0
		Нетушки	0
		Что это даст	1
		Не думаю	0
8	Ни хрена подобного!	Discourse	Number of
	Твою мать	formula	preferences
	Чёрта с два!	Как бы не так	3
	С какого	И не подумаю	3
	Иди ты!	Ни за что	0
	А как ты смотришь на то чтобы пойти на хутор бабочек ловить?	Только не это	0
	Да пошёл ты!	Больно надо	0
	Фиг тебе!	С какой стати	7
	Ещё чего!	Да пошёл ты	7
	Отвали/иди нахуй/ни хрена	Я протестую	0
	Отстань! (Можно и покрепче, но неприлично!)	А смысл	0
	Questa è la mia vita	Вот ещё	2
	Ну еще бы..	Ещё чего	2
	Извини	Ищъ чего захотел	3
		Нет уж	1
		Помилуйте	0
		Побойся бога	0
		Ищи дурака	0
		Нетушки	1
		Что ты пристал	4

		Я больше ничего не хочу услышать	1
9	Не надо!	Discourse	Number of
	Да не надо	formula	preferences
	Да ладно,	Вот ещё	1
	Не стоит/ не переживай/ пустяки	Ещё чего	1
	Забей	И речи быть не может	0
	Не беспокойся.	Ни к чему	7
	Да ну!/Брось ты!	Что ты	1
	Да не переживай!	Не стоит	8
	Ну зачем,	беспокоиться	
	Да не надо	А смысл	1
	Отстань!/забей!	Да ну	3
	Sto meglio	Не стоит	5
	Расслабься	Нет уж	1
	Умалю	Только не это	1
		Очень надо	0
		Нетушки	0
		Что это даст	0
		Да ладно	6
10	Не волнуйся.	Discourse	Number of
	Не волнуйся/ не парься	formula	preferences
	Да ладно,	Вот ещё	1
	Не переживай/ занимайся своими делами	Ещё чего	1
	Все в порядке	И речи быть не может	2
	Забей.	Ни к чему	4
	Не волнуйся!	Что ты	6
	Не парся!	Не стоит	9
	В этом нет необходимости,	беспокоиться	
	Забей	Да ну	2
	Спасибо, не беспокойся!	Нет уж	0
	Ce la faro domani	Ни за что	0

	Спокойно	Только не это	0
	Спасибо, ну	Очень надо	0
		Нетушки	0
		Да ладно	7
		Да что ты	6
11	Бог с тобой!	Discourse	Number of
	Ей богу	formula	preferences
	Нет уж	А смысл	0
	Ради бога/ пожалуйста не надо/ не за что	Вот ещё	2
	Ради бога	Да ну	3
	Да что ты, упаси боже.	Ещё чего	2
	Боже упаси!	И речи быть не может	3
	Даже не предлагай!	Не стоит	5
	Я тебя умоляю,	Нет и нет	0
	Упаси Боже	Нет уж	3
	Ты что?!!	Ни за что	4
	Chiediamoglielo. Con noi grazie mille	С меня хватит	0
	Не сейчас.	Только не это	4
	Умалю	Очень надо	0
		Ищи дурака	0
		Нетушки	0
		Что это даст	0
		Это моё дело	0
		К чему	0
		Какой смысл	0
		Какой толк	0
		Что толку	0
		Ни в коем случае	8
		Ну что ты	4
12	И не надейся! /Даже не думай!	Discourse	Number of
	Выбрось это из головы/ хватит	formula	preferences
	Не носи чушь!	А смысл	0
	Забудь об этом/ и не мечтай	Вот ещё	0

Забудь
 Забудь об этом и выбей из головы.
 Выбрось из головы!
 Выкинь это из головы!
 Забудь об этом,
 Выкинь это из головы
 Забудь!/Ты что?!!
 Non sono sicura
 Оглянись вокруг
 *имя друга

Да ну	0
Ещё чего	1
И речи быть не может	6
Не стоит	0
Нет и нет	0
Нет уж	1
Ни за что	1
С меня хватит	1
Только не это	0
Очень надо	0
Ищи дурака	0
Нетушки	0

Что это даст	0
Об этом нечего и думать	4
Сам подумай	2
Да уж всё	1
Ищешь чего захотел	2
С какой стати	0
Что ты пристал	5
Я больше ничего не хочу услышать	1

13	Discourse formula	Number of preferences
С ума сошел?	А смысл	0
Ни за что на свете	Вот ещё	1
Ни в жизнь!	Да ну	2
Ни за какие ковришки/ ни за что	Ещё чего	5
Ни за что	И речи быть не может	6
Да ну, нафиг надо	Не стоит	0
Ни за что!/ Ни в коем случае!		
Даже не мечтай!		
Ни за что,		

	Ни за что на свете	Нет и нет	3
	Ни за что!!!/это не для меня!	Нет уж	3
	Non mi piacciono le storie dell'orrore	Ни за что	7
	Даже не мечтай.	С меня хватит	0
	Что??	Только не это	3
		Очень надо	0
		Ищи дурака	0
		Нетушки	3
		Что это даст	0
14	Не сегодня.	Discourse	Number of
	Не сегодня	formula	preferences
	В другой раз,	А смысл	0
	Не в этот раз	Вот ещё	0
	Не в этот раз	Да ну	2
	Извиняй, не могу никак.	Ещё чего	2
	Не может быть и речи!	И речи быть не может	3
	Не сегодня.	Не стоит	5
	Давай не сегодня,	Нет и нет	3
	Это не тот случай	Нет уж	3
	Увы и ах!	Ни за что	1
	Andiamo, ma parto presto, domani lavorerò	С меня хватит	1
	Не сегодня	Только не это	1
	Мне нельзя	Очень надо	0
		Ищи дурака	0
		Нетушки	3
		Что это даст	0
		Ничего не выйдет	4
15	Ага! Щас!	Discourse	Number of
	Черта с два/ хрен ей	formula	preferences
	Ещё чего!	А смысл	0
	Ага, щас/ после дождичка в четверг	Вот ещё	4
	С какого фига?	Ещё чего	4
	Мне абсолютно безразлично.		

