Iryna Lenchuk[1]
Amer Ahmed[2]
Department of English Language and Literature
College of Arts and Applied Sciences, Dhofar University

VOT ÉTO DA! SOME REMARKS ON ASSESSMENT IN RUSSIAN

Abstract: *This article investigates assessment in Russian as a type of social action by using the approach to linguistic relativity where the diversity of lexicosyntactic resources available to the speakers of natural languages brings about different collateral effects to the social act of assessment. An analysis of selected samples of a Russian spoken corpus presented in this paper shows that specific lexicosyntactic resources available to the speakers of Russian, such as flexible word order and particles (e.g. da, nu, vot, to), have specific collateral effects. In addition to building agreement in assessment, these lexicosyntactic resources (i) create the context of closeness where more can be said with less overtly expressed linguistic means, and (ii) intensify the social act of assessment by making it more emotionally charged.*

Keywords: *spoken language, colloquial speech studies, assessment as social action, linguistic relativity.*

Introduction

How do people participate in social events? One way to do that is by offering assessments. According to Pomerantz (1984: 57), "assessments are produced as *products* of participation; with an assessment, a speaker claims knowledge of that which he or she is assessing". Sidnell and Enfield (2012: 312) define assessment as the use of evaluative expressions to express a person's stance towards the object of assessment, which is typically offered in the grammatical form of assertion. In interaction, assessment offered by the first speaker is typically followed by the

[1] ilenchuk@du.edu.om
[2] aahmed@du.edu.om

assessment of the second speaker that is (dis)aligned with the first speaker's stance on the object of assessment.

"The machinery" (Sacks 1995, v. 2: 169) of assessment has been studied cross-culturally and cross-linguistically (see e.g. Goodwin and Goodwin 1987; Heritage and Raymond 2005; Tanaka 2016). For example, Sidnell and Enfield (2012) review the analysis of the epistemically authoritative second-position assessment in three languages: Caribbean English Creole (Sidnell 2009a), Finnish (Sorjonen and Hakulinen 2009) and Lao (Enfield 2007). Their analyses of assessment are framed within a new perspective on the concept of linguistic relativity that they proposed, which can be briefly summarised as follows. Natural languages are diverse and therefore they differ in what lexicosyntactic resources are available to their speakers in their attempts to organise turn-by-turn interaction. Sidnell and Enfield argue that these differences bring about different collateral effects, that are referred to as side effects created by specifically selected lexicosyntactic tools for the purpose of achieving intersubjectivity, i.e. understanding in interaction.

Based on an analysis of selected samples of a Russian spoken corpus, this paper attempts to continue the cross-linguistic work on assessment from the point of view of conversational analysis and interactional linguistics (see e.g. Sidnell 2009b) by investigating how assessment is done in Russian. Specifically, the paper focuses on assessment from the point of view of the lexicosyntactic resources that are available to the speakers of Russian for building agreement in assessment. The claim is that these linguistic resources (i) create a certain context in which speakers perform the act of assessment and (ii) lead to collateral effects specific to the act of assessment in Russian.

Social actions as rituals

Recently, the universal nature of talk-in-interaction across many cultural and linguistic communities has been noticed and addressed by Sidnell (2009c: 3), who argues that despite all the diversity, "people everywhere encounter the same sorts of organisational problems and make use of the same basic abilities in their solution to them…".

The claim that human actions are universal has a long-standing tradition which goes back to Goffman who was interested in studying the organisation of social life through everyday encounters or situations. Goffman (1967: 44) argued that despite the cultural differences, "people everywhere are the same", i.e. they self-regulate their actions through rituals built into them by the society. Goffman noted that

Universal human nature is not a very human thing. By acquiring it, the person becomes a kind of construct, built up not from inner psychic propensities but from moral rules that are impressed upon him from without...The general capacity to be bound by moral rules may well belong to the individual, but the particular set of rules which transforms him into a human being derives from requirements established in the ritual organisation of social encounters. (45)

Goffman believed that the order of social rituals was centered on the construct of face rather than justice. The participants of everyday social situations want to be validated and acknowledged; therefore, they will steer away from the types of social actions that might threaten the integrity of face. He described it in the following way,

Social life is an uncluttered, orderly thing because the person voluntarily stays away from the places and topics and times where he is not wanted and where he might be disparaged for going. He cooperates to save his face, finding that there is much to be gained from venturing nothing. (110)

Thus, Goffman proposes the universality of the organisation of social life through ritual, where a person is taught self-expression through face, "an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes" (1967: 5), such as pride, honor, dignity and consideration. Goffman also acknowledged a certain amount of cross-cultural variation in relation to these "human-nature elements" (45), where the lack of some values may be counterbalanced by others. However, despite all the variations, what remains central in the organisation of social life is the essential ritual of face saving and face maintenance.

