

Research Article

Open Access

Julija Baranova*

Other-initiated repair in Russian

DOI 10.1515/opli-2015-0019

Received September 30, 2014; accepted June 23, 2015

Abstract: This article describes the interactional patterns and linguistic structures associated with other-initiated repair, as observed in a corpus of video-recorded conversations in Russian. In the discussion of various repair cases special attention is given to the modifications that the trouble source turn undergoes in response to an open versus a restricted repair initiation. Speakers often modify their problematic turn in multiple ways at ones when responding to an open repair initiation. They can alter the word order of the problematic turn, change prosodic contour of the utterance, omit redundant elements and add more specific ones. By contrast, restricted repair initiations usually receive specific repair solutions that target only one problem at a time.

Keywords: other-initiated repair, modifications, Russian.

One basic goal of any interaction is mutual understanding. Getting the recipient to hear and understand what you are trying to convey is, however, not an easy task to achieve. Problems of understanding are common in interaction and require an effective tool to restore the progressivity of the conversation. Conversational repair is the basic process through which it is achieved (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). The main goal of this article is to provide a descriptive overview of practices of other-initiated repair in Russian. Repair involves coordinated work between the interactants (Clark, 1996; Robinson, 2014; Schegloff, 2006). To demonstrate that it indeed is a joint activity I will discuss in some detail how the speakers of the trouble source turn modify their original message when responding to the repair initiation.

1 The Russian language

Russian belongs to the Indo-European language family. It is the first language to approximately 150 million people in Russian Federation and outside its borders. While several reference grammars of Russian are available (Pulkina, 1984; Timberlake, 2004; Wade, 2000) studies on the use of Russian language in spontaneous discourse are relatively scarce (but see Bolden, 2003, 2008, 2012, 2013; Bolden & Guimaraes, 2012; Robinson & Bolden, 2010).

The basic constituent order in Russian is SVO (Hawkins, 1983; Tomlin, 1986), although in practice word order is relatively flexible. Russian has little interrogative syntax. Interrogation is mostly achieved by high pitch and the use of interrogative particles or question words. Russian verbs inflect for tense, person, number, and on certain occasions for gender. Russian nouns differ in gender (feminine, masculine, and neuter), number (singular and plural), and case (six cases). Adjectives are usually placed in front of the noun and agree with it in gender, number, and case. This means that Russian verbs and adjectives contain a lot of information about the subject and often make subject pronouns redundant.

Article note: Part of a special issue on other-initiated repair across languages, edited by Mark Dingemanse and N. J. Enfield.

*Corresponding author: Julija Baranova: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, E-mail: julija.baranova@mpi.nl

2 Data collection and corpus

The corpus on which this work is based was constructed in accordance with a set of guidelines developed by and for the members of the comparative project reported on in this special issue (Dingemanse & Enfield, 2015). Here are the key properties of the data:

Table 1: Key properties of the data collected for the studies in this issue

-
- Recordings were made on video.
 - Informed consent was obtained from those who participated.
 - Target behaviour was spontaneous conversation among people who know each other well (family, friends, neighbours, acquaintances), in highly familiar environments (homes, village spaces, work areas).
 - Participants were not responding to any instruction, nor were they given a task—they were simply aware that the researcher was collecting recordings of language usage in everyday life.
 - From multiple interactions that were collected in the larger corpus, the selection for analysis in this study was of a set of 10-minute segments, taken from as many different interactions as possible (allowing that some interactions are sampled more than once), to ensure against bias from over-representation of particular interactions or speakers.
-

The corpus underlying the work reported here consists of eleven different recordings made by the author during three field trips to Russia in 2011 and 2012. The recordings took place on several locations in the region of Chelyabinsk. The total sampled recording time was 3h 40min. The length of the sample per recording varied from 10 to 40 minutes. The amount of other-initiated repair sequences per 10-minute sample ranged between 2 and 26, showing that other-initiated repair is a frequent feature of conversation.

3 Sequential structure of other-initiated repair

Participants in a conversation encounter problems of speaking, hearing, and understanding on a regular basis. Those problems suspend the progressivity of the discourse and have to be addressed, or repaired, before the conversation can go on (Jefferson, 1987; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2000). Several repair types have been described (Schegloff et al., 1977). This article is concerned with the type where the speaker of the trouble source turn is the one who provides the repair solution. The repair is, however, initiated by the other participant. This is called other-initiated repair (OIR).

Initiating repair does only half of the job. The trouble also has to be successfully repaired. As will be discussed later, the speaker of the trouble source turn often modifies it in various ways to restore mutual understanding. So, what are the practices for other-initiation of repair in Russian, and how do repair initiations lead to repair solutions?

3.1 Minimal OIR sequence

Often a single repair initiation is sufficient to solve the problem of hearing, speaking, or understanding in a conversation so that the talk can continue. The result is a minimal repair sequence that typically consists of three parts: a trouble source turn (T-1), a repair initiation (T0), and a repair solution (T+1) (cf. Bolden, 2011; Enfield et al., 2013). See Extract 1 for an illustration.

Speaker A asks recipient B a question, but B does not immediately provide an answer. After a pause, B initiates an interjection-type repair with *a:?* ‘Huh’. In response to this repair initiation speaker A offers a repair solution containing a full repeat of A’s original turn. Two additional elements are added to this repetition: the head pointing and the word *etaj* ‘this one’. These elements target the person reference and narrow its scope from any female person to a female who is currently in the apartment (Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh, 2004). Participant B tacitly accepts this repair solution as satisfactory by providing an answer to the question at line 5.

Extract 1. 20110807_Family_evening_2_325846

- 1 A Yej skol'ka ↓let ta T-1
She-DAT how many-Q years PCL
How old is she?
- 2 (0.5)
- 3 B a:? TO
INTJ
Huh?
- 4 A ((head pointing)) Yej skol'ka ↓let ta (etaj)= T+1
She-DAT how many-Q years PCL this one-ACC-F
How old is she, this one?
- 5 B =OJ. (0.9) Dvatsat' tr^i shto li (yej)
INTJ Twenty three what PCL she-DAT
Oh (0.9) (She's) twenty three or so

3.2 Non-minimal OIR sequences

An adequate repair solution is not always achieved within one repair sequence. It may be that multiple repair initiations are required before the conversation can resume its course (Enfield, Drew, & Baranova, forthcoming). The structure of a non-minimal OIR sequence can be quite complicated, where each of the three OIR elements –T-1, T0, or T+1– can contain a trouble source. Extract 2 illustrates a sequence with two successive repair initiations, where the first repair solution becomes the trouble source turn of the second repair initiation (i.e. T+1a becomes T-1b). Typically, each repair initiation in a non-minimal sequence is more specific than the previous, just like the solutions that they receive.

Extract 2. 20110114_family_visit_2_328600.

- 1 A Mashka termas biriot.
Name-DIM thermos takes
Mashka is bringing a thermos
- 2 (0.3)
- 3 A terma-chajnik ana skazala kakoj-ta T-1
Thermo-kettle she said some-M
Some thermo kettle, she said
- 4 C nu: vo:t [() s nami
PCL PCL with us
Well () with us
- 5 B [kto,
Who-Q T0a
Who?
- 6 A Mashka T+1a=T-1b
Name-DIM
Mashka
- 7 (0.4)
- 8 B Kakaja. T0b
Which-F
Which (Mashka)?
- 9 (0.3)
- 10 A Palevaja ani gavariu zhe s nami yedut T+1b
Last name they say-1SG PCL with us go-PL
Polevaya. I'm telling you, they are coming with us.