	Чёрта с два!	Ищъ	чего	3
	Ага, разбежался!	захотел		
	Ещё чего (ни за что)	Нет уж		4
	Фигушки/ну нафиг	Ни за что		4
	Очумели?!!	Только не это		0
	Dalle le mano	Помилуйте		1
	Да разве!	С какой стати		10
	В смысле?	Побойся бога		0
		Ищи дурака		5
		Нетушки		0
		Что ты пристал		0
		Я	больше	1
		ничего не хочу		
		услышать		
		Как бы не так		2
		И не подумаю		7
		Больно надо		0
		Да пошёл ты		1
		Я протестую		1
16	На меня не рассчитывай	Discourse	Number	of
	Отстань/ перестань	formula	preferences	
	Найди кого-нибудь другого	А смысл		2
	Это плохая идея/ забудь/ даже не спрашивай	Вот ещё		2
	Оставьте меня в покое	Ещё чего		3
	Ни в коем случае.	Ищъ	чего	0
	Отстань от меня!	захотел		
	Оставь меня в покое!	Нет уж		4
	Оставь меня в покое	Ни за что		3
	Отстань/успокойся уже	Только не это		2
	Будет перебор! Увы!	Помилуйте		3
	Non li conosco bene	С какой стати		3
	Ну куда	Побойся бога		3
	Не смогу	Ищи дурака		2
		Нетушки		0
		Что ты пристал		0

		Я больше	1
		ничего не хочу	
		услышать	
		И речи быть не может	4
		Ни к чему	0
		Что ты	1
17	Спятил?	Discourse	Number of
	Думаешь?/Серьезно/С ума сошел?	formula	preferences
	Ты спятил?	А смысл	0
	Серьезно?/ реально?	Вот ещё	3
	Серьезно?	Да ну	1
	Ты издеваешься?	Ещё чего	7
	Да ты что?!	И речи быть не может	2
	Ты что, с дуба рухнул?	Не стоит	3
	Ты в себе?	Нет и нет	1
	Ты вообще?	Нет уж	5
	Ты что? У тебя «все дома»?	Ни за что	4
	Molto pericoloso	С меня хватит	0
	Совсем что ли?	Только не это	2
	Капец	Очень надо	0
		Ищи дурака	2
		Нетушки	1
		Что это даст	0
		Об этом нечего	2
		и думать	
18	Куда уж там	Discourse	Number of
	Перестань/ не гони	formula	preferences
	Не дури.	А смысл	6
	Поздно / будь как будет	Вот ещё	1
	Не парься	Да ну	5
	Не забивай себе голову.	Ещё чего	4
	Да ну!		

Ни за что!
 Оставь как есть,
 Расслабься/забей/оставляем как есть
 Успокойся! Все будет ОК!
 In caso ci siedereo sotto l'ombrellone
 Оставь все как есть
 Буть спокойной

И речи быть не может	3
Не стоит	1
Нет и нет	1
Нет уж	4
Ни за что	1
С меня хватит	0
Только не это	0
Очень надо	0

Ищи дурака	0
Нетушки	0
Что это даст	1
Не пойдёт	1
Ты смеешься?	5

19 Никак!
 Нет конечно/ ни за что
 Никак нельзя!
 Нельзя/ никак/ увы никак/ ни за что
 Исключено
 Никоим образом
 Ни в коем случае.
 Ни в коем случае!
 Конечно нельзя!
 Как ты себе это представляешь/так не получится
 Да ты что!!!
 La ripetizione è sempre meglio
 Никак.
 Серозно?

Discourse formula	Number of preferences
А смысл	0
Вот ещё	2
Да ну	0
Ещё чего	2
И речи быть не может	6
Не стоит	0
Нет и нет	2
Нет уж	3
Ни за что	3
С меня хватит	0
Только не это	2
Очень надо	0
Ищи дурака	0
Нетушки	0
Что это даст	1
Об этом нечего и думать	3

		Так уж	0
		получилось	
		Ты что?	2
		Смеешься?	1
		Ты серьезно?	5
20	Какой там кофе	Discourse	Number of
	Ну еще чего	formula	preferences
	Ещё чего.	А смысл	4
	Смешно / дохлый номер / да конечно	Вот ещё	2
	Ага	Ещё чего	1
	Да ладно тебе.	И речи быть не	1
	Да конечно!	может	
	Ну, конечно!	Ни за что	2
	О чем ты говоришь,	Только не это	2
	Сомнительно	Это моё дело	1
	Не пройдет, увы!!!	К чему	4
	Вuon idea	Какой смысл	7
	Ни за что	Какой толк	4
	Посмотрим	Легко сказать	6
		Тебе легко	3
		говорить	
		Что толку	3
		Что это даст	2
		Да ну	1
		Не стоит	1
		Нетушки	0
		Ты что?	3
		Ты	4
		издеваешься?	