

Research Trends in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis in the Field of Slavic Linguistics

RENEE PERELMUTTER, KRZYSZTOF E. BOROWSKI

*University of Kansas, 1445 Jayhawk Blvd., Lawrence, KS 66045,
United States, rperel@ku.edu; University of Wisconsin–Madison,
1220 Linden Dr, Madison, WI 53706, borowski3@wisc.edu*

1.02 Pregledni znanstveni članek – 1.02 Review Article

Članek obravnava novejšje trende in usmeritve v raziskavah slovanskih jezikov, povezanih s pragmatiko in analizo diskurza. Znotraj podpodročja pragmatike obravnava raziskave ohranjanja dostojanstva/(ne)vljudnosti, sovražnega govora, govornih dejanj in pragmatike čustev. V poglavju o analizi diskurza so predstavljeni pojmi, kot so diskurzni označevalci, dvojezičnost, deikse, evidentnost in stališče, humor, izmenjava govornih vlog in kritična diskurzivna analiza (KDA) oz. kritične diskurzivne študije (KDŠ). Izpostavljena so tudi področja, ki potrebujejo več slavističnih raziskav, in sicer ohranjanje dostojanstva in moč v institucionalnih kontekstih, pragmatika in učenje slovanskih jezikov kot drugih in tujih jezikov ter dvojezični oz. večjezični diskurz in pragmatika.

This article surveys recent trends and directions in pragmatics and discourse analysis-related research of Slavic languages. Within the subfield of pragmatics, the article surveys studies of facework/(im)politeness, hate speech, speech acts, and pragmatics of emotions. The discourse analysis section surveys such topics as discourse markers, bilingualism, deixis, evidentiality and stance, humor, turn-taking, and critical discourse analysis (CDA) / critical discourse studies (CDS). The article also outlines areas in need of more research for Slavists – these include facework and power in institutional contexts, pragmatics and L2 learning of Slavic languages, and bilingual/multilingual discourse and pragmatics.

Ključne besede: pragmatika, analize diskurza, diskurzni označevalci, (ne)vljudnost, kritične diskurzivne študije, slovansko jezikoslovje

Keywords: pragmatics, discourse analysis, discourse markers, (im)politeness, critical discourse studies, Slavic linguistics

1 Introduction

This article¹ surveys the trends and new directions in the discourse and pragmatics of Slavic languages in the past fifteen years, with a special emphasis on

¹ The authors are grateful to Stephen M. Dickey (KU SGES), with whom we discussed this review at its early stages. We are grateful to Marc L. Greenberg (KU SGES) for

the newest research and theoretical developments made using Slavic data in the Western academy. Until recently, there has been a disconnect between Eastern European and Western research on both pragmatics and discourse. Kosta and Thielemann (2004) observe that in many Slavic countries, the study of discourse primarily followed the Prague school. Grenoble also discusses this gap in the literature in her programmatic article on discourse analysis in the eighth issue of *Glossos* (2006), which collected articles from leading American Slavists who considered the state of the field and evaluated the future directions of Slavic linguistics in the Western academy. Grenoble's article outlines the main trends in discourse analysis (illustrated with her own Russian discourse data) and suggests directions for future research. Throughout the article, Grenoble makes a powerful argument as to why Slavists, and American Slavists in particular, should turn their attention to the study of discourse, which requires a thorough knowledge of both the language under study and its cultural context. At the same time, she finds that few Slavic linguists have dedicated themselves to the study of discourse:

Much more work needs to be done not only on Russian, but on all Slavic languages. [...] 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. (Grenoble 2006: 2)

Over fifteen years after the publication of Grenoble's 'Discourse Analysis,' the body of work on Slavic pragmatics and discourse analysis has expanded, with scholars in Slavic-speaking countries increasingly using Western theoretical approaches to the study of discourse and pragmatics. As this article will show, significant work has been done in the 2000s, and even in the last 5-10 years, promising more theoretically important work to come.

In her 2006 article, Grenoble takes a broad view of what discourse analysis encompasses, including fields that arguably constitute subfields of linguistics rather than subfields of discourse analysis, including conversation analysis and pragmatics. Grenoble's decision makes sense given how much overlap there often is between the various theoretical approaches to how language is used in context, including in naturally occurring face-to-face conversations, mediated contexts, institutional contexts, and more. We pay special attention to three avenues of inquiry within these disciplines: (1) the study of facework, which overlaps with the study of (im)politeness and power, and which is often a useful lens for the study of other domains, such as speech acts; (2) discourse

suggesting we send it to *Slavia Centralis*, and to the editorial team of *Slavia Centralis* for their interest and feedback. Thanks to Bogi Perelmutter who provided proofreading and commentary. Above all, we are grateful to the two anonymous reviewers, whose detailed constructive criticism helped us improve the article. Any remaining mistakes are ours alone.

markers, which attracted an especially robust recent scholarly effort for Slavic; and (3) recent trends in discourse analysis, including turn-taking, statistical models, evidentiality, humor, and more. The article does not aim to present a comprehensive survey, but rather to discuss trends and developments in the study of pragmatics and discourse.

2 Methodology

In order to identify articles for this review, the authors used major academic search databases such as the MLA International Bibliography, American Bibliography of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences Bibliographies (via EBSCOHost), Anthropology Plus, JSTOR, Project Muse, and Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA). We searched for Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis as keywords, as well as for specific phenomena within these domains (such as politeness or turn-taking), combining these keywords with a search for specific Slavic languages. We also worked with Google Scholar to find articles that cited the articles we agreed to review. We supplemented our search by consulting the bibliographies of articles we selected for review. Our search retrieved many more articles than we would be able to review within this space. We primarily focused on articles published in the past 15 years, in English, within Western academic settings, and which we deemed to be especially influential and/or innovative. Since what is deemed influential and innovative can vary, we prioritised articles that had high citation numbers, which appeared in highly-ranked peer-reviewed journals (such as the *Journal of Pragmatics*) or in notable edited volumes from major presses. The article does not represent an exhaustive review of the field, and any remaining omissions are ours alone.

3 Trends in Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a subdiscipline of linguistics that deals with both language in use and the contexts in which language is used. Within the domain of pragmatics, facework and (im)politeness represents a prominent area of research in interpersonal pragmatics, one which has been rapidly developing and to which Slavic linguists have contributed with major studies.

3.1 Facework and (Im)politeness

Goffman defines face as ‘the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself (sic)?? by the line others assume he (sic) has?? taken during a particular contact’ (Goffman 1967: 5). Influential works of Leech (1983) and

Brown and Levinson (1987) engaged with the Goffman's notion of face by theorising how social face can be negotiated and maintained in conversation. Following the Gricean cooperative principle (1975/1989), both Leech (1983) and Brown and Levinson (1987) assume that interlocutors strive to cooperate in interaction, focusing their attention on politeness, or strategies to maintain or enhance social face in discourse.

Brown and Levinson (1987) outline positive and negative politeness strategies: positive politeness addresses a person's positive face wants, i.e., a person's desire to be approved of by others, while negative politeness addresses a person's negative face wants, i.e., the desire to be unhindered in one's actions. Addressing negative face wants often involves the mitigation of face-threatening acts (FTAs), which can be accomplished through a variety of linguistic strategies. For example, a request is a potentially face-threatening act as it can inconvenience the receiver and thus threaten that person's desire for independence. To mitigate the FTA of requesting, a variety of linguistic strategies, such as indirectness and hedging, are used. The authors thus do not consider direct requests polite. Though Brown and Levinson include some comparative linguistic material in *Politeness* (1987), critics called for research into the pragmatics of non-Anglo-Western languages in order to test and challenge the ideas cross-culturally (cf. Eelen 2001).

As Eelen (2001) and other critiques of politeness theories have pointed out, a fair amount of cross-cultural variation exists in terms of the discursive negotiation of politeness (for detailed critique, cf. Al-Hindawi 2016). Slavic politeness in particular deviates from Anglo-Western norms, prompting engagement from researchers. Thus, Zemskaja's (1997) article provided an overview of the Russian category of politeness and a discussion of the specifically Russian features of politeness. Directness/indirectness in discourse (e.g., in requests and other speech acts) has been consistently identified as a major point of difference between Slavic and Anglo-Western politeness paradigms. Larina's (2009) monograph provides a detailed descriptive analysis of the Russian category of politeness. Larina relies on the familiar Brown and Levinson (1987) notion of face wants while discussing cultural differences. She also engages with the notion of social proximity as central to Russian communication, juxtaposing it to what she perceives as Western individualism and distance. This discussion is then used to explain why in Russian, direct requests can be polite (cf. Mills 1992 for discussion of Russian indirect requesting strategies). Wierzbicka (1985) makes similar claims about direct requests and politeness in Polish.

However, other studies show that directness is only sometimes cooperative, and indirectness can be appropriate/polite. For example, direct advice-giving, an FTA according to Brown and Levinson (1987), can be cooperative, friendly, and positive in Russian culture (Aleksieva 1990; Belyaeva 1996). However, advice can also be undesired and viewed as an imposition and can be threatening if a power differential is involved, as in Perelmutter's (2010) discussions of face threats in situations where an authority figure gives unsolicited advice to a person with lesser power.

The notion of closeness or proximity in Russian culture may be further nuanced by introducing the positive notion of *semejnyj* ‘family-like’ attitude in discourse. In Rathmayr’s (2009) article on new Russian politeness, one of the informants discusses how sellers in small magazines, boutiques, or markets can develop positive relationships with their clients by combining a warm attitude with *nenavjazčivyj sovet* ‘non-coercive advice’ about their products. The informant calls such relationships *polusemejnye* ‘semi-familial’. The folk notions of *semejnyj* ‘family-like’, as opposed to *chuzhoj, postoronnij* ‘outsider’ approaches, influence reception. Certain people are ratified to use specific potentially face-threatening speech acts, and to use specific encodings of those speech acts (e.g., to give direct advice) in certain circumstances, such as social proximity or a familial relationship. However, the acceptability of direct advice as polite should not be applied to the culture as a whole.

Discussions of facework and (im)politeness in East-Central European contexts represent a significant gap in the literature. Ogiermann and Suszczyńska (2011) use semi-structured interviews with Hungarians and Poles to look into sociocultural norms of what is considered (im)polite, as well as how such ideas may have changed after the fall of the Iron Curtain. The authors find that positive politeness—which the authors claim is traditionally more significant and preferred in the Polish context—has been in the process of losing importance in favour of negative politeness since 1989. In addition to this, Poles’ definitions of what is considered im/polite behaviour include few references to verbal im/politeness or language in general. This finding may partly explain why aggressive language is better tolerated in Poland than in other European countries (cf. the Discourse Analysis section in this chapter).

