Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica, 4, 2 (2012) 275-289

Marking Discourse – Towards an Integrated Model of Discourse Spaces

Péter FURKÓ

University of Debrecen/Institute of English and American Studies
Department of English Linguistics
furko.peter@gmail.com

Abstract. The aim of the first part of the paper is to consider possible ways of categorising and mapping the functional spectrum of discourse markers as well as to propose a model of discourse spaces, which, it is my hope, reflects the wide range of macro- and micro functions DMs fulfill as well as the multi- and interdisciplinary nature of DM research. In the second part, I illustrate two of the possible applications of the proposed model: (1) its usefulness in mapping the functional spectrum of the English DM *oh*, (2) the utility of the model for the contrastive analysis of English *oh* and Hungarian *ó*.

Keywords: discourse markers, discourse domains, discourse coherence, functional typology

1. Introduction

Discourse markers (DMs) (non-propositional uses of *you know, well, of course, I mean*, etc.) comprise an intriguing class of linguistic items that do not change the basic meaning of utterances but are essential for the organisation and structuring of discourse and for marking the speaker's attitudes to the proposition being expressed as well as the processes of pragmatic inferences i.e. the hearer's efforts to find out what is not explicitly stated but is implied by a given utterance. It is generally agreed that DMs play a vital role in utterance interpretation; there is, however, disagreement on the type of meaning they express and the kind of functions they perform. DMs are

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

used, for example, as frames in the interaction, they may be conversationally salient as opening gambits, turn-taking devices, backchannels, etc., they may express solidarity between interlocutors; the presence of a particular DM can increase or decrease the force of an utterance, alternatively, it may mark backgrounded or foregrounded information. The extreme multifunctionality and context-dependence DMs display, as two of their most basic criterial features, entail not only that different types of DMs perform a variety of functions in different contexts, but also that a particular token of a DM serves multiple purposes in a given utterance.

There have been several attempts to systematically describe and categorise the plethora of functions DMs can serve, in the course of which scholars alternatively make reference to planes of discourse (e.g. Schiffrin 1987), discourse levels (e.g. González 2004), domains of discourse (cf. Erman 2001), or functional domains (e.g. Andersen 2001). In the present paper I will, first of all, provide a short overview of some of the most influential taxonomies of DM functions, and will use the term *discourse spaces* as a common denominator of the concepts used in various theoretical models. After proposing an integrated and empirically motivated model of five discourse spaces (ideational space, subjective space, interpersonal space, textual space and cognitive space) I will apply the model in order to explain the differences in the functional spectra of English *oh* and Hungarian *ó*.

2. Mapping the functional spectrum of DMs – how many discourse spaces are there?

In this section I am going to provide an overview of five of the taxonomies that have been suggested by representatives of the Anglo-American discourse marker and pragmatic marker tradition (cf. Andersen 2001: 39) with a view to proposing an integrated model of discourse spaces that might serve as a frame of reference for further DM research.

It would be safe to say that over the last twenty-five years the majority of the books and articles written on DMs have made reference to Schiffrin's 1987 monograph entitled *Discourse Markers.*[1] Schiffrin's work was pioneering in that she demonstrated how a set of DMs (*oh*, *well*, *now*, *then*, *you know*, *I mean*, *so*, *because*, *and*, *but*, and *or*) performs important functions in conversation and calls for systematic and rigorous analysis. Schiffrin's approach is interdisciplinary,[2] within linguistics and sociology, and demonstrates that markers and the conversations in which they function can only be properly understood as an integration of structural, semantic, pragmatic, and social factors. Schiffrin collected

[1] Park, for example, observes that "Schiffrin represents perhaps the most extensive research to date on discourse markers" (1998: 279).

[2] Taking a multidisciplinary concept of discourse analysis as a starting point.

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

data for her analysis during sociolinguistic fieldwork; the individual DMs she put under scrutiny occurred in sociolinguistic interviews. The study raises a wide range of theoretical and methodological issues; however, because the search for an adequate model of discourse constitutes a central theme in the book, her study is frequently labelled as a "coherence-based approach".