How do Goffman's ideas mentioned above relate to the social act of assessment? It can be argued that they provide a theoretical foundation for the following assumptions. The first assumption deals with the universality of assessment that people from many cultural and linguistic communities engage in while participating in social activities. The second assumption deals with the rules of this participation, specifically, with acknowledgment and validation of the participants' epistemic rights to assess the object of their assessment (Heritage and Raymond 2005; Sidnell and Enfield 2012). The third assumption deals with the importance of face maintenance through preference for agreements rather than disagreements with the assessment provided by a co-participant (Pomerantz 1984). Face saving and face maintenance is also realised through preference to emphasise "shared affect and co-experience the participants display to each other" (Goodwin and Goodwin 1987: 41) over the object of assessment.

Background

Naturally occurring speech (*razgovognay rech*) can be studied from many different perspectives. It can be analysed from the point of view of Austin's speech act theory that studies "a use of language that not only says but does" (Mey 2006: 54). The study of speech acts (e.g., apologising, threatening, greeting, convincing, complimenting, etc.) are at the centre of pragmatics, a field of linguistics that investigates how meaning is achieved in the context of language use. (Mey 2006). A number of studies written in the Russian language are centred on the analysis of speech acts. For example, Borger (2004) examines the lexico-grammatical features of the speech acts of negative reaction realised through refusals, prohibitions, disagreements, rebuttals, and disapprovals as well as their pragmatic force in the discourse of modern plays. Bragina and Sharonov (2019) focus their analysis on pseudo-questions, i.e. mock citations of interlocutor's speech and rhymed pseudo answers that are labeled as acts of 'pedagogical aggression'. In their study they analysed excerpts taken from literary sources (i.e. short stories, novels) found in the database of the National Corpus of the Russian Language. Through the use of Discourse Completion Tasks as tools for data collection, Vlasyan and Kozhukhova (2019) investigate formal and informal invitations in the Russian language within the framework of politeness theory.

The study presented in this paper analyses naturally occurring speech (*razgovognay rech*) within the framework of conversation analysis rather than pragmatics. The focus of conversation analysis (CA) is on researching the organisation of human action in and through the talk-in-interaction. Thus, the study does not address the act of assessment as a speech act but rather focuses on how assessment is achieved as a type of social action through talk-in-interaction. To the best of the authors' knowledge, there are no studies that investigate assessment in Russian using the methodology of conversation analysis and the present study aims to address this gap.

We start the analysis of assessment by providing an overview of the studies that focus on assessment in Japanese (Tanaka 2016) and Finnish (Hakulinen & Sorjonen 2016). The choice to review assessment studies on Japanese and Finnish is explained by the fact that despite many differences, Japanese, Finnish and Russian share some common syntactic properties, such as a flexible word order. In these languages, a flexible word order is possible since the arguments of a predicate are marked for morphological case (e.g. subject vs. object). The fact that both subject and object arguments are morphologically case marked allows for the possibility of pronouncing some of these arguments and dropping the others by constructing

Iryna Lenchuk, Amer Ahmed

null subject sentences. A null subject sentence is a sentence in which the subject can be omitted but can still be recovered either through the verb morphology or through the context (for Russian, see Bailyn 2011; for Finnish, see Biberauer et al. 2009; for Japanese, see Camacho 2013).