A detailed investigation of Polish norms of politeness can be found in Ogiermann (2012). The author states that there is a strong focus on maintaining a positive face in selected speech acts – such as Polish apologies, which tend to be overly effusive and personal, unlike their English equivalents characterised by vagueness and distance. Contrary to previous findings (Marcjanik 1997; Wierzbicka 1985, 1993), Ogiermann argues that Polish politeness is based more on effusiveness and emotionality than on directness. The study suggests that Poles do not perceive interpersonal communication as a potential face threat, but rather as an opportunity to make themselves available to each other. This finding is supported by evidence from requests in Polish that tend to exaggerate rather than diminish the hearer’s contribution, e.g., *Mam do Ciebie ogromną prośbę*. ‘I have a **huge** favour to ask you.’ (Ogiermann 2012: 44)

Earlier authors like Leech (1983) considered conflict discourse to be marginal in communication. Interest in impoliteness has been rapidly expanding after the publication of Culpeper’s famous 1996 article ‘Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness,’ which criticised Brown and Levinson’s paradigm for side-lining impoliteness. Culpeper (1996) relies on taxonomies developed for politeness research to study impoliteness. However, Culpeper later revised and nuanced his approach (e.g., Culpeper et al. 2003; Culpeper 2011), suggesting along with

many other scholars that impoliteness is both pervasive in human interaction and needs to be studied separately from politeness, using approaches developed for it (Bousfield et al. 2008; cf. a recent and thorough discussion in Dynel 2013).

The study of impoliteness and conflict discourse received a further boost from the observation that conflict is commonplace in mediated contexts, especially in online contexts such as blogs and blog comments, forums, YouTube comments, social media sites like Twitter, Facebook, V Kontakte, etc.; and in other mediated and often performative contexts such as televised political debates, reality TV shows, and more (for Slavic, see e.g., Perelmutter 2010, 2013, 2015; Furman 2016). In mediated contexts, especially on the Internet, multi-participant rather than dyadic discourse is often the norm. The way multiple people engage in conflict discourse online often differs significantly from dyadic, face-to-face contexts; thus tools developed for such contexts do not necessarily suffice to describe the data. Some linguists, including Slavists, have been developing new theoretical approaches to study multi-participant conflict discourse in mediated contexts (cf. Lorenzo-Dus et al. 2011).

Mediated contexts present rich datasets for the study of affiliation and disaffiliation strategies, which are especially important in multi-participant discourse. Here, the boundaries between politeness and impoliteness can be blurred when interlocutors use facework to both disaffiliate from opponents and build alliances with other interlocutors. Studying flamewars in the Russian blogosphere, Perelmutter (2013) shows how two interlocutors bond over their use of the third person singular pronoun to refer to a third interlocutor who is present in the discussion but is symbolically excluded from it. Solidarity is explored in Furman's (2016) investigation of impoliteness and mock impoliteness in the Russian TV show *Dom Dva*. He explores a variety of impolite strategies from insults to mock impoliteness used to signal solidarity. Furman finds that mock impoliteness can be used in an affiliative manner, e.g., in same-sex bonding, flirting, and ritualised banter between the participants of the show, and even between the show host and the participants.

Perelmutter's (2018) article on online discourse, impoliteness, and globalisation in an online community for Russian-speaking Israelis demonstrates how the choices of linguistic code (Modern Russian, Hebrew, and the new immigrant vernacular Israeli Russian) play out in a multiparticipant online conflict. When participants use Israeli Russian, they in-group other forum members who share this vernacular – and their migrant experiences. Refraining from sharing this common immigrant vernacular with a participant during online conflict constitutes an Ignore, Snub the Other impoliteness strategy – other members are essentially disaffiliating from their opponent, denying this person common experiences and linguistic code. Patterns of affiliation and disaffiliation in this online community can also be observed through the choice of usernames or nicks, and how these nicks can be manipulated during conflict discourse – e.g., translated, diminutivised, and commented on – to index Jewish Russian and migrant identities (Perelmutter 2021).

Genre expectations add an important dimension to (im)polite encounters online: thus, Perelmutter (2013) shows that a flamewar has recognisable moves that participants are expected to follow. Similarly, studying online complaint discourse (Perelmutter 2010) and conflictual confessions of marital infidelity (Perelmutter 2015) in women's online communities demonstrates the interaction between genre expectations, performance, and facework in multiparticipant contexts.

Humour is a frequently encountered resource in the pragmatics of Slavic discourse, in both mediated and face-to-face encounters. Mažara (2013) analyses Czech TV talk shows to show how they incorporate verbal irony as a pragmatic resource to perform facework strategies. Thus, within the institutional context of televised debates, irony can be used to attack a political opponent's positive and negative face, protect one's negative face, and enhance one's own positive face (see also the discussion of humour as a resource under Trends in Discourse Analysis).

3.2 Facework, (Im)politeness, and Power

A crucial and yet relatively underexplored direction of (im)politeness research is the influence of institutionalised social power upon the pragmatic strategies used by interlocutors. Scholars do not always agree on how to interpret verbal aggression by an institutionally ratified speaker (e.g., a policeman) towards a speaker without such power. Keinpointner (2008) suggests that institutional impoliteness can be *ratified*, expected – e.g., police officers addressing civilians, army officers addressing recruits, employers addressing employees – discursively employing 'legitimate power' (Dynel 2013; cf. also Eelen 2001; Mullany 2008). According to Dynel (2013), such ratified aggression may be interpreted not as impoliteness, but rather as the bald-on-record politeness strategy as described by Brown and Levinson (1983 (cf. also the discussion in Culpeper 2011)). Institutionally ratified speech; however, may be interpreted as a face attack by certain interlocutors, and hierarchy and power in discourse can be tested and challenged, disrupted, and even completely disratified in some instances.

Recent research using Slavic data adds important dimensions to the study of the interaction between (im)politeness and institutional power. Thus, a recent article by Márquez Reiter et al. (2016) examines how Russian motorists respond to traffic stops by police officers; the motorists record the interactions via dashboard cameras and upload them on YouTube, providing examples for other motorists who wish to counteract perceived problems of corruption among officers. By analysing counter-questions that motorists pose to officers in response to requests for identification, the authors present a nuanced and theoretically important analysis of how institutional power (in this case, that of police personnel) can be challenged and disrupted, and the distinction between

personal and institutional face and power concerns can be blurred. In a similar vein, Cerović (2016) investigates the use of rhetorical questions as a way to challenge and disrupt institutional authority in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (BCS, ‘Serbo-Croatian’ in the article) encounters between crime suspects and the detectives who interrogate them. Just like in the Márquez Reiter (2016) paper above, Cerović effectively demonstrates how power-holders can be challenged in institutional discourse. Detectives respond with disapproval (recognising the implicit power challenge in rhetorical questions), but can sometimes treat a rhetorical question as genuine if it suits their institutional goals.

Another interesting and rapidly developing field of study which touches on institutional power is the study of doctor-patient interactions, which are a subtype of institutionalised discourse in which one of the interlocutors (the medical professional) has significantly more power over the patient. Scholarship on doctor-patient communication in Slavic languages has only recently been gaining ground, even though this is a well-established topic in the fields of conversation analysis, discourse analysis, and pragmatics in the Anglo-Western context. Given the scarce interest in medical discourse overall (but see Boniecka 2004), the book-long study by Stefaniak (2011) represents a significant step forward. The author takes a sociopragmatic approach to the ideas of identity and power asymmetry in patient-doctor medical encounters. Stefaniak demonstrates that doctor-patient communication is indeed asymmetrical and that both parties interactionally cooperate with each other in order to sustain relations of asymmetry. The results show that due to the cultural underpinnings of doctor-patient relations in Poland, patients employ various mitigation strategies in their conversations with doctors. For example, patients make requests by adding them to the response to a question previously asked by the doctor. Since requests position patients as experts, they represent imminent face threats to the authority of the doctor. In order to minimise this effect, patients postpone their requests until the very end of the conversation. Furthermore, their requests are indirect and hedged, as evidenced in the use of the conditional voice combined with impersonal constructions (cf. the example below, from Stefaniak 2011: 160; emphases original, translation KEB):

(1)

(Patient) *Mnie to przydałoby się panie doktorze,*
 Doctor (m., V-form), I **could really use,**
[chy]ba, wyniki porobić.
I guess, some tests [to do].

(Doctor) *[No:]*
 Yeah:
No to w następnym y: miesiącu.
 Next uh: month then.

The face-threatening aspect of requests in medical discourse is further elaborated in Stefaniak (2010) where the author focuses on patients’ self-assessments

as potential face-threatening acts. To mitigate this threat, patients defer to mitigation strategies of hedges, bushes, or shields (Caffi 2007) while doctors use power strategies of interruptions, topic change, or silence. Such power moves, Stefaniak argues, signal the doctor's responses to infringements of the power asymmetry typical for a medical encounter, and represent the doctor's direct response to FTAs performed by the patient (Stefaniak 2010: 289–290).

Stefaniak (2011) finds gender to be a significant factor in doctor-patient communication. For instance, women tend to be more active participants in such conversations, but they use mitigation strategies more frequently when performing FTAs. However, when women do not use mitigation strategies, doctors defer to power strategies more often than in conversations with men. Finally, the level of doctor-patient asymmetry for women patients – as measured by how often doctors use power strategies (such as interrupting or changing the topic of the conversation) in interactions with patients – is reduced only in encounters with women doctors.

Finally, Weidner (2015) examines the Polish *Proszę (mi) powiedzieć* 'Please tell (me)' construction in doctor-patient communication by studying the interface between interlocutors' deontic or epistemological stances and turn-taking. The results show that only two such constructions were found in utterances produced by the patient, which may indicate the existence of unspoken rules as to who has the authority to produce directives in medical encounters. Finally, the same author examines the epistemic potential of Polish *aha* (Weidner, 2016a) in both medical discourse and naturally occurring phone conversations, demonstrating that it encodes cognitive changes of state. In this capacity, *aha* can signal revelation, now-understanding (with *aha* quantitatively longer than in the next category), or change in informedness (Weidner 2016a: 197).

A number of important studies of doctor-patient interactions in Polish have been conducted by Sowińska, focusing on such topics as narratives of patients struggling with medically unexplained symptoms (2018) (see also under The Pragmatics of Emotions) and narratives of vicarious experience embedded in the speech of Polish doctors (Sowińska and Sokół 2018).

3.4 Impoliteness and Hate Speech

An eminent trend in recent research focuses on the emergent and important political phenomenon of hate speech, especially in online media. A noteworthy contribution here is the volume edited by Kopytowska (2017), with a focus on hate speech in various international contexts. In another study, Baider and Kopytowska (2017) analyse metaphors in Cypriot Greek- and Polish-language comments about immigration. Their analysis shows that while the metaphor of *INVASION* is present in both datasets, Polish data from the pragmatic point of view tends to be more direct and offensive. Similarly, Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (2017) compares English- and Polish-language data on uncivil

behaviour to find that in the Polish context, offensive language finds more support amongst Internet users.

