Dialogic speech as a field of compound-complex sentence communicative types application

Jerome Baghana – Elena A. Ogneva – Tatiana G. Voloshina – Galina V. Mironova – Katarina Slobodova Novakova

Abstract

The purpose of the article is to identify the specifics of compound-complex sentences functioning in the dialogues of script texts. The research work has a complex system to analyze the linguistic processes, which are manifested in script texts of British and American scriptwriters. According to the study, the authors analyze the peculiarities of dialogue constituents and take the following definitions: communicative turn and communicative move, presenting the dialogue construction parts. In the given work, the peculiarities of communicative turn with such component as a compound-complex sentence is being analyzed. Special attention is paid to the position of the compound-complex sentence (initiative or reactive) in the script dialogues as well as the functions of the complex constructions are revealed, which are to give substantial information, describe reasons of actions, state the detailed events of the characters' past. English and American script texts present communication of characters, which is close to real everyday life expressions of people of all nations; they combine formal and informal types of communication. Compound complex sentences are an integral part of scripts dialogues of different genres. Nearly all types of compound-complex sentence variations (five out of six) are used as elements of script texts. The major part of compound-complex examples, found in dialogues of script texts in the initial position, presents the models with minimal compound blocks aiming to present general information. If the characters' intention is to reveal the shadow meanings, enumerate the facts, give profound information, the compound-complex sentences take the position of reaction; in this case, one can notice the extended types of complex models in dialogues of script texts.

Key words: dialogue, turn, move, script, initiative position, reaction position, compound-complex sentence, compound block, complex block

Introduction

The study of the dialogue peculiarities as of a form of speech communication remains relevant for many decades, since the existing classical works and numerous studies, appearing recently, only partially highlight the mechanisms of interaction of communicants.

In this paper, the research of dialogical text is carried out on the example of script texts in the framework of system-structural and communicative directions. One of the key linguistic issues is the identification of the principles of the text formation process, which leads to the need to define textual constituents. However, despite the intensive development of communicative linguistics, at present, there is no unified classification of communicative units of dialogue speech.

It should be mentioned, the contribution of German linguists to the theory of dialogic communication is undeniable, since they made an initial attempt to identify the main components of minimal dialogic text units. G. Zimmermann, J. Weiss, J. Jager, J. Schwitalla, D. Krallmann, H. Henne, T. Rehbock, M. Muller, R. Schmachtenberg, S. Franke made significant contributions to the study of dialogic communication in the German linguistic school. For having codified the entire

linguistic experience in this field, B. Techtmeier identifies three components as micro units of dialogic speech: *gesprächsschritt*, *repliken*, *äußerungen* [Techtmeier,1984].

The British linguistic school of dialogue (M. Coulthard, J. Sinclair) calls the minimum unit of dialogical speech *turn*. The set of turns giving the formation is called *move*.

Many researchers studying dialogical units proceed from the proposed system of units developed by Russian linguist L. M. Mikhailov, where the main components of dialogical unity are the *communicative turn* and the *communicative move*.

According to this classification, the *communicative turn* is the minimum unit of speech activity in dialogic communication that belongs to one communicant and goes back to one syntactic model (Mikhailov, 2000: 15).

Traditionally, *communication turns* are divided into *initiating* or opening statements and *reacting* - ones that reveal the addressee's point of view. The composition of both the initiating and reacting communicative turns can be represented by any type of statement - motivational, interrogative, emotional, exclamation.

Between the communicative turns, initiating and the reacting turns associated with it, a variety of logical and semantic dialogic relations can arise, which is possible due to two features of the turn as of a minimal unit of dialogic communication: 1) to open form the narrative turn, 2) to be one of the most general intentions and to inherit it, it is the message transforming procedure (Mikhailov, 2000: 45).