Schiffrin views conversation as a multilayered interaction, consisting of five discourse spaces,[3] namely an *exchange structure*, an *action structure*, an *ideational structure*, a *participation framework*, and an *information state*, each of which is connected to the others and all of which contribute to the conversational procedure:[4]

1. The **exchange structure** consists of units of talk organised in turns or adjacency-pairs (e.g. questions and answers, greetings). Schiffrin borrowed this concept from ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. The reason she includes exchange structure in her model is to capture the fact that participants establish and define the alternation of sequential roles. An exchange structure is critical in fulfilling what Goffman (1981: 14-15 quoted in Schiffrin 1987: 24) calls the "system constraints" of talk. The units (turns and adjacency pairs) are not linguistic *per se*; they are realised by the use of language.
2. The **action structure** refers to speech act structure. This component captures the interpersonal function of conversation. It corresponds to Goffman's notion of "ritual constraints" (1981: 21 quoted in Schiffrin 1987: 25) and defines the speakers' identity and social situation, the type of action taking place, the one at which participants intend to arrive and what they actually get to. As in the structure type, speakers and hearers negotiate their organisation. Similarly, the units are not linguistic *per se*, they are realised by the use of language.
3. The **ideational structure** includes propositions that carry semantic content, ideas and the different relationships that can be established between them for a satisfactory discourse organisation. Thus, in contrast to exchange and action structures (which, according to Schiffrin, are pragmatic because of the role which speakers and hearers play in negotiating their organisation), the units within this structure are semantic and propositional (therefore linguistic). The relations within this structure are cohesive, topical and functional.
4. The **participation framework** refers to the different types of relations that a speaker and a hearer can set up and the way they are related to their propositions, acts and turns. As with exchange and action structures,

[3] She calls them "planes of talk".

[4] cf. Schiffrin 1987: 24ff. The reason I discuss her model at greater length than the ensuing approaches is that she was the first scholar to describe the functional spectrum of DMs in terms of discourse planes (spaces), and, in many ways, her approach still serves as a frame of reference for scholars' intent on setting up functional taxonomies for DMs.

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

participation framework relates language to its users. As a result, participation frameworks are also pragmatic because they involve speakers' relations to each other and to what is being said, meant, and done.

5. The **information state** is related to the cognitive capacity of the participants, how they organise their knowledge and what they know or assume they know of their shared knowledge. Since not all the information flowing between both participants is relevant, this level involves an internal inferential process they have to go through.

Schiffrin claims that a process of integration of all these discourse spaces is needed in order to make communication successful, and DMs are prominently active in this process: they have "a function within the overall integration of discourse as a system" (1987: 313).

In her analysis of the individual DMs, Schiffrin points out that they create *contextual coordinates* (i.e. deictic centres of the utterance) that indicate for the hearer how an utterance is to be interpreted. For example, *oh* is functional at the level of informational state as it marks a speaker's shift of focus (e.g. in the case of repairs, answers, or acknowledgement of information), while *well* is a response marker whose function is to signal that "the options offered through a prior utterance for the coherence of an upcoming response are not precisely followed" (1987: 127). The difference between *oh* and *well* is, thus, that the former item marks responses at a *cognitive level* (information state), whereas the latter marks responses at an *interactional level* (the level of the participation framework).

According to Schiffrin, all discourse markers have a *primary function*; i.e. they signal discourse structure on one of the five discourse spaces. In addition, all of them can have a *secondary function*, signalling a different kind of structure on at least one other discourse space, but might function in all 5 discourse spaces at once (1987: 320).

To summarise the above, Schiffrin's model explores the multifunctionality of DMs with reference to different discourse planes, while individual DMs' distributional properties and/or complementary functions are explained in terms of their primary and secondary functions.