Looking at the intersection of argumentation and aggression, Kuße (2018) analyzes popular discourse about the Russian-Ukrainian conflict before the 2022 Russian invasion. Focusing on different genres—from language and poetry to multimodal political maps—the author traces aggressive reasons and theses as part-and-parcel of argumentative communication. Kuße finds that in the case of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict, aggressive argumentation has to do with centripetal (on the Russian side) and centrifugal (on the Ukrainian side) discursive tendencies. As the author suggests, ‘the enemy is not the stranger’ in this case study, but the person ‘who wants to live and exist separately’ (Kuße 2018: 61), feeding the ongoing conflict even more.

Exploring the link between hate speech and discursive othering, Kopytowska, Grabowski, and Woźniak (2017) examine proximation mechanisms by comparing online news articles and comments about migrants and refugees. The authors point to how certain deictic features (for instance, the use of the proximal *ci* ‘these’) and metaphors (for instance, *of water*) facilitate the spatio-temporal proximation of migrants and refugees in the mediated experience of Internet users. The study concludes that representations of such groups are encouraged by the negative characteristics included in their descriptions, which are further developed and elaborated upon in comment sections where commenters use more aggressive language and introduce representations (e.g., the dehumanising metaphors of ‘savages’ or ‘beasts’) absent in the articles themselves. According to the authors, the increased presence of verbal violence in the comment sections analysed is caused by the above-mentioned strategies of proximation, and cannot merely be attributed to the conservative profile of the online news portal examined.

Kuße (2019) investigates the phenomenon of verbal violence masked behind diffuse messages in Russian-language political communication, drawing on examples from the Lenin, Stalin, Brezhnev, and Putin eras. The author defines diffuse communication as ‘messages (...) characterised by an unclear illocutionary and/or axiological direction’ (Kuße 2019: 24) and focuses on seemingly positive or neutral terms that mask what is otherwise hostile communication. In the study, these terms include words such as ‘friend,’ ‘brothers,’ ‘security,’ and ‘freedom,’ but also the phrase *odin narod* or ‘one people’ when used to talk about Ukrainians and Russians. Kuße concludes that diffuse political communication is typical for authoritarian and totalitarian systems, and that diffuseness as a language feature is aggressive when it becomes an instrument of power.

Recent years have brought about an interest in pragmatically informed studies of political discourse as yet another research trend. For instance, Trajkova and Neshkovska (2018) analyse online hate speech on Macedonian social media ahead and after the 2016 parliamentary elections. Looking at the intersection of hateful speech, stancetaking, and politics, the authors identify several discursive stances taken by online posters on Facebook and Twitter. The most common

stance is that of Analyst & Judge, identified in 65% of the examples. Posters in this category not only analyse specific political contexts, but also provide readers with their subjective explanations. The authors find that in Macedonian social media discourse, power is commonly exerted through negativity, leading to numerous instances of hateful speech, with which elite and nonelite political actors hope to influence public opinion. Additionally, while in a numerical minority, some posters engaged in analysis, judging, and activism.

In another study, Trajkova (2020) studies the public discourse in pro- and anti-government media in Macedonian across the period leading up to and shortly after the change of the country's official name to the Republic of North Macedonia in early 2019. The author finds that the trope of fear was commonly employed by both pro- and anti-government media to frame the name change from drastically opposing perspectives. While the former sources used threatening language to highlight the negative consequences of not ratifying the name change, the opposing sources represented the name change as a catastrophic event resulting in a loss of identity and nation for the Macedonian people.

3.5 (Im)politeness and Speech Acts

The study of speech acts developed following Austin's Speech Act Theory (1962); it examines the uses of language to perform specific acts (e.g., swearing an oath, cursing, congratulating, apologising). Speech acts have increasingly been studied in combination with facework and (im)politeness, as specific speech acts are mobilised to both enact and mitigate face-threatening acts in discourse. Late 1990s and 2000s saw a number of full-length studies focusing on particular Slavic speech acts (advice, apologies, requests) in the context of politeness theories. Thus, Rathmayr's (1996) study uses politeness theory to study Russian apologies; this study has been criticised for being oriented towards an older generation of speakers (Nikolaeva, 2000). Ogiermann's book-length study from 2009 investigates apologising in Polish and Russian and contrasts the speech act of apology in these languages with English. Ogiermann shows that Polish and Russian apologies (especially the so-called remedial apologies) correlate with a positive face; she argues that apologies are less face-threatening for Polish and Russian speakers than they are for speakers of English. In a recent study, Kravchenko and Blidchenko-Naiko (2020) explore the pragmatics of the indirect speech act of justification in Ukrainian conversational data using the framework of (im)politeness and facework. The authors identify two distinct patterns of justification use: one pattern is used to attempt to prevent a face-threatening act from being delivered by an interlocutor; the other is a strategy that speakers use to repair after they deliver a speech-threatening act.

Apologies as speech acts have also been studied in professional and business discourse. For instance, Tereszkiwicz (2020) examines complaint management in online Polish interactions between customers and companies on Twitter.

Comparing two corpora (2015 and 2017), the author identifies several changes in the pragmatic character of such interactions. As the study shows, the frequency in the use of the first name increased over time while the corresponding usage of V-forms of address decreased. A novel tendency observed in the 2017 corpus was the use of nicknames in forms of address. In the later corpus, the number of apologies doubled, as did the number of offers of help or repair. Apology-specific forms such as *Przepraszamy* ‘We apologise’ and *Przykro nam* ‘We are sorry’ were also more often used in the later dataset. The author concludes that over the period examined, a noticeable shift toward a more customer-centred and customer-oriented discourse occurred. The data also demonstrates a shift toward more formulaic and standardised features, suggesting that the companies analysed adopted a more accommodative stance in their communication with customers, in line with more global trends of globalisation.

In addition to various domains, apologies are also a subject of study from a comparative, Slavic–non-Slavic perspective. In that vein, Suszczyńska (1999) offers a comparative account of apology formulas in English, Hungarian, and Polish. Using a discourse completion test, the author finds that for Polish speakers, the generic *Przepraszam* ‘I apologise’ represents the most commonly employed IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device) with 291 occurrences in the data, more than three times that of the other three formulas combined (*Przykro mi* ‘Sorry’, *Wybacz* ‘Forgive’, *Nie gniewaj się* ‘Don’t be angry’). Królak and Rudnicka (2006) analyze requests and orders in Polish. The authors suggest that diminutives reduce the emotional distance between the speaker and the hearer while simultaneously lowering the potential cost of the action for the hearer; e.g., *Chodź tu na chwileczkę*. ‘Come here for a while._{DIM.DIM}’ (Królak and Rudnicka 2006: 131). Mišić Ilić and Radulović (2015) examine commissive illocutionary acts in American, British, and Serbian political speeches. The study finds that when making commitments, politicians do so implicitly most of the time, avoiding direct responsibility and attempting to keep their public image at the expense of the promises made.

Cross-linguistic comparative studies also emerge at the intersection of discourse, pragmatics, and cognitive linguistics. In one example, Góralczyk and Łozińska (2021) take a cognitive linguistic perspective on how Polish and Russian grammars encode directive meaning in yoga discourse. The authors find that when it comes to giving instructions, Polish speakers almost equally use imperative and non-past indicative constructions, while Russian speakers favour the latter much more over imperative and past indicative forms. Unlike in Russian, past indicative forms are absent from Polish-language discourse, despite there being a similar morphosyntactic pattern available. According to the authors, this discrepancy can be explained by the greater systemic diversity of directives in Russian, which provides users with more fine-grained distinctions when it comes to the impact of the directives.

3.6 The Pragmatics of Emotions

An underexplored and potentially fruitful direction of research involves the pragmatics of emotions in Slavic and in cross-cultural perspective. Thus, Andrews and Krenmayr (2007) examine anger in German and Russian from cross-cultural semantic and pragmatic perspectives. Jing-Schmidt and Kapatsinski's (2012) inquiry into the pragmatics of 'the apprehensive' in English, Mandarin, and Russian studies fear expressions that serve pragmatic purposes (such as *boius'*, *ja ne mogu soglasit'sja* 'I am afraid I cannot agree'). Sowińska's (2014) study of doctor-patient interactions shows how doctors use strategies such as distancing-mitigation and self-justification when constructing such emotions as frustration and impatience towards patients with medically unexplained symptoms. Apresjan (2013) uses corpus methodology to test assumptions made in cross-cultural pragmatics about emotional etiquette in Russian and English. Some hypotheses did not bear out (e.g., pity does not appear to be central), but others were confirmed (e.g., 'shame' is central in Russian). Kurtyka (2019) looks at the pragmatic function of indirect complaints in spoken Polish and finds that they exhibit mostly affiliative functions, strengthen ties between interlocutors, and allow for venting without the need to offer advice.

4 Discourse Analysis

While both pragmatics and discourse analysis study language in use, pragmatics pays attention to how context influences meaning, while discourse analysis is a set of methodological approaches to studying language beyond the sentence level. Discourse analysts study larger units of texts and examine how they may be organised, for example through such means as discourse markers. Discourse Analysis can also be used to relate language to social context, and this is especially relevant in the case of Critical Discourse Analysis.

4.1 Discourse Markers

Discourse markers (Schiffrin 1988) are a difficult-to-define and often elusive category of linguistic units which can be used to structure discourse. The study of discourse markers represents one of the most fruitful areas of research within Slavic especially using South and West Slavic data. While earlier attempts at describing the meaning and/or function(s) of discourse markers were mostly grounded in prescriptive and standard-biased approaches to the study of language (Mišković-Luković and Dedaić 2010), the last two decades have witnessed an upsurge in scholarship that applies novel theories to previously understudied Slavic data.

In South Slavic, the volume edited by Dedaić and Mišković-Luković (2010) represents a significant contribution to the field. In the introduction, the editors claim that there is a tendency to neglect discourse markers due to their semantic ambiguity and associations with nonstandard speech. In the chapters that follow, several authors propose new approaches to discourse markers in Bosnian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Macedonian, Serbian, and Slovene. Premilovac (2010) offers a new interpretation of the Bosnian *ono* as a discourse particle, typically perceived as a filler word. While *ono* can function as a demonstrative, non-demonstrative usage of the particle encodes the speaker's intent for the utterance produced to be interpreted in a non-evidential manner. Consider the following example given by Premilovac (2010: 98):

(2)

Zamisli nas, ono non-stop zimi sjedimo u autu.

'Imagine us, *ono* non-stop in the winter we sit in the car.'