11 (0.5)
 12 B bli:n ()
 INTJ
 Damn () ((starts eating food on his plate))

The first repair initiation in line 5, *ktō*. ‘who’, obviously targets the person reference *Mashka* from line 1. Speaker A apparently assumes that B’s problem is the one of hearing. It can be inferred from the fact that speaker A repeats the name without further clarification. This repetition does not result in B’s recognition of the person. Speaker B then initiates another repair, a more specific one, *kakaja* ‘Which (Mashka)’. Finally, speaker A provides the last name of the person *Polevaya*. This restores mutual understanding between the speakers, as shown by the fact that speaker B is able to respond with an expression of annoyance (line 12) at the news that the person in question will join them on the family trip. Both repair solutions in this extract are references to the same person, but the latter is more specific than the previous, securing mutual understanding.

4 Formats for other-initiation of repair

The extracts discussed so far demonstrate that there are different ways to initiate repair. In this section I provide an overview of the forms that speakers of Russian use in T0 position. My interest lies not only in the specific linguistic resources that are used by speakers of Russian for formulating other-initiation of repair, but also in the contextual principles for selection of one type or form over another, and the kinds of functional outcomes that each type or form can have (that is, the repair operations that the forms elicit in T+1).

Drawing on previous work two main types of repair initiator are distinguished: open and restricted repair initiators, also known as “open-class” versus “closed-class” (Drew, 1997; Benjamin, 2013, pp. 19–66). The main difference between these two is the degree of specificity with which they locate the problem in the prior turn, T-1. Open repair initiators like *a:?* ‘huh?’ from Extract 1 do not target any specific element from the trouble source turn. Repetition (with or without modification) appears to be the most common repair solution in response to open type repair initiators (Drew, 1997). Restricted repair initiators specify the problem by locating it more precisely, like *kto?* ‘who?’ in Extract 2, which locates it in the person reference. Each of these types of repair initiators can be further divided into subtypes as represented in Table 2.

Table 2: Some basic format types for other-initiation of repair

Open. ‘Open’ repair initiators are requests that indicate some problem with the prior talk while leaving open what or where the problem is exactly.

- *Interjection.* An interjection with questioning intonation.
- *Question-word.* An item from the larger paradigm of question words in the language. Most usually a thing interrogative, sometimes a manner interrogative.
- *Formulaic.* Expressions not incorporating interjection or question-word, often managing social relations or enacting politeness.

Restricted. Restricted repair initiators restrict the problem space by locating or characterising the problem in more detail.

- *Request type (asking for specification/clarification).* Typically done by content question-words, often in combination with partial repetition.
- *Offer type (asking for confirmation).* Typically done by a repetition or rephrasing of all or part of T-1.
- *Alternative question.* Repair initiator that invites a selection from among alternatives.

Within restricted, *external* repair initiators address problems about unexpressed elements of T-1; this ‘external’ function can be performed by all of the listed format types for ‘restricted’.

The following table shows the relative frequencies of these types in the Russian corpus analysed in this study:

Table 3 Types of repair initiators and their frequency in the Russian corpus

Type	Subtype	Frequency (n=204)	Proportion
Open	Interjection	27	13%
	Question-word	8	4%
	Formulaic	0	—
Restricted	Request (seeking specification)	65	32%
	Offer (seeking confirmation)	98	48%
	Alternative question	6	3%

4.1 Open formats

Repair initiators of the open type do not unambiguously specify the trouble source in a turn (Drew 1997). The entire turn or just one of its elements might be problematic. This is reflected in the repair solution, T+1, that these repair initiators receive. They are often partial or full repeats of T-1. Verbatim repeats of the original turn in T+1 position are rare. After an open OIR speakers of the trouble source turn alter their message in multiple ways to make sure it results in mutual understanding the second time. The trouble source turn and its redoing (the repair solution) can have distinct phonetic forms (Curl, 2005). Repair solutions can also feature changes in word order, additions of new elements and omissions of dispensable ones (Schegloff, 2004).

4.1.1 Interjection strategy

The interjection strategy is the most frequent open format observed in the corpus of informal Russian. Interjection type repair initiators can be articulated with the mouth open or closed. The open-mouth variant is transcribed as *a:?* (see Extracts 3, 4, 6, 7) and the close-mouth variant as *m?* (see Extracts 5, 8, 9). Both variants are produced with a rising final pitch. The open-mouth interjection seems to be more common. Phonetically, it is a low central unrounded vowel, as in many other languages (Dingemanse, Torreira, & Enfield, 2013). The advantage of such articulation is that it requires minimal effort. The closed-mouth variant can be considered a reduced version of *a:?* and requires even less effort: the lips are closed and the air is forced through the nose forming the *m?* sound. This variant is usually encountered in situations where people are in close proximity to each other. In the remaining of this section I will list the strategies speakers apply to modify the trouble source turn in the T+1 position.

Extract 3. 20110807_Family_evening_1_616380

- 1 A (vam) uhm zapros pirichislili?
 you-PL-DAT request transferred-PL-PFV
Have they transferred (you) (your) request?
- 2 (0.6)
- 3 B da:
 yes
Yes
- 4 (4.3)
- 5 A Mne tozhe tyshiu dvesti. T-1
 I-DAT also thousand-ACC two hundred
(They transferred) 1200 to me too
- 6 (0.9)

- 7 B a:
INTJ
Huh? TO
- 8 A ^Mne tozhe tyshiu dvesti T+1
I-DAT also thousand-ACC two hundred
(*They transferred*) 1200 to me too
- 9 B pachimu.
Why-Q
Why.

The repair solution in this case is a verbatim repeat of the trouble source turn. Besides the slightly higher initial pitch of the repair solution, the phonetic contour of this turn is very similar to the original message at line 5. Such repetitions are characteristic for turns that are disjunctive from previous discourse (Curl, 2005). At line 1 speaker A asks B a questions related to a bank transfer that B was expecting. B responds to the question with a confirmative *da*: ‘yes’ (line 3). Speaker A does not take this response up for full 4 seconds. While A’s question at line 1 is focusing on B, A’s utterance at line 5 shift the focus of the talk to A herself. Verbatim repetition with a higher initial pitch suggests that speaker A treats her own turn at line 5 as deviant from the previous discourse.

The following extract is another example of repair initiated using an interjection. This time the solution is not a full but a partial repeat containing only some elements from T-1. In Extract 4 speaker A is a girl who is informing her relatives, B and C, that she will go on the family trip the next day. This news is surprising to them because just some minutes before the girl told them she would in fact *not* go on the trip.

Extract 4. 20120114_family_visit_1_463680

- 1 A ((enters the room)) paye:du ya zaftra. T-1
go-1SG-FUT-PFV I tomorrow
I will go tomorrow
- 2 B a? = TO
INTJ
Huh?
- 3 C =paye[di-
will go-(2SG)
(*You*) will go
- 4 A [paye::du T+1
go1SG-FUT-PFV
I will go
- 5 (0.5)

The sequence starts with speaker A telling her relatives, B and C, a surprising news, her decision to go on the family trip after all. This news refutes recipients’ assumption that A will not go. In T-1 she marks the word *paye:du* as it is the newsworthy part of her message. Recipients display lack of understanding by initiating repair at lines 2 (and partially at line 3). T+1 only repeats a part of T-1; the omitted material is partly redundant as person and future tense are encoded on the verb *paye::du* (line 4)¹ (Schegloff, 2004).

