Lenore A. Grenoble
Dartmouth College

Discourse Analysis

Introduction. Discourse analysis is the study of language in use. It rests on the basic premise that language cannot be understood without reference to the context, both linguistic and extra-linguistic, in which it is used. It draws from the findings and methodologies of a wide range of fields, such as anthropology, philosophy, sociology, social and cognitive psychology, and artificial intelligence. It is itself a broad field comprised of a large number of linguistic subfields and approaches, including speech act theory, conversation analysis, pragmatics, and the ethnography of speaking. At the same time, the lines between certain linguistic subfields, in particular psycholinguistics, anthropological linguistics, and cognitive linguistics and discourse analysis overlap, and approaches to the study of discourse are informed by these subfields, and in many cases findings are independently corroborated. As a very interdisciplinary approach, the boundaries of this field are fuzzy.[1]

The fundamental assumption underlying all approaches to discourse analysis is that language must be studied as it is used, in its context of production, and so the object of analysis is very rarely in the form of a sentence. Instead, written or spoken texts, usually larger than one sentence or one utterance, provide the data. In other words, the discourse analyst works with naturally occurring corpora, and with such corpora come a wide variety of features such as hesitations, non-standard forms, self-corrections, repetitions, incomplete clauses, words, and so—all linguistic material which would be relegated to performance by Chomsky (1965) and so stand outside the scope of analysis for many formal linguists. But for the discourse analyst, such "performance" data are

[1] It is interesting, in this light, to compare the contents of several standard handbooks of discourse analysis. Brown and Yule (1986) focus heavily on pragmatics and information structure, while Schiffrin (1994) includes several chapters directly related to sociolinguistic methodologies (i.e. chapters on interactional sociolinguistics, ethnomethodology and variation analysis). Mey (1993) has three chapters on conversation analysis (a topic which Schiffrin also covers) and a chapter on "societal pragmatics."

indeed relevant and may in fact be the focus of research. The focus on actual instances of language use also means that the analysis does not look at language only as an abstract system; this is a fundamental difference between formal work on syntax versus discourse analysis.

This paper first provides an overview of discourse analysis and its general goals, including a discussion of the notion of discourse itself. It then summarizes some key theoretical frameworks in discourse analysis, their foundations and methodologies, and provides sample analyses.[2] Certain topics are more fruitfully analyzed in one or the other frameworks, and this article aims to identify issues for future research. The arguments presented here illustrated primarily by my own Russian data; much more work needs to be done not only on Russian, but on all Slavic languages. Discourse analysis is an active and dynamic discipline, and Slavic data are seriously underrepresented, in particular in Western publications not aimed at a Slavic audience. At the same time, American Slavists (with a handful of notable exceptions) are largely absent from the field of discourse analysis. Furthermore, discourse analysis is one field of linguistic inquiry where the traditional distinction between a general and a Slavic linguist breaks down: it is a discipline which aims to analyze the total picture of natural communication, examining how all of language comes together in its linguistic and extralinguistic context. In discourse analysis, no part of language and the communicative situation is off limits: the analyst may potentially need to take into account phonetics, morphosyntax, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and paralinguistic features in addition to real world knowledge. For this reason, discourse analysts either work on their native language, or on a language they know very well.

Discourse Analysis: An Overview. The term *discourse* is used in a variety of ways by differing scholars. Some linguists use it to signal only spoken language and refer to written language as *text*.[3] Most discourse analysts understand discourse to be an actual instance of language use (see Johnstone 2002). One of the first to use the term was Zellig Harris, who appears to have dismissed it as a viable linguistic unit. He specifically ruled

[2] All data, unless otherwise noted, are taken from my own field recordings in Moscow and St. Petersburg and transcribed by native speakers of Russian. This research has been funded by the John Sloane Dickey Center for International Understanding and the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX).
[3] For a discussion of the use of this terminology in Russian, see Petrova (2003).

out the kind of study which discourse analysis aims to do, arguing that descriptive linguistics does not consider "stretches" of language above the utterance level; that "any longer discourse is describable as a succession of utterances, i.e. a succession of elements having the stated interrelations" (1951:12).

Discourse analysis is based on the opposing premise, that the interrelations between utterances are critical, and that the discourse cannot be understood by analyzing language at the utterance level alone. In other words, a discourse is more than a linear string of utterances. This in turn means that a wide range of phenomena need to be understood, and the discourse analyst needs tools to understand how the language, linguistic context and extra-linguistic co-text. Critically, discourse is itself structured, and one goal of analysis is elucidating the structures of any particular set of discourse. Thus, for example, conversation analysis aims to determine the structures of conversation and the mechanisms by which interlocutors negotiate turns. Key approaches in discourse analysis include pragmatics, text linguistics, relevance theory and the transactional discourse model, which has been used almost exclusively to date in the study of Slavic discourse. This is by no means an exhaustive list of different approaches to discourse analysis but rather a representative list of some of the more foundational approaches, all of which serve as tools for the linguist analyzing a discourse. Note that some linguists would see these approaches as individual subfields of *linguistics*, not of *discourse analysis*; this is particularly true of conversation analysis, pragmatics, and text analysis. I have chosen here to take a broad view of discourse analysis which instead encompasses them.

Most of discourse analysis is functional in spirit, but is informed by and relies on advances in theoretical linguistics. Because it examines naturally occurring language situated in a context of some sorts, contextual information which is not strictly linguistic, but social and/or cultural, may be required in the analysis. A good example is provided by the study of clitics. While a generative syntactician might ask about the position of clitics on a tree, and a phonologist might ask how to account for clitics within a specific theoretical framework (e.g. Optimality Theory), the discourse analyst asks a very different question: why use clitics? Or, more accurately from the Slavic viewpoint, why use full forms when clitics are available? So, for example, it can be said that in Serbo-

Croatian clitic forms are in a specific syntactic position (in C°), and that their distribution differs from full, non-clitic forms in that the latter do not undergo prosodic inversion (Holloway King 1996) but this information cannot account for the functional difference between (1a) with a clitic and (1b) with a full form:

(1) a. Svjedok te je okrivio. [clitic]
b. Svjedok je TEBE okrivio. [full form]
'The witness accused you' (Browne 1975: 124)

The difference has to do with what Browne calls *emphasis*: emphasized forms must be accented, and clitics do not carry an accent. Thus while at one level the use of the full terms can be explained prosodically, but the notion "emphasis" is clearly a discourse concept, and requires a separate and different kind of explanation. Another example is provided by the Russian interrogative *li*, which must come after the first prosodic word. Franks (1999: 118) accounts for this by asserting that the focused constituents are in specifier position to the right of C° and again due to prosodic inversion, *li* is displaced to the right edge of the first prosodic word, producing (2a), and not (2b) or (2c):

(2) a. Na ètom li zavode on rabotaet?
'Does he work at this factory?'
b. *Na ètom zavode li on rabotaet?
c. *Na ètom zavode on li rabotaet?

This is a convincing account, and useful in describing the distribution of *li*. It does not, however, answer the question the discourse analyst must ask, namely, why interrogatives such as (2a) with *li* occur at all, given that the question without *li* (*On rabotaet na ètom zavode*?) is grammatical and more frequent. The difference in the research questions belies a fundamental difference between functional and formal approaches to language analysis.

Approaches to Discourse Analysis. There are a large number of different theoretical approaches to discourse analysis, ranging from what might be called loose,

functionally-based approaches to very formal theories, with Discourse Representation Theory[4] providing the best example of the latter. Most approaches lie in between the strictly formal and the strictly functional theories, with representative examples being Relevance Theory and the Transactional Discourse Model (Yokoyoma 1986).

Pragmatics, Grice, and Speech Act Theory. Pragmatics as a general term can be understood in at least as many ways as discourse analysis; the two terms are equated by some linguists, while others see it as a subdiscipline of linguistics in its own right. Padučeva (1996) discusses pragmatics in her book on semantics of Russian tense, aspect and narrative structure, further illustrating the difficulty of relegating it to one or another subdiscipline. In its narrower sense, pragmatics refers to linguistic theory that has been directly influenced by the philosophy of language. Here, pragmatics is understood to include reference and deixis, implicature, presupposition, Gricean pragmatics and speech act theory. In what follows I focus on the latter two, and return to questions of reference in the discussion of information structure (§3.2).[5] Davis (1991) is a collection of seminal papers in pragmatics; Mey (1998) is an excellent handbook; and standard textbooks of pragmatics are Leech (1983), Levinson (1983) and Mey (1993).