The activity of sitting in the car is not to be taken literally, but rather figuratively as a metaphor of wintertime monotony. In this way, *ono* allows the speaker to avoid responsibility for untrue and/or inadequate claim(s) by signalling that the utterance that follows needs to be interpreted loosely.

Fielder (2010) examines the Bulgarian *ama*. Using a corpus of contemporary spoken Bulgarian and the nineteenth-century comic novel *Baj Ganjo*, the author finds that *ama* is used as both a discourse marker and adversative conjunction, both historically and currently. In the latter function, *ama* plays an interactional role by indexing the speaker's adversative reaction to preceding discourse or an extralinguistic element. Dedaić (2010) investigates the functions of Croatian *dakle* in discourse and classifies them as conclusional, reformulational, argumentative/rhetorical, and attitudinal. Sévigny (2010) analyzes the Macedonian *kamo* as an attitudinal discourse marker that encodes the speaker's attitudes and beliefs. Depending on the prosodic information used, *kamo* can signal a wide range of feelings, from irritation to frustration (e.g., *Kamo masa?* 'Isn't there any table here?', Sévigny 2010: 54). The discourse marker can also index the speaker's disbelief (cf. the example below). Overall, the author argues that *kamo* in Macedonian functions as a dissociative marker that allows the speaker to produce an indirect effect of irony or irritation, amplified by the prosodic information accompanying it in discourse (Sévigny 2010: 56–57):

(3)

– *Vidi, ete ga tsarinata!*

'Look, there is the Czarina!'

– *Kamo?*

'Where?' [I don't see her and I don't believe you see her either. Show her to me.]

In another chapter of this volume, Mišković-Luković (2010) investigates the Serbian particles *baš* and *kao* with regard to the process of conceptual adjustment.

The author concludes that while the former signals literal resemblance, the latter encodes less-than-literal resemblance between the literal and intended meaning (Mišković-Luković 2010: 75, 81). The two particles seem to be working in opposite directions, as the *baš* explicature is usually strong while the *kao* one is typically weak, and, in this character, resembles the loose propositional interpretation signalled by the Bosnian *ono* (see above). Thus, *baš* and *kao* represent two opposite spectrums in terms of how an utterance is to be interpreted, with *baš* encoding literalness and *kao* indexing its lack and, consequently, loose talk.

These observations about the pragmatic import of *baš* confirm conclusions made in an earlier study. In Miskovic (2001), the author examined the Serbian particle *baš* from a relevance perspective and proposed that *baš* does not influence the truth condition of the proposition and that the particle contributes to the explicature of the utterance by narrowing and specifying the scope of the particle.

In the last study included in the *South Slavic discourse particles* volume, Žagar (2010) explores the role of the Slovene *pa* in compound connectives *ker pa* and *sicer pa*. The author concludes that *pa* performs the role of an interactional device that allows the speaker to activate background knowledge in discourse.

Aside from this volume, research on South Slavic discourse markers and particles has been ongoing in other works as well. For instance, Halupka-Rešetar and Radić-Bojanić (2014) analyse the Serbian discourse marker *znači* and identify its functions in discourse: reformulational, concluding, and interactional. The authors posit that *znači* serves as a pragmatic guidepost, orienting the hearer toward the contextual effect intended by the speaker. Dedaić (2005) examines the fuzzy semantics of the Croatian discourse marker *tobože*. This study shows that the marker has an interactional character, allowing interlocutors to negotiate the speaker-hearer social roles. Focusing on the role of *tobože*-marked opinions and statements, the author argues that they either indicate rejection of those opinions (the hearer role) or index a stance in contradiction to those statements (the speaker role). Dedaić proposes a pragmatic interpretation of *tobože*, according to which the discourse marker encodes echo, denial, and irony: it echoes a previously stated idea, it rejects and mocks that idea (Dedaić 2005: 675). In this way, the Croatian *tobože* becomes a discursive tool of disassociation, allowing the speaker to both produce off-the-record criticism and avoid direct responsibility.

Additional and more recent studies concerning BCS discourse markers in major pragmatics journals include an excellent study of the Serbian discourse marker *bre* by Mišković-Luković et al. (2015), which uses a corpus collected from Serbian newspapers, magazines, and the Internet. The authors analyse how *bre* contributes to the interpretation of the utterance as a whole, through the framework of relevance theory. *Bre* can signal the speaker's expectation that the addressee will disapprove of the speaker's utterance; the usage of *bre* signals that the forthcoming utterance will be controversial, but that the speaker thinks it is the right thing to do/think. Mišković-Luković and Dedaić (2012) investigate

the BCS discourse marker *odnosno* ('that is,' 'in other words'), discussing the semantics and pragmatics of *odnosno* in the International Criminal Tribunal's war testimonies. The polysemy of *odnosno* has been discussed by judges and others in the context of the tribunal. The scholars identify two pragmatic meanings of *odnosno*: reformulatory and distributive.

Linguists working with Polish data have also been studying discourse markers. Works by Matuszewska (2014), Sawicki (2016), and Weidner (2016b) tackle the Polish particle *no* in three different contexts: children's spoken discourse, literary dialogues, and doctor-patient interactions. Matuszewska (2014) posits that the particle may 'represent a source of knowledge about the speaker's inner world as well as the way they perceive reality' (Matuszewska 2014: 160), and that it may index emotional attitudes toward the topic of the conversation as well as the hearer. Sawicki (2016) identifies several (both responsive and non-responsive) functions of the Polish *no*, concluding that in the initial position, the particle encodes a range of roles – from acknowledgment to agreement – as far as the content of the previous turn goes. Finally, Weidner (2016b) proposes that *no* be viewed in a stratal fashion as a discourse particle that both serves as an epistemic acknowledgment of the previous turn and indexes the speaker's evaluation of the content.

Looking at *no*-prefaced instances (*no właśnie, no oczywiście, no wiem*) in doctor-patient conversations, Weidner (2013) explores the function of the Polish particle *no* as an epistemic evaluation marker. The analysis shows that the particle plays an interactive role in discourse, allowing both the doctor and the patient to index their epistemic rights and to position those rights with regard to their interlocutors'. The author suggests that the function of *no* seems to have a direct link with knowledge and epistemic status and that in its most immediate function, *no* serves as an interactive marker of acknowledgment of previously contributed information in the conversation.

In two other studies, Adamczyk (2015, 2017) examines the pragmatic-semantic interface of the Polish *jakby* and *gdzieś tam*, respectively. In the former, the author argues that *jakby* as a pragmatic marker performs multiple functions, from facilitating floor-holding to introducing explanations of previously expressed thoughts. In the latter, Adamczyk suggests that *gdzieś tam* 'somewhere there' is currently undergoing pragmatic expansion from hedging to non-hedging functions, and identifies the following roles: vagueness marker, mitigator of illocutionary force, mitigator of stylistic anomaly, and marker of concept framing.

Bocale (2019) further adds to the discussion on discourse markers by investigating the Polish distal particle *tam* 'there' and its potential development as a discourse marker. The author identifies several pragmatic meanings for the particle, which include modal contexts, negations, non-declarative speech acts, indefiniteness, approximation, disjunctive coordination, and evidentiality. According to the author, the common feature for all of these seems to be the act of conveying irrealis meaning (Bocale 2019: 102):

(4)

Ale wiesz co, ja, autentycznie, ja słyszałam Miodka w jakimś TAM programie, kiedy mówił, że ustalają sobie językoznawcy na jakichś TAM kongresach i to jest uzależnione często od frekwencji użycia.

‘But you know what, I really heard [Jan] Miodek in some *TAM* program when he said that linguists establish it at some *TAM* congresses, and that it is often dependent on the frequency of use.’

A number of excellent recent studies of discourse markers address Russian data. Kiseleva and Paillard’s volume (2003) collects a number of studies of Russian ‘discourse words’ and their functions, including *nikak*, *vidimo*, *podì*, and more. Bolden (2016) examines the Russian discourse marker *nu*, very frequent in the conversational context. The author presents *nu* as a discursive alert device signalling that a disjunction in discourse is about to happen. As an interactional device, *nu* thus alerts the speaker that ‘what is coming up is *not* the appropriate, unproblematic, expected next – and the recipient then has to figure out what it is that is inappropriate, problematic, or unexpected about it’ (Bolden 2016: 77). Marshall’s (2002) unpublished dissertation examines *ved’*, *zhe*, and *-to*, their function as discourse markers, and the necessity to incorporate discourse markers into L2 instruction. Rezanova and Kogut (2015) use statistical methods to examine discourse markers in scientific texts in Russian and German.

Kolyaseva (2018, 2021) investigated Russian discourse markers *tipa* and *vrode* in two recent articles in the *Journal of Pragmatics*. Kolyaseva (2018) analyses the discourse of young Russian speakers at an online forum for students ‘Overheard at Moscow State University (MSU)’ to construct a typology of pragmatic functions of the discourse marker *tipa* ‘quasi, like, sort of’. This discourse marker, the author argues, serves as a type of quotative in informal student discourse. Kolyaseva (2021) again investigates the group ‘Overheard at MSU’, conducting a large-scale study of comments to posts in this social media group, which comprised a dataset containing approximately 630,000 words. The study focused on particles *tipa* ‘quasi, like, sort of’ and *vrode* ‘like’ which cannot necessarily be used synonymously. The article argues that both particles are used to mark evidentiality and epistemic modality, but with divergent functions. *Vrode* marks uncertainty, and a mismatch between what is expected and reality while *tipa* can serve a quotative function or acts as a marker of doubt or approximation.

There have been a number of studies focusing on discourse markers that express hesitation. Thus, Laitinen (2013) contributes to the research of paralinguistic resources in interaction by studying hesitation markers. Using a corpus of Russian TV talk shows, Laitinen argues that hesitation is a discourse-cognitive category. Hesitation markers include metacognitive/metalinguistic phrases (e.g., *kak èto skazat’* ‘how to say’), lexical markers indicating that a search for a word is underway (*nu* ‘well’), pauses, prolonged syllables, repetition of prepositions, pronouns, and conjunctions, and more. Laitinen shows

that the usage of hesitation markers plays a role in organising discourse; in telling sequences, hesitation marks shifts in narration, allowing the speakers to attend to interactional aspects of telling and re-orient as necessary. Hlavac (2011) studies hesitation and monitoring phenomena (HMPs) in Croatian and English. HMPs are paralinguistic markers like nervous laughter, filled and unfilled pauses, etc. HMPs frequently co-occur with code-switches and perform a function similar to (but different from) that of discourse markers – integrating the other-language material.

4.2 Additional Trends in Discourse Analysis

In this section, we discuss selected recent directions in discourse analysis of Slavic languages that use interdisciplinary methodologies to further the field of Slavic linguistics, as well as provide theoretical and empirical contributions to the field of linguistics as a whole.