The communicative move is a larger unit of dialogic communication, which consists of two or more turns and allows the speaker to fully implement his plan (Mikhailov, 2000: 24). Problems affecting various aspects of the communicative process were covered in the research of such linguists as C. Goffman, P. V. Zernetsky, T. A. Zaitseva, A. V. Belova and others. The analysis of existing concepts and dialogic contexts suggests that the term communicative move most adequately reflects the essence and functions of the speech contribution to the dialogue before the turn-taking process.

By a *communicative move*, we mean a communicative unit consisting of two or more *communicative turns*, used by one communicant, implementing the speaker's communicative intent.

The components of the communicative turn present interrogative, affirmative, exclamation sentences. Like a communicative turn, communicative moves are divided into initiating (stimulating, controlling, intentional) and reacting (responsive, dependent). The typology of initiating and reacting moves is very diverse and includes communication moves consisting of two, three, four, or more steps.

Methods

Methods of the analysis are defined by the objectives, theoretical and practical orientation of the research, and the character of the presented material. In the paper the authors implied various types of analysis: the linguistic, functional, and interdisciplinary analysis. Linguistic and non-linguistic information is taken into account for this study. The main attention is paid to linguistic and non-linguistic information, intercultural analyses, especially dealing with the problem of mentality and language correlation.

Results and discussions

Dialogue, as a form of speech, assumes the existence of a larger unit of speech created by two communicants. In linguistics, there are many terms used to denote textual units of a monologue, such as "dictema"(M. Bloch), "speech complex" (I. G. Koshevaya), "super-phrasal unity" (N. A. Levkovskaya, L. A. Bulakhovksiy),

"paragraph" (A. M. Peshkovsky), "complex syntactic whole unit" (G. L. Solganik). The intensive study of the dialogic text has led researchers to the need to identify a certain macro unit of dialogic communication.

For the first time in Russian linguistics, an attempt was made to justify the typology of "dialogical unities" in the work of L. Leonov, the author defined it as "any pair of replicas between which there is a semantic, anaphoric or structural connection." On this basis, the author distinguished three types of dialogical unities: 1. semantic, 2. anaphoric, 3. structural (Leonov, 2000: 3-5).

In American pragmatic linguistics, the term "adjacency pairs" is proposed to denote a unit consisting of correlated utterances of two interlocutors; this term refers to pairs of utterances: *question – answer, greeting – greeting, offer – acceptance of the offer, apology – acceptance of the apology* (Levinson, 2000: 30).

The term "Paarsequenzen," proposed in the course of German linguists, similarly implies "the standard of repeated statements that have a specific character and correlate speech contributions, for example, *greeting – greeting, question – answer, offer – acceptance (rejection), reproach – justification*" (Meibauer, 2001: 133).

Following L. M. Mikhailov in our research, we use the term "dialogical unity", which means "a monothematic unit of dialogue with communicative integrity, created by two communicants, set by a communicative intent and expressed in the logical-semantic, grammatical, lexical, prosodic correlation of components" (Mikhailov, 2000:79).

Thus, in our study we proceed from the hierarchy of communicative units, in accordance with which the lower level is the minimal unit of speech activity dialogic communication is "communication turn" which belongs to one of the communicants, and goes back to the same syntactic pattern; at a higher level is another unit – "communication move," consisting of two or more communication steps representing a unified communication of one interlocutor; the macro unit of dialogic communication is a dialogic unity consisting of communicative turns and moves that are united by a single theme and implemented by two or more communicants.

In the course of our research, the analysis of the functioning of compound-complex sentences is carried out on the material of dialogic script texts of British and American scriptwriters in the position of a communicative turn.

The communicative goal of the dialogue is to achieve a common intention of the speakers, which is implemented on the principle of cooperation or communicative cooperation, and it is implemented by communicants in the form of a communicative turn.

The analysis of the script texts has shown that in the vast majority of cases, the studied compound-complex sentence occupies the position of the reacting step (72% of the entire body of examples representing the minimum communicative unit), for example:

Eric: *"And I know it now more than anything, your father he wants to know that we're safe, okay?"*

Amanda: *"We'll get out of here, and everything will be fine, I promise"* (Jurassic Park II).