Besides omission of redundant elements, repair solution can also contain additional ones that make the original trouble source turn more specific (Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh, 2004). Extract 5 starts with speaker A complimenting speaker B on a salad that B offered to A earlier in the conversation.

¹ A reviewer suggests that T+1 may additionally be doing insisting, in response to the surprise at this departure from prior information.

Extract 5. 20110804_Colleagues_celebration_1_1097300

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|
| 1 | A | Fkusnyj tiotia Nad'
Tasty-ADJ-M aunt Nadya-VOC
<i>It's tasty, auntie Nadya</i> | T-1 |
| 2 | B | m?
INTJ
<i>Hm?</i> | T0 |
| 3 | A | Fkusnyj s rybaj
Tasty-ADJ-M with fish-INSTR
<i>(it's) tasty, the one with the fish</i> | T+1 |

In this extract, repair solution contains a repetition of only some elements from the trouble source turn. The address term *tiotia Nad'* 'auntie Nadya' is omitted. Its function of addressee selection is fulfilled and its repetition becomes redundant (Schegloff, 2004). Another element, *s rybaj* 'the one with the fish', is, however, added. This extra information makes clearer what exactly the word *fkusnyj* 'tasty' refers to. The recipient B has then more information available to infer that A is talking about the salad that A is eating.

Additional elements do not necessarily have to be verbal ones. So is additional information in Extract 6 a combination of verbal and nonverbal materials.

Extract 6. 20110821_Country_A2_749120

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----|
| 1 | A | nu imeyet v vidu adezhda [spetsa:l'naja
PCL has-PRS in mind clothes-F special-F
<i>He means, special clothes</i> | T-1 |
| 2 | B | [a:?
INTJ
<i>Huh</i> | T0 |
| 3 | A | SPETS ADE:ZHDA.
Special clothes
<i>Camo clothes ((touches her own arm on several places as if demonstrating camouflaging spots on her shirt))</i> | T+1 |
| 4 | B | a::::
Intj
<i>Oh</i> | |

Speaker A omits a part of the trouble source turn, which is *imeyet v vidu* 'he means'. This part is a preface used to clarify that speaker A is giving an explanation on something said by a different speaker. This preface can be omitted from the repair solution since it conveys information that is also available from the context (Schegloff, 2004). Importantly, speaker A replaces a quite general description *adezhda spetsal'naja* 'special clothing' by a more specific expression *spets adezhda* (Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh, 2004). This expression is an abbreviated version of the previous description but its meaning is narrower - 'camo clothes'. Furthermore, speaker A adds a gestural component to the original message. With gestures speaker A "creates" camouflaging spots on her clothing. This modification secures B's understanding that A is talking about special clothing with camouflaging spots on it. Finally, the repair solution is pronounced slightly louder than the trouble source turn, most likely to prevent any problems of hearing from arising on the second saying. This repair solution successfully results in B's understanding of A's turn. B's response *a::::* can be considered as a change-of-the-state token similar to the English 'Oh' (Heritage, 1984).

The following three extracts will demonstrate another strategy that people use when constructing a repair solution for an open class repair initiator. This strategy involves modifications of the word order, also known as scrambling (Ross, 1967). Word order modifications are pragmatically meaningful since they allow the speaker to foreground some elements and not others.

Extracts 7, 8, and 9 are taken from the same conversation between two girlfriends. In Extract 7 they are telling each other how they sterilises jars to store food for the winter period.

Extract 7. 20110807_Family_evening_2_432717

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|
| 1 | A | a ty kak eta: (0.5) stiri[lizu:esh banki
PCL you-SG how-Q PCL sterilise-2SG jars
<i>How (do) you (0.5) sterilise the jars?</i> | T-1 |
| 2 | B | [a:?
INTJ
<i>Huh?</i> | T0 |
| 3 | | (1.1) | |
| 4 | A | banki kak sti[rilizu-
Jars how-Q sterilise-(2SG)
<i>The jars how (do) yo- stelise</i> | T+1 |
| 5 | B | [vo:n
There
<i>There ((points to the pan in the kitchen))</i> | |

A's turn at line 2 is incomplete when B initiates repair using *a:?* at line 2. So, this repair initiation targets the incomplete part of the turn and not what comes after. However, the repair solution starts with the part of line 1 that A articulates after the repair is initiated. More specifically, T+1 starts with the last element of line 1, the word *banki* 'jars'.

Another word order modification is demonstrated in Extract 8. The same women are now talking about an event in B's family.

Extract 8. 20110807_Family_evening_2_289393

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|
| 1 | A | Eta u (nejo) kagda yubil[ey?
PCL with she-GEN when-Q jubilee
<i>When is (her) jubilee?</i> | T-1 |
| 2 | B | [m?
INTJ
<i>Huh?</i> | T0 |
| 3 | | (0.2) | |
| 4 | A | Yubiley-(ta) kakova u nej[o?
Jubilee (PCL) which-Q-GEN with she-GEN
<i>Her jubilee, on which (date) (is it)?</i> | T+1 |
| 5 | B | [f subo:tu
In Saturday-ACC
<i>On Saturday</i> | |

Again, the repair is initiated in overlap with the last element of the trouble source turn. This element is subsequently up fronted in the repair solution. Besides scrambling the word order speaker A makes the trouble source turn more specific by replacing the question word *kagda* 'when' with *kakova* 'on which (date)'. This makes clear that speaker A is going for a date.

Although the previous two examples demonstrate how nouns are shifted up front in T+1, the following case shows that a verb can be up fronted too.

Extract 9. 20110807_Family_evening_2_944867a

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|
| 1 | A | Ty vishniu zakatyvala ili chio?=
You-SG cherry-ACC roll-PST-IMFV-F or what-Q
<i>Did you make cherries or what?</i> | T-1 |
| 2 | B | =m?
INTJ
<i>Huh?</i> | T0 |
| 3 | | (0.4) | |
| 4 | A | Zakatyvala chio vishniu?
Roll-PST-IMFV-F what-Q cherry-ACC
<i>(You) made what cherries?</i> | T+1 |
| 5 | | (0.1) | |
| 6 | B | Mali:na
Raspberry-NOM
<i>(it's) raspberry</i> | |

As in the previous examples, the repair initiator in Extract 9 is of the open type. Yet, instead of a full repeat, T+1 is a partial repeat of the trouble source turn where the verb *zakatyvala* (here means ‘made’) is up fronted. In contrast with the previous two examples there is no overlap in Extract 9 and the repair is initiated in the clear.

Scrambling the word order of an utterance can be used in Russian to encode information structure (Dyakonova, 2004). An overlap might also be involved in the fronting of some elements from T-1 as observed in Extracts 7 and 8. The strategy of word order modifications is not limited to Russian. However, Russian language allows such modifications without obvious intonational alterations.

4.1.2 Question word strategy

The question word used in the Russian sample to initiate open repair is *shto*/что and its short version *chio*/чѐ (for English see e.g. Benjamin, 2013b, pp. 67–139). Both can be translated in English as ‘what’. *Shto* is relatively rare in the conversational corpora on which this article draws.

Extract 10. 20120114_family_visit_1_1111040

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|
| 1 | A | Luk yest' u vas?
Onion is with you-PL-GEN
<i>Do you have onions</i> | T-1 |
| 2 | B | Shto?
What-Q
<i>What?</i> | T0 |
| 3 | A | zilionyj luk (yest' u vas)
Green-M onion-M is with you-PL-GEN
<i>Do (you have) green onions?</i> | T+1 |

The open repair initiation at line 2 provides speaker A an opportunity to refine her reference by replacing the reference to the general category *luk* ‘onions’ with a more specific member of that group *zilionyj luk* ‘green onions’. The recalibrated reference in T+1 narrows the scope of the reference offered in T-1 (Lerner, Bolden, Hepburn, & Mandelbaum, 2012).