Bilingualism and discourse analysis. A number of recent studies address discourse analysis in bilingual and multilingual situations, an important area of study which should benefit from further exploration of migrant and refugee contexts. Notable studies include Ries (2013), who shows how code-switching in bilingual families of Russian Germans who immigrated from the Soviet Union serves discursive purposes; e.g., language choice marks the opening and closing of a conversation. Hlavac (2011) discusses bilingualism and hesitation markers.

Deixis. Slavic linguists continue to contribute important studies to the intersection of deixis and discourse. Thus, Kresin (1998) analyses the impact of deictic reference (esp. the distal demonstrative pronoun *tot* or ‘that one’) in hierarchising Russian narrative discourse. Grenoble and Riley (1996) examine deixis and discourse coherence using presentative deictics *voici/voilà* and Russian *vot/von* to organise and mark the progression of discourse; while the interlocutors use *vot/von* to co-construct a frame of reference for the discourse.

Evidentiality, attitudinal and epistemological stance in discourse. Evidential and evaluative markers in discourse have also received attention in recent years: thus, Richter (2013) conducted experiments to discuss how speakers express evaluative stance in Russian conversational discourse - especially prosodic and rhetorical strategies to express positive or negative attitudes. A higher pitch is typical of positive evaluations, a lower pitch of negative evaluations. Kosta (2013) examines the use of lexical items to express evidential and/or epistemic meanings, such as the Russian evidential particles *vrode* and *vrode by*, among others. Perelmutter’s (2009) study of the particle *jako* in the Russian Primary chronicle shows that *jako* is used as an epistemological marker to signal the chronicler’s distancing from the quoted text.

In an important recent article, Garabrandt (2021) investigates the Russian-language online phenomenon of space omission in phrases such as *samavinovata* ‘it’s all your_{FEM} fault’ in a Russian-language online community for

women. Garabrandt argues that space omission in this community acts as a computer-mediated communication cue marking a specific kind of reported speech – one that has been heard multiple times by the reporter, and which is evaluated negatively. Garabrandt’s research shows that space omission in reported speech signals that the originator of the negative speech is positioned as an outsider to the group. Given the pervasiveness of space omission as a cue in Russian online discourse, more research on space omission in other contexts is necessary to reveal how these patterns of usage might generalise, and how they might relate to axes of social identity such as gender.

Humour. Various humorous strategies play a prominent role in Slavic discourse and pragmatics. Nadine Thielemann has published a number of studies focusing on the role of humour in Russian interaction, including a recent post-doctoral thesis on conversational humour, pragmatics, and cognition (2015) and others. Thielemann’s article on arguing by anecdote (2010) looks at how *anekdoty* (jocular stories) are incorporated by speakers in mediated contexts (talk shows, media interviews, panel discussions, and more) to achieve interactional goals. In an excellent study, Thielemann (2013) draws on conversational data from ORD, the Russian National Corpus, and her own recordings to research Russian humorous strategies (irony, parody, teasing) as a discourse modality. Thielemann explores how animated speech is used to ‘stage an utterance’ attributed to a character the speaker animates; through such staged utterances, speakers distance themselves from the conveyed discourse and convey a message ‘this is play.’

In a recent article, Thielemann (2019) expands her investigations of humour in discourse to focus on allusive talk, or the role of indirect intertextual references in Russian conversations. Intertextual references are commonplace in Russian conversations but are often difficult to research and even mark, as they may not be explicitly marked as allusions or citations from texts. The presence of such allusions marks ‘a shared repertoire of culturally grounded texts is exploited to generate an additional layer of meanings’ (Thielemann 2019:124). When speakers understand and react (e.g., playfully, with laughter) to such indirect allusions, this reinforces common ground and serves as an in-grouping strategy.

Parentheticals. Grenoble (2004)’s study of Russian parentheticals uses relevance theory to separate parentheticals into procedural and conceptual parentheticals: ‘The procedural parentheticals include parenthetical verbs, sentential adverbials and adverbial discourse connectives, while conceptual parentheticals include parenthetical clauses of an open-ended class of possibilities.’

New methodologies. An important recent development within discourse analysis relates to the development of mixed-methods and quantitative methodologies to analyse discourse. An interesting example is an article by Sherstinova (2013), who uses the ORD Speech Corpus of Russian Everyday Communication to statistically model the most frequent utterances in spontaneous Russian discourse. She compiles a list of most frequent Russian utterances between 1-4

words long; discourse particles frequently appear in the list of most common Russian utterances. Stepanova (2013) uses the ORD Speech Corpus of Russian Everyday Communication to analyse speech rate production in Russian discourse, with special attention to demographic features. Speech rate correlates with speakers' linguistic competence (the higher-competent speakers speak slower), and with such identity-salient factors as sex and age. Unexpectedly, she reveals that Russian women speak more slowly than Russian men.

Turn-Taking. Turn-taking is of perennial interest to scholars of discourse analysis, and Slavic linguists have done recent work on this important topic. In the notable article 'Talking out of turn: (Co)-constructing Russian conversation,' Grenoble (2013) shows how Russian-speaking migrants recorded in Brooklyn, New York, collaborate in interaction by anticipating and sharing syntax: one speaker begins a syntactic construction, and another speaker completes it, creating 'co-constructions' of various types of which most basic are completions (one speaker begins a syntactic construction, the other completes the turn) and extensions (one speaker completes a syntactic unit, the other creates a longer syntactic unit by adding or extending the first).

Professional discourse. Studies that examine professional discourse and modes of communication apply pragmatic theory and methods to analyses of written communication. Often, they offer a cross-linguistic comparison between Slavic and non-Slavic languages (most commonly English), expanding the growing body of scholarship in cross-cultural pragmatics (Wierzbicka 1985, 1993). In this vein, Duszak (1994) provides an account of (in)directness strategies used by English- and Polish-language authors in academic discourse. The author concludes that while directness and assertiveness figure prominently in English materials, Polish authors tend to offer accounts that are more hedged, tentative, and indirect. Blagojević and Mišić Ilić (2012) further develop this line of research by looking at the use of interrogatives in English- and Serbian-language academic works. Their analysis finds that compared to their English counterparts, Serbian scholars employ more interrogative forms, even if they write in English. A comparative angle is also employed by Mišić Ilić (2017) who provides an overview and typology of pragmatic borrowings from English into Serbian.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA). Concerned with critical analyses of language-based constructions of political and social knowledge (Hart 2011), the field of critical discourse studies (CDS) has been attracting an increasing number of researchers working with Slavic languages. This trend is especially evident within the last decade or so as the ideas of globalisation and multiculturalism (and migration in particular) have trickled into mainstream public discourse. As political actors and laypersons started producing discourse that engages with those discussions, scholars have turned their attention to the media and mediated representations of those narratives (e.g., Chovanec and Molek-Kozakowska 2017). Despite the growing interest in (critical) discourse studies, such publications are; however, mostly limited to West Slavic data.

For instance, Chovanec (2017) examines exclusionary and othering scripts about the Roma by looking at British and Czech online discussion forums. The author shows how linguistic strategies of delocalisation delegitimise the Roma's right to reside in either of the countries, effectively rendering the community both spatially and temporarily distant. Grzymała-Kazłowska (2007, 2009) studies discourses about immigrants in the Polish press at the turn of the century and finds that representations of newcomers to Poland have become increasingly crystallised and polarised, ranging from multicultural to ethno-nationalistic discourses. Similarly, Krzyżanowski (2018) demonstrates how the post-2015 discursive shift in political discourse in Poland, enabled by the instalment of the right-wing Law and Justice government, has produced strong anti-immigrant and xenophobic rhetoric. Continuing this thread, Cap (2018) applies his proximation theory (Cap 2013) to political discourse in order to explore the role of deixis in the processes of legitimisation and persuasion. The author concludes that the discursive narrowing of the distance between residents of Poland and potential newcomers to the country represents a key factor in the Polish government's successful management of the so-called refugee/immigration crisis.

In notable East Slavic examples, Nedashkivska (2009) takes a gender-linguistic approach to Ukrainian-language discussions and finds that females and males present themselves differently on the Internet. The author finds that these differences are more cognitive than linguistic in nature. Thus, females operate more 'locally' and orient themselves to the addressee first (e.g., *šanovnyj* 'dear.M.FORMAL'+first+last name, Nedashkivska 2009: 225) while males use language implying indirectness and a more generalised addressee base (e.g., through frequent use of *treba/potribno/neobxidno* 'it is necessary', Nedashkivska 2009: 228). In another study, Kiss (2021) analyses the role of bloggers as social actors in contemporary language policy debates in Ukraine. Drawing on her textual and multimedia analysis, the author identifies four major conceptualisations of language as revealed in the blog corpus. The two most common conceptualisations are based on the ideas that 'language unites' and 'language constitutes identity,' followed by the concepts of language as something that requires support and language as a weapon.

The 2014 annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation has also been the focus of several CDA- and CDS-oriented studies, including the 2020 edited volume *Language of Conflict: Discourses of the Ukrainian Crisis*. In one of the chapters in the volume, Karpenko-Seccombe (2020) examines Ukrainian and Russian parliamentary debates on the annexation. Using data from two corpora, one Ukrainian and one Russian, the author identifies quantitative and qualitative differences in the frequency of war-related keywords in each corpus (35% in the former versus 14.5% in the latter). Karpenko-Seccombe's study demonstrates that the same event was discussed and portrayed rather differently in the two countries and that aggression-related themes were much more prevalent on the Ukrainian side.

Arcimavičienė (2020) uses critical metaphor theories to study metaphorical representations of the Crimea crisis in speeches of Ukrainian (Petro Poroshenko) and Russian (Vladimir Putin) presidents. The author finds that each politician deploys different metaphors to explain their view of the 2014 events. For Poroshenko, value and moral systems represent a central and most commonly used discursive category. In that view, Ukraine is often personified as a rational and moral actor engaged in an unjust war with its aggressive neighbour, Russia. Unlike Poroshenko, Putin mobilises metaphors of physical space and motion to present Russia as a victim of external forces, defending itself against what is portrayed as Western expansionism. In a similar study, Baysha (2020) uses qualitative discourse analysis to investigate the usage of demeaning terms ('memes') in Facebook debates of Ukrainian citizens who hold pro-Maidan and anti-Maidan positions. Applying Carpentier's framework of antagonistic discourse, the author shows how terms such as *kolorad* 'Colorado bug', *vatnik* ('cotton-head'), *skakun* 'jumper', *kastrjulegolovi* (Ukrainian)/*kastrjulegolovyje* (Russian) 'panhead', and others are used to create homogenisation of the self and dehumanisation of the other, construct the existence of a radical difference between self and other where the self is inferior, and finally, use the radical othering of the opponent to call for the destruction of the enemy.