Speech Act Theory. Speech act theory finds its foundations in the philosophy of language. The philosopher John Austin was the first to point that language can "perform" certain functions, bringing together a series of lectures on the topic in his collection from the 1955 William James Lectures at Harvard, published in 1962. Austin recognized that certain sentences differ from other declarative, or *constative*, sentences, in that they do not assert truth values or have informative communicative value; they do not *say* things but rather *do* things. This class of *performatives* includes such sentences as the following:

[4] Discourse Representation Theory (DRT) is a formal approach to the study of discourse meaning, aiming at a formal semantic representation of the discourse. The basis of the theory, model-theoretic semantics, was initially applied to sentence-level structures only; DRT expands it to a system which is used to "process" discourses into what are called discourse representation structures. The scope and goals of DRT differ rather radically from the other methodologies outlined here: it is not as concerned with interactive discourse or with non-linguistic context, which are central to these other theoretical frameworks. DRT is presented in Kamp and Reyle (1993), a hefty, two-volume introduction; shorter representative works can be found in the papers in Blaser (1988); see also Kamp and Reyle (1996) or Kamp (1981).

[5] Thanks in part to the influence of Jakobson's seminal paper on shifters (1957/1971), deixis is one area in which American Slavists have worked extensively and have been very influential. See, for example, Chvany (1988); Grenoble (1999, 1998, 1996, 1995, 1994); Yokoyama (1991), as well as the papers in Andrews and Tobin (1996), to name just a few.

(3) a. Ja obeščaju
'I promise'
b. Ja daju slovo
'I give my word'
c. Ja izvinjajus′
'I apologize'

In uttering such sentences, one performs a certain act. These performatives[6] cannot be either true or false—truth conditions are irrelevant— but they can *misfire*. For example, in uttering *I pronounce you man and wife*, a couple will not be married if the speaker is not licensed to marry people, if the couple hasn't filled out the necessary paperwork, etc., in other words, if certain *felicity* conditions have not been met.

Each utterance has three underlying component acts: a *locutionary*, an *illocutionary* and a *perlocutionary* act. The locutionary act involves the actual speech production of sounds, i.e., the act of uttering; the illocutionary act is the force or the act that is performed in the locution; and the perlocutionary act is the "consequential effects" (Austin 1962:102) of the locution on the addressee. In principle, the illocutionary force is determined by a conventional force of uttering a particular sentence, e.g. Russian *vxodite* 'come in', can have the force of ordering, inviting, advising, and so on. In contrast, its perlocutionary effect (pleasing, surprising, etc.) is dependent upon the particular circumstances of the situation in which it is uttered, but the lines between the illocutionary force and the perlocutionary effect are not always clear.

Austin's theory is extensively developed by Searle (1969) to extend Speech act theory to linguistic analysis.[7] Searle establishes a taxonomy of speech acts and defined conditions for determining speech act types, making explicit the rules governing their use. For example, his work provides a detailed analysis on "how to promise" (Searle 1965). Illocutionary force can be divided into five subcategories (Searle 1976). In other words, there are just five types of utterances with which five types of basic actions can be

[6] A standard test for performatives in English is the insertion of *hereby*, which does not combine with nonperformatives. Note that in uttering *I hereby promise you a $10 reward*, the speaker has made a promise, while in **I hereby write my paper*, the speaker has not written a paper.
[7] Searle's contributions are extensive and cannot be treated with justice here; for a more complete discussion see Levinson (1983, chapter 5) or Mey (1993, chapters 6-8).

performed: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. Representatives commit the speaker to a certain state of affairs; these include assertions of facts. Directives "direct" the addressee toward performing some act.; examples include orders, requests and questions. Commissives are the speech act whereby speakers commit themselves to something; this category includes promises and threats, for example. Expressives express a psychological state; prime examples are apologizing, welcoming and so on. Declarations bring about changes in states of affairs; christening and declaring war are two clear examples.

A certain group of speech acts are of special interest: indirect speech acts, where one appears to be saying one thing but says another. The classic example is *Can you pass the butter*? which is not an information-seeking question (an answer of *yes* or *no* is interpreted as a wisecrack), but rather has imperative force (*Pass me the butter*). The category of indirect speech acts rests on the notion that sentences have a literal force and an additional inferred force. One goal of Speech act theory, then, is determining which acts are indirect speech acts, and further determining how their inferred force is to be interpreted. How to interlocutors identify and then interpret indirect speech acts? The answer is by no means trivial. One possible explanation is that such indirect speech acts as *Can you pass the butter*? are formulaic. Note that the tense/mood of the verb can be altered (*Could you...*), *please* can be added, and yet we are essentially left with the same request, or the same illocutionary force. Thus one could argue that *Can you please* VP? is an idiom for the request. Another possible explanation, and one which philosophers such as Searle would advocate, is that the meaning can be derived by a series of rules, and Searle contributed much to the discussion of just how this can be done; Gricean pragmatics (§2.1.2) can be invoked to account for the interpretation as well. (See Searle 1975; Levinson 1983, chapter 5, presents a thorough review and discussion of the literature. Bulygina and Šmelev 1992 give an overview in Russian, with a discussion of the distribution of *razve* and *neuželi* in terms of Speech act theory.)

Consider one very common example, the use of what appears to be a question in public transportation: *Vy ne vyxodite*? ('Are you getting off?) On the surface, this would appear to be an information-seeking question and, in fact, if the answer is affirmative, either a verbal response (*da* 'yes') or kinesic one (as in a head nod) is appropriate. But

when the answer negative, the perlocutionary force is manifested by the addressee stepping to the side, for the illocutionary force is something along the lines of 'I am getting off at the next stop and need to make my way to the door; are you getting off too or will you step aside to make way for me?' This is an interesting example because, judging by the response, it appears to either as an interrogative, or as a request, depending upon whether the response is affirmative or negative. Furthermore, like *Can you pass the butter*?, *Vy ne vyxodite*? is a formulaic linguistic exchange, rooted in modern Russian culture. This suggests that the interpretation of speech acts is, at least to a certain extent, dependent upon the culture of their usage. In fact, speech acts vary from language to language, making it difficult to determine a taxonomy of all speech acts. Nonetheless, this variation is in and of itself interesting. A pan-Slavic taxonomy of speech would be an admirable, albeit ambitious, goal, which would do much to inform our understanding of how speech acts vary across different Slavic languages and cultures.

A major problem in Speech act theory for discourse analysis is that it appears to be impossible to determine an exhaustive list of the mapping relations between utterances and actions. The extent to which Speech act theory can provide an adequate theoretical framework is itself questionable (Levinson 1983). Searle himself has suggested that discourse can be better understood in terms of speaker goals than in terms of rules and responses. But while Speech act theory may not provide an adequate framework of discourse analysis as a whole, speech acts are an important part of language use and fulfill important functions in the discourse. Even if they do not account for the discourse in its entirety, they can account for how some parts of the discourse develop. An example is provided by adjacency pairs, such as Question—Answer sequences (see §3.2). Now, adjacency pairs raise questions for speech act theory inasmuch as, while there is an illocutionary act of asking, there does not appear to be any act of answering (Levinson 1983:293). Consider the following example where the third line, which is morphosyntactically a question, comes as a response to the customer's request:

(4) (adapted from Yokoyama 1990:1)

Sales clerk	Čto vam?	'What do you need?'
Customer	"Ogonek" i…	'An "Ogonek" and …'
Sales clerk	gde vy tut vidite "Ogonek"?	'Where do you see an "Ogonek" here?'

Such responses are commonplace in colloquial Russian and may even be the norm. Here the clerk's response is perceived not as an interrogative, but rather as a declarative statement ('there is no milk'). As Yokoyama points out, the response is received as rude, in large part because a declarative response would in fact be possible. As this example illustrates, the illocutionary force of speech acts is achieved over extended stretches of discourse, not just over adjacency pairs (Clyne et al. 1991).

It is also clear that speech acts differ between cultures and languages; Searle himself (1975) points out that while *Can you hand me that book*? functions as a request in English, the Czech translation (*Mužete mi podat tu knižku*?) is infelicitous. Much of the literature on intercultural communication examines speech acts (see Clyne 1994 for an introduction and overview; see also Platt 1989). An example is provided by Mey (1993: 153) points out that in the same situation, a speaker of American English and a speaker of French could respond somewhat differently:

(5) a. I'm afraid I didn't express myself too clearly.
b. Mais vous ne comprenez pas!
'But you don't understand!'