Schiffrin's taxonomy provides a convenient starting point for followers of the Anglo-American discourse marker tradition. Redeker (1990, 1991, 2006) identifies three instead of five discourse spaces in which DMs can fulfil their functions: *ideational structure* (expresses relations in the world the discourse describes, such as temporal sequence, causal relations, etc.), *rhetorical structure* (conveys the speaker's illocutionary intentions), and *sequential structure* (expresses the paratactic and/or hypotactic relations between loosely adjacent discourse segments). According to

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

Redeker, DMs[5] indicate to the hearer that a shift between the different discourse structures is taking place, thus, their primary function is to bring to the listener's attention "a particular kind of linkage of the upcoming utterance with the immediate discourse context" (1991: 1168).

Fraser (1988, 1996) distinguishes between three different types of DMs, namely *discourse topic markers* (e.g. *by the way, y'see*), which signal what the speaker is talking about, *discourse activity markers* (e.g. *admittedly, after all*), which have a function of clarifying, conceding, explaining, etc. various discourse activities, and *message relationship markers* (e.g. *however, in addition*) that indicate whether the messages are parallel, contrastive, etc.

Erman (2001) proposes three functional domains: the *discourse domain,* the *social domain* and the *metalinguistic domain*. According to her, DMs functioning in the *discourse domain* are oriented towards the text and they concern the organisation, encoding and editing of the text. DMs functioning in the *social domain* primarily involve the addressee, while DMs that mark functions in the *metalinguistic domain* are "oriented towards the speaker and her/his attitude to the content and value of the message" (2001: 1341). Similarly to previous accounts, Erman emphasises that the three discourse spaces she proposes are not discrete, i.e. there are no clear-cut boundaries between them, however, a particular token of a DM in a given context has a "predominant function" that "seems to belong in one domain rather than in the other" (2001: 1342).

Andersen (2001: 60) argues that the plethora of functions DMs can be put to (e.g. marking evidentiality, speaker attitudes, common ground, mutual manifestness, politeness, speech monitoring, etc.) can be subsumed under three pragmatic spaces: those of *subjectivity*, *interactional capacity* and *textual capacity*. Although, as he points out, he does not attempt to propose these notions for the purpose of setting up a taxonomy, he argues (2001: 60ff) that *subjectivity* is a pragmatic space all DMs can function in, while certain DMs (e.g. *you know*) tend to have more *interactional capacity* than others (e.g. *I mean*). Similarly, there are DMs that function more often in *textual spaces* than others (*so* vs. *of course*).

Table 1 below summarises the five authors' respective functional taxonomies of discourse markers and the corresponding discourse spaces (planes / domains / levels, etc. of discourse) as well as my proposal for a model that integrates the five functional taxonomies:

[5] She calls them "discourse operators".

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

Table 1. The functions of DMs in different discourse spaces

	Semantic space	***Pragmatic spaces***			
		Interactional space			
	Ideational space	***Subjective space***	***Interpersonal space***	***Textual space***	***Cognitive space***
Schiffrin (1987, 2006)	Ideational structure *and, but, or so*	Action structure **well, *and, *but*	Participation framework *well, I mean*	Exchange structure* *well, *and, *but*	Information state *oh, you know*
Redeker (1990, 2006)	Ideational structure *then, after that*	Rhetorical structure *well, you know*		Sequential structure *but, so*	
Fraser (1988, 1993)	message relationship markers *but, despite, however*	discourse activity markers *admittedly, after all*		discourse topic markers *by the way, you see*	
Erman (2001)		(metalinguistic monitors, e.g. hedges, emphasisers, approximators)	social monitors e.g. interactive markers, turn-takers	text-monitors e.g. repair markers, editing markers	
Andersen (2001)		subjectivity (expressed by all DMs)	interactional capacity e.g. *you know*	textual capacity e.g. *so*	