Weiss (2020) critically analyses family-related metaphors referring to Ukraine in discourses surrounding the 2014 crisis. The results show a number of diminutivising and infantilising metaphors used in reference to Ukraine as a nation and state. For instance, Ukraine tends to be portrayed as Russia's younger sister or, worse yet, as a 'stillborn child' born in 1991. In one extended metaphor voiced in a political TV talk show, the existence of an independent Ukrainian state is openly questioned and infantilised, suggesting that only Russia's sovereignty over Ukraine will help the country prosper:

(6)

Украина – это по сути искусственно созданное государство [...] этот зародыш, эмбрион развивался в Советской империи, в 91-м родилось на свет мёртворождённое дитя. [...] Но тем не менее на Украине родился один крепкий, здоровый ребёнок. И имя ему: Новороссия. У него: русская мать, русский отец и непременно счастливое русское будущее.

'Ukraine is actually an artificially created state [...] This foetus, or embryo developed in the Soviet empire. In 1991, the stillborn child entered the world. [...] Nevertheless, a healthy and strong baby was born in Ukraine. Its name is Novorossija. It has a Russian mother, a Russian father and no doubt a happy Russian future.' G. Kornilov, source: A. Gordon i G. Kornilov, *Politika s Petrom Tolstym*, 9 April 2015 (Weiss 2020: 224–225).

A notable contribution to the volume is provided by Nedashkivska (2020), who conducted an analysis of discursive practices on Ukrainian social media (such as Facebook) and online media sites to examine how discursive practices contribute to the production and circulation of language ideologies in Ukraine after 2012. Searching Facebook for keywords which relate to language, bilingualism,

and language ideologies in both Ukrainian and Russian, Nedashkivska utilised the snowball method to construct a corpus of 18 social media pages and 8 social media sites. The research revealed a plurality of language ideologies, including discourses related to language choice (between Ukrainian and Russian); Ukrainian language activism as it relates to national identity; bilingualism; and the ideology of plurilingualism and internal diversity. Nedashkivska's analysis and documentation of discursive practices that contribute to the construction of coexisting and often competing language ideologies is going to be fundamental to future research on the shifts in language ideologies occurring in Ukraine after the Russian Federation's invasion in early 2022.

5 Conclusions

Recent years have seen an explosion of notable studies examining Slavic data to theorise new directions in the scholarship of pragmatics and discourse; Slavists appear with increasing frequency amidst the pages of the *Journal of Pragmatics* and other leading journals in the field. Important work remains to be done in multiple areas of pragmatics and discourse analysis. Thus, the interplay of institutional contexts, facework, and power has only recently begun to receive the attention of pragmatics theorists. The importance of institutional contexts in Slavic lands, and the rich experience of changing institutional discourses (e.g., pre- and post- the Soviet period) would benefit from multiple empirical investigations which have the potential of contributing both theory and data to this important direction in pragmatics.

Mediated environments, especially online environments in all their diversity, present an intriguing avenue for the study of facework, emotions, discourse particles, and a plethora of other topics connected to discourse and pragmatics in the context of multi-participant discourse which is rich in textual cues. The trends of online othering, radicalisation, and hate speech benefit from theoretically informed pragmatics investigations (Perelmutter 2013). The intersection between specific linguistic means (such as discourse markers) and their functions in discourse remains fruitful for Slavists, as is the interaction between pragmatics and morphosyntax (cf. Zeldovich's detailed study of the intersection of pragmatics and grammar, including aspect, case, and adjectival form).

Of special interest to Slavists is the intersection of L2 learning (specifically as it relates to Russian instruction) and pragmatics. A number of recent dissertations and articles address various aspects of Russian pragmatics acquisition in L2 learners (Moskala-Gallaher 2011; Tsylyna 2016; Shardakova 2005; Gallaher 2014; Shleykina 2016, and others); however, there is room for more detailed studies as well as systematic theorising of pragmatics of L2 acquisition of Slavic languages. In addition, moving away from a Russian focus and researching L2 acquisition of other Slavic languages should yield important insights. A welcome addition to the field is the work of Sivachenko (2020), whose dissertation

investigated the pragmatic behaviour of first-language Ukrainian speakers and the acquisition of these strategies – such as direct, conventionally indirect, and indirect requests – by L2 learners of Ukrainian.

Finally, issues of bilingual and multilingual discourse and pragmatics deserve further attention. Ries (2013) and Hlavac (2011) discuss code-switching and discourse; and a recent article by Perelmutter (2018) shows the impact of globalisation and migration in multilingual (im)politeness and facework of Jewish-Russian migrants to Israel. This promising and important field of study would benefit from further contributions from Slavists.

REFERENCES

- Magdalena ADAMCZYK, 2015: Do hedges always hedge? *Pragmatics* 25/3, 321–344.
- , 2017: On the pragmatic expansion of Polish *gdzieś tam* ‘somewhere (there)/about’. *Pragmatic markers, discourse markers and modal particles: new perspectives*. Ed. Chiara Fedriani and Andrea Sansó. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 369–397.
- Fareed H. AL-HINDAWI and Musaab A. Raheem ALKHAZAALI, 2016: A critique of politeness theories. *Theory and practice in language studies* 6/8, 1537–1545.
- L.I. ALEKSEEVA, 1990: Rechevoi akt soveta v sovremennom russkom iazyke. *Potsdamer Forschungen* 106, 43–58.
- Edna ANDREWS and Tina KRENNMAYR, 2007: Cross-cultural linguistic realizations of conceptualizations of anger: revisiting cognitive and pragmatic paradigms. *Glossos* 9/2, 1–29.
- Yurij D. APRESJAN, 1988: *Pragmaticeskaja informacija dlja tolkovogo slovarja. Pragmatika I problemy intensional’nosti*. Moscow: Institut jazykoznanija AN SSSR.
- Liudmila ARCIMAVIČIENĖ, 2020: Metaphor, identity and conflict in political discourse: a case study of President Poroshenko and President Putin’s speeches. *Language of conflict: discourses of the Ukrainian crisis*. Ed. Natalia Knoblock. London: Bloomsbury. 86–119.
- John Langshaw AUSTIN, 1962: *How to do things with words. The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Ed. James O. Urmson. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fabienne BAIDER and Monika KOPYTOWSKA, 2017: Conceptualising the Other: online discourses on the current refugee crisis in Cyprus and in Poland. *Lodz papers in pragmatics* 13/2, 203–233.
- Olga BAYSHA, 2020: Baysha, O., & Knoblock, N. (2020). The Antagonistic Discourses of the Euromaidan: Koloradi, Sovki, and Vatniki vs. Jumpers, Maidowns, and Panheads. *Language of conflict: discourses of the Ukrainian crisis*. Ed. Natalia Knoblock. London: Bloomsbury. 101–106.
- Yelena BELYAEVA, 1996: Advice and soviet: a cross-cultural perspective on speech acts. Ed. J.M. Johnson et al. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. 13–24.

Savka BLAGOJEVIĆ and Biljana MIŠIĆ ILIĆ, 2012: Interrogatives in English and Serbian academic discourse – a contrastive pragmatic approach. *Brno Studies in English* 38/2, 17–35.

Paola BOCALE, 2019: Deictic and epistemic distance in Polish. *Studi di linguistica slava: Nuove prospettive e metodologie di ricerca*. Ed. Iliyana Krapova et al. Venice: Edizioni Ca' Foscari. 93–110.

Galina B. BOLDEN, 2016: The discourse marker *nu* in Russian conversation. *NU / NÁ: A family of discourse markers across the languages of Europe and beyond*. Ed. Peter Auer and Yael Maschler. Berlin, Boston: Walter de Gruyter. 48–80.

Barbara BONIECKA, 2004: Niestandardowe zachowania językowe lekarzy i pacjentów [Doctors' and patients' nonstandard linguistic behaviors]. *Poznańskie spotkania językoznawcze [Poznań linguistic meetings]*. Ed. Zygmunt Zagórski and Zdzisława Krążyńska. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk. 7–25.

Derek BOUSFIELD and Miriam LOCHER, eds., 2008: *Impoliteness in language: studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Penelope BROWN and Stephen C. LEVINSON, 1987: *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Claudia CAFFI, 2007: *Mitigation*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Piotr CAP, 2013: *Proximization: the pragmatics of symbolic distance crossing*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

—, 2018: 'We don't want any immigrants or terrorists here': the linguistic manufacturing of xenophobia in the post-2015 Poland. *Discourse & society* [online first]: 1–19.

Marijana CEROVIĆ, 2016: When suspects ask questions: rhetorical questions as a challenging device. *Journal of Pragmatics* 105, 18–38.

Jan CHOVANEC, 2017: The othering of Roma migrants in British and Czech online news discussion forums. *Representing the Other in European media discourses*. Ed. Jan Chovanec and Katarzyna Molek-Kozakowska. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 235–258.

Jan CHOVANEC and Katarzyna MOLEK-KOZAKOWSKA (eds.), 2017: *Representing the Other in European media discourses*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jonathan CULPEPER, 1996: Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of pragmatics* 25/3, 349–367.

Jonathan CULPEPER, Derek BOUSFIELD, and Anne WICHMANN, 2003: Impoliteness revisited: with special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of pragmatics* 35/10–11, 1545–1579.

Jonathan CULPEPER, 2011: *Impoliteness: using language to cause offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mirjana N. DEDAĆ, 2005: Ironic denial: *tobože* in Croatian political discourse. *Journal of pragmatics* 37/5, 667–683.

—, 2010: Reformulating and concluding: the pragmatics of the Croatian discourse marker *dakle*. *South Slavic discourse particles*. Ed. Mirjana N. Dedać and Mirjana Mišković-Luković. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 109–131.

Mirjana N. DEDAĆ and Mirjana Mišković-Luković (eds.), 2010: *South Slavic discourse particles*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Anna DUSZAK, 1994: Academic discourse and intellectual styles. *Journal of pragmatics* 21/3, 291–313.

Marta DYNEL, 2015: The landscape of impoliteness research. *Journal of politeness research* 11/2, 329–354.

Gino EELLEN, 2001: *A critique of politeness theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Grace E. FIELDER, 2010: *Ama*, a Bulgarian adversative connective. *South Slavic discourse particles*. Ed. Mirjana N. Dedać and Mirjana Mišković-Luković. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 23–44.

Michael FURMAN, 2013: Impoliteness and mock-impoliteness. A descriptive analysis. *Approaches to Slavic Interaction*. Ed. Nadine Thielemann and Peter Kosta. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 237–256.

Beata GALLAHER, 2014: Politeness and sociocultural values in American and Russian cultures emerging from the speech act of complaint. Pragmatic competence of L2 learners of Russian. *Russian language journal/Русский язык* 64, 201–226.

