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ABSTRACT

The present paper reports the results of the study aimed to investigate the problem of discourse markers, their functions and distribution across the four discussed registers: dialogue in drama (which can be ascribed to spoken discourse), academic prose, legal documents and newspaper articles in the English language. It draws upon the theoretical assumptions of text linguistics on discourse, cohesive devices, the notion of register and its components. The study is based on theories of various linguists proposing different terms and definitions for the discourse marker, on the corpus of occurrences of these linguistic items in the examined sources. The investigation also attempts to examine the functional complexity of discourse markers in cohesive texts. As a result, it was proved that discourse markers play a significant role in the above mentioned four registers and the choice of these linguistic elements depends on the specificity of a register.
INTRODUCTION

The present study is concerned with the issue of discourse markers as text forming devices in the English discourse. The choice of this topic as an object of investigation was motivated by the fact that, in the first place, the linguistic items subsumed under this title were the last to receive researchers’ attention as text forming or text forward moving devices: a rather lengthy and abundant in investigations history of text analysis for a long time ignored such items as *oh, well, you know, I guess, I’m afraid, I mean*, etc. or gave them only a cursory examination. Secondly, these items do not comprise a uniformed system. Due to their polyfunctionality, differences in correlation between propositional meaning and contextual meaning as well as other factors, these particles were differently named in linguistic literature and different functions were ascribed to them. For example, Fraser (1993) calls them “discourse markers” and maintains that each of them has a principle meaning, which signals how the speaker intends the utterance to relate to the prior discourse. Trujillo Saez (2003) agrees with Fraser on the name, but gives a slightly different definition of discourse markers as items used to ease the interpretation of utterances. According to Aijmer (2002), they are “discourse particles” functioning as signposts in the communication, facilitating the addressee’s interpretation of the utterance in various contexts.

Starting with the assumption that the use of discourse markers indicates effective communication between the author and the reader (the addressee and the addressor), that they belong to the system of devices ensuring text cohesion and coherence and that they are polyfunctional, we have based our research on the following hypotheses:

- discourse markers are indispensable in all registers
- though some discourse markers can be met across several registers and their functions may overlap, the register itself determines the choice of discourse marker

The diverse corpus of discourse markers, their polyfunctionality and the fact that the functioning of these particles across registers has not been studied determined the aims of this research:

- on the basis of the existing and available researches on discourse markers we aimed to define the functions discourse markers play in a coherent text;
- on the basis of quantitative and qualitative approaches to the obtained data we aimed to reveal distribution of discourse markers in certain registers.
The research is based on the analysis of the texts of four different registers: drama, which is considered to be closest to spoken discourse, academic prose, legal documents and newspaper articles. The scope of the research material is fifty pages of each text. The following sources were analyzed: “A Streetcar Named Desire” by T. Williams (drama); “Two-phase Flow Simulation of Plazma-ignited Combustion in an Energetic Fluid Bed” by B. Li and D.Y. Kwok, “Instabilities of Magnetohydrodynamic Waves Driven by the Velocity Anistropy of the Energetic Ions” by Oleh YA. Kolesnichenko and Adam K. Yukhimuk, a number of articles from PhysicsWeb in the Internet (academic prose); Last Will and Testament, Employment Agreement, Sample Revocable Living Trust, Sample Employment Termination Contract and other legal documents available from the Internet (legal documents); The New York Times (issue No. 52).

The occurrences of discourse markers were thoroughly counted and presented in tables, followed by the examples of the most frequently used items. The range of functions expressed by the most frequent markers is also presented.

In accordance with the basic purpose the paper is divided into three parts:

- PART 1 examines some basic notions in text linguistics. It provides an overview of the concepts of discourse, cohesion, textuality, cohesive devices and the notion of register and its components.
- PART 2 of the paper gives a closer outlook of discourse markers. It presents points of view of such linguists as Halliday and Hasan (1992), Schiffrin (1987), Blakemore (1987), Fraser (1996), Trujillo Saez (2003) on the definition and delimitation of these particles. Also, the discussion of the functions of these linguistic items in various contexts is based on the points of view of Aijmer (2002) and Andersen (2001).
- PART 3 focuses on the distribution of discourse markers in the four above mentioned types of discourse. The most frequent of them are arranged in tables, presenting the number of occurrences and the percental ratio of the distribution. Some of the peculiarities of discussed registers and the functions of discourse markers in them are outlined.