Here the idea is that the American might address the issue of misunderstanding indirectly, with a 'self-correcting' speech act, while the French speaker makes a declarative statement. Crucially, for the American the French can be interpreted as an insult, although in French (4b) is not insulting. Despite the linguistic and pedagogical importance of this kind of work, we are currently lacking good cross-cultural comparisons of speech acts, and there is a general lack of empirical research in the field of cross-cultural communication as a whole. There are a few comparative studies involving Slavic data, such as Durst-Anderson (1995) on Russian, Danish and English, or

Ronowicz (1995) on Polish and Australian English. But these are just the beginnings of a larger research agenda. Slavic data are particularly timely, and can be approached from two angles. The first is that of elucidating the native Slavic speech act strategies in the homeland, and the second involves examining cross-cultural miscommunications involving Slavs who have emigrated and speakers of other languages.

Gricean Pragmatics. H. P. Grice (1975/1989) argues that conversational participants adhere to what he calls the Cooperative Principle which states, in essence, that the interlocutors have an unspoken agreement to talk cooperatively, in a mutual way, with each contributing to the conversation and speaking on topic. Grice formulates this principle as: Make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (Grice 1989:26). This idea is further developed in the Maxims of Conversation:

Maxim of Quantity

1. Make your contribution as informative as required.
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Maxims of Quality

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Maxim of Relation

Be relevant.

Maxims of Manner

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief.
4. Be orderly.

These maxims of conversation are more informative when, at first glance at least, it appears that one of the conversation participants is not adhering to them, or *flouting* them. For example, in the following excerpt, Speaker B appears to be flouting the Maxim of Relevance:

(6) 1. A. A vy vot xotite buterbrodik? 'Do you want a little sandwich?'
2. B. Čto, uže? 'What, already?'
3. A. Uže vot Anjuša prišla 'Anjuša has already arrived.'

Here the difficulty is that line (3) does not appear to respond to line (2), which could be expanded to something along the lines of 'what, is it already time to eat lunch?' A Gricean approach would go something like this: I (speaker A) assume you (speaker B) to be adhering to the Cooperative Principle, and since you did not directly say that it is time to eat lunch, but did say that Anjuša has arrived, so it must be that her arrival is somehow related to lunch time. In sum, the response is taken to be relevant, and so provides enough information for the addressee to derive an explanation. (Levinson 1993, chapter 3, provides an excellent critical discussion of Gricean pragmatics and implicatures. Israeli 1997 uses the cooperative principle to explain syntactic reduplication (repetition of a word or modified word within the same prosodic unit), but finds the principle too limited to account for all the data.)

Conversation Analysis. Conversation analysis stems from the initial work of a group of ethnomethodologists (notably, Harvey Sacks and Emanuel Schegloff) who began, in the 1960's, examining what happens in nonscripted, spontaneous speech. They discovered that, contrary to prior claims, conversation is rule-governed; the trick is that the rules look quite a bit different than phonological or syntactic rules. That is to say that we do not have—and probably never will have—a formal set of rules which can generate all and only "correct" conversational structures. That does not mean, however, that conversation is unstructured. Rather, the structure is of a very different nature than that of a clause or sentence, in large part due to the fact that conversation involves not a single speaker but rather two or more speakers. It is mutually developed and the rules for conversation resemble the rules for other social interactions. From this we can derive the

two basic premises of conversational analysis: (1) language is a form of social interaction; and (2) conversational structures are rule-governed.

Thus conversation analysis maintains that verbal interactions are both structurally organized and contextually oriented (Heritage 1984), and a primary goal of the analysis is elucidating these structures and determining how they are interrelated. Conversation analysis is often viewed as being the most "hard core" branch of discourse analysis, and its general approaches and tenets will be convivial to linguists who are oriented toward more formal linguistic approaches. For example, it can be said that each level of linguistic analysis is typically seen as having a "basic unit," e.g., the phoneme is "basic" in phonology, the morpheme in morphology, and the clause in syntax. Conversation is not different: the fundamental unit in conversation is the turn. Conversation analysis has been extensively involved in examining the organization of turn-taking.

Turns are analyzed as consisting of *turn-constructional units* (TCUs) where a TCU is defined as a "unit-type with which a speaker may set out to construct a turn" (Sacks et al. 1974: 702). Unlike other linguistic units (such as phonemes, morphemes, clauses and phrases), the TCU is a dynamic kind of unit which is jointly created by the interlocutors; in this way it fundamentally differs from other linguistic units. This feature also makes it notoriously difficult to define, because it is both expandable and stoppable, a point which Sacks et al. makes explicit:

> The turn-unit is of a sort which (a) employs a specification of minimal sizes, but (b) provides for expansion within a unit, (c) is stoppable (though not at any point), and (d) has transition places discretely recurring with it, (e) which can themselves be expanded or contracted; all of these features except the first are loci of interactional determination. By virtue of this character, it is misconceived to treat turns as units characterized by a division of labor in which the speaker determines the unit and its boundaries, with other parties having as their task the recognition of them. [...] That is, *the turn as a unit is interactively determined.*
>
> [Sacks et al. 1974: 726-27]

The TCU is seen as having an identifiable trajectory or, in other words, conversational participants identify a beginning, middle and end to a TCU. Just how this comes about is a continuing focus of current research in conversation analysis, which addresses issues of how interlocutors project *transition-relevance places* (TRPs).

Although not explicitly stated, Sacks et al. does implicitly treat the turn unit as consisting of one or more syntactic units; they do define it as consisting of "sentential, clausal, phrasal and lexical constructions" (p. 702). Further research has shown that syntactic completion alone is not sufficient in the definition of a TCU; as a look at any conversation will show, a TCU can consist of multiple syntactic units. Both prosody and semantic completion are clearly involved, and more recent research points to the importance of gaze, body movements and gestures in face-to-face interaction.

Turns are organized and co-ordinated in sequences of exchange. An exchange is the basic unit of interaction (Sinclair et al 1972; Coulthard and Brazil 1992:64): it is "basic" because it consists minimally of contributions by two participants and combines to form the largest unit of interaction, the transaction. There is some discussion whether exchanges should be seen as basically organized in terms of two parts (e.g. adjacency pairs such as question—answer) or as consisting of three parts (question—answer—acknowledgment). While it has been suggested that adjacency pairs are the fundamental unit of conversation (Goffman 1976; Coulthard 1977:70), I will treat them as part of a group of "special" turns. Adjacency pairs are "special" in the sense that, by and large, there is a rule governing them: once the first part of the adjacency pair has been produced, the current speaker must stop talking, and the next speaker must produce the second part of the pair. Both two-part and three-part exchanges are found in natural conversation:

(7) two-part exchange: Question—Answer

A.	skol′ko vremeni?	'what time is it?'
B.	pol pjatogo	'4:30'

(8) three-part exchange: Question—Answer—Acknowledgment

A.	a ty nikogda ni kurila?	'and you never smoked?'
B.	nu net, gospodi,	'well, no, good lord,
	probovala kak vse probujut tak	I tried it like everyone tries it'
A.	ponjatno (3.0)	'I see'

There are certain speech acts which are problematic for the interpretation of adjacency pairs as existing of two parts. These include accepting requests (where the second pair part may be missing, if the second pair part must be a verbal response, as opposed to an action), and accepting or refusing invitations. There is evidence that the nature of the speech act/adjacency pair relation differs across different cultures (Platt 1989). Some of this has been investigated in Slavic in relation to politeness strategies (Mills 1992; Suszczynska 1999), but much more research is needed.

Furthermore, adjacency pairs do not always follow the strict ordering anticipated by the rule which governs their use. For example, the pairs in the following excerpt do not follow the sequence Q(uestion)1-A(nswer)1, Q2-A2, but rather Q1-Q2-Q1[A2]-Q3-A3, Q4-A4-A1:

(9) (Zemskaja and Kapanadze 1978:144)

Q1	A ty oktuda èti slova vzjal? A?	'where did you get these words from? ah?'
Q2	Čto?	'what?'
Q1/A2	Otkuda ty èti slova vzjal?	'where did you get these words from?'
Q3	kakie?	'which ones?'
A3	nasčet spravki	'about the certificate'
Q4	spravki?	'the certificate?'
A4	da.	'yes'
A1	(smeetsja) sam pridumal	(laughs) 'I made them up myself'

While it has been frequently observed that turn changes tend to occur smoothly, without overlap and with no pauses, or at least minimal pauses, it is less clear how that comes to

be or, in other words, how all participants "know" when a turn change will occur. Finally, to take this from the opposite side, why does overlap occur when it does, if the mechanical structure of the conversation functions? These are key questions for conversation analysis. It is important to note that because conversational structure is a central issue for this kind of analysis, it needs to investigate certain topics which are out of bounds for other subfields of linguistics. These topics include eye gaze, body position and gesture, the general speech tempo, and pauses, hesitations and overlaps, and even laughter. Again, in many formal approaches to linguistics, most of these would be relegated to the area of performance, and are just irrelevant to the analysis. But for a conversation analyst, these are issues of central concern.