In an investigation of the connection between the lexico-grammatical resources provided for a language and the type of social action that is facilitated in that language, Tanaka (2016) identifies the following main strategies used by Japanese speakers in interaction: (1) word order variability; (2) omitting unexpressed arguments. Japanese speakers use these strategies for the purpose of expediting an agreement within the base turn construction unit (TCU) and for showing preference and affiliation with the stance taken in a prior assessment. The strategy of omitting unexpressed arguments is illustrated in example (1):

Example 1 (example 1 and 7 in Tanaka, 2016, p. 9 and p. 13, respectively)

```
1 +³ Orie: yuukyuu      tte      ii      yo      ne
            paid.leaves   TOP      nice    FP      FP
            'concerning paid leaves, nice, aren't ((they))?'
2 → Fumi:   ii      yo      ne: [ :
            nice    FP      FP
            'nice, aren't ((they))?'
```

In turn 1, Orie offers a positive assessment of *yuukyuu* 'paid leaves' by placing positive assessment in the predicate position, which is shaded in turn 1. Fumi expedites her assessment by repeating the same predicate and by placing it in the turn-initial position (see the shaded part in turn 2). As seen from turn 2 of the example in 1, Fumi omits the subject argument 'paid leaves'.

Tanaka (2016) states that the grammar of the Japanese language allows for structures where arguments can be unpronounced and therefore, predicates can be placed in the turn-initial position without a mandatory subject. These structures are commonly used by the Japanese speakers as means for building positive agreement with a prior assessment.

Another syntactic resource that is available to Japanese speakers who participate in the act of assessment is word order flexibility. This means that by housing

ФИЛОЛОГ XIII 2022 26

---

³ Following Tanaka (2016), the initial assessment is indicated by a plus sign, i.e. '+', and the second assessment is indicated by '→', i.e. an arrow sign.

82

assessment in the turn-initial predicate, the speaker can add any extra material, if needed, in the post-predicate position. This is illustrated in example (2) below.

Example 2 (example 8 in Tanaka, 2016, p. 14)

1 + Shin: ((whispered)) °° shippai   da   yo °°
                          fiasco   COP   FP
        'a fiasco, ((it)) was.'
2 →Nobu: ((whispered)) °sshipp(h)i   da   yo=kinoo   wa   hhhh[.hhh°
                       fiasco   COP   FP yesterday   TOP
         'a fiasco, ((it)) was, as for yesterday hhhh .hhh .'

In turn 1 of example 2, Shin offers assessment of his trip to the beach by placing the predicate in the turn-initial position. Nobu agrees with this assessment by using the strategy of turn-initial repeated predicate and by placing the tropicalised element *kinoo wa* 'as for the yesterday' in a post-predicate position. According to Tanaka, the possibility of this word order in Japanese is used by the Japanese speakers as a strategy to index agreement early at the beginning of the TCU by repeating the predicate that houses the assessment and by locating extra material in the post-predicate position.

In Finnish, two typological features are relevant for building assessment, which is (i) a possibility of forming a clause without a subject and (ii) flexibility of word order. According to Hakulinen and Sorjonen (2016: 125), free word order in Finnish creates the following paradigm of agreeing with a prior assessment: Adverb + V, V(+V), V+S (+X), S+V (+X), V+ particle. The authors argue that the structures chosen by the speakers in assessment might have different functions in conversations or in Sidnell and Enfield's (2012) words, different collateral effects. For example, Hakulinen and Sorjonen argue that the verb repeat paradigm option (V + V) signals assertion of the agreement offered in a previous turn, VS response signals differences in speakers' position to the object of assessment, whereas V + particle signals topic closure, as illustrated in example (3).

Example 3 (example 13 in Hakulinen & Sorjonen 2016: 145)

16 Antti: .nhh J<u>oo</u>:, .mth (.) ↑Ai   siel   ol'   oikeen   löpökamina
            PRT   PRT   there   was   true   oil.stove
         .nhh J<u>oo</u>:, .mth (.) ↑So there was a real <u>oil</u> st<u>o</u>ve.

17 → **Sehän   oli   hieno   homma.**=
     that-CLI   was   fine   business
     Now that was something.=

18 Pekka: → =**mt <u>O</u>li   joo**
              was   yes

19   (0.6)

In line 16, the speaker offers assessment of a stove that heated a hut where Antti and his friends stayed during their winter trip to Lapland. By assessing the stove as something extraordinary, Antti invites Pekka to elaborate on the topic of assessment to which Pekka responds with the construction V + joo (V + PRT). The agreement offered is followed by a pause which signals the closure of the topic. Thus, in addition to agreeing with the previously offered assessment, the structure V + PRT is used in Finnish as a topic closure.