The categorisation I propose above hopefully reflects the wide range of macro- (ideational, interpersonal and textual) and micro functions (hedging / boosting, framing, information management, conversation management, marking contrast / inferential premises / conclusions, etc.) that have been identified in the relevant literature[6] as well as the multi- and interdisciplinary nature of DM research, i.e. the different foci of interest shown by various (cognitive, social and cultural) approaches with varying degrees of emphasis on DMs' role in the interaction (e.g. Conversation Analysis), discourse organisation (cohesion/ coherence-based approaches), inferential processes (e.g. Relevance Theory), or socio-cultural ritualisation (e.g. ethnomethodology, interactional sociolinguistics). The model also reflects some of the distinctions that are highlighted and problematised on the spearhead[7] of DM research, such as the semantics/pragmatics interface and the corresponding conceptual/procedural, truth-functional/non-truth-functional dichotomies.

In the remaining part of my paper I will attempt to illustrate two of the possible applications of the proposed model of discourse spaces (see Table 1): (1)

[6] For a comprehensive overview of DMs' functions cf. e.g. Lenk (1998) or Aijmer (2002).
[7] DM research is called the "spearhead discipline" by Hansen (2006).

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

its usefulness in categorising DMs' macro- and micro-functions with special reference to comparing / integrating previous descriptions of the English DM *oh*, (2) the utility of the model for contrastive analyses of DMs across different linguistic and cultural domains, more specifically, for a contrastive study of English *oh* and Hungarian *ó*.

3. English *oh* and Hungarian *ó* – similar sounds, different discourse spaces

3.1. The functional spectrum of English *oh*

As mentioned above, according to Schiffrin (1987) *oh* is functional at the level of information state as it marks the speaker's shift of focus / reorientation toward a piece of information that has become conversationally relevant (1987: 74). In the course of mapping the micro-functions of *oh* in her data, she identifies the following uses of *oh*:

- *oh* in (other as well as self-initiated) repairs,
- *oh* as an attention-getting device,
- *oh* in narratives, especially as marking background information, asides, etc.,
- *oh* marking elaboration and clarification as well as requests for elaboration or clarification,
- *oh* as a floor-keeping device,
- *oh* signalling the speaker's engagement in the conversation,
- *oh* signalling that an interlocutor's emotions (e.g. surprise, fear, or pain) are either less intense or more intense than expected (Schiffrin 1987: 73ff).

Stenström (1994) concentrates on the interactional functions *oh* performs in naturally-occurring conversations:

- *oh* can function as a backchannel and be used as a stronger alternative to *right*, *sure, aha* (1994: 1 and 83),
- *oh* can express emphasis and serve a similar function to *certainly* (1994: 17),
- it can function as a response marker and as such, signal the receipt of information (1994: 28),
- when signalling acknowledgement *oh* can be an alternative to *really, I see, yes,* and *OK* (1994: 67),
- in question-answer-follow-up sequences *oh* marks follow-up sequences (1994: 126).

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

Yet another comprehensive account is provided by Aijmer (1987), who, in addition to some of the above functions, observes that *oh* can be used

- to refer back to an earlier piece of information that is necessary for the hearer to understand the upcoming utterance,
- to mark (a sudden reaction of) surprise,
- to signal an upcoming non-serious (ironic, self-mocking, etc.) utterance,
- as an enquoting device similar to *he was like* or *and he went,*
- before conventionalised phrases as in *Oh, I beg your pardon* or *Oh, have fun then*.

A more recent account of *oh*, provided by Macaulay (2005), lists five super-functions (marking acknowledgement, agreement, emotions, questions and dialogic functions) and a range of sub-functions such as marking quotations, introducing questions, asking for confirmation, etc., all of which were identified in the previous research discussed above.