An example is provided by pauses. Despite claims that the turn-taking structure operates without pauses and overlaps, in point of fact one finds a large number of both in Russian discourse. To date there is no adequate theory of pauses and silence in discourse, and here crosslinguistic information is critical. We do know that the amount of silence, or non-speech time, that is tolerated in a conversations varies greatly in different cultures, with Native Americans being relatively tolerant of silence, and certain Europeans (perhaps Anglo-New Yorkers) less tolerant. How long can a pause in conversation be and still be a pause, as opposed to a period of silence? Jefferson (1989) shows that a period of one second is a "standard maximum" period of silence in American English conversation. If we turn to pauses in Russian conversation,[8] two things are immediately clear: (1) pauses do in fact occur at the end of turns; (2) pauses—even relatively long ones—can be found turn-internally. In (10), shorter pauses (less than one second) occur turn-internally, while pauses of longer than 1 second are found at TRP's, suggesting a correlation between pause length[9] and the turn-taking structure:

(10) 1. A. a god u nas živet kot (0.51)
2. i každyj raz kogda na nego sps- nu straxoljud (0.77)

[8] These excerpts are transcribed according to the standard conventions of conversation analysis, given in Jefferson (1979), with one exception: curly brackets { } are used in glosses to differentiate ellided material from overlap. Following convention, square brackets [] are used to indicate overlapped speech, = indicates continuing speech, and ??? indicate incomprehensible speech.

[9] Pauses and pitch track for these excerpts were measured on a wide band spectogram with the Computerized Sound Lab by Kay Elemetrics.

3. nu strašnyj (0.62)
4. ryžij takoj oj morda naglaja (0.69)
5. boka vpalye (0.22)
6. šerst′ vot tak vot [???] oj (0.84)
7. B. [xorošij]
8. A. vsja otrava (1.56)
9. B. kak ona tak ljubimogo kotik[a
10. A. [ja ego obožaju=
11. =ja ego s″est′ gotova (1.13)

1. A. the cat has been living with us for a year now
2. and every time{you look at} him..well, he's a monster
3. well ugly
4. he's red, oj, with an insolent mug
5. his sides are sunken in
6. his fur's like this, [???] oj
7. B. [good]
8. A. pure poison
9. B. how can she {talk like that about} her beloved c[at
10. A. [I adore him=
11. =I'm ready to eat him up

However, an excerpt from another conversation demonstrates that pause length alone does not suffice to account for the placement of turn transitions:

(11) 1 A mamočka no ty mne pomožeš′
2 ja grju (1.54)
3 kak ja tebe pomogu
4 ja ni odnogo angličanina ne znaju (1.15)
5 B to est′ tebe nužno {… }

1	A	‘mama, but will you help me?’
2		‘I say’
3		‘how can I help you?’
4		‘I don’t know a single Englishman’
5	B	‘So you need {…}’

Here we see that the relatively lengthy pause of 1.54 seconds at the end of line 2 is not interpreted by the addressee as occurring at a TRP; it is not until after line 4 that the addressee begins to speak. Clearly, the lack of syntactic and semantic completion plays a role in the interpretation of this first pause; a change of speakers at this point would leave something unsaid. Moreover, the distribution of these pauses is directly related to the information structure of the discourse: the text is segmented into what Chafe (1994: 57–70) calls *intonation units*, where approximately one chunk of new information is found in each unit, and each unit acts as a prosodic unit. Although Chafe’s definition of an intonation unit refers to the perceptual qualities of intonation, acoustic measurements of each of these excerpts also show a declination of fundamental frequency over each “unit” as segmented here.

A final point should be made with regard to the overall methodologies of conversation analysis, and that is that because it investigates actual speech, studies are generally based on talk which occurs in very particular settings. For example, early work looked at transcripts from a suicide crisis center (Sacks 1972) or calls to the police (Schegloff 1968). This in part stems from the history of conversation analysis, deriving from ethnomethodological work in language and language use. But in large part it also stems from the recognition that the setting and context can and do influence conversational structures. Still, as Schegloff himself emphasizes, this in no way entails that the resulting analysis pertains only at the microlevel of very specific speech settings. Rather, general rule that apply to the description of global levels can be extracted; the elucidation of the overall structural organization of conversation with work done “*in service* of the situated particulars of the originating data, *not in contrast* to them” (Schegloff 1999:144; original emphasis). In his position paper on the future directions of conversation analysis, Schegloff (1999) calls for research aimed at identifying how

conversation is organized at a more global level of interaction. I take this to strongly support research on languages other than English, and to support contrastive conversation analysis. In order to answer the global-level questions which Schegloff poses, we need more data to enable us to identify what is culture specific, and to determine cross-linguistic, cross-cultural rules of conversation.

Future Directions in Conversation Analysis. A number of issues are central to current research in conversation analysis, and studies of all the Slavic languages would do much to inform current theories and to establish future research goals. One issue is the role on non-linguistic features in the turn-taking structure of conversation. Fox et al. (1996) argue that points of possible turn completion are determined on the basis of both sequential location and "interactional import," by which they refer to the pragmatics of the utterance sequences. Their study shows the TCU to be determined by a "constellation" of gesture, gaze and body position, in combination with syntactic and semantic completion and prosody. This study is based on American English and, as they themselves point out, comparative research is needed on other languages. Predicting that in general their findings will apply to other languages, they also suggest that exactly how these linguistic and non-linguistic strategies are used in turn-taking may vary from language to language. More recently, their work has been further developed to include questions of grammar, grammaticization and conversation, including investigations of whether linguistic theories should take into account the role of semiotic modalities such as gesture and gaze in determining language-based categories such as reference (Ford et al. 2002). Second, in a special issue of *Research on Language and Social Interaction* (1999, 32/1–2) devoted to the topic of future directions for research, Heritage points to the need for more quantitative analyses in CA and makes the prediction that such work will play a critical role in the development of the field. Again, Slavic data would be very helpful here.

The role of intonation in conversational structure itself remains to be fully understood for all languages, and very little research has been done on Slavic prosody from this perspective (see also §3.1). It is well known that word order is in large measure discourse-determined, and that there is a strong link between word order and intonation (Yokoyama 1986). Considerably less is known, however, about how all this comes

together in conversation. Key issues include not only an expansion of the work on intonation and information structure, but also particular attention to such questions as determining the relationship between intonation and TCUs, interruptions, overlaps. It is clear that there is general downdrift of F0 over the course of a turn, with F0 reset occurring at the beginning of the new TCU,[10] and that a misinterpretation of prosodic cues can account for at least some instances of overlap (Wells and Macfarlane 1998). Exactly how prosody functions over the course of long turns, and over the course of long conversations is unclear. It is uncertain to what extent downdrift plays a role in signaling an upcoming TRP to the interlocutor(s), and to what extent such other factors as syntactic and semantic completion are involved.

Relevance Theory. Relevance Theory was developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986), at least in part as a reaction to Gricean Pragmatics, stemming from the idea that Grice's Conversational Principle leaves many basic questions about human communication unanswered. For example, Grice postulates the Maxim of Relevance (*be relevant*; §2.1) as fundamental to the conversational principle, but does not actually define what relevance is. Sperber and Wilson (1986) develop a theory of relevance which centers around the claim that such relevance is grounded in human cognition; their goal is to identify a set of mental processes which are encaptured by this notion of relevance and to show how these come into play in ordinary language usage. The essential claim of Relevance Theory is relatively straightforward: in any given context, the addressee assumes that what the speaker is saying is relevant. That is to say, the utterance is expected to be relevant, and conforms to a general relevancy principle. In the postface to the second edition of their founding work, Sperber and Wilson (1995:260-1) address certain confusions arising from their initial formulation of a single relevance principle but restate the original claims in terms of two principles:

(1) *The First (Cognitive) Principle*

Human cognition tends to be geared to the maximization of relevance.