These studies have shown that specific lexicosyntactic properties of Japanese and Finnish are used as resources to build assessment in interaction. Despite the fact that both languages share the syntactic property of flexible word order, building positive agreement in Finnish and Japanese has language specific consequences or collateral effects. In Japanese, the speakers can expedite positive agreement in assessment by placing it in turn-initial position and locating all other arguments in the post-predicate position. In Finnish, in addition to signalling agreement in assessment, V + PRT structure is also used as a topic closure. The next section attempts to shed light on how assessment is done in Russian and on the consequences or collateral effects of assessment as a type of social action.

The data: Some methodological issues

The Russian data analysed in the paper are taken from a tape-recorded and transcribed corpus of the Russian spoken language (Zemskaia & Kapanadze 1978). This corpus was also used in a number of studies of Russian colloquial speech (see e.g. Vepreva, Shalina, & Matveeva 2019). We acknowledge the fact that the data are taken from a corpus that dates back to 1978. The rationale for using this corpus is the following. Unfortunately, there is no publicly available corpus of spontaneously occurring speech in Russian. The corpus of the colloquial Russian language, which is part of the National Corpus of Russian (2019) has examples of lexical items and syntactic structures that occur in colloquial Russian at the sentence level only. The spontaneous speech in this corpus is presented only in narratives told by one narra-

tor. To the best of our knowledge, the data collected and recorded as the result of the project titled the St. Petersburg One Day of Speech Corpus has not been made publicly available (see e.g. Bogdanova et al. 2015) and it seems that the corpus is still under construction.

The corpus used in this paper has been tape-recorded and transcribed and constitutes a valid representation of the spontaneously occurring Russian speech. For the purpose of this paper, the decision has been made to keep the transcription as it is used in the original. We are aware of the fact that the transcription used in the corpus does not follow the established CA conventions that seem to capture a more nuanced approach to transcribing naturally occurring interaction (for an overview of different approaches to transcribing naturally occurring interaction, see e.g. Hepburn and Bolden 2013). However, the standard rule of transcribing non-English data has been observed in this paper to follow a three-line presentation of the Russian data, i.e. a transliteration line, a morpheme-by-morpheme breakdown line and an English translation line.

Samples of naturally occurring Russian conversations are selected on the basis of their relevance to the social action of assessment (positive and negative) that speakers regularly participate in.

Data analysis

This section provides a description of the analysis of assessment in Russian. The purpose of the analysis is to demonstrate that despite its universal nature, assessment in Russian has specific consequences or collateral effects in relation to the type of social action undertaken by speakers of Russian. These collateral effects are determined by certain lexicosyntactic resources available to the speakers of Russian participating in the act of assessment. The discussion of the data starts with excerpt 1.

Excerpt 1 (**About the play**) (Zemskaia & Kapanadze 1978: 200)

1 + B: Da-a/ oni stavili Steinbek-a/ **blestĩashche sovershenno** bylo postavleno/
PRT they staged Steinbeck-ACC brilliantly really was staged
'Yeah, they staged Steinbeck. It was brilliantly staged.'
2 → D: **Da-a?**
PRT
'Really!'

3 → G: **Vot   ėto   da!**
     PRT   this   PRT
     'Isn't it something'
4 → A: **Steinbek-a//**
     Steinbeck-ACC
     'Steinbeck'

In Excerpt 1, the act of assessment starts with speaker's B positive assessment of the performance of Steinbeck's play staged by the students. D's utterance in turn 2 that consists of the particle *da* only is interpreted as the expressions of admiration of the fact that Steinbeck's play has been played in a local theatre. In G's utterance in turn 3, *da* is included in the expression *Vot ėto da* 'Isn't it something!', an expression that upgrades the first speaker's assessment by making it very expressive and emotionally charged. At the same time, speaker A in turn 4 chooses to express his agreement by repeating the object of assessment, i.e. *Steinbek-a* 'Steinbeck', and omitting the verb and other arguments included in the utterance.

Similar to Japanese and Finnish, Russian allows for a flexible word order due to its extensive system of morphological case. Thus, speaker B in 1, can place the adverbial phrase *blestia͡shche sovershenno* 'really brilliantly' at the beginning of the utterance that signals assessment. Speaker A in 4 has the choice of expressing his agreement by using only the object since the Accusative marker *–a* on the object *Steinbeik-a* Steinbeck-ACC identifies it as an object.