The above accounts of *oh* take a primarily sociopragmatic approach to its functional spectrum and, as such, mostly concentrate on the *interactional* and *textual discourse spaces*: the terms in which the various uses of *oh* are described are widely used in interactional sociolinguistics (e.g. Schiffrin's use of footing, framing, participant alignment), conversation analysis (e.g. Stenström's reference to turn-taking, self-selecting, adjacency pairs), variation analysis (cf. Macaulay 2005) and Gricean Pragmatics. Scholars who provide accounts of the role *oh* plays in the *cognitive discourse space* include Heritage (1998), Andersen (2001) and Jucker and Smith (1998). Heritage (1998) argues that *oh* marks that, from the viewpoint of the respondent to a question, the previous utterance is problematic in terms of its relevance, presuppositions, or context, which cause the problems for achieving explicitness. Fuller argues that Heritage's account can be extended "to include not only questions but all cues to utterances" (2003: 29) including visual cues and other types of ostensive stimuli. Andersen, on the other hand, points out that *oh* marks the speaker attitude of surprise and, from the hearer's perspective, signals the need for contextual renegotiation (2001: 48). Finally, Jucker and Smith (1998: 175) briefly mention *oh* and argue that by way of interpreting exchanges such as example 1 below, traditional analyses would suggest that speaker A is simply acknowledging a "piece of information as a new fact" (cf. marking acknowledgement in socio-pragmatic accounts); however, according to their Relevance Theoretic account, what A is really responding to is an implication, i.e. not the utterance *per se* but "whatever is mutually believed to be pertinent about" the state of affairs described in a particular utterance (in this case the implication that A and B have a meeting or some other previously arranged event at two o'clock).

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

example 1
Speaker A: It's two o'clock.
Speaker B: Oh.

In addition to the accounts that are aimed at identifying a range of functions and/or a single unifying function shared by several or possibly all occurrences of *oh* in a variety of contexts, there are a number of studies that focus on a particular discourse type or genre, and, as a result, reveal a narrower range of more specific functions. Among such studies mention has to be made of Trester's (2009) study in which she examines the role *oh* plays in expressing speaker stance toward constructed dialogic (i.e. quoted) discourse. She bases her findings on data collected during sociolinguistic interviews with members of a long-form improvisational troupe and identifies functions such as (1) signalling shifts in footing, (2) facilitating the identification and interpretation of the discourse which is being reported, and, (3) expressing evaluation and speaker alignment. Similarly, Tannen's (2010) study shows that *oh* can precede speakers' ventriloquising (speaking in the voice of other people's) thoughts as in *Now your mom would say, "Oh, you need more lettuce!"* (311).

From Norrick's study of conversational narratives it turns out that *oh* (1) prefaces evaluative segments in narrative structure (2000: 145), (2) marks the listener's registration of surprise at a reported incident, and (3) precedes story prefaces as in *Oh, did I tell you…* (2000: 167) and the introduction of new topics as in *Oh, by the way…* (ibid.).

3.2. Previous accounts of Hungarian *ó*

In the course of my search for literature on Hungarian *ó* I have not been able to find a single paper that would either provide a comprehensive account of this item or approach its uses from a discourse-pragmatic perspective. *Ó*, for the most part, is treated as an interjection[8] and is described as a sound resulting from the speaker's (involuntary) expression of his/her emotions. Keszler (2000), for example, in the course of categorising words into word classes, includes *ó* in the list of interjections, but contrasts the word class of interjections (as a subclass of sentence words) with that of interactional sentence words[9] such as *ühüm* (~'uhm'), *igen* (~'yes'), *ja* (~'yeah', 'sure'), *nos* (~'well', 'let's see') and *persze* (~'of course', 'sure'). Keszler's categorisation, thus, suggests Hungarian *ó* has no primary function in the *interactional discourse space*.

[8] The most frequently used Hungarian term is *indulatszó*, ~'word of emotion'.
[9] The Hungarian term she uses is 'interakciós mondatszó' (~ 'interactional sentence-word').