[10] There is a large body of literature on this topic for English: see especially Couper-Kuhlen 1993, 1996; a variety of articles in Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 1996a; Schuetze-Coburn et al. 1991. Language and Speech (1998, 41/3–4) is a special (double) issue devoted to the topic of prosody and conversation.

(2) *The Second (Communicative) Principle*

Every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance.

It is this second, communicative principle which was defined as the Relevance Principle in the original edition of this work (renamed here because of misunderstanding which resulted from some equating the Cognitive Principle with the Relevance Principle). Sperber and Wilson argue that the relevance principle is "more explicit" than Grice's cooperative principle and maxims (1995:161).

Relevance theory is useful in analyzing those kinds of linguistic items and strategies which are more pragmatic than lexical or syntactic in nature; it has much to say about why a particular entity is chosen by the speaker. That is to say, it works well with entities that can only be understood with reference to the communicative situation. These includes a broad range of devices, such as discourse particles and markers, parentheticals, modality:, as well as such aspects of communication as humor, irony, metaphor and implicature. In order to understand how Relevance theory might be useful, we can briefly examine its application to discourse particles. It has been applied to studies of particles in a number of languages, such as English, Greek, Hebrew and Japanese, to name a few.[11] The use of particles can be explained in terms of the different kinds of meaning they encode: there is a distinction between *conceptual* and *procedural* meaning (Blakemore 1987). Briefly, utterances with conceptual meaning have propositional value and affect truth conditions. Items with procedural meaning do not have propositional content; they say more about how information is to be processed or situated. Some Russian discourse particles (such as *k tomu že*, *značit)* carry both conceptual and procedural meaning, while others (such as *že*, *-to)* carry procedural meaning only.

The usefulness of this approach can be illustrated with a sample analysis of the Russian particle *ved '*. In an approach that is representative of earlier work on particles, Vasilyevna (1972:46) classifies *ved '* with other polysemantic particles, asserting that its "principal function is to emphasize the obviousness of a fact or truth contained in an utterance." It is not clear why *ved '* is "polysemantic," if this can be seen as its principal

[11] See the collection of articles in Rouchota and Jucker (1998).

or perhaps even invariant meaning, but she does continue to provide a taxonomy of six uses of *ved'*, given here in abbreviated form, stating that it:

(1) lends the idea expressed the tone of an argument requiring no proof;
(2) may emphasize the significance of a fact or the importance of an utterance;
(3) is used in general questions when the speaker tries to prompt his interlocutor to give the answer he wants to hear;
(4) is used for emphasis in expressing a prediction, warning or reproach;
(5) emphasizes the unexpectedness of finding out a fact, the discovery of a plain truth, the detection of a hidden contradiction, etc., or expresses a guess:
(6) in rhetorical questions is used merely to draw the interlocutor's attention to the thought which is to follow and to which the particle actually refers.

(Vasilyevna 1972: 46-50)

These definitions fall short in two crucial ways: on the one hand they fail to capture an important generalization about the use of *ved'*, while on the other hand they do not provide enough information as to how to use the particle felicitously. These shortcomings stem from a failure to examine how *ved'* operates with the information structure of the text, and by failing to analyze it within a clearer theoretical framework. While such taxonomies such as the above may be useful for lexical items which have unambiguous referential value, they cannot adequately account for items which carry procedural meaning; the distinction between conceptual and procedural meaning is not recognized. In the following excerpt, we see the use of *ved'* to link information from the previous discourse to that of the upcoming discourse:

(12) Èto lučšaja situacija po sravneniju s prošlym godom, no, v kakom smysle, tjažselo skazat′. Dlja bednyx, konečno, luãše bylo togda, oni lučše v očeredi postojat dva časa, no kupjat deševo, a dlja ostal′nyx lučše sejčas, navernoe,

→ **ved′** rabotajut u nas po nočam vozle metro èti kioski, kotorye prodajut importnye tovary tam, vypivku, edu, zakusku, a … pokupajut vse ravno, pokupajut.

(Moscow, 1992)

'It's a better situation compared to last year but, in just which sense, it's hard to say. For the poor, of course, it was better then—they're better off standing in line for two hours but buying cheaply, but for the rest of us it's better know, probably,

→ **After all** those kiosks are open at night by the metro, the ones that sell imported goods, drinks, foods, a bite to eat, and ... people buy [things] anyway, they buy them...'

In the first three lines of this excerpt, the speaker is talking about the relative standard of living in Moscow after the downfall of Communism. She appears to change topics at the end of line 3, when she says that the kiosks work all night. What *ved ′* does here, to oversimplify a bit, is to signal to the interlocutors that this is not a change of topic at all, but rather relevant to the discussion of the standard of living. It fulfills this function through a combination of its conceptual and procedural meanings. As is known, this particle is etymologically related to the verb *vědati* 'to know' and so has conceptual meaning: it signals knowledge of some kind. It also carries procedural meaning: it asserts that the information is relevant to the current discussion. In so doing, it provides a link between the prior discourse and upcoming discourse, but it is more than a conjunction: it is a signal of relevance.

This is not presented as a complete analysis of this particle, but rather as a sketch of an outline of how that analysis might proceed in Relevance Theory. This brief sketch runs the risk of implying that *ved ′* has not been examined elsewhere, which is not the case. For more complete studies, see Bonno and Kodzasov (1998) and Paillard and Markowicz (1986).

The Transactional Discourse Model. In a framework which she has labeled the Transactional Discourse Model (TDM), Yokoyama (1986) proposes a model of discourse where the minimal communicative unit is made up of four components: the two interlocutors (A and B) and their "matters of current concern" (C_a and C_b). A's and B's

knowledge sets, and their respective sets C_a and C_b, of matters of current concern; are represented with circles in TDM. The intersection of these sets (joint knowledge, shared concerns) is iconically represented by a Venn diagram. The model is designed to describe and account for the transfer of knowledge; Yokoyama is careful to distinguish propositional, referential and predicational knowledge, which she defines as "the knowledge that an abstract predicate is about to be specified by the proposition verbalized in A's forthcoming utterance" (1999:414).

The Transactional Discourse Model is the one model to discourse by an American Slavist, coming directly from the American Slavic tradition. Although it has been applied effectively by Yokoyama and a number of others (see, for example, Moon 1995; Robblee 1991; Zaitseva 1994, 1995), to the best of my knowledge it has not been used by other (non-Slavic) linguists. Its lack of recognition outside of Slavic studies may stem from the fact that TDM has much in common with Relevance Theory, which has gained widespread recognition. Integral to TDM is the notion of shared knowledge sets and an intersection of common concerns which is, in principle, largely in agreement with the foundations of Relevance Theory. Specifically, it is based on the premise that the explanation of many discourse phenomena (such as word order) can only be found with reference to the psychological states of the interlocutors. In this the model has much in common with other theories of information structure (§3.2).

Future Directions. In the above discussions of different theoretical approaches to discourse analysis, a number of different areas for future research by American Slavists have been identified. In this section I discuss two major topics which are currently of great interest in general linguistics, intonation in discourse and information structure. Both of these have been singled out because their study potentially involves a number of different subdisciplines in linguistics. The results of this research are of interest to a broad range of linguists.

Intonation in Discourse. Intonation in discourse has become a major topic in linguistics over the last few years. The timing on this stems from a number of events which more or less coincided: (1) large theoretical advances in both the study of intonation and of discourse, meaning a broader research base and a much larger array of theoretical tools for analysis of both; (2) significant technological advances, in particular

in terms of computer software, which has simplified the instrumental measurements of the sound waves and greatly increased accuracy.[12]

Intonation has been studied from two essentially different views: the acoustic approach measures intonation in terms of changes in fundamental frequency (F_0), while the perceptual approach relies on auditory perception, and intonation can be defined in terms of pitch. Changes in F_0 can be tracked through conversation with reference to a declination unit (DU), a term which refers to the downdrift phenomenon of F_0 over the course of speech (Cohen and 't Hart 1967; see Ladd (1993) for discussion). In terms of both kinds of work—acoustic and perceptual—much work is needed in Slavic. Sentential-level intonation has been studied for a number of Slavic languages, most primarily Russian (see Odé 1987, 1988, 1988, 1990; Yokoyama 1985, 1986), and there has been significant work on Czech and Polish. Yokoyama (1986) is particularly successful in applying Pierrehumbert's framework to Russian. Odé (2003) develops a model for Russian intonation based on earlier work on Dutch, rejecting the Bryzgunova IK system.