In this dialogue, the reacting turn is a compound-complex sentence, combining the minimal compound-complex (*we'll get out of here*) in the initial position and the minimal complex set (*and everything will be fine, I promise*) in the final position. The analyzed offer contains the intention of the speaker - the reacting communicant promises that they will be able to overcome all difficulties.

The frequency of compound-complex sentences with compound and complex blocks located in the position of the initiating step is 28% of the entire corpus of sentences that represent the minimum communicative unit, for example:

WOO: "*This morning, you switched off at six-thirty-four, and when you started working again, it was auxiliary power.*

Arnold: *My God! The auxiliary generator is triggered first and then used to start the main generator because it needs a strong charge. The main generator must be reset manually"* (Jurassic Park).

As the initiation of the analyzed dialogue, the initiatory turn is expressed by a compound-complex sentence with a minimal compound-complex (*You shut down at six thirty-four this morning*) occupying the initial position, and a minimal complex set (*and when you started back up, it was with auxiliary power*) in the final position. This initiating turn has the idea to present general information of an event – to give the message: *the hero left the workplace and forgot to turn off additional equipment*.

In the course of the study, it was noted that in the initiating positions of the communicative turns, a compound-complex sentence with parataxis and hypotaxis blocks is less common to be found, since this position implies the beginning of a conversation: prompting replicas most often do not require a detailed form.

It seems that the reason of the overwhelming number of examples constitute a reacting turn is that compound-complex sentences are the grammatical form that can cover a large amount of information and serve as the optimal syntactic tool used by communicants to narrate events, explain reasons, enumerate arguments, for example:

WATSON: "*You could have done worse.*"

GABRIELLE: "*I was on my way here, and suddenly there were footsteps behind me, and because I felt a hand over my mouth and the smell of chloroform struck my nose I was half unconscious and afterward I felt I was in the water and then a man was wrapping me in a blanket"* (Carnahan 2012).

In this example, the reacting turn is construction with an extended complex sets (*I was on my way here*), (*and suddenly there were footsteps behind me*), (*and then a man was wrapping me in a blanket*) in the initial position, interposition and finite position, an extended compound-complex *(and because I felt a hand over my mouth and the smell of chloroform struck my nose I was half unconscious*) in the interposition and the minimal compound-complex (*then I felt I was in the water*) in the interposition.

In the analyzed sentence, the heroine Gabriella tells the detective Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson about the circumstances under which she was attacked, while her response is a whole story: *the girl was walking home late in the evening, heard someone's footsteps, she was attacked by a stranger and tried to put her to sleep, then threw her into the river, then another man saved the heroine, and she regained consciousness at the moment when she was wrapped in a blanket*.

Many researchers of dialogic speech study initiating and reacting turns from the point of view of the purpose of the utterance: a communicative turn can be represented by a narrative, motivational or interrogative sentence (L. M. Mikhailov, L. M. Koloeva, T. A. Zaitseva, A. A. Rodicheva).

The narrative sentence as a functional type has the leading intent of giving the message, which sets the communicative intent of this communicative type of a sentence. In comparison with other functional types of sentence – interrogative and incentive – the narrative sentence expresses the intention of the utterance in grammatical terms less vividly, so it is more flexible to transformations, functional modifications.

In dialogical texts of film scripts, it was found that a compound-complex sentence with parataxis and hypotaxis, which occupies the position of the initiating step, is usually a narrative utterance (82% of all sentences for the purpose of utterance in the initiating position), for example:

238

AGENT SMITH: "*We are willing to wipe the slate clean, to give you a fresh start and all we are asking in return is your cooperation in bringing a known terrorist to justice* (Neo nods to himself)."
NEO: "*Yeah. Wow. That sounds like a real good deal"* (Carnahan 2012).

In this dialogue, the analyzed turn is expressed by a compound-complex sentence in the form of a narrative statement. This sentence is formed by a model with a minimal paratactic complex and a minimal hypotactic complex.