The following example demonstrates the use of *chio*/чѐ as an open repair initiator. The sequence is between a child and his grandfather. The child is drawing grandfather’s attention to the fact that he is being filmed implying that the grandfather should watch his language.

Extract 11. 20120202_cooking_3_309900

- 1 A Tebia zhe ka:mira snimaet T-1
 you-SG-ACC PCL camera film-3SG-PRS
The camera is filming you
- 2 B chio? T0
 What-Q
What?
- 3 (0.4)
- 4 A kamira snimaet T+1
 Camera film-3SG-PRS
The camera is filming
- 5 (0.5)
- 6 B nu snima:et da i snimaet
 PCL film-3SG-PRS PCL and film-3SG
So it films and let it film
- 7 (1.0)
- 8 B a ja tut matirius' da?
 PCL I here curse-1SG-PRS yes
And I'm cursing here, am I?

The repair solution is a partial repeat of the trouble source turn. *Tebia* ('you') can be inferred from the context and is omitted in T+1. In general, question word strategy does not differ much from the interjection strategy. Both *huh?* and *what?* leave the nature of the problem in T-1 open to the recipient's interpretation. The modifications that are observed in T+1 are also similar.

4.1.3 Other open strategies

As shown in Table 3, the only open repair strategies observed in the Russian sample were interjections and question words. Formulaic repair initiators as English *sorry* or *pardon* described by Drew (1997; see also Kitzinger 2013) were not encountered. The low frequency of such apologetic repair initiators was also demonstrated for English and other languages (Robinson 2006, Dingemanse, Blythe, Dirksmeyer 2014). Russian has at least two potential apology-based formats: *prastite* and *izvinite*. To show that an apologetic format does exist in Russian, I provide here one example taken from the National Corpus of Russian². This corpus contains transcripts from different types of discourse varying from spontaneous casual speech to movie scripts. Extract 12 is taken from a movie script. The original transcript of this example is kept, only the English translations are added.

Extract 12. Aleksandr Orlov, Anatoly Stepanov, "The woman who sings", movie (1978)

- 1 A ИЗВИНИТЕ.
 Sorry
(I'm) sorry
- 2 B Маша.
 Name
Masha.
- 3 A Валентин Сергеич. T-1
 First Name Patronymic
Valentin Sergeich

² <http://www.ruscorpora.ru/en>

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|
| 4 | B | Простите?
Sorry
<i>Sorry?</i> | T0 |
| 5 | A | Сергеевич.
Patronymic
<i>Sergeevich</i> | T+1 |
| 6 | B | а / очень приятно / Валентин Сергееч.
INTJ very nice First Name Patronymic
<i>Oh very nice (to meet you) Valentin Sergeich</i> | |
| 7 | A | Мне тоже.
I-DAT too
<i>For me too</i> | |

Despite the fact that this example is not from spontaneous speech as the other examples in this paper, it demonstrates the existence of a formulaic repair initiation format in Russian. Conversation analytic research of this format will be necessary to understand its interactional functions and properties.

In this section I have demonstrated that a response to an open repair initiator does not limit the speaker to the full or partial repeat of T-1. Speakers can modify their original message in various ways. They can alter the word order of the trouble source turn, change prosodic contour of the utterance, omit redundant elements and add more specific ones. This shows that speakers put much effort in making themselves clear the second time around in response to an open repair initiator. Open repair initiators are produced relatively effortlessly, but they do not specify what or where the problem is. In response to this, speakers attempt to repair multiple possible problems at once in T+1.

4.2 Restricted formats

The restricted category includes repair initiators that make the source of trouble specific. Here they are divided into two categories: request type and offer type.

4.2.1 Request subtype of restricted format

Request type repair initiators single out a specific component of the trouble source turn by means of a content question word such as who, what, and where. These question words target references to persons, things, locations, and so on. In Extract 13 the target of the repair initiator is a person reference 'her' in line 1.

Extract 13. 20120114_family_visit_1_18360

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|
| 1 | A | Vaz'mite zaftra ejo=
Take-PL-IMP tomorrow she-ACC
<i>Take her tomorrow</i> | T-1 |
| 2 | C | =da:=
Yes
<i>Yes</i> | |
| 3 | B | =kavo?=
Who-ACC
<i>Whom?</i> | T0 |
| 4 | C | =Ta:niu:
Name-ACC
<i>Tanya</i> | T+1 |

- 5 A =Tani[u
Name-ACC
Tanya
- 6 B [Taniu.
Name-ACC
Tanya

Speaker B's restricted repair initiator *kavo* 'whom' (line 3) results in the replacement of an ambiguous and unspecific person reference (*ejo* 'her') into a more specific one: the person name *Tanya*. The pronominal reference is ambiguous because it occurs in the context where participants have just moved from one discourse topic onto another. The repair initiation targets only the person reference, and is treated as such in the repair solutions offered by speakers C and A (lines 4 and 5). Note that the elements from T-1 that are not targeted by the repair initiator are omitted from T+1. This is in contrast with the repair solutions for open class repair initiators, where T+1 contained various modifications targeting multiple potential problems. So, the more specific the repair initiator is, the more specific its solution.

The following example also involves a problem related to a person reference. In this extract two women are talking about nurses who work at the local thermal station. Speaker A uses the standard format of the name *Lena*, whereas speaker B uses the diminutive *Lenka* to refer to the same person.

Extract 14. 20110821_Country_A2_621600

- 1 A a tam kto?
PCL there who-Q
Who (works) there?
- 2 (0.8)
- 3 A Lenka? T-1
Name-DIM
Lenka?
- 4 (1.5)
- 5 B tam byvaet i e:ta sa:maye,=
There is-IMPV-PRS and DEM
There is (sometimes) this...
- 6 B =m- pachimu Lena.
why-Q Name
Hm- Why Lena.
- 7 (0.6)
- 8 B K[akaja Lena.= T0
Which-F-NOM Name
Which Lena?
- 9 A [nu::
PCL
Well
- 10 A = kak ejo.
How-Q she-ACC
What's her (name)
- 11 (0.1)
- 12 A Zemskaya ta T+1
Last name PCL
Zemskaya.
- 13 (0.6)

14 B byva:et Le:na
 is-IMPFV-PRS Name
there's (sometimes) Lena

In this case, speakers A and B talk about the nurses that do regular check-ups at the thermal station. Both have their own sources of evidence for this. A has access to this information through her husband who currently works at the station and receives these check-ups, while B is familiar with some nurses in the town. The conversation shows how these different sources of knowledge result in a negotiation of epistemic authority (Heritage, 2013; Labov & Fanshel, 1977; Raymond & Heritage, 2006). At line 6 speaker B seems to challenge A's suggestion that someone named Lena is working at the station by initiating a why-interrogative (Bolden & Robinson, 2011). When no response comes from A, speaker B backs down from her challenge by initiating repair instead (line 8). The restricted repair initiation, *kakaja Lena* 'which Lena?', results in a successful repair solution, namely the last name of the person in question. Note that speaker B does not use the same person reference for the nurse as speaker A (lines 6, 8, 14). While speaker A uses the diminutive *Lenka*, speaker B uses the standard format of the name *Lena*. A possible explanation for this is that speaker A, due to her relationship with Lena, is in a better position to call her by the diminutive *Lenka*, while speaker B is not. By using the diminutive, speaker A demonstrates her personal acquaintance with Lena and claims her authority on the matter (Stivers, 2007).