The lexicosyntactic resources that are available to the speakers in Excerpt 1 include particles, morphological case and flexible word order for building agreement. Thus, the context is created with minimum overtly expressed resources since some of the arguments can be omitted and the emotion of admiration can be expressed by the particles only. In addition, some of the sentence constituents that express assessment can be dislocated from their canonical syntactic positions and be moved to the beginning of the utterance, thus expediting assessment provided by the speakers. The collateral effects of these resources are a shared emotional closeness created among the speakers engaged in the act of assessment. This is also illustrated in excerpt 2 presented below.

Excerpt 2 (About Vit'ka) (Zemskaia & Kapanadze 1978: 147)

1 A: A?   Sdelat' chto zhe/   konechno   nichego ne   sdelaesh′//
    PRT do   what PRT   of.course   nothing not   do
    'PRT What can you do? You can't do anything of course.'
2 + Y: **Nu** Vit'ka/ Vit'ka-**to**   on vsë vremi͡a tam//
    PRT Vit'ka Vit'ka-PRT he all time   there
    'PRT Vit'ka, Vit'ka-PRT he is always there.'
3 → A: **Net** Vit'ka-**to**   molodet͡s umnit͡sa// molodet͡s/ molodet͡s//
    PRT Vit'ka-PRT good.man good.man good.man good.man
    'PRT Vit'ka-PRT is a good man. A good man, a good man.'

In excerpt 2, two friends A and Y talk about the death of their mutual friend. In turn 1, speaker A expresses the feeling of helplessness in the face of death. What happens in line 2, which starts with the particle *nu*, is the introduction of a new, more positive turn and an indirect positive assessment of Vit'ka, the speakers' friend. By saying that Vit'ka is *vsë vremi͡a tam* 'always there', Y provides an indirect positive assessment of Vit'ka, who spends time with the family of their mutual deceased friend. The second speaker A agrees with the assessment. The utterance in turn 3 contains two particles *net* and *to*. The negative participle *net* at the beginning of turn 3 and the particle *to* that attaches to the noun Vit'ka are used here to signal emphasis. The speaker uses them to emphasise the assessment of Vit'ka as a really good person and a good friend. In addition to the use of particles, speaker A repeats the predicate *molodet͡s molodet͡s* 'a good man, a good man'. This repetition is used as a closure of the positive assessment of Vit'ka as a good person and a good man that was initiated by the use of particles.

Similar to excerpt 1, in excerpt 2, the agreement in assessment is offered through the use of particles and a flexible word order. For example, in addition to using adjectives, such as *good* when describing Vit'ka, the particle *to* is used here as an intensifier, thus creating a stronger degree of positive assessment. The collateral effect of these resources is that by positively assessing their friend Vit'ka, the speakers counterbalance the feeling of helplessness that they have experienced because of the loss of their mutual friend.

The use of particles and argument fronting as intensifiers in assessment is also observed in Except 3.

Excerpt 3 (Katya's behaviour) (Zemskaia & Kapanadze 1978: 183)

1. A: ... Katia͡ vela   sebia͡   nichego?
      Katya behaved herslf   not.bad
      'Did Katya behaved herself well?'

2 + B: Ochen' khorosho
      very   well
      'Very well.'

3. A: Slushalas'?
      obey
      'Did she listen to you?'

4. B: → Da da s   ne͡ĭ vobshche nikakikh   problem
      yes yes with her absolutely no   problem
      'Yes, yes, there are no problems with her absolutely'

      absoliu͡tno ... ona takaia͡   spoko͡ĭnaia͡
      absolutely ... she PRON quiet
      'Absolutely, she is very quiet.'

5. → A: Khorosho
      good
      'Good.'

In except 3, speakers A and B discuss the behaviour of a child named Katya. Initially B offers a positive assessment of Katya's behaviour through the use of the adverb phrase *ochen' khorosho* 'very well'. In turn 4 in response to A's question, B continues the positive assessment of Katya's behaviour first by repeating the particle *da* (i.e. *da da* 'yes yes') and second, by topicalising the prepositional phrase *s ney* 'with her' in turn 4. The topicalisation of the prepositional phrase is possible due to the flexible word order in Russian. The collateral effect of the topicalisation of the prepositional phrase is in emphasising the object of assessment (i.e. Katya's behaviour). The turn *khorosho* 'good' by speaker A concludes the assessment of the child's behaviour and acts as a token of agreement with the assessment provided by B.