The frequency of compound-complex sentences expressed by a narrative utterance and located in the position of the reacting step reaches 87% of all sentences for the purpose of the utterance in the reacting position, for example:
CARTER: "*Oh, Cyril, eh? So it's all girls together, is it?"*
ERIC: "*He's thinking Sid and Gerald won't like it much when they hear you've been sticking your nose in, but we have to be diplomatic"* (Ephron 2002).

The reacting step in this dialogue is represented by a compound-complex sentence in the form of a narrative utterance. The analyzed sentence has the intent of a message: the main character says that he does not like to be interfered with. The analyzed compound-complex sentence combines an extended hypotactic complex (*He's thinking Sid and Gerald won't like it much when they hear you've been sticking your nose in*) in the initial position and a minimal paratactic complex (*but we have to be diplomatic*) in the final position. The extended hypotactic complex contains four predicative units and is built on a type of syntactic relationships, such as sequential subordination.

In the course of the analysis of compound-complex constructions in the reacting position, it was noted that there is a connection between the narrative structure of a sentence and the number of links in its chain. The largest number of links in the extended hypotactic complex reaches four predicative units, as evidenced by the previous example.

The syntactic form of compound-complex constructions with an extended hypotactic complex and a minimal paratactic complex can be very diverse and include not only constructions based on sequential subordination (66% of sentences of this type), but also models with homogeneous (11%) and heterogeneous (23%) subordination.
Examples:
1. PAUL: "*Maybe I'm not ready yet …"*
JOSEPH: "*I don't know if you're ready to see what I want to show you, but unfortunately, we have run out of time* " (Ephron 2002).
2. DANIEL: "*I will never agree to all this.*"
CAROL: "*But if you don't join me, then there won't be no settlement because you'll be murdered in the street, and the whole Points will be mine"* (Gangs of New York).

The reacting turn in the first dialogue is construction with an extended hypotactic complex in the initial position (*I don't know if you're ready to see what I want to show you*) and a minimal paratactic complex in the final position (*but unfortunately, we have run out of time*). The extended hypotactic complex of the analyzed sentence is based on such a type of syntactic connection as sequential subordination.

In the second dialogue, the compound-complex sentence is constructed with an extended hypotactic complex (*But if you don't join with me, then there won't be no settlement because you'll be murdered in the street*) in the initial position and a minimal paratactic complex (*and the whole Points will be mine*) in the final position. The extended hypotactic complex combines three predicative units and is formed by means of non-uniform subordination.

A communicative turn represented by a narrative compound-complex sentence, implemented in the form of a communicative turn, in the vast majority of

examples is a narrative construction (82% of all compound-complex sentences) and has a large structural diversity: six types of models can be distinguished. Compound complex constructions in the form of a narrative utterance represent both an initiating and reacting turns.

The most productive model of a compound-complex sentence in the position of the initiating turn is a construction that combines a minimal paratactic complex and a minimal closed-type hypotactic complex (68% of the body of examples that function as an initiating step), for example:

EDWARD: "*It was a hard period but now I know what the real life is."*
HAROLD: "*Even when you're taught by misfortunes?"* (Hodge 2000).

It should be noted that most of these constructions are not used for detailed descriptions or to convey the thoughts of the characters, which was illustrated in the examples.

The frequency of use of constructions with minimal paratactic complex and extended hypotactic complex is 2.5 times lower than constructions with minimal complexes, and is 25% of all sentences that represent a communicative turn, for example:

CHARLIE: "*Well, I've met some very remarkable people in India and – and when I read what you've been doing here, I – I wanted to help*."
GANDHI: "*Not anymore"* (Briley 2000).

The analyzed compound-complex sentence in the position of the initiating turn is a construction with a minimal paratactic complex in the initial position (*Well, I've met some very remarkable people in India*) and an extended hypotactic complex in the final position (*and – and when I read what you've been doing here, I – I wanted to help*). The hypotactic complex in a sentence is based on a type of syntactic connection, such as sequential subordination. The structural feature of the analyzed constructions that occupy the initiating position is that the hypotactic complex is formed by a single syntactic connection, mainly sequential subordination.