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

In a similar vein, Pusztai et al. (2003, 2009), distinguish between three contexts of use:

- *ó* used for the expression of sadness as in *Ó, micsoda balszerencse* ('DM what misfortune');
- *ó* expressing surprise or joy, e.g. *Ó, hát te is itt vagy?* ('DM, you're also here?') and *Ó, de pompás!* ('DM, how fine');
- *ó* in politeness formulas such as *Ó, bocsánat* or *Ó, pardon* (~'DM, sorry' and ~'DM, excuse me', respectively).

In addition, Pusztai et al.'s lexical entry for *ó* includes other DMs (in Keszler's terms interactional sentence words) such as *jaj, ah, jé,* and *á* that are, supposedly, synonymous with *ó*.

Grétsy (2008) also defines *ó* as an interjection that is a result of an involuntary expression of the speaker's emotions, sometimes marking approval and joy (as in *Ó, ez nagyszerű,* 'DM, that's great'), at other times conveying commiseration, pain and complaint (e.g. *Ó, de kár*…, 'DM, what a pity' and *Ó, jaj*, ~'DM, alas').

3.3. Hungarian *ó* and English *oh* in contrast

A corpus-based approach to the various uses of Hungarian *ó* revealed[10] that there is a great deal more to the functional spectrum of *ó* than the above-discussed descriptions suggest. For the purposes of a contrastive study of English *oh* and Hungarian *ó* I used a translation corpus that subsumes two sub-corpora: the Language A corpus (henceforth LAC) consists of the dialogues from the first season of the popular TV show *House* (also known as *House M. D.* © NBC Universal Television), while the Language B corpus (henceforth LBC) is a collection of the corresponding Hungarian translations. After compiling a list of utterances / exchanges where *ó* was used in the LBC in a variety of micro-functions, I tested the naturalness and/or acceptability of each token in terms of Hungarian native speakers' (henceforth HNSs) perceptions of the DM's use: I asked 36 subjects to rate each token (Key Word in Context) of Hungarian *ó* on a 1-5 Likert scale, where 1 labelled the least acceptable, 5 labelled the most naturally-occurring instances of *ó*. In Furkó (to appear) I provided a detailed account of the research process as well as the findings of the contrastive[11] study, in the present paper, therefore, I will only consider some of the differences and similarities between the use of the two DMs in terms of the model of discourse spaces I presented in section 2.

[10] cf. Furkó (to appear)
[11] corpus- as well as intuition-based

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

The tokens that were rated by HNSs as the most naturally-occurring uses of Hungarian *ó* corresponded to the functions *ó* fulfils in the *subjective discourse space*, such as marking emotions and attitudes, as in *ó, a fenébe,* and *ó, a francba* (both utterances can be glossed roughly as ~'DM, damn'). Certain politeness formulas (cf. *interpersonal discourse space*) were also rated as appropriate contexts for the use of this marker (e.g. *ó, elnézést*, 'DM, sorry'). An interesting finding that had not been discussed in previous accounts was the occurrence of *ó* in the DM cluster *ó, persze* (~'DM, sure') and as a booster of the force of an utterance that expresses disagreement (*ó, dehogynem,* ~'DM, but of course'), both micro-functions correspond to the role of Hungarian *ó* in the *subjective discourse space*.

Among the contexts of *ó* that were rated in the middle acceptability range I found host units that expressed conclusions based on the previous speaker's utterance (e.g. extract 1), requests for clarification (e.g. extract 2) as well as statements that marked new information (extract 3).

extract 1
A: I really do have a cough.
A: *Tényleg csúnyán köhögök.*
B: Oh, so you weren't lying.
B: *Ó, szóval nem füllentés volt.*

extract 2
A: Look, I was wondering.... Before this happened, we were having sex.
A: *Nézze*! *Mielőtt ez megtörtént éppen szexeltünk*!
B: What, you, you're wondering if whatever he has you might have gotten it?
B: *Ó, esetleg azt gondolja, elkaphatott magától valamit*?

extract 3
A: Can I talk to my parents?
A: *Beszélhetek erről a szüleimmel*?
B: Oh, they know all about this.
B: *Ó, ők már tudnak róla.*