The study of intonation in Slavic discourse is largely unstudied. The groundwork is in place, in particular as laid out by Yokoyama (1986). (See also Schallert 1990 for a brief introduction to the use of intonation in monologue.) One very important is the role of intonation in information structure. Here Slavic is of course particularly interesting in terms of the role of intonation and word order. Another aspect involves questions of intonation and speech acts, including the role of intonation in determining speech act type and illocutionary force. Intonation in Russian, for example, determines differences between declarative sentences and interrogatives. But from a discourse perspective intonation will provide many more clues in terms of interpretation of illocutionary force in such examples as (3), where the intonation of is morphosyntactically a question aids in the interpretation of it as a representative illocutionary act (with the speaker asserting that there is no milk).

[12] There are a number of different computer programs for analyzing sound waves. One of the most widely used now is Praat, at http://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/praat/. Conversation analysis in particular favors the use of video, not just sound recordings. Recent developments in software include programs which are designed to include a variety of media including video, sound clips, text with interlinear glosses, and so on. A good and up-to-date discussion of software can be found at the Tool Room of the E-Meld School of Best Practices website, http://emeld.org/school/classroom/software/index.html.

Information Structure. Much of the research on Slavic discourse has focused on information structure. The term *information structure*, or *information packaging*, is used to refer to various ways in which information, which includes propositional information as well as real-world knowledge, is linguistically encoded. That is, information structure examines how information is "packaged," or linguistically encoded, and why one or another structure might be selected to convey a given chunk of propositional knowledge. From this view, then, one asks why a passive construction is used instead of an active one, for example: in both constructions the propositional value is arguably the same, with agent/patient relations unchanged; what differs is the information structure. Word order differences provide prime examples of information packaging in Slavic. Note that this approach to information structure differs fundamentally from some of the other approaches outlined here. If we consider Gricean pragmatics, for example, one needs to account for why a sentence like *uže vot Anjuša prišla* 'Anjuša has already arrived' [line 3, (5)] can be used in answer to the question *Is it already time to eat*? In analyzing information structure, we are concerned with the conditions under which certain structures are felicitous, and when they are not, and what they say about the packaging of propositional content.

Areas of special interest in information structure are topic/comment, focus, grounding, transitivity (as defined by Hopper and Thompson 1980), givenness, reference and anaphora, deixis, and so on. These can be addressed either from function to form (from the stance of the information structure), or from form to function (from the linguistic encoding to its function). An example is provided by the study of grounding and transitivity, versus the study of aspect in the text. (For the use of aspect in grounding, see Chvany 1985a, 1985b; for a brief discussion of the form/function issue, see Nichols 1985.) Importantly, there is an entire range of linguistic devices and structures which have to do with the varying means for encoding information and relating it to the larger discourse as a whole. This latter point is crucial, that information status is determined by the position in the discourse and so, from the point of the view of the discourse analyst, such entities as topic and focus cannot be studied based on isolated sentences. As with intonation, the study of information structure cuts across a number of subdisciplines of linguistics, and so is of interest to a range of linguists. While certain topics—such as

reference, deixis, and definiteness—overlap with pragmatics and the philosophy of language, much of information structure is territory shared with cognitive linguistics and cognitive science. In fact, the two disciplines (cognitive science and discourse analysis) may approach the same issues in language data but from different angles, and the results of each approach inform the other. An example is provided by discussions of givenness, definiteness and recoverability. In a now classic study, Haviland and Clark (1974), tested pairs of sentences such as the following:

(13) a. Mary got some beer out of the car
b. The beer was warm.

(14) a. Mary got some picnic supplies out of the car.
b. The beer was warm.

They found that comprehension times for the target sentence *The beer was warm* were shorter when the context in (12) is supplied, and longer when (13) is supplied. This can be explained in that *beer* is explicitly given in (12), while in (13) the addressee must go through an inferential process (what Brown and Yule 1986: 257 call a *bridging assumption*) whereby *beer* is construed as part of the picnic supplies. It can be further noted that beer in 12b) can be pronominalized (and probably would be in natural speech), while it cannot be pronominalized in (13b). But the basic point here lies not in the details of the analysis, but rather in the fact that data coming from psycholinguistic perceptual experiments can do much to validate what may otherwise appear to be intuitive interpretations on the part of the analyst. Moreover, discussions of information structure quite naturally and inevitably relate to mental states, as any discussion of accessibility, topicality, givenness, and so on at least presuppose the accessibility of referents by the interlocutors. It is not without reason that some recent major works in this field include overt reference to mental processes in the title, such as *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time* (Chafe 1994) or in the subtitle of Lambrecht (1994): *Topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referents*. In fact, Lambrecht's definition of information structure includes specific ties with mental states and representations:

> INFORMATION STRUCTURE: That component of sentence grammar in which propositions as conceptual representations of states of affairs are paired with lexicogrammatical structures in accordance with the mental states of interlocutors who use and interpret these structures as units of information in given discourse contexts.
>
> Lambrecht (1994:5)

Lambrecht's book presents a ground-breaking view of information structure.[13] Arguing against the traditional view that information can be segmented into 'old' and 'new' parts which are mapped onto the syntax, he sees information as a property of denotata, not of lexical items and/or syntactic constituents. This has serious consequences for the definitions of topic/comment and focus: topic cannot be identified with 'old' information and focus cannot be identified with 'new'. Moreover, with this view of information as a foundation, Lambrecht is able to argue that information is a separate level of linguistic representation. He does not define how this information-structure component is to be integrated into existing theories of linguistic analysis, but explicitly states that his goal is to lay the theoretical groundwork which will make such an integration possible. From that standpoint, Lambrecht has clearly defined a goal for future research. Ultimately, a comprehensive theory of how the information-structure component fits into linguistic analysis is a job of mutual cooperation between linguists working in a number of subfields: discourse, semantics, syntax and phonology.

Conclusion: Discourse Analysis and Slavic Linguistics. American Slavists are well-positioned for research in discourse. The discourse analyst must know the language of analysis very well; while it is possible for one person to study the syntax or phonetics of a range of languages, aiming at typologies and universals, without knowing these languages fluently, this does not hold for discourse analysis. A thorough knowledge of the language, of its cultural contexts, register and stylistic variations, is crucial. For this reason, little work has been done in the area of contrastive discourse analysis, and most

[13] I would advise readers to approach Lambrecht's book by first reading a comprehensive review article of it (Polinsky 1999), which provides an excellent overview.

of it centers around English compared to another language. Examples include Jovanovic and Martinovic-Zic (2004), which discusses English and Serbo-Croatian, and Slobin (2004), which analyzes Russian, Serbo-Croatian, and Ukrainian, along with English and several other languages. To the extent that the aim of linguistics in general is the elucidation of typologies and universal grammar, contrastive discourse analysis between closely related languages (such as two languages on the same branch in Slavic, or from two different branches) would do much to inform what little knowledge we have of discourse universals.

That said, few linguists seem to be engaged in this kind of research. A survey of key journals devoted to discourse analysis and pragmatics shows little work on Slavic languages, both by Slavists and non-Slavists, and American Slavists are minimally represented. Based on article titles, *Pragmatics* 1990–to date has only a handful of articles on Slavic languages: one on Bulgarian (Choi 1997); one on Polish (Galasinski (1997); one on Serbian (Miskovic 2001); and two on Russian (Grenoble 1995; Rathmayr 1999). The *Journal of Pragmatics* shows roughly the same picture, with six articles on Russian (Grenoble 2004; Grenoble and Riley 1996; Israeli 1997; Kresin 1998; Yokoyama 1994; Zaitseva 1994); two on Bulgarian (Fitneva 2001; Tchizmarova 2005) and one on Croatian (Dedaic 2005). This survey is overly harsh, as journals such as *Voprosy jazykoznanija* regularly have articles that fall under the rubric of discourse analysis and much work is being done in a variety of frameworks by Czech linguists, in a continuation of the Prague functionalist tradition. Work is also appearing in edited volumes (Chruszczewski 2004a, 2004b), although many of these are difficult to obtain.

Throughout this discussion I have indicated areas needing research both in terms of individual theoretical approaches to discourse, and in terms of a more-issue oriented discussion. It should be clear that there are a great many topics in need of research, essentially all of discourse analysis stands wide open. But for the work of American Slavists in this field to be successful and influential, it must meet certain requirements. First of all, it must be framed in a way that is both accessible and of interest to other discourse analysts. It must use current terminology, current methodologies, and current theoretical frameworks. Moreover, it must address the larger issues which will interest other analysts, by providing data that will have an impact on linguistic theory, or by

providing data for cross-linguistic comparison. It is the mission of Slavic linguists not only to give good descriptive analyses of Slavic data, but to inform linguistic theory.