The least productive construction of a compound-complex sentence in the initiation of dialogues of script texts is a model with hypotactic complexes combined by the composition, the frequency of such models reaches 7%.

One must mention, British and American scripts in the position of the initiating turn, two-complex constructions consisting of two minimal closed-type hypotactic complexes are typical, for example:

WATSON: "*He used to think over all the details himself only cause this made me thinking and when at last I got his ideas it was like a thunderstorm in summer"* (Carnahan 2000).

The compound-complex sentence of the analyzed example occupies the position of the initiating step and combines two minimal hypotactic complexes (1 complex: *He used to think over all the details himself only cause this made me thinking*, 2 complex: *and when at last I got his ideas it was like a thunderstorm in summer*) in the initial and final positions.

The other types of constructions (a model with an extended paratactic and minimal hypotactic complex, a structure with an extended paratactic and extended hypotactic complex, a model with a minimum or extended and multiple hypotactic complexes) were not identified in the position of the initiating step in any dialogue of the film scripts.

In the reacting position, the communicative turn, represented by five structural types of a compound-complex sentence, is implemented in the following types of constructions: models with minimal paratactic and minimal hypotactic complex of closed type, structures with extended hypotactic complex with minimal paratactic complex, construction with expanded paratactic complex and minimal hypotactic complex, a model with several hypotactic complexes combined by an

essay, a construction with a minimal or expanded paratactic complex and several hypotactic complexes.

The most productive models combine a minimal paratactic complex and a minimal closed-type hypotactic complex. The frequency of such constructions reaches 51% of all affirmative sentences used in the reacting position, for example:

STARLING: "*Has something happened on the case?*"

CRAWFORD: "*Well, Mason doesn't know the details of the case but he does apparently have some new information which he'll only share with you*" (Zaillian 2000).

This compound-complex sentence in the reacting turn represents a construction with a minimal paratactic complex in the initial position (*Well, Mason doesn't know the details of the case*) and a minimal hypotactic complex (*but he does apparently have some new information which he'll only share with you*) in the final position. The three-part compound-complex sentence being analyzed is used in this dialogue to convey a small amount of factual material: a prisoner named Mason is willing to share information with a police agent.

A more voluminous construction used in the script text in the reaction position is a compound-complex sentence with a combination of an extended hypotactic complex and a minimal paratactic complex. The studied constructions represent a communicative step in dialogues of script texts half as much as nuclear sentences (26% of the sentences in the reacting position), for example:

HOLMES: "*My dear Mrs. Hudson – criminals are as unpredictable as head-colds. You never quite know when you're going to catch one*".

MRS. HUDSON: "*I do wish you'd give me a little more warning when you come home unexpected, and I would have roasted a goose – and had some flowers for you*" (Carnahan 2000).

The compound-complex sentence is a combination of an extended hypotactic complex (*I do wish you'd give me a little more warning when you come home unexpected*) and a minimal paratactic complex (*and I would have roasted a goose – and had some flowers for you*). The extended hypotactic complex of this sentence is based on such a type of syntactic connection as sequential subordination.

Examples of compound-complex sentences with a minimal paratactic complex and an extended hypotactic complex based on sequential subordination are the most productive of the examples of this type; the frequency is 87%. In contrast to compound-complex constructions in the initiation, constructions in reaction with an extended hypotactic complex are based not only on homogeneous subordination but also on such types of syntactic connection as homogeneous and heterogeneous subordination. However, such constructions do not have a high frequency and makeup 8% and 5%, respectively.

The productivity of compound-complex sentences with an extended paratactic complex and a minimal hypotactic complex in the position of the reacting turn decreases and, compared with the initiating turn, is used four times less often, which is 12%, for example:

HOLMES : "*So, what do we have after all?*"

WATSON: "*We have so far investigated eight drafty castles and inns and our bicycles had been attacked by sheep and our ears were assaulted by bagpipes of witnesses to be and we are exactly where we started*" (Carnahan 2000).