Olga GARABRANDT, 2021: “Itsyournfault”: Space omission in a Russian women’s support group. *Journal of pragmatics* 182, 133–143.

Erving GOFFMAN, 1967: *Interaction ritual*. New York: Anchor Books.

Iwona GÓRALCZYK and Joanna ŁOZIŃSKA, 2021: Yoga instructions in Polish and Russian as directive speech acts: a cognitive linguistic perspective. *Language and cognition* 13, 613–642.

Lenore A. GRENOBLE, 2004: Parentheticals in Russian. *Journal of pragmatics* 36/11, 1953–1974.

—, 2006: Discourse analysis. *Glossos* 8.

—, 2013: Talking out of turn: (co)-constructing Russian conversation. *Approaches to Slavic interaction*. Ed. Nadine Thielemann and Peter Kosta. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 17–33.

Lenore A. GRENOBLE and Matthew RILEY, 1996: The role of deictics in discourse coherence: French *voici/voilà* and Russian *vot/von*. *Journal of pragmatics* 26, 819–838.

H. Paul. GRICE, 1975: Logic and conversation. *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3: *Speech acts*. Ed. Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan. 41–58.

Aleksandra GRZYMAŁA-KAZŁOWSKA, 2009: Clashes of discourse: the representations of immigrants in Poland. *Journal of immigrant and refugee studies* 7/1, 58–81.

—, 2007: *Konstruowanie “innego”: wizerunki imigrantów w Polsce* [Constructing the ‘Other’: representations of immigrants in Poland]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Sabina HALUPKA-REŠETAR and Biljana RADIĆ-BOJANIĆ, 2014: The discourse marker *znači* in Serbian: an analysis of semi-formal academic discourse. *Pragmatics* 24/4, 785–798.

Christopher HART, 2011: Introduction. Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition. Ed. Christopher Hart. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jim HLAVAC, 2011: Hesitation and monitoring phenomena in bilingual speech: a consequence of code-switching or a strategy to facilitate its incorporation? *Journal of pragmatics* 43/15, 3793–3806.

Zhuo JING-SCHMIDT and Vsevolod KAPATSINSKI, 2012: The apprehensive: fear as endophoric evidence and its pragmatics in English, Mandarin, and Russian. *Journal of pragmatics* 44/4, 346–373.

Tatyana KARPENKO-SECCOMBE, 2020: Discourses of conflict: cross-linguistic corpus-assisted comparative discourse study of Russian and Ukrainian parliamentary debates of 2014. Language of conflict: discourses of the Ukrainian crisis. Ed. Natalia Knoblock. London: Bloomsbury. 33–85.

Manfred KIENPOINTNER, 2008: Impoliteness and emotional arguments. *Journal of politeness research. Language, behaviour, culture* 4/2, 243–265.

Ksenija L. KISELEVA and Denis PAILLARD, eds., 2003: Diskursivnyje slova russkogo jazyka: kontekstnoe var'irovanie i semantičeskoe edinstvo [Russian discursive words: contextual variation and semantic invariance]. Moscow: Azbukovnik.

Nadiya KISS, 2021: Bloggers as social actors in language policy debates in Ukraine. *Journal of belonging, identity, language, and diversity (J-BILD)* 5/1, 161–186.

Natalia KNOBLOCK, ed., 2020: *Language of conflict: discourses of the Ukrainian crisis*. London: Bloomsbury.

Alena F. KOLYASEVA, 2018: The ‘new’ Russian quotative *tipa*: pragmatic scope and functions. *Journal of pragmatics* 128, 82–97.

—, 2021: The divergent paths of pragmaticalization: the case of the Russian particles *tipa* and *vrode*. *Journal of pragmatics*. (In press).

Monika KOPYTOWSKA, ed., 2017: *Contemporary discourses of hate and radicalism across space and genres*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Monika KOPYTOWSKA, Łukasz GRABOWSKI and Julita WOŹNIAK, 2017: Mobilizing against the Other: cyberhate, refugee crisis and proximization. *Contemporary discourses of hate and radicalism across space and genres*. Ed. Monika Kopytowska. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 57–97.

Peter KOSTA, 2013: How can I lie if I am telling the truth? The unbearable lightness of being of strong. *Approaches to Slavic interaction*. Ed. Nadine Thielemann and Peter Kosta. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 167–186.

Peter KOSTA and Nadine THIELEMANN, 2009: Gesprächsanalyse. *Die Slavischen Sprachen*. Ed. Sebastian Kempgen et al. Berlin: De Gruyter. 1029–1047.

Iryna KOZLOVA, 2004: Can you complain? Cross-cultural comparison of indirect complaints in Russian and American English. *Prospect* 19/1, 84–105.

Susan C. KRESIN, 1998: Deixis and thematic hierarchies in Russian narrative discourse. *Journal of pragmatics* 30/4, 421–435.

Emilia KRÓLAK and Kinga RUDNICKA, 2006: Selected aspects of directives in Polish. *Resla* 19, 129–142.

Natalya KRAVCHENKO and Viktoriia BLIDCHENKO-NAIKO, 2020: Multifaceted linguistic pragmatics of justification (Ukrainian speech-based study). *Open journal of modern linguistics* 10/1, 11–22.

Michał KRZYŻANOWSKI, 2018: Discursive shifts in ethno-nationalist politics: on politicization and mediatization of the ‘refugee crisis’ in Poland. *Journal of immigrant & refugee studies* 16/1–2, 1–21.

Andrzej KURTYKA, 2019: I complain, therefore I am: On indirect complaints in Polish. *Journal of pragmatics* 153, 35–45.

Holger KUßE, 2018: Argumentation and aggression: about maps and poems in the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* V/2, 37–63.

–, 2019: Diffuse messages as aggression and violence in political discourse. *Political discourse in Central, Eastern and Balkan Europe*. Ed. Martina Berrocal and Aleksandra Salamurović. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 23–38.

Hanna LAITINEN, 2013: Hesitation markers in transitions within (story)telling sequences of Russian television shows. *Approaches to Slavic interaction*. Ed. Nadine Thielemann and Peter Kosta. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 85–104.

Tat’iana V. LARINA, 2009: *Kategorija vezhlivosti i stil’ kommunikatsii. Sopostavlenie angliiskikh i russkikh lingvokul’turnykh traditsii*. Moscow: Rukopisnye pamiatniki drevnei Rusi.

Geoffrey N. LEECH, 1983: *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Barbara LEWANDOWSKA-TOMASZCZYK, 2017: Incivility and confrontation in online conflict discourses. *Lodz papers in pragmatics* 13/2, 347–363.

Nuria LORENZO-DUS, Pilar GARCÉS-CONEJOS BLITVICH, and Patricia BOU-FRANCH, 2011: On-line polylogues and impoliteness: the case of postings sent in response to the Obama Reggaeton YouTube video. *Journal of pragmatics* 43/10, 2578–2593.

Małgorzata MARCJANIK, 1997: *Polska grzeczność językowa* [Polish linguistic politeness]. Kielce: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna im. Jana Kochanowskiego.

Rosina MÁRQUEZ-REITER, Kristina GANCHENKO, and Anna CHARALAMBI-DOU, 2016: Requests and counters in Russian traffic police officer-citizen encounters. *Pragmatics and society* 7/4, 512–539.

T.A. MARSHALL, 2002: *Connotations and functions of Russian discourse markers ved’, zhe and -to*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Cornell University.

Izabela MATUSZEWSKA, 2014: Funkcje partykuły “no” w dziecięcych wypowiedziach mówionych. *Poznańskie studia polonistyczne* 21/1, 151–167.

Jekaterina MAŽARA, 2013: Irony in the face(s) of politeness: strategic use of verbal irony in Czech political TV debates. *Approaches to Slavic interaction*. Ed. Nadine Thielemann and Peter Kosta. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 187–212.

Margaret H. MILLS, 1992: Conventionalized politeness in Russian requests: a pragmatic view of indirectness. *Russian linguistics* 16/1, 65–78.

Biljana MIŠIĆ-ILIĆ, 2017: Pragmatic borrowing from English into Serbian: linguistic and sociocultural aspects. *Journal of pragmatics* 113, 103–115.

Biljana MIŠIĆ-ILIĆ and Milica RADULOVIĆ, 2015: Commissive and expressive illocutionary acts in political discourse. *Lodz papers in pragmatics* 11/1, 19–49.

Mirjana MISKOVIĆ, 2001: The particle *baš* in contemporary Serbian. *Pragmatics* 11/1, 17–30.

Mirjana MIŠKOVIĆ-LUKOVIĆ, 2010: Markers of conceptual adjustment: Serbian *baš* and *kao*. *South Slavic discourse particles*. Ed. Mirjana N. Dedać and Mirjana Mišković-Luković. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 65–89.

Mirjana MIŠKOVIĆ-LUKOVIĆ and Mirjana N. DEDAĆ, 2010: South Slavic discourse particles: introduction. *South Slavic discourse particles*. Ed. Mirjana N. Dedać and Mirjana Mišković-Luković. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1–22.

—, 2012: The discourse marker *odnosno* at the ICTY: A case of disputed translation in war crime trials. *Journal of pragmatics* 44/10, 1355–1377.

Mirjana MIŠKOVIĆ-LUKOVIĆ, Mirjana N. DEDAĆ, and Vladimir POLOMAC, 2015: The meaning and interpretation of the Serbian discourse marker *BRE*. *Journal of pragmatics* 87, 18–30.

Beata MOSKALA-GALLAHER, 2011: *The speech act of complaint in English and in Russian and its emergence in the pragmatic competence of adult American learners of Russian*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Bryn Mawr College.

Louise MULLANY, 2008: ‘Stop hassling me!’ Impoliteness, power and gender identity in the professional workplace. *Impoliteness in language: studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice*. Ed. Derek Bousfield and Miriam A. Locher. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 231–251.

Alla NEDASHKIVSKA, 2009: Gender voices in electronic discourse: a forum in Ukrainian. *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 17/1–2, 217–245.

—, 2020: Discursive practices in online media: Language ideologies in time of crisis. *Language of conflict: discourses of the Ukrainian crisis*. Ed. Natalia Knoblock. London: Bloomsbury. 157–176.

Tat’jana M. NIKOLAEVA, 2000: Etnotipologija izvinenij kak zerkalo “Modelej Mira”. *Russian linguistics* 24/2, 183–192.

Eva OGIERMANN, 2009: Politeness and in-directness across cultures: a comparison of English, German, Polish and Russian requests. *Journal of politeness research* 5/2, 189–216.

—, 2012: About Polish politeness. *Speech acts and politeness across languages and cultures*. Ed. Leyre Ruiz de Zarobe and Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe. Bern: Peter Lang. 27–52.