Russian question words like *kavo* (Extract 13) and *kakaja* (Extract 14) bear gender and/or case agreement with the person or object that they refer to. This provides Russians with more ways to implement restricted repair. By this I mean that restricted repair initiations in Russian can be more specific about the troublesome referent than, for example, their equivalents in English.



In all examples discussed so far the trouble source was in the verbal component of the utterance. On some occasions it is the nonverbal behaviour that is problematic and occasions a repair initiation. Extract 16 illustrates such a situation. It features two successive repair initiations targeting a piece of non-verbal behaviour: first an open repair initiator, then a restricted one. The sequence starts with a woman (C) trying to convince her daughter (B) to do some groceries. During this interaction girl's grandmother (A) is collecting some sweets wrappers that are lying on the table. The granddaughter is also holding sweets wrappers in her hands. With the same hand with which she was collecting the wrappers, the grandmother produces a tapping gesture on the table, right in front of her granddaughter.

Extract 15. 20120113_family_cooking_A1_542060

- 1 A ((Taps on the table four times)) T-1
- 2 C ty zhe eshio ni pashla,
You-SG PCL yet NEG go-PST-PFV
You're not going yet ((meaning: to some different place where B has to be))
- 3 B [Choa? T0a
What-Q
What?
- 4 A [((taps on the table six times)) T+1a
- 5 B Choa ((taps on the table two times)) T0b
What-Q
What {do you mean by tapping}?
- 6 A [((holds finger in the same place for 0.4 seconds, then retracts))
- 7 [bumashki palosh T+1b
Papers-DIM put-PFV-IMP
Lay down the (sweets) wrappers {here}
- 8 B ((lays down the sweets wrappers))
- 9 B tsk ()
((Tongue click)) ()

In line 1, grandmother (A) makes a request for her granddaughter (B) by means of repetitious tapping on the table. B produces an open repair initiator, *chioa* 'what', in line 3. This is different from *chio* described earlier in terms of the length and prosody, which makes the question word more marked and contributes to it sounding as a complaint. In overlap with this repair initiation, grandmother repeats her gesture. Then speaker B produces an upgraded repair initiator: *chioa* combined with a tapping gesture. By combining a verbal question word with the non-verbal repetition of A's visible behaviour, this communicative move functions as a restricted type repair initiator: "what {do you mean by tapping}?" (line 5). Adding the gestural component to the repair initiator excludes the possibility that granddaughter's problem is based on not being able to perceive the gesture. This limits grandmother's choice for a repair solution. Since the granddaughter indicated that the gesture was perceived, another repetition of the gesture would not solve the problem of understanding. The grandmother provides a repair solution that is more explicit: she verbalises her request in lines 7 while holding her finger on the table. The granddaughter now complies but produces a click with her tongue in line 8 that expresses her disapproval of the unclear request.

4.2.2 Offer subtype of restricted format

Offer-type repair initiators are polar questions that put forward a possible solution for confirmation or disconfirmation.

Extract 16 features two female relatives who live in different towns. Speaker A is telling B that she had recently met a man from B's town. The man asked to say hello to B's son. The identity of the man is not immediately clear to B.

Extract 16. 20110821_Country_A2_165158

- 1 A Privet emu piridavayte. Gena, gavarit, minia zavut. T-1
Hello him-DAT give-IMP-IMPV-2PL Name say-3SG I-ACC call-3SG
'Say hello to him'. 'My name is Gena', he said.
- 2 B Gena? T0
Name
Gena?

- 3 A Da. T+1
 yes
 Yes

The repair solution in this case is a simple confirmation *da* ‘yes’. However, repair initiators seeking confirmation do not always receive simple yes/no answers. A repetition of the candidate understanding with declarative intonation is also possible in Russian as shown in Extract 17.

Extract 17. 20110821_Country_A2_411600

- 1 A Ni budut ani bol’she zdes’. =
 NEG will-FUT they more here
They won’t be (living) here anymore
- 2 A =U ix doch eh vyshla zamuzh,=
 With they-GEN daughter uhm got married-F-PFV
Their daughter uhm got married,
- 3 = radila. i vot nada, payedut tuda T-1
 get a child-PST=PFV-F and PCL need-MOD go-FUT-PFV there
had a child and now they need, they will go there
- 4 B v Azjorsk? T0
 to Name town
To Ozyorsk?
- 5 A V Azjorsk. T+1
 to Name town
To Ozyorsk

Based on the limited number of cases it is difficult to state what the difference is between a yes/no answer in T+1 compared to confirmatory repetition. In this particular case, speaker A has trouble retrieving the city name before the repair is initiated. This is evident from the underspecified place reference *tuda* ‘there’ at line 3. Speaker B then initiates repair at line 4 by means of a candidate understanding, offering the city name that A could not produce. Speaker A is now able to produce the correct city name and she does so at line 5. At the same time she is confirming recipient’s guess.

To summarise this section, restricted repair initiators are precise in locating a problematic element in the trouble source turn. This allows the repair solutions to be specific as well, targeting only the problematic element from T-1. This is in contrast with the elaborate repair solutions that open repair initiators usually receive.

5 Morphosyntactic devices involved in OIR sequences

The practice of repair employs grammatical resources available in the language. After all, a repair initiation is often a question and a repair solution is its answer. In this section, I will discuss some of the morphosyntactic devices that can be encountered in repair initiations and repair solutions.

5.2.1 Practices involved in T0

For the Russian sample, two particles were encountered in the T0 position. Their use in Russian is, however, much broader and is not limited to repair sequences only.

Both particles that I will discuss in this section were found in offer type repair initiators that make confirmation relevant. One such particle is *to/to* (pronounced as *ta*), whose use is illustrated in Extracts 18 and 19.

Extract 18. 20110817_Niece_1_946272

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|
| 1 | A | Ani uyezhtiali
They go away—PST-3PL-IMPV to Germany Italy
<i>They have been traveling to Germany, Italy. They (are) only a day or two-</i> | T-1 |
| 2 | B | Irkiny ta?
Name-DIM-GEN-PL PCL
<i>Ira's (parents) (you mean)?</i> | T0 |
| 3 | A | Da
Yes
Yes | T+1 |

The repair initiation in line 2 is of a restricted type and makes (dis)confirmation relevant. The target of this repair initiator is the personal pronoun *ani* 'they' in line 1. Speaker B initiates repair by producing a candidate understanding, 'Ira's (parents)' with a Russian discourse particle *-ta*, which is then simply confirmed by speaker A. The particle *-ta* has recently been described as a marker of structural delay demonstrating that an item is misplaced in the ongoing line of talk (Bolden, 2008). By the use of this particle speakers also seem to express their accountability for the delay. In Extract 18 speaker B initiates repair that targets the very beginning of speaker A's telling. So, B's repair initiation brings the participants back to the beginning of A's utterance form which she had already departed.

The following example is similar, though the candidate understanding is rejected in this case. Speaker A is an elderly woman who brought her home-maid wine on a family visit. Speaker B is the woman who is hosting the visit. In the discourse previous to this sequence, A offered B to taste her wine. In the meantime, other visitors that are present in the room are talking about the tea blend that the host made herself.