In this example, a compound-complex sentence that takes the position of a reacting turn combines an extended paratactic complex that combines three blocks (*We have so far invested eight drafty castles*) – (*and our bicycles had been attacked by sheep*) – (*and our ears were assaulted by bagpipes*), and a minimal hypotactic complex (*and we are exactly where we started*). The analyzed five-part sentence is the optimal form for implementing a large amount of information. When asked by

Sherlock Holmes about the result of the search for evidence, Dr. Watson describes in detail all the actions that the friends took that day: firstly, they visited more than eight castles and hotels, secondly, they were blocked by a flock of sheep, then they barely endured the music of bagpipes, and in the end, it turned out that all attempts were unsuccessful.

Sentences based on a model with several hypotactic complexes combined by a composition account for 7% in the reacting position, as do constructions implemented in the initiating position, for example:

Librarian: "*What should I do with you?*"

Evelyn: "*You put up with me because I can read and write ancient Egyptian, decipher hieroglyphs and hieroglyphs, and I'm the only person within a thousand miles who knows how to properly encode and catalog this library*" (Sommers 2000).

The compound-complex sentence in this dialogue combines two minimal hypotactic complexes.

It should be noted that the main function of hypotactic complexes is the development of storylines in the text, which was studied on the material of English fiction. In the texts of scripts, hypotactic complexes also perform this function, which is clearly shown in sentences with a hypotactic chain with a deepening syntactic perspective.

The least productive construction in the reacting position is a model with a combination of a minimal or extended paratactic complex and several hypotactic complexes, the frequency of such proposals reaches 4 %, for example:

LAWRENCE: "*Can I help you?*"

WILLIAM: "*Well, yes, I wish I hadn't overheard your conversation – but I did, and I just think, you know...*"

Комментарий сценариста: "*He's not a very convincing or frightening figure*".

WILLIAM*: " ...the person you're talking about is a real person and she probably deserves a little bit more consideration cause she's a woman*" (Curtis 1997).

This compound-complex sentence combines two minimal hypotactic complexes in the initial (*Well, yes, I wish I hadn't overheard your conversation*) and finite (*and she probably deserves a little bit more consideration cause she's a woman*) positions, an inter positional paratactic complex (*but I did*) and an extended hypotactic complex based on sequential submission (*and I just think, you know.. the person you're talking about is a real person*). In the extended hypotactic complex, there is a deepening of the syntactic perspective to three connected subordinate parts.

The analyzed compound-complex sentence is the reasoning of William, who met his girlfriend in a cafe and hears the customers at the next table expressing their opinion about his companion: firstly, the hero is sorry that he interferes in the conversation, and secondly, he is embarrassed, he says that all people deserve respect, and, finally, declares that it is indecent for men to speak about a woman that way.

This sentence is interrupted by a pause (which is indicated by an ellipsis in the text), during which William gathers his thoughts. At the place of the sentence break, the scriptwriter's remark is given that the hero is far from a confident person. After a short pause, William continued his speech and managed to protect the dignity of his companion. The compound-complex sentences, in which the line chain breaks, are typical only for texts of dialogic communication.

Therefore, in contrast to nuclear compound-complex sentences that describe limited factual material, constructions with extended paratactic or hypotactic complexes provide a broader description of events and contribute to the detail of the storyline of the script. Five models out of six, which are used to construct compound-complex sentences are actively used by the authors of scripts to implement this or that information in a reacting position.