Agreement with a negative assessment can create a shared emotional space for expressing an emotion of amusement, which is illustrated in excerpt 4.

Except 4 (About the actress) (Zemskaia & Kapanadze 1978: 205)

1 -[4] B: Ona byla prima/ no (.) no ona po-moĭemu étogo ne zasluzhivala//
    she was prima/ but but she I.think this not deserve
    'She was prima but I think she does not deserve it.'
    V obshchem ona vo vsekh roliãkh byla sovershenno odinakovaĭa//
    in total she in all roles was completely same
    'Briefly speaking, she was the same in all her roles.'

2 → A: **Odinakovaĭa?**
    Same
    'The same.'

3   B: **Chto** Nastasĭa Filippovna/ **chto** ona starshaĭa sestra/
    PRT Natasiya Filipovna/ PRT she elder sister/
    'Whether she is Nastasija Filippovna or whether she is the elder sister'
    nikakoĭ raznitŝy sovsem//
    no difference at.all
    'There is no difference.'

4   A: (nerazb.) dyshit vsë odinakovo (imitiruet tiãzhëloe dykhanie)//
    (unclear) breathe all similar (imitating the heavy breathing)
    'Her breathing is always the same.'
  → Kak nachnët ona/ **Oĭ!** Iã ne mogu//
    PRT started she PRT I not be.able
    'Whenever she starts it! PRT I can't stand it.'

Excerpt 4 starts with a negative assessment of one actor's acting abilities. In the next turn, speaker A agrees with the assessment by repeating the predicate *odinakovaĭa* 'the same'. In turn 3, the particle *chto* is used by B to introduce a list of different roles played by the actor and emphasise monotony and lack of variety in the actor's acting abilities. Speaker A continues with the assessment. In 4, speaker A uses flexible word order, i.e. a particle, a verb and a subject, which is followed by another particle. The particle *oĭ* is used in this turn to intensify the assessment and to create a humorous effect. In this excerpt, the lexicosyntactic resources selected by the speakers allow for a gradual build-up of the positive emotions that culminate in a humorous situation with speaker A imitating the iconic heavy breathing of the actor.

In addition to creating a shared emotional space, the particles can also be used as a topic closure, as illustrated in excerpts 5 and 6.

---

[4] The initial negative assessment is indicated by a negative sign, i.e. '-'.

Excerpt 5 (About the herring) (Zemskaia & Kapanadze 1978: 165)

1 + A: Ochen' khorosha selëdka
        very   good   herring
        'The herring is very good.'
2 → M: selëdka ne   solënai͡a//
          herring not   salty
        'The herring is not salty.'
3 + A: Ochen' khorosha selëdka
          very   good   herring
        'The herring is very good.'
4 → E: **Ugu**// (.)
        PRT

In excerpt 5, A provides an initial positive assessment. In turn 1, the assessment is expressed through the use of a marked word order, as it starts with the predicate *ochen' khorosha* 'very good' instead of the subject selëdka '*herring*'. M indirectly agrees with the positive assessment of A by providing an utterance that describes the qualities of the assessed object. A confirms his prior assessment by repeating the original assessment housed in the predicate. Speaker E agrees with the assessment by using the particle *ugu* that signals a confirmation of the original assessment of A and M and a topic closure, as signaled by the pause that follows the particle *ugu*.
    Now consider except 6.

Excerpt 6 (About the dacha) (Zemskaia & Kapanadze 1978: 148)

1 S: I   uchastok naverno   bol'shoĭ//
      and plot   probably big
      'And a plot is probably big.'
2 G: Net// Uchastok sotok   shestnadt͡sat'//
      PRT   plot   weaving.land sixteen
      'PRT, the plot is sixteen weaving land.'
3 + S: Shestnadt͡sat'?// **Ochen' khorosho**// **Neplokho**//
        sixteen   very   well   not.bad
      'Sixteen? Very well. Not bad.'
4 → G: **N-da**//
        PRT

A flexible word order in Russian allows the speaker to emphasise the object of assessment, i.e. *uchastok*, which is followed by a description of the plot. In turn 3, S provides positive assessment by repeating the number *shestnadt͡sat'* 'sixteen' and by the use of the adverbs *ochen' khorosho* 'very well' and *neplokho* 'not bad'. In turn 4, G responds with the particle *n-da*. The function of the particle *n-da* in turn 4 is to neutralise if not downgrade the object of assessment that speaker G starts in turn 2. This neutralisation or downgrading the assessment is needed in response to speakers S's positive assessment in turn 3.