Extract 19. 20120202_cooking_3_806500

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|
| 1 | A | fkusnae Lilia?
Tasty-ADJ-N Name
<i>Is it tasty, Lilia?</i> | T-1 |
| 2 | B | chaj ta?
Tea-M PCL
<i>The tea, (you mean)?</i> | T0 |
| 3 | A | vino.
Wine-N
<i>The wine.</i> | T+1 |

The repair initiation in line 2 makes clear that B does not understand which object A refers to. There are at least two possible referents salient from the context: the tea and the wine. Speaker B offers a candidate understanding *chaj ta?* 'the tea, (you mean)?' This is then rejected by speaker A in T+1 position. The rejection is done by offering the correct object reference – *vino* 'the wine'.

The following example involves two attempts at initiation repair. Each contains a different polar particle. In the first case it is *ta* and in the second *da*.

Extract 20. 20110827_Family_2_286940

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|------|
| 1 | A | U minia luchshe siodnia, da? ((tocuhes the wound on her lips))
With I-GEN better today yes?
<i>It's better today, yes?</i> | T-1a |
| 2 | B | Baliachka ta?
Sore PCL
<i>The (cold) sore (you mean)?</i> | T0a |

- 3 A Uhum T+1a
Uhum
uhum
- 4 A ja jijo (siodnia) tak ((makes scraching movements over her face)) T-1b
I her (today) so
I (did) like this to it today
- 5 B Raskavyriala i namazala, da?³ T0b
Scratch-PST-PFV-F and smear-PST-PFV-F yes
You scratched it open and applied the salve, yes?
- 6 A Uhum T+1b
Uhum
Uhum

Both particles, *ta* and *da*, can be used in repair initiators that offer candidate understandings. *Da* can be used with longer utterances as seen in Extract 20 (line 5). *Ta* is usually used to only mark nouns or pronouns, even if they are produced within a longer utterance. It shows that the nouns with the particle *ta* in Extracts 18 (line 2), 19 (line 2), and 20 (line 2) are compounds that complement the T-1 turn. It does not seem to be the case for the utterance marked by the particle *da* (Extract 20, line 5). This utterance replaces T-1 instead of complementing it. Obviously, systematic research is needed to map out all the functions of these particles and it is beyond the scope of this article.

5.2.2 Practices involved in T+1

One discourse particle that is occasionally encountered in the T+1 position is sentence-initial *nu*. Like most particles it serves multiple functions in the language and can be encountered in environments other than repair sequences. The most important functions of this particle in spontaneous discourse have been described by Bolden (in press). In line with her findings, the particle *nu* has been found to perform at least two functions in T+1 position. First, it indicates that the answer is not straightforward. Second, that the answer is or should already be known to the recipient. Extracts 21 and 22 illustrate the first function of *nu*.

In Extract 21 two women are talking about the way they sterilise their jars before storing there food for the winter.

Extract 21. 20110807_Family_evening_2_441463

- 1 A A ja: chaynik biru, f chajnik- chajnik= T-1
PCL I water kettle-ACC take-1SG-PRS in water kettle-LOC kettle-LOC
- 2 = kipichu to ya banki stavliu. Esli malin'kiyi ani eta-
Boil-1SG-PRS PCL I jars put-1SG-PRS If small-PL they PCL
And I take a water kettle. (When) I put the water kettle on, I (also) put the jars. If they are small well-
- 3 B f cha:ynik T0
Into water kettle-ACC
Into the water kettle
- 4 A Nu, kak tibe skazat'. Bal'shie trioxlitrovyji= T+1
PCL how you-DAT say-INF big-PL three liter-PL
Well, how to say it. The big three-liter ones=
- 5 =priam f chajnik vot tak vot stavliu,
right in kettle PCL so PCL put-1SG
=I put directly into the kettle like this...

³ A reviewer points out that *da* may be analogous to a tag question, a function that in my analysis does not exclude it from serving as a repair initiator.

Speaker B's repair initiation is a candidate understanding that makes confirmation relevant – a proposal that speaker A indeed uses a water kettle to sterilise her jars. However, speaker A does not simply confirm or disconfirm this candidate understanding, as the answer depends on the size of the jars that one is going to sterilise. Speaker A can only confirm B's suggestion if it refers to big jars. The repair solution that follows is then not a straightforward yes/no answer; it is an explanation, where the speaker describes which jars are being sterilised in the water kettle.

In Extract 22 several girlfriends gathered for dinner. One woman is talking about her family that lives at least 2000 km away. She is telling the others that her grandson will soon be baptised and a man called Pasha will become his godfather. One of the recipients of the telling asks who Pasha is.

Extract 22. 20110826_Old_Friends_B1_660333

- 1 C kt^o kriosnye bu:dut
Who-Q godparents will be-3PL
Who will be godparents?
- 2 A a- Pasha. (.) chio Pasha tam samyj takoj. T-1
PCL Name what-Q Name there the most such
Well, Pasha. (.) Pasha is the most (suitable) there
- 3 B Pasha eta kto? TO
Name it who-Q
Pasha that (is) who?
- 4 A Nu drugan u nivo luchshij tam. T+1
PCL friend with he-GEN the best there
Well it's his best friend there.

Repair solution in line 4 starts with the particle *nu*. As in the previous example it indicates that the answer is not straightforward. Since none of the participants in the conversation can possibly know Pasha who lives in a different part of Russia, it is difficult for speaker A to describe who he is. The person description that speaker A provides is based on who Pasha is in relation to the person that is familiar to the recipients – A's son.

As mentioned earlier, the second function of the particle *nu* is marking that the requested information should already be available to the recipient. This use of the particle *nu* is illustrated in Extract 24. In this example, a teenaged girl – speaker A, and her mother – speaker B, are visiting girl's grandmother. The girl is about to leave and makes a request for B to bring something from her grandmother's house to her own. This is the second time the girl makes this request. Extract 23 illustrates its first attempt. The mother finally responds by initiating repair in line 2 of Extract 24: 'so what is there to bring then?'

Extract 23. 20110114_family_visit_2_675117

- 1 A ((off camera)) m(h)a:m
Mama-VOC
Mom
- 2 (0.4)
- 3 B ((turns head towards A))
- 4 A ((enters the room)) tam veshi na stule mai shtany i kofta belaja-
there things on chair-LOC my trousers and pullover-F white-F
There're (my) things, my trousers and white pullover
- 5 A [tam kalgotki-
There tights
There're (my) tights
- 6 C [da svid[^]anja ((waves everyone goodbye and leaves the room))
Good bye
Good bye

Speaker A secures her mother's attention with the vocative at line 1. Then she formulates her request at lines 4 and 5. The girl, however, gets interrupted by the departure of participant C and does not get the chance to complete her request. She and other participants start talking about the reason why speaker C had to leave. Only 1 minute later does speaker A repeat her request.

Extract 24. 20110114_family_visit_2_719720

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----|
| 1 | A | ((pointing gesture)) Vaz'miosh?
Take-2SG-FUT
<i>Will you bring (it)?</i> | T-1 |
| 2 | B | nu () nu chio tam bra't-ta?
PCL () PCL what-Q there take-PCL
<i>So what's there to bring then?</i> | T0 |
| 3 | A | nu shtany: mai chiornye i kofta belaya
PCL trousers-PL my-PL black and pullover white
<i>My black trousers and white pullover</i> | T+1 |

The repair initiator itself at line 2 starts with the particle *nu*, most likely marking that A should have provided this information in the first place. The use of the same particle *nu* by A in T+1 indicates that the requested information has already been provided.

Occasionally, Russian speakers make use of the formulaic (*ja*) *gavariu* 'I'm saying' as a T+1 marker. Extract 25 demonstrates how it is used in a conversation between two girlfriends.