Still within the middle score range were utterances where *ó* marked the expression of regret (e.g. *Ó ez nagy kár*, 'DM, that's quite a shame') or functioned as a booster (extract 4):

extract 4
A: Paranoia?
A: *Paranoia*?
B: Oh yeah – she's schizophrenic.
B: *Ó igen. A páciens skizofrén.*

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

The most striking differences between the use of English *oh* and Hungarian *ó* can be observed in the case of utterances / contexts of use where *oh* in the LAC plays a role in the *cognitive discourse space*. Here we can find sudden (mock) realisation (extract 5), and a range of echoic utterances such as the expression of sarcasm and irony (e.g. extract 6) as well as parody / put-down (extract 7). As we can see from the original utterances in the LAC as well as in previous accounts of *oh* discussed in section 3.1 above, all of these contexts provide perfectly acceptable host units for the English DM *oh*; however, in such utterances the use of Hungarian *ó* scored very low on the acceptability scale:

extract 5
A: Usually it means, whoever drew the blood didn't do it right.
A: *Aki levette a vért, hibázott.*
B: Oh, that's right – 'cause... you drew the blood.
B: ?*Ó, igen. És maga vette le.*

extract 6
A: There's a protocol for putting a patient in a high-pressure oxygen room to treat autoimmune problems.
A: *Ilyen problémák esetén nagynyomású oxigénkamra lenne az előírás.*
B: Oh, you people. Always with the protocols.
B: ?*Ó, hihetetlen. Mindig az előírások.*

extract 7
A: An MRI would give us a better idea -
A: *Egy MR sokat segítene.*
B: Oh, an MRI? Come on. For pneumonia?
B: ?*Ó, egy MR*? *Ugyan már. Tüdőgyulladásra*?

4. Conclusion

In this paper I have investigated possible ways of categorising and mapping the functional spectrum of discourse markers, in the course of which I proposed a model of discourse spaces, which, it is my hope, reflects the wide range of macro- and micro functions DMs fulfill as well as the multi- and interdisciplinary nature of DM research, i.e. the different foci of interest shown by various (cognitive, social and cultural) approaches with varying degrees of emphasis on DMs' role in the interaction, discourse organisation, inferential processes, and socio-cultural ritualisation. In the second part of the paper I used my model in order to give an intergrated account of the English DM *oh* and to provide a contrastive analysis of English *oh* and Hungarian *ó*. My findings regarding the former confirmed the results

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

of previous research: English *oh* has a primary function in the *cognitive discourse space* and secondary, but equally salient functions in the *interactional* and *textual spaces*. As for Hungarian *ó*, a combination of corpus-driven and intuition-based data collection methods revealed that its primary function is in the *interactional / subjective discourse space*, while functions in the *textual* and *cognitive spaces* are non-salient in the corpus and are considered marginal by Hungarian native speakers.

The lack of a generally accepted functional typology and the inherently multidisciplinary nature of DM studies, naturally, reflects the fact that the field of DM research is rather heterogeneous with no "overarching theoretical framework" (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2006: 1). Some even argue that further empirical research is futile until a generally agreed model of communication is outlined and such fundamental issues as categorisation and functional classification are clarified (cf. Dér 2010: 3). Others argue that the lack of convergence in terms of discourse coherence models is due to the fact that discourse is a derivate concept at best, and "is an artifact with no psychological reality", at worst (Blakemore 2002: 5).

My aim, therefore, has not been to propose yet another discourse coherence model, but, more simply, to integrate previous models in an attempt to find a heuristic tool that – in the absence of a generally accepted model – helps to map the functional spectra of a variety of DMs with a view to contrasting individual DMs within as well as across languages.