Conclusions

To sum it all, a compound-complex sentence, represented by a communicative turn, is an integral component of the dialogical texts of the scripts. The productivity of narrative constructions, in contrast to interrogative and motivational ones, which function as a communicative turn in the scripts, is 84.5% of the entire corpus of constructions. The degree of demand for compound complex constructions in the reacting position is three times greater than in the initiating position, which is determined by the communicative task of the text and is associated with the need to provide more detailed information about characters, events, time, and place of action in the reacting position than in the initiating position. In contrast to the three models that generate offers in the initiating position, the number of implemented models in the initiating position increases to five out of six possible ones. The most frequent models in the positions of initiation and reaction are minimal models (51% - 68%) and constructions with an extended hypotactic complex and a minimal paratactic complex (26% – 25%), which form the basis of the most productive constructions used in dialogic texts of film scripts.

Bibliographic references

BRILEY J. 2000-2012. Ghandi. Kinomania.ru. Available online: http://www.kinomania.ru/movies/g/Gandhi/script_466.shtml.
CARNAHAN M. M. 2000-2012. Kingdom. Electronic script. Kinomania.ru. Available online: http://www.kinomania.ru/movies/k/Kingdom/script_356.shtml.
CURTIS R. 1997-2012. Notting Hill. Electronic screenplay. Movie-Page.com. Orlando. Available online: http://home.online.no/~bhundlan/scripts/NottingHill.htm.
EPHRON N. 2002-2011. You've Got Mail (based on The Shop Around the Corner by N. Laszlo). English online. Abc-english-grammar.com. Khaifa, Israel. Available online: http://abc-english-grammar.com/1/scripts21.htm.
GANGS OF NEW YORK. 2000-2012. Kinomania.ru. Available online: http://www.kinomania.ru/movies/g/Gangs_Of_NY/script_244.shtml.
HODGE J. 2000-2012. The Beach. Electronic script. Available online: http://www.kinomania.ru/movies/b/Beach/script_156.shtml.
JURASSIC PARK. 2000-2012. Electronic script. HomeEnglish. Available online: http://www.homeenglish.ru/scjur.htm.
JURASSIC PARK II. 2000-2012. Electronic script. HomeEnglish. Available online: http://www.homeenglish.ru/scjura.htm.
LEONOV S. A. 2000. The interaction of the analysis and interpretation in the text study. Penza. 40p.
LEVINSON S. C. 2000. Presumptive meanings: the theory of generalized conversational implicature. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press. 480 p.
MALA, E. – MUGLOVA, D. – STRANOVSKA, E. 2019. Stimulation of creativity potential and ambiguity tolerance as effective foreign language teaching predictors. In: Slavonic Pedagogical Studies Journal, vol. 8. n. 1, pp. 164-175. ISSN 1339-8660
MEIBAUER J. 2001. Pragmatik: eine Einführung. Tübingen : Stauffenburg. 208 p.
MIKHAILOV L. M. 2003. German language: grammar of oral speech. Moscow: Astrel. 348 p.
RUBIN B. J. 2000-2012. Ghost. Kinomania.ru. Available online: http://www.kinomania.ru/movies/g/Ghost/script_312.shtml.
SOMMERS S. 2000-2012.The Mummy. Electronic script. Kinomania.ru. Available online: http://www.kinomania.ru/movies/m/Mummy/script_126.shtml.
TECHTMEIER B. 1984. Das Gespräch: Funktionen, Normen und Strukturen. Berlin : Akademie-Verlag. 201 p.
Available online: http://www.kinomania.ru/movies/h/Hannibal/script_43.shtml.

Jerome Baghana
Belgorod State University
Studencheskaia Street 14
308015, Belgorod
Russia
Baghana@yandex.ru

Elena A. Ogneva
Belgorod State University
Studencheskaia Street 14
308015, Belgorod
Russia

Tatiana G. Voloshina
Belgorod State University
Studencheskaia Street 14
308015, Belgorod
Russia
tatianavoloshina@rambler.ru

Galina V. Mironova
Belgorod State University
Studencheskaia Street 14
308015, Belgorod
Russia

Katarína Slobodová Nováková
University of Ss. Cyril and Methdius
Namestie J. Herdu 2
Trnava, 91701
Slovakia
katarina.novakova@ucm.sk