Extract 25. 20110807_Family_evening_2_553772

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|
| 1 | A | A u nas eti piriexali, ili ya tibe gavarila.
PCL with us DEM-PL move-3PL-PST-PFV or I you-DAT tell-1SG-PST-IMPV
<i>And in our (flat) those (people) have moved or have I told you already.</i> | T-1 |
| 2 | B | A?
INTJ
<i>Huh?</i> | T0 |
| 3 | A | Da sasedi gavariu, piriexali, (.) Na tretij etazh.
PCL neighbours say-1SG-PRS move-3PL-PST-PFV on third-M floor-M
<i>(My) neighbours, I'm saying, have moved (.) to the third floor.</i> | T+1 |

The addition of 'I'm saying' to the repair solutions makes clear that the speaker is quoting him or herself. In doing so, the speaker of the trouble source turn treats the trouble as the one of hearing. A marker similar to Russian *gavariu* is also encountered in other languages. (see Introduction to this special issue).

6 Actions

Initiating repair is a practice that can perform actions beyond repair alone (Schegloff, 1997). In the current sample, it was observed to perform actions as varied as an expression of surprise (Jefferson, 1972; Selting, 1996, p. 299; Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006), pre-disagreement, news receipt, and tease (Gisladottir, 2015; Kendrick, 2015). Although an in depth analysis of these actions falls out of the scope of this article, in this section I discuss two cases where practices of repair are employed to express surprise and pre-disagreement.

In Extract 26 two women are talking about a mutual friend who has recently received a large amount of money from a relative. Speaker B expresses her surprise in T0 position through the exaggerated intonation.

Extract 26 20110827_Family_2_572333

- 1 A va ftornik ana f pasiolak priedet,=
In Tuesday she in village come-FUT-3SG
On Tuesday she'll come to the village
- 2 A =ej Marinka vyslala tam ash chut' li =
she-DAT Marina-DIM send-PST-PFV-F there PCL PCL PCL
she sent to Marina almost as much as
- 3 A =na desit' tysich tam chio-ta karoche=
For ten thousand there some short-ADV
for 10.000 or something, anyway
- 4 A =[nu ana v:::-
PCL she in
so she in-
- 5 B [de:n'gi to yest' yej nada da?
Money that is she-ACC need-MOD yes
So she needs money, doesn't she?
- 6 A da. v ye:vrikax ana tam zhe
Yes in euro-PL-DIM she there PCL
Yes. She in euro's, you know
- 7 (0.6)
- 8 B ↑DESIT' TYSICH YEVRIKAF? TO
Ten thousand euro-DIM-PL-GEN
TEN THOUSAND EURO?
- 9 (0.1)
- 10 A ↑NYE::T.=
No
NO
- 11 B =o go:spadi=
INTJ god-VOC
Oh (my) god
- 12 A =ruble:j nashix. T+1
Rubles-GEN our-GEN
No, our rubles.

The repair initiation in line 2 is of a restricted type. More specifically, it is a candidate understanding that makes confirmation relevant (Schegloff, 1993). It does, however, more than this: it also expresses B's surprise about something she has just heard, a function signalled by its exaggerated prosody, specifically high volume and pitch (Selting, 1996, pp. 231–270; Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006). Speaker A responds to B's candidate understanding by disconfirming it. She also responds to the surprise expressed through the repair initiation by articulating the T+1 in a distinct manner. Its volume is relatively high and in contrast with the repair initiator it has a lower final pitch.

The following example demonstrates how the practice of initiating repair can be employed to express disagreement (Schegloff et al., 1977). The context involves four women having dinner together. Earlier in the conversation some of the women expressed their desire to put the television on to watch some TV show. The host of the gathering rejects this, claiming that the guests can watch it later on the Internet. Subsequently, participant B employs the practice of other-initiated repair to disagree with the host.

Extract 27. 20110826_Old_Friends_B1_436838

- 1 A Pasmotrite v internete. T-1
 Watch-2PL-FUT-PFV in Internet-LOC
You (can) watch in on Internet
- 2 B A:ha:, v kakom interneti ya tibe pasmatriu? TO
 INTJ in which-M-SG Internet I you-SG-DAT watch-1SG-FUT-PFV
Yeah, on what Internet will I watch (it)?
- 3 A Ka mne pridiosh, ya tibe fkliuchu pasmotrish. T+1
 To me come-2SG-FUT I you-SG-DAT put on-1SG-FUT watch-2SG-FUT
You (can) come to me, I'll put (it) on (and) you will watch (it).

This example is not strictly an instance of other-initiated repair. It does, however, demonstrate that linguistic resources also involved in repair initiation can be applied to express disagreement. Formally, B's line 2 could have been a repair initiation of a restricted type that seeks clarification as indicated by the question *v kakom* 'on which/what'. Action-wise, however, this turn is not aimed at restoring mutual understanding —as a repair initiator would be— but is expressing B's resistance of speaker A's suggestion. I argue this based on several observations. First, on the face of it, B's turn appears to indicate a lack of understanding of what Internet is, but the 'Yeah' preface at line 2 suggests there is no problem of understanding and that the turn is being ironic/sarcastic. Furthermore, as it happens, B has no computer and thus has no access to the Internet at home. Her turn draws attention to this by indicating that the matter of locating something on the Internet is not straightforward for her. Speaker A's response acknowledges this problem and proposes a solution: she can come to B's place to access the Internet. A's response does not clarify what the Internet is, and so in that sense is not a repair solution for a presumed problem of understanding on the part of B.

7 Conclusion

This article has offered a descriptive overview of the practice of other-initiated repair in Russian. While the main focus was on listing various repair types encountered in the sample of casual Russian, special attention was given to the ways in which the trouble source is modified after repair is initiated. Repair solutions in response to an open repair initiator are elaborate, often involving multiple modification strategies at the same time. Especially modifications of word order in T+1 form an interesting feature that is allowed by the relative flexibility of word order in Russian. By contrast, restricted repair initiations often result in more specific repair solutions targeting only one problem. This article also described some other language-specific features. For instance, question-word repair initiators in Russian are often more specific about the referent than their English counterparts. Their specificity arises from the correspondence of the question word and the referent in gender, case, and number. Finally, repair initiators that seek confirmation occasionally make use of polar particles. These particles combine functions of tag questions with formally related polar questions; their precise functions in sequences of other-initiated repair and beyond will be a fruitful locus for future research.

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to the special issue editors Mark Dingemanse and Nick Enfield, and to two anonymous reviewers for their constructive criticism. This research was supported by the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics and a European Research Council grant 'Human Sociality and Systems of Language Use' (grant nt. 240853).