References

Aijmer, Karin. 1987. 'Oh' and 'ah' in English Conversation. In Meijs, Willem (ed.) *Corpus Linguistics and Beyond*, 61-86. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Aijmer, Karin. 2002. *English Discourse Particles: Evidence from a Corpus*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Aijmer, Karin & Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen. 2006. Introduction. In Aijmer, Karin & Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen (eds.), *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*, 1-10. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Andersen, Gisle. 2001. *Pragmatic Markers and Sociolinguistic Variation: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach to the Language of Adolescents*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Blakemore, Diane. 2002. *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dér Csilla Ilona. 2010. On the Status of Discourse Markers. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 57: 3-28.

Erman, Britt. 2001. Pragmatic Markers Revisited with a Focus on *you know* in Adult and Adolescent Talk. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1337-1359.

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

Fraser, Bruce. 1988. Types of English Discourse Markers. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 38: 19-33.
Fraser, Bruce. 1996. Pragmatic Markers. *Pragmatics* 6: 167-190.
Fuller, Janet M. 2003. The Influence of Speaker Roles on Discourse Marker Use. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 23-45.
Furkó Péter. (to appear) Oh What a Difference an *Ó* Makes – a Contrastive Study of English *Oh* and Hungarian *Ó*. In: Németh, Lenke & Varró, Gabriella (eds.) *Festschrift for Professor Virágos Zsolt.* Debrecen: Debrecen University Press.
Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
González, Monserrat. 2004. *Pragmatic Markers in Oral Narrative - The Case of English and Catalan*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Grétsy László. 2008. Búcsú az óévtől. [Farewell from the Old Year]. *Szabad Föld* 12/19/2008. Available online at http://www.szabadfold.hu/cimke?id=67&oldal=11 accessed 14th March, 2012.
Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 2006. A Dynamic Polysemy Approach to the Lexical Semantics of Discourse Markers. In Fischer, Kerstin (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Oxford: Elsevier.
Heritage, John, 1998. Oh-prefaced Responses to Inquiry. *Language in Society* 27: 291-334.
Jucker, Andreas H. & Sara W. Smith. 1998. And People Just You Know Like 'Wow': Discourse Markers as Negotiating Strategies. In: Jucker, Andreas H. & Yael Ziv. (eds.) *Discourse Markers*: *Descriptions and Theory*, 171-201. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Keszler Borbála (ed.) 2000. *Magyar grammatika* [*Hungarian Grammar*]. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
Lenk, Uta. 1998. *Marking Discourse Coherence: Functions of Discourse Markers in Spoken English*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
Macaulay, Ronald K. S. 2005. *Talk That Counts: Age, Gender, and Social Class Differences in Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Norrick, Neal R. 2000. *Conversational Narrative: Storytelling in Everyday Talk*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Park, Yong-Yae. 1998. A Discourse Analysis of Contrastive Connectives in English, Korean, and Japanese Conversation with Special Reference to the Context of Dispreferred Responses. In Jucker, Andreas H. & Yael Ziv. (eds.), *Discourse Markers. Description and Theory*, 277-301. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Pusztai Ferenc; Juhász József; Gerstner Károly; J. Soltész Katalin (eds.), 2003 and 2009. *Magyar értelmező kéziszótár* [*Hungarian Etymological Dictionary*]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Redeker, Gisela. 1990. Ideational and Pragmatic Markers of Discourse Structure. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 367-381.
Redeker, Gisela. 1991. Linguistic markers of discourse structure. *Linguistics* 29: 1139-1172.
Redeker, Gisela. 2006. Discourse Markers as Attentional Cues at Discourse Transitions. In Fischer, Kerstin (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 339-359. Oxford: Elsevier.
Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Stenström, Anna-Brita. 1994. *An Introduction to Spoken Interaction*. London & New York: Longman.

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)

Tannen, Deborah. 2010. Abduction and Identity in Family Interaction: Ventriloquizing as Indirectness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 307-316.

Trester, Anna Marie. 2009. Discourse Marker 'oh' as a Means for Realizing the Identity Potential of Constructed Dialogue in Interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13/2: 147-168.

BDD-A7529 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:39:17 UTC)