REFERENCES

Andrews, Edna. (1991) Grammar and pragmatics: The two axes of language and deixis. Linda R. Waugh and Stephen Rudy, eds. *New vistas in grammar: Invariance and variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 407-13.

Andrews, Edna and Yishai Tobin, eds. (1996) *Toward a calculus of meaning: Studies in markedness, distinctive features and deixis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baranov, A. N. and D. O. Dobrovol′skij. (1996) Cognitive modeling of actual meaning in the field of phraseology. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26(3): 409-29.

Baranov, A. N. and G. E. Kreidlin. (1992) Struktura dialogičeskogo teksta: Leksičeskie pokazateli minimal′nykh dialogov. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 12(3): 84-93.

Blaser, A., ed. (1988) *Scientific symposium on syntax and semantics for text processing and man-machine-communication* (1988, Heidelberg, Germany). Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Bonno, K. and S. V. Kodzasov. (1998) Semantičeskoe var′irovanie diskursivnyx slov i ego vlijanie na linearizaciju i intonirovanie (na primere častic i ved′). K. L. Kiseleva and D. Pajar, eds. *Diskursivnye slova russkogo jazyka: Opyt kontekstno-semnatičeskogo opisanija*. Moscow: Metatekst. Pp. 382-443.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. (1983) *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Browne, Wayles. (1975) Serbo-Croatian clitics for English-speaking learners. Rudolf Filipoviç, ed. *Contrastive analysis of English and Serbo-Croatian*. *Volume 1*. Zagreb: Institut za lingvistiku. Pp. 105-34.

Bulygina, T. V. and A. D. Šmelev. (1992) Modal′nost′. T. V. Bulygina, ed., *Čelovečeskij faktor v jazyke. Kommunikacija, modal'nost', dejksis*. Moscow: Nauka. Pp. 110-53.

Chafe, Wallace. (1994) *Discourse, consciousness, and time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. (1987) Cognitive constraints on information flow. R. S. Tomlin, ed. *Coherence and grounding in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 21-51

———. (1976) Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. Charles N. Li., ed. *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press. Pp. 27-55.

Choi, Gwon-Jin. (1997) Viewpoint shifting in Korean and Bulgarian: the use of kinship terms. *Pragmatics* 7(3): 389-95.

Chruszczewski, Piotr P., ed. 2004a. *Aspekty współczesnych dyskursów*. Cracow: Tertium.

———. (2004b) *Perspektywy dyskursu religijnego.* Cracow: Tertium.

Chvany, Catherine V. (1988) Distance, deixis and discreteness in Bulgarian and English verb morphology. Alexander M. Schenker, ed. *American contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists*. Columbus, OH: Slavica. Pp. 69-90.

———. (1985a) Backgrounded perfectives and plot-line imperfectives: towards a theory of grounding in text. Michael S. Flier and Alan Timberlake, eds. *The Scope of Slavic Aspect*. Columbus, OH: Slavica. Pp. 247-73.

———. (1985b) Foregrounding, ‘transitivity’, saliency (in sequential and non-sequential prose). *Essays in Poetics* 10(2): 1-27.

———. (1983) On ‘definiteness’ in Bulgarian, Russian, and English. Michael S. Flier, ed. *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists*. Columbus, OH: Slavica. Pp. 71-92.

Clyne, Michael. (1994) *Inter-cultural communication at work: Cultural values in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, Michael, Martin Ball and Deborah Neill. (1991) Intercultural communication at work in Australia: Complaints and apologies in turns. *Multilingua* 10(3): 251-73. Cohen, A. and 't Hart, J. (1967) *On the anatomy of intonation*. *Lingua* 19: 177-92.

Coulthard, Malcolm. (1977) *An introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Longman.

Coulthard, Malcolm and David Brazil. (1992) Exchange structure. Malcolm Coulthard, ed. *Advances in spoken discourse*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 50-78.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. (1996) Intonation and clause combining in discourse: The case of *because*. *Pragmatics* 6(3): 389-426.

———. (1993) *English speech rhythm: Form and function in everyday verbal interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth and Margret Selting, eds. (1996a.) *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth and Margret Selting. (1996b.) Towards an interactional perspective on prosody and a prosodic perspective on interaction. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Selting, eds. *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 57-100.

Davis, Steven, ed. (1991) Pragmatics. A Reader. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dedaić, Mirjana N. (2005) Ironic denial: tobože in Croatian political discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(5): 667-683.

Durst-Anderson, Per. (1995) Imperative frames and modality. Direct vs. indirect speech acts in Russian, Danish and English. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 18(6):611-653.

Dymarskij, M. Ja. (2001) *Problemy tekstoobrazovanija i xudožestvennyj tekst. Na materiale russkoj prozy XIX-XX vv*. Moscow: URSS.

Fitneva, Stanka A. (2001) Epistemic marking and reliability judgments: evidence from Bulgarian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(3): 401-20.

Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox and Sandra A. Thompson. (1996) Practices in the construction of turns: The "TCU" revisited. *Pragmatics* 6(3): 427-54.

Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox and Sandra A. Thompson, eds. (2002) *The language of turn and sequence*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fox, Barbara. (1999) Directions in research: Language and the body. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31(1-2): 51-9.

Franks, Steven. (1999) Optimality theory and clitics at PF. Katarzyna Dziwirek, Herbert Coats, and Cynthia Vakareliyska, eds. *Annual workshop on formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Seattle Meeting, 1998*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. Pp. 101-16.

Galasinki, Dariusz. (1997) The making of history: Some remarks on politicians' representation of historical events. Pragmatics 7(1): 55-68.

Goodwin, Charles. (1993) Recording human interaction in natural settings. *Pragmatics* 3(2): 181- 209.

Grenoble, Lenore A. (2004) Parentheticals in Russian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(11): 1953-1974.

———. (1999) Linking the code to the message: The role of shifters in discourse. Henryk Baran and Yelena Shoumilova, eds. *Roman Jakobson: Texts, documents, studies*. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities. Pp. 519-29.

———. (1998) *Deixis and information packaging in Russian discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

———. (1996) Deixis, thematic structure and participant tracking in Russian discourse. Bertrand Gaiffe, Anne Reboul, Laurent Romary, Chantal Cridlig, eds. *Papers from the Second International Conference on Deixis*. CRIN/LORIA. Pp. 71-84.

———. (1995) Spatial configurations, deixis and apartment descriptions in Russian. *Pragmatics* 5(3): 365-85.

———. (1994) Discourse deixis and information tracking, in Susanne Gahl, Andy Dolbey and Chris Johnson, eds. *Proceedings of the XXth meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. Pp. 208-19.

Grenoble, Lenore A. and Matthew Riley. (1996) The role of deictics in discourse coherence: French voici/voilà and Russian vot/von. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(6): 819-38.

Grice, H.P. (1989) *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Groenendijk, Jeroen, Dick de Jongh, and Martin Stokhof, eds. (1987) *Studies in Discourse Representation Theory and the theory of generalized quantifiers*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Harris, Zelig. (1951) *Structural linguistics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Haviland, S. and H. Clark. (1974) What's new? Acquiring new information as a process in comprehension. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 13:512-21.

Heritage, John. (1999) Conversation analysis at century's end: Practice of talk-in-interaction, their distributions, and their outcomes. Research on Language and Social Interaction 32(1-2): 69- 76.

———. (1984) *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Holloway King, Tracy. (1996) Slavic clitics, long head movement, and prosodic inversion. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 4(2): 274-311.

Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson. (1980) Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56: 251-99.

Israeli, Alina. (1997) Syntactic reduplication in Russian: A cooperative principle device in dialogues. *Journal of Pragmatics* 27(5):587-609.

Jakobson, Roman. (1957/1971) Shifters, verbal categories and the Russian verb. *Selected Writings of Roman Jakobson, volume II*. The Hague: Mouton. Pp. 130-47.

Jefferson, Gail. (1989) Preliminary notes on a prosodic metric which provides for a 'standard maximum' silence of approximately one second in conversation. Derek Roger and Peter Bull, eds. *Conversation: An interdisciplinary perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Pp. 166-96.

———. (1979) A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination. George Psathas, ed. *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington. Pp. 79-96.