References

- Benjamin, Trevor. 2013. "Signaling Trouble: On the Linguistic Design of Other-Initiation of Repair in English Conversation."
- Bolden, Galina B. forthcoming. "Nu-Prefaced Responses in Russian Conversation." In *At the Intersection of Turn and Sequence: Turn-Initial Particles across Languages*, edited by John Heritage and Marja-Leena Sorjonen. John Benjamins.
- . in press. "The Discourse Marker Nu in Russian Conversation." In *Nu and Its Relatives: A Discourse Marker across the Languages of Europe and beyond*, edited by P. Auer and Y. Maschler. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 2003. "Doing Being Late: The Use of the Russian Particle -to in Personal State Inquiries." *Crossroads of Language, Interaction, and Culture* 5: 3–27.
- . 2008. "Reopening Russian Conversations: The Discourse Particle-to and the Negotiation of Interpersonal Accountability in Closings." *Human Communication Research* 34 (1): 99–136.
- Bolden, Galina B. 2011. "On the Organization of Repair in Multiperson Conversation: The Case of 'Other'-Selection in Other-Initiated Repair Sequences." *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 44 (3): 237–62. doi:10.1080/08351813.2011.591835.
- Bolden, Galina B. 2012. "Across Languages and Cultures: Brokering Problems of Understanding in Conversational Repair." *Language in Society* 41 (01): 97–121. doi:10.1017/S0047404511000923.
- . 2013. "Unpacking 'Self' Repair and Epistemics in Conversation." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 76 (4): 314–42.
- Bolden, Galina B., and Estefania Guimaraes. 2012. "Grammatical Flexibility as a Resource in Explicating Referents." *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 45 (2): 156–74. doi:10.1080/08351813.2012.673861.
- Bolden, Galina B., and Jeffrey D Robinson. 2011. "Soliciting Accounts With Why-Interrogatives in Conversation." *Journal of Communication* 61 (1): 94–119. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2010.01528.x.
- Clark, Herbert H. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Curl, Traci S. 2005. "Practices in Other-Initiated Repair Resolution: The Phonetic Differentiation of 'Repetitions.'" *Discourse Processes* 39 (1): 1–43. doi:10.1207/s15326950dp3901_1.
- Dingemanse, Mark, Joe Blythe, and Tyko Dirksmeyer. (2014) "Formats for Other-Initiation of Repair across Languages: An Exercise in Pragmatic Typology." *Studies in Language* 38, 1, 5–43. doi:10.1075/sl.38.1.01din.
- Dingemanse, Mark, and N. J. Enfield. 2015. "Other-Initiated Repair across Languages: Towards a Typology of Conversational Structures." *Open Linguistics* 1 (1).
- Dingemanse, Mark, Francisco Torreira, and N. J. Enfield. 2013. "Is 'Huh?' a Universal Word? Conversational Infrastructure and the Convergent Evolution of Linguistic Items." *PloS One* 8 (11): e78273.
- Drew, Paul. 1997. "'Open' Class Repair Initiators in Response to Sequential Sources of Trouble in Conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 69–101.
- Dyakonova, Marina. 2004. "Information Structure Development: Evidence from the Acquisition of Word Order in Russian and English." *Nordlyd* 32 (1). <http://septentrio.uit.no/index.php/nordlyd/article/view/60>.
- Enfield, N. J., Mark Dingemanse, Julija Baranova, Joe Blythe, Penelope Brown, Tyko Dirksmeyer, Paul Drew, et al. 2013. "Huh? What? – A First Survey in 21 Languages." In *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, edited by Makoto Hayashi, Geoffrey Raymond, and Jack Sidnell, 343–80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Enfield, N. J., Paul Drew, and Julija Baranova. forthcoming. "Non-Minimal Sequences of Other-Initiation of Repair: A Cross-Linguistic Study."
- Gisladottir, Rosa S. 2015. "Other-Initiated Repair in Icelandic." *Open Linguistics* 1 (1). <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/opli.2014.1.issue-1/opli-2015-0004/opli-2015-0004.xml>.
- Hawkins, John A. 1983. *Word Order Universals*. New York: Academic Press.
- Heritage, John. 1984. "A Change of State Token and Aspects of Its Sequential Placement." In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage, 299–345. Studies in Emotion and Social Interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2013. "Epistemics in Conversation." In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, edited by Jack Sidnell and Tanya Stivers, 825. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1972. "Side Sequences." In *Studies in Social Interaction*, edited by David N. Sudnow, 294–338. New York: MacMillan/The Free Press.
- . 1987. "On Embedded and Exposed Correction in Conversation." In *Talk and Social Organization*, edited by Graham Button and John R. E. Lee, 86–100. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kendrick, Kolin H. 2015. "Other-Initiated Repair in English." *Open Linguistics* 1 (1). <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/opli.2014.1.issue-1/opli-2014-0009/opli-2014-0009.xml>.
- Labov, William, and David Fanshel. 1977. *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lerner, Gene H., Galina B. Bolden, Alexa Hepburn, and Jenny Mandelbaum. 2012. "Reference Recalibration Repairs: Adjusting the Precision of Formulations for the Task at Hand." *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 45 (2): 191–212. doi:10.1080/08351813.2012.674190.

- Mazeland, Harrie, and Minna Zaman-Zadeh. 2004. "The Logic of Clarification. Some Observations about Word- Clarification Repairs in Finnish-as-a-Lingua-Franca Interactions." In *Second Language Conversations*, edited by Rod Gardner and Johannes Wagner, 132–56. Advances in Applied Linguistics Series. London, New York: Continuum.
- Pulkina, I. M. 1984. *A Short Russian Reference Grammar*. Translated by V. Korotky. 7th ed. Moscow.
- Raymond, Geoffrey, and John Heritage. 2006. "The Epistemics of Social Relations: Owning Grandchildren." *Language in Society* 35: 677–705. doi:10.1017/S0047404506060325.
- Robinson, Jeffrey D. 2006. "Managing Trouble Responsibility and Relationships during Conversational Repair." *Communication Monographs* 73 (2): 137–61.
- . 2014. "What 'What?' Tells Us About How Conversationalists Manage Intersubjectivity." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 47 (2): 109–29. doi:10.1080/08351813.2014.900214.
- Robinson, Jeffrey D., and Galina B. Bolden. 2010. "Preference Organization of Sequence-Initiating Actions: The Case of Explicit Account Solicitations." *Discourse Studies* 12 (4): 501–33. doi:10.1177/1461445610371051.
- Ross, John Robert. 1967. "Constraints on Variables in Syntax." MIT.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation." *Language* 50 (4): 696–735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1993. "Reflections on Quantification in the Study of Conversation." *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 26 (1): 99–128. doi:10.1207/s15327973rlsi2601_5.
- . 1997. "Practices and Actions: Boundary Cases of Other-Initiated Repair." *Discourse Processes* 23 (3): 499–545. doi:10.1080/01638539709545001.
- . 2000. "When 'Others' Initiate Repair." *Applied Linguistics* 21 (2): 205–43. doi:10.1093/applin/21.2.205.
- . 2004. "On Dispensability." *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 37 (2): 95–149.
- . 2006. "Interaction: The Infrastructure for Social Institutions, the Natural Ecological Niche for Language, and the Arena in Which Culture Is Enacted." In , edited by N. J. Enfield and Stephen C. Levinson, 70–96. Oxford: Berg.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson, and Harvey Sacks. 1977. "The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation." *Language* 53 (2): 361–82.
- Selting, Margret. 1996. "Prosody as an Activity-Type Distinctive Cue in Conversation: The Case of so-Called 'Astonished' Questions in Repair-Initiation." In *Prosody in Conversation: Interactional Studies*, 231–70.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2007. "Alternative Recognitionals in Initial References to Persons." In *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural, and Social Perspectives*, edited by N. J. Enfield and Tanya Stivers, 73–96. Cambridge University Press.
- Timberlake, Alan. 2004. *A Reference Grammar of Russian*. Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlin, Russell S. 1986. *Basic Word Order: Functional Principles*. London: Croom-Helm.
- Wade, Terence. 2000. *A Comprehensive Russian Grammar*. Edited by Michael J. de Holman. 2nd ed. Oxford/ Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Wilkinson, Sue, and Celia Kitzinger. 2006. "Surprise As an Interactional Achievement: Reaction Tokens in Conversation." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 69 (2): 150–82. doi:doi:10.1177/019027250606900203.