Eva OGIERMANN and Małgorzata SUSZCZYŃSKA, 2011: On im/politeness behind the Iron Curtain. *Politeness across cultures*. Ed. Francesca Bargiela-Chiappini and Dániel Z. Kádár. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 194–215.

Renee PERELMUTTER, 2009: Pragmatic functions of reported speech with *jako* in the Old Russian Primary Chronicle. *Journal of historical pragmatics* 10/1, 108–131.

—, 2010: Impoliteness recycled: subject ellipsis in Modern Russian complaint discourse. *Journal of pragmatics* 42/12, 3214–3231.

—, 2013: *Klassika zhanra*: The flamewar as a genre in the Russian blogosphere. *Journal of pragmatics* 45/1, 74–89.

—, 2015: Shaming, group face, and identity construction in a Russian virtual community for women. *Interdisciplinary perspectives on im/politeness*. Ed. Marina Terkourafi. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 149–180.

—, 2018: Globalization, conflict discourse, and Jewish identity in an Israeli Russian-speaking online community. *Journal of pragmatics* 134, 134–148.

—, 2021: Online nicks, impoliteness, and Jewish identity in Israeli Russian conflict discourse. *Approaches to internet pragmatics: theory and practice*. Ed. Chaoqun Xie, Francisco Yus, and Hartmut Haberland. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 235–256.

Aida PREMILOVAC, 2010: The Bosnian discourse particle *ono*. *South Slavic discourse particles*. Ed. Mirjana N. Dedaić and Mirjana Mišković-Luković. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 91–108.

Renate RATHMAYR, 1996: *Pragmatik der Entschuldigungen. Vergleichende Untersuchungen am Beispiel der russischen Sprache und Kultur*. Vienna: Böhlau-Verlag.

—, 2009: Novaia russkaia vezhlivost' – moda delovogo etiketa ili korennoe pragmaticheskoe izmenenie? *Voprosy iazykoznanii*, 63–81.

Zoya I. REZANOVA and Svetlana V. KOGUT, 2015: Types of discourse markers: their ethnocultural diversity in scientific text. *Procedia-Social and behavioral sciences* 215, 266–272.

Nicole RICHTER, 2013: How evaluation is transferred in oral discourse in Russian. *Approaches to Slavic interaction*. Ed. Nadine Thielemann and Peter Kosta. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 133–146.

Veronika RIES, 2013: Bilingual language use in the family environment: evidence from a telephone conversation between members of a community of speakers of German descent. *Approaches to Slavic interaction*. Ed. Nadine Thielemann and Peter Kosta. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 281–294.

Lea SAWICKI, 2016: The Polish multifunctional particle *no*. *NU / NÁ: A family of discourse markers across the languages of Europe and beyond*. Ed. Peter Auer and Yael Maschler. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter. 81–103.

Deborah SCHIFFRIN, 1988: *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alexandre SÉVIGNY, 2010: *Kamo*, an attitudinal pragmatic marker of Macedonian. *South Slavic discourse particles*. Ed. Mirjana N. Dedaić and Mirjana Mišković-Luković. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 45–64.

Maria SHARDAKOVA, 2005: Intercultural pragmatics in the speech of American L2 learners of Russian: apologies offered by Americans in Russian. *Intercultural pragmatics* 2/4, 423–451.

Tatiana SHERSTINOVA, 2013: Russian everyday utterances: the top lists and some statistics. *Approaches to Slavic interaction*. Ed. Nadine Thielemann and Peter Kosta. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 105–116.

Galina SHLEYKINA, 2016: *The speech act of greeting performed by Russian EFL learners*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Oklahoma State University.

Olena SIVACHENKO, 2020: *Requesting in Ukrainian: native speakers' pragmatic behaviour and acquisition by language learners*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Alberta.

Agnieszka SOWIŃSKA, 2014: 'I must do everything to eliminate my negative attitude': Polish general practitioners' emotions toward patients with medically unexplained symptoms. *Linguistic approaches to emotions in context*. Ed. Fabienne H. Baider and Georgeta Cislaru. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 309–329.

—, 2018: 'I didn't want to be Psycho no. 1': identity struggles in narratives of patients presenting medically unexplained symptoms. *Discourse studies* 20/4, 506–522.

Agnieszka SOWIŃSKA and Małgorzata SOKÓŁ, 2018: "Luckily, she's alive": narratives of vicarious experience told by Polish doctors. *Journal of pragmatics* 152, 76–88.

Karolina STEFANIAK, 2010: Power and asymmetry in medical encounters: patients' self-assessments as face-threatening acts. *Pragmatic perspectives on language and linguistics*, vol. 1: *Speech actions in theory and applied studies*. Ed. Iwona Witczak-Plisiecka. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars. 276–297.

—, 2011: *Władza i tożsamość w komunikacji lekarz – pacjent* [Power and identity in doctor-patient communication]. Wrocław: Oficyna Wydawnicza ATUT - Wrocławskie Wydawnictwo Oświatowe.

Svetlana B. STEPANOVA, 2013: Speech rate as reflection of speaker's social characteristics. *Approaches to Slavic interaction*. Ed. Nadine Thielemann and Peter Kosta. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 117–132.

Małgorzata SUSZCZYŃSKA, 1999: Apologizing in English, Polish and Hungarian: different languages, different strategies. *Journal of pragmatics* 31/8, 1053–1065.

Anna TERESZKIEWICZ, 2020: Complaint management on Twitter – evolution of interactional patterns on Polish corporate profiles. *Pragmatics* 30/3, 405–430.

Nadine THIELEMANN, 2010: Arguing by "anekdot" – humorous accounts in Russian media interaction. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, 185–215.

—, 2013: Humor as staging an utterance. *Approaches to Slavic Interaction*. Ed. Nadine Thielemann and Peter Kosta. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 257–280.

Nadine THIELEMANN and Peter KOSTA, eds., 2013: *Approaches to Slavic interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nadine THIELEMANN, 2015: *Joking and beyond – conversational humor at the interface of pragmatics and cognition*. (Habilitation UHH 2015 [postdoctoral thesis]).

—, 2020: Allusive talk – playing on indirect intertextual references in Russian conversation. *Journal of pragmatics* 155, 123–134.

Zoria TRAJKOVA, 2020: Media framing of the Macedonia name change issue: the use of fear-inducing language strategies. *Lodz papers in pragmatics* 16/2, 265–284.

Zoria TRAJKOVA and Silvana Neshkovska, 2018: Online hate propaganda during election period: the case of Macedonia. *Lodz papers in pragmatics* 14/2, 309–334.

Marina TSYLINA, 2016: *Perception of pragmatic appropriateness of Russian imperatives: the case of L2 learners and heritage learners of Russian*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Oregon.

Matylda WEIDNER, 2013: 'This is how I see it': *no*-prefacing in Polish. *Approaches to Slavic interaction*. Ed. Nadine Thielemann and Peter Kosta. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 147–166.

—, 2015: Telling somebody what to tell: 'Proszę mi powiedzieć' in Polish doctor–patient interaction. *Journal of pragmatics* 78, 70–83.

—, 2016a: Aha-moments in interaction: indexing a change of state in Polish. *Journal of pragmatics* 104, 193–206.

—, 2016b: The particle *no* in Polish talk-in-interaction. *NU / NÁ: A family of discourse markers across the languages of Europe and beyond*. Ed. Peter Auer and Yael Maschler. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter. 104–131.

Daniel WEISS, 2020: The Ukrainian nation – stepmother, younger sister or stillborn baby? Evidence from Russian TV debates and related political sources (2013–15). *Language of conflict: discourses of the Ukrainian crisis*. Ed. Natalia Knoblock. London: Bloomsbury. 211–243.

Anna WIERZBICKA, 1985: Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts. Polish vs. English. *Journal of pragmatics* 9/2–3, 145–178.

—, 1993: *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Igor Ž. ŽAGAR, 2010: *Pa*, a modifier of connectives: An argumentative analysis. *South Slavic discourse particles*. Ed. Mirjana N. Dedačić and Mirjana Mišković-Luković. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 133–162.

G.M. ZELDOVICH, 2012: *Pragmatika grammatiki* [Pragmatics of grammar]. Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskih kultur Publ.

Elena A. ZEMSKAJA, 1997: Kategorija vezlivosti: obschie voprosy – nacional'no-kul'turnaja specifika russkogo jazyka [The category of politeness: general issues – the national-cultural specifics of the Russian language]. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 56/2, 271–301.

RAZISKOVALNI TRENDI V PRAGMATIKI IN ANALIZI DISKURZA NA PODROČJU SLOVANSKEGA JEZIKOSLOVJA

V članku je narejen pregled najnovejših trendov v pragmatiki in diskurzni raziskovanju slovanskih jezikov. Pregled začenjamo s pozivom Lenore Grenoble iz leta 2006 za povečanje slovanskih raziskav na področjih analize diskurza in pragmatike. V letih, ki so sledila, so se pojavila številna dela, ki se ukvarjajo s temi področji, kar je vodilo v pojav znanstvenih razprav o tematikah, kot so (ne)vljudnost, ohranjanje dostojanstva, govorna dejanja in označevalci diskurza. Slednji so bili deležni velike pozornosti slavistk in slavistov vseh treh slovanskih jezikovnih vej. Po kratki metodološki razpravi preučujemo nekaj najpomembnejših trendov v pragmatiki. Pregledujemo nedavna raziskovanja na področju študij ohranjanja dostojanstva in (ne)vljudnosti (kot tudi njunega presečišča z institucionalno močjo), nevljudnosti in sovražnega govora, (ne)vljudnosti in govornih dejanj ter pragmatike čustev. Pragmatični pojavi, obravnavani v tem razdelku, vključujejo (govorna) dejanja, ki ogrožajo naše dostojanstvo, dajanje nasvetov, norme (ne)vljudnosti v spletnih in nespletnih kontekstih, pragmatične vidike institucionalnih diskurzov, moč v interakcijah med zdravnikom in pacientom, sovražne diskurze, nastale

kot odgovor na politično dogajanje, in opravičilo. V naslednjem razdelku se osredotočamo na raziskave na področju analize diskurza. Razdelek začnemo s pregledom novejših raziskav slovanskih diskurznihi označevalcev. Nato povzemamo izbrana dela, ki se ukvarjajo s tematikami, kot so dvojezičnost, deikse, evidentnost in drža, humor, izmenjava govornih vlog, strokovni diskurz in vedno bolj priljubljeno področje kritične analize diskurza, ki temelji na slovanskih podatkih. Članek zaključujemo s predlogi za prihodnje raziskovanje presečišča ohranjanja dostojanstva, moči in institucionalnih kontekstov, oblike in funkcije v diskurzu, morfosintakse in pragmatike, pragmatike in usvajanja drugega jezika ter pragmatike v dvo- in večjezičnem diskurzu.