Discussion

This paper investigates assessment in Russian; specifically, it examines the use of the lexicosyntactic resources available to the Russian speakers in the evaluative act of assessment and their collateral effects. Table 1 presents a summary of the analysed excerpts for the purpose of identifying the collateral effects of the lexicosyntactic resources available to Russian speakers.

Table 1: Lexicosyntactic resources and their collateral effects

Excerpt No.	The object of assessment	Lexicosyntactic resources	Collateral effects
Excerpt 1	Steinbeck's play	flexible word order, morphological case	assessment emphasis upgrading assessment
		particles (*da, vot*)	by making it emotionally charged co-constructing agreement among the speakers
Except 2	Vit'ka's behaviour	particles (*-to, nu*) flexible word order repetition	assessment emphasis counterbalancing a tragic event
Excerpt 3	child's behaviour	flexible word order particles	intensifying assessment creating assessment agreement
Excerpt 4	acting abilities of an actress	repetition particles (e.g., *oĭ*) flexible word order	intensifying assessment and creating an opportunity for a shared emotion of amusement

| Excerpt 5 | a herring | flexible word order repetition particles (e.g., *ugu*) | assessment agreement assessment closure |
| Excerpt 6 | a dacha | flexible word order repetition particles (e.g., *nda*) | neutralising the object of assessment |

Table 1 shows the following lexicosyntactic resources that are available to speakers of the Russian language: flexible word order, assessment repetition, particles. The data analysis shows that the particles used by the speakers of Russian in the analysed excerpts, such as *da, n-da, to, vot, net, oǐ* and a flexible word order allow the speakers to create the context of shared emotional space and closeness. This allows more to be said with less overtly expressed linguistic means as the omitted arguments and other elided linguistic materials can be recovered from the context. The particles (e.g., the particle *–to*) can emphasise the object of assessment or create a humorous effect (e.g., the particle *oǐ*). In addition, the particles can neutralise the object of assessment or provide closure to the evaluative act of assessment (e.g., the particle *n-da*). The collateral effects of the lexicosyntactic resources available to the speakers of Russian during the evaluative act of assessment make assessment an activity which can be expedited and emphasised by placing the evaluative remark at the beginning of the utterance. The particles make assessment an activity that provides space for shared emotions and affect.

Conclusion

This paper investigates how assessment is done in Russian; specifically, it examines the use of lexicosyntactic resources available to the speakers of Russian in assessment, such as particles and flexible word order. The claim that is made in this paper is that these linguistic resources (i) create a certain context for a social action of assessment and (ii) carry specific collateral or side effects. Since this is the first study on assessment in Russian to the best knowledge of the authors, further studies are needed to continue this line of work in cross-linguistic CA.

Abbreviations

TOP   topic particle
FP   final particle

COP   copula
V   verb
S   subject
X   complement
PRT   particle
CLI   clitic
ACC   Accusative case
PRON   Pronoun

References

1. Bailyn, J. F. (2011), *The syntax of Russian*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Biberauer, T., Holmberg, A., Roberts I., & Sheehan, M. (2009). *Parametric variation: Null subjects in Minimalist theory.* Cambridge University Press.
3. Bogdanova-Beglarian N., Martynenko G., & Sherstinova T. (2015), "The 'One Day of Speech' corpus: Phonetic and syntactic studies of everyday spoken Russian". In Ronzhin A., Potapova R., Fakotakis N. (Eds) *Speech and Computer.* SPECOM 2015. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 9319. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
4. Borger, Y. V. (2004), "Kompleksnyǐ analiz rechevykh aktov negativnoǐ reactsii (na meteriale sovremennykh dramaticheskikh proizvedeniǐ". [*Complex analysis of speech acts of negative reaction (based on the analysis of modern drama)*]. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Tiumensk State University, Russia.
5. Bragina, N., & Sharonov, I. (2019), "'Pedagogical' aggression in Russian everyday communication". *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 23 (4). doi: 10.22363/2312-9182-2019-23-4-975-993. 975-993.
6. Camacho, J. A. (2013), *Null subjects*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Enfield, N. J. (2007), *A grammar of Lao*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
8. Goffman, E. (1967), *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior.* Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
9. Goodwin, C., and Goodwin, M. (1987), "Concurrent operations on talk: Notes on the interactive organization of assessments". *IPRA Papers in Pragmatics, 1*(1), 1-54.
10. Hakulinen, A., & Sorjonen, M-L. (2016), "Designing utterances for action: Verb repeat responses to assessment". In M. Haakana, M. Laakso, & J. Lindström (Eds.), *Talk in interaction: Comparative dimensions*. Helsinki: Studia Fennica Linguistica. 152-180.
11. Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2013), "The conversation analytic approach to transcription". In J. Sidnell and T. Stivers (Eds.) *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Blackwell Publishing. 57-76.
12. Heritage, J., and Paymond, G. (2005), "The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction". *Social Psychology Quarterly, 68*(1), 15-38.