Johnstone, Barbara. (2002) *Discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Jovanovic, Jelena and Aida Martinovic-Zic. (2004) Why manner matters. Contrasting English and Serbo-Croatian typology in motion descriptions. Carol Lynn Moder and Aida Martinovic-Zic, eds. *Discourse across languages and cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. , 211-26.

Kamp, Hans and Uwe Reyle. (1996) A calculus for first order discourse representation structures. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*. 5(3-4): 297-348.

———. (1993) *From discourse to logic: Introduction to Modeltheoretic semantics of natural language, formal logic and Discourse Representation Theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kresin, Susan. (1998) Deixis and thematic hierarchies in Russian narrative discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30(4): 421-435.

Ladd, D. Robert. (1994) Intonational phonology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lambrecht, Knud. (1994) *Information structure and sentence form. Topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983) *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Levinson, Stephen C. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mey, Jacob L. (1993) *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Mey, Jacob L., ed. (1998) *Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Mills, Margaret H. (1992) Conventionalized politeness in Russian requests: A pragmatic view of indirectness. *Russian Linguistics* 16(1): 65-78.

———. (1991) The performance force of the interrogative in colloquial Russian: From direct to indirect speech acts. *Slavic and East European Journal* 35(4): 553-569.

Miskovic, Mirjana. (2001) The particle baš in contemporary Serbian. *Pragmatics* 11(1): 17-30.

Moon, Grace. (1995) Use of the "subject" in Russian imperatives. Olga T. Yokoyama, ed. *Harvard studies in Slavic linguistics, volume III*. Cambridge: MA, Harvard University, Slavic Department. Pp. 99-126.

Muskens, Reinhard. (1996) Combining Montague semantics and Discourse Representation Theory. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 19(2): 143-86.

Nichols, Johanna. (1985) The grammatical marking of theme in literary Russian. Michael S. Flier and Richard D. Brecht, eds. *Issues in Russian morphosyntax*. Columbus, OH: Slavica. Pp. 170-86.

Odé, Cecilia. (2003) Description and transcription of Russian intonation (ToRI). P. Houtzagers, J. Kalsbeek, J. Schaeken, eds., *Dutch contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists. Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 30*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. pp. 279-88.

———. (1990) Acoustics vs. perception in the study of intonation. *IPO Annual Progress Report* 25: 32-39.

———. (1989) *Russian intonation: A perceptual description, I & II*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

———. (1988) Rising pitch accents in Russian intonation: An experiment. A. A. Barentsen, B. M. Groen, and R. Sprenger, eds. *Dutch contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists. Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. Pp. 421-35.

———. (1987) Towards a perceptual analysis of Russian intonation. A. A. Barentsen, B. M. Groen, and R. Sprenger, eds. *Dutch studies in Russian linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. Pp. 395-442.

Padučeva, E. V. (1996) *Semantičeskie issledovanija. Semantika vremeni i vida v russkom jazyke. Semantika narrativa*. Moscow: Škola "Jazyki russkoj kul'tury."

Paillard, D. and V. Markowicz. (1986) Le partage du savoir ou l'ignorance n'est pas un argument. À propos de la particule VED′. *Les particules énociative en russe contemporain*. Paris.

Petrova, N. V. (2003) Tekst i diskurs. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 51(6): 123-131.

Pierrehumbert, Janet. (1980) The Phonology and Phonetics of English Intonation. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT. (Published 1988 by Indiana University Linguistics Society.)

Platt, John. (1989) Some types of communicative strategies across cultures: Sense and sensitivity. Ofelia Garcia and Ricardo Otheguy, eds. *English across Cultures, Cultures across English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 13-29.

Polinsky, Maria. (1999) Review of Lambrecht 1994. *Language* 75(3): 567-582.

Rathmayr, Renate. (1999) Métadiscours et réalité linguistique: L'exemple de la politesse russe. Pragmatics 9(1): 97-117.

Robblee, Karen. (1991) *Predicate semantics and syntactic variation in Contemporary Standard Russian*. Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA.

Rouchota, Villy and Andreas H. Jucker, eds. (1998) *Current issues in relevance theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ronowicz, Edmund A. (1995) Aussies are friendly and Poles aren't rude: Some remarks on overcoming problems in intercultural communication. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 30: 31-44.

Sacks, Harvey. (1992/1995) Lectures on conversation. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

———. (1972) An initial investigation of the usability of conversational materials for doing sociology. David N. Sudnow, ed. *Studies in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 31-74.

Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emmanuel A. and Gail Jefferson. (1974) A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language* 50: 696-735.

Schallert, Jan E. (1990) Intonation beyond the utterance: A distributional analysis of rising and falling contours. Margaret H. Mills and O. A. Lapteva, eds. *Topics in colloquial Russian*. New York: Peter Lang. Pp. 51-66.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1999) What next? Language and social interaction study at the century's turn. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 32(1-2): 141-148.

———. (1968) Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70: 1075-1095.

Schiffrin, Deborah. *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Schuetze-Coburn, S., M. Shapley and E.G. Weber. (1991) Units of intonation in discourse: A comparison of acoustic and auditory analyses. *Language and Speech* 34(3): 207-234.

Searle, John R. (1979) *Expression and meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. (1969) *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. (1976) The classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society* 5:1-24.

———. (1975) Indirect speech acts. Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan eds. *Syntax and Semantics, volume 3*. New York: Academic Press. Pp. 59-82.

———. (1965) What is a speech act? Max Black, ed. *Philosophy in America*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Pp. 221- 39.

Selting, Margret. (1996) On the interplay of syntax and prosody in the constitution of turn constructional units and turns in conversation. *Pragmatics* 6(3): 371-388.

Shriberg, Elizabeth, Rebecca Bates, Andreas Stolcke, Paul Taylor, Daniel Jurafsky, Klaus Ries, Noah Coccaro, Rachel Martin, Marie Meteer, and Carol Van Ess-Dykema. (1998) Can prosody aid the automatic classification of dialog acts in conversational speech? *Language and Speech* 41(3-4): 443-92.

Slobin, Dan I. (2004) How people move. Discourse effects of linguistic typology. Carol Lynn Moder and Aida Martinovic-Zic, eds. *Discourse across languages and cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 195-210.

Sperber, Dan and Deirdre Wilson. (1986/1995) *Relevance. Communication and cognition*. (second edition) Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Suszczynska, M. (1999) Apologizing in English, Polish and Hungarian: Different languages, different strategies. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31/8: 1053-065.

Tchizmarova, Ivelina K. (2005) Hedging functions of the Bulgarian discourse marker xajde. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37 (8) 1143-163.

Vasilyeva, A. N. (1972) Particles in Colloquial Russian. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Wells, B. and S. Macfarlane. (1998) Prosody as an interactional resource: Turn-projection and overlap. *Language and Speech* 41(3-4): 265-94.

Wierzbicka, Anna. (1986) Two Russian speech act verbs: Lexicography as a key to conceptual and cultural analysis. *Folia Slavica* 81: 134-59.

Yokoyama, Olga. (1999) Russian genderlects and referential expressions. *Language in Society* 28:401-29.

———. (1998) The speech act empathy hierarchy and Russian possessives: In honor of Susumu Kuno. Akio Kamio and Ken-ichi Takami, eds. *Function and structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 57-82.

———. (1994) Iconic manifestation of interlocutor distance in Russian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22(1): 83-102.

———. (1991) Shifters and non-verbal categories of Russian. Linda R. Waugh and Stephen Rudy, eds. *New vistas in grammar: Invariance and variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 363-86.

———. (1990) Responding with a question in colloquial Russian. Margaret H. Mills, ed. *Topics in colloquial Russian*. New York: Peter Lang. Pp. 1-16.

———. (1988) Disbelief, lies, and manipulations in a Transactional Discourse Model. *Argumentation* 2(1): 133-155.

———. (1986) Discourse and Word Order. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

———. (1985) A diversified approach to Russian word order. Michael S. Flier and Richard D. Brecht, Richard D., eds. *Issues in Russian morphosyntax*. Columbus, OH: Slavica. Pp. 187-208.

Zaitseva, Valentina. (1995) *The speaker's perspective in grammar and lexicon*. New York: Peter Lang.

———. (1994) The metaphoric nature of coding: Toward a theory of utterance. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22(1): 103-26.

Zemskaja, E. P. and L. A. Kapanadze. (1978) *Russkaja razgovornaja reč'. Teksty*. Moscow: Nauka.