13. Mey, J. L. (2006), "Pragmatics: Overview". In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics,* 2nd ed. Elsevier. 51-62.

14. The National Corpus of Russian. (2019), Retrieved from http://www.ruscorpora. ru/new/en/.

15. Pomerantz, A. (1984), "Agreeing and disagreeing with assessment: Some features of preferred/ dispreferred turn shapes". In M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.) *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis.* Cambridge University Press. 57-101.

16. Sacks, H. (1995), *Lectures on conversation.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

17. Sidnell, J. (2009a), "Language specific resources in repair and assessment". In J Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspective*. Cambridge University Press. 303-320.

18. Sidnell, J. (2009b), *Conversation analysis: An introduction.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

19. Sidnell, J. (2009c), "Comparative perspectives in conversation analysis". In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives*. Cambridge University Press. 3-27.

20. Sidnell, J., & Enfield, N. J. (2012), "Language diversity and social action: A third locus of linguistic relativity". *Current Anthropology, 53*(3), 302-333.

21. Sorjonen, M.-L., and Hakulinen, A. (2009), "Alternative responses to assessments". In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives*. 281-303. Cambridge University Press.

22. Tanaka, H. (2016). "Lexico-grammatical structures of agreements with assessments in English conversation: From a Japanese perspective". *Journal of Pragmatics 100*, 8-24.

23. Vepreva, I., Shalina, I., Matveeva, T. (2019), "Russian colloquial speech: Aspects of research and relevant issues". *Quaestio Rossica,* 7(3), 919–936. 10.15826/qr.2019.3.415.

24. Vlasyan, G. & Kozhukhova, I. (2019), "Formal and informal Russian invitation: Context and politeness strategies". *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 23 (4), 994-1013. doi: 10.22363/2312-9182-2019-23-4-994-1013.

25. Zemskaia, E. A., and Kapanadze, L.A. (Eds.) (1978), *Russkaia razgovornaia rech: Texty. (Russian spoken language: Collection of texts)*. Moskva: Nauka.

Ирина Ленчук
Амер Ахмед
Универзитет у Дофару, Висока школа умјетности и примијењених наука
Одсјек за енглески језик и књижевност

ВОТ ÉТО ДА! НЕКЕ НАПОМЕНЕ О ВРЕДНОВАЊУ У РУСКОМ ЈЕЗИКУ

Резиме

Чланак истражује вредновање у руском језику као врсту друштвене активности, користећи приступ лингвистичкој релативности, гдје разноликост лексичко-синтаксичких ресурса која је доступна говорницима природних језика истиче различите споредне ефекте у друштвеном чину вредновања. Анализа одабраних узорака из корпуса руског говорног језика која је представљена у овом раду показала је да одређени лексичко-синтаксички ресурси који су доступни говорницима руског језика, као што је флексибилан ред ријечи и партикуле (нпр. *да, ну, вот, то*), имају специфичне споредне ефекте. Поред тога што доводе до слагања приликом вредновања, ови лексичко-синтаксички ресурси (1) креирају контекст блискости у којем се више може рећи кориштењем мање изражајних лингвистичких средстава, и (2) интензивирају друштвени чин оцјењивања тако што чине да он буде мање набијен емоцијама.

▸ *Кључне ријечи*: говорни језик, студије колоквијалног говора, вредновање као друштвена активност, лингвистичка релативност.