The results of the investigation are summed up in the CONCLUSIONS.

The theoretical value of the paper lies in the possibility of using its results for further investigation of the specificity of discourse markers and their functions.
The practical value of the paper is seen in the possibility of using its material and results in teachers’ practical work.

It is notable that non-native speakers of English (e.g. students at Lithuanian schools) should be taught to use discourse markers for coherent speech and writing. In learning to use these linguistic items there are a number of factors that should be taken into account:

- how frequently they are used (e.g. however is more frequent than nonetheless)
- whether they generally precede clauses (e.g. so, thus, also), occur within clauses (e.g. therefore), or come at the end of the clauses (e.g. too)
- how they are used in relation to particular kinds of text and context (formal, informal, written or spoken)
- whether they can introduce or separate substantial blocks of text (e.g. however, furthermore), or they tend to be used with shorter stretches (e.g. as well)

The results of the investigation might also be used in courses of general linguistics, pragmatics, or specialized courses of discourse stylistics.
PART 1. INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS

Discourse markers as linguistic phenomena have been analyzed and widely discussed by many linguists (Levinson, 1983, Schiffrin, 1987, Blakemore, 1987, Fraser, 1993, etc.). There is a wide range of words that could be interpreted as discourse markers. These are mostly words with little lexical meaning that appear on the periphery of clause structure (Masaitiene, 2003). Discourse markers have important interactive role in discourse as they indicate a relationship between the speaker and the hearer, between the addressee and the addressee. As Schiffrin (1987, 49) writes, “the analysis of discourse markers is part of the more general analysis of discourse coherence – how speakers and hearers jointly integrate forms, meanings, and actions to make overall sense out of what is said”. So discourse markers form a group of linguistic items that are inseparable from discourse and fulfill significant roles in discourse interpretation. Therefore, it becomes relevant to briefly introduce the concept of discourse and that of register. The relevance of the latter is determined by the aims of this research which were delineated in INTRODUCTION.

1.1. The Concept of Discourse

Many linguists consider two different kinds of language as potential objects for study: one abstracted in order to teach a language or literacy or to study how the rules of language work, and another which has been used to communicate something and is felt to be coherent (and may, or may not, happen to correspond to a correct sentence or a series of correct sentences). This latter kind of language –language in use / for communication – is called discourse. It treats the rules of grammar as a resource, conforming to them when it needs to but departing from them when it does not (Cook, 1989).

Discourse analysis is the study of written and spoken language in its psychological and social context, which looks at both language form and language function and includes the study of both spoken interaction and written texts (McCarthy, 1991). It identifies linguistic features that characterize different genres as well as social and cultural factors that aid in our interpretation and understanding of different texts and types of talk. An analysis of written texts might include a study of topic development and cohesion across the sentences, while an analysis of spoken language might focus on these
aspects plus turn-taking, opening and closing sequences of social encounters, or narrative structure (McCarthy, 1991).

To discourse analysts, “discourse” usually means actual instances of communication in the medium of language. Not all linguistic communication is spoken or written: there are manual languages (American Sign Language), whose speakers use gestures rather than sound or graphic signs. In discourse analysis we are interested in what happens when people draw on the knowledge they have about language, based on their memories of things they have said, heard, seen, or written before, to do things in the world, exchange information, express feelings, make things happen, create beauty, entertain themselves and others, and so on. This knowledge – a set of generalizations, which can sometimes be stated as rules about what words generally mean, about what goes where in a sentence, and so on – is what is often referred to as “language”, when language is thought of as an abstract system of rules or structural relationships. Discourse is both the source of this knowledge (people’s generalizations about language are made on the basis of the discourse they participate in) and the result of it (people apply what they already know in creating and interpreting new discourse).

Discourse analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used.

D. Schiffrin (1995) considers three different definitions of discourse: discourse as sentences, discourse as language use, and the third definition attempts to bridge the first two and views discourse as utterances.

The classic definition of discourse is discourse as sentences. Many structuralists viewed discourse as “language above the sentence or above the clause” (Stubbs, 1983,1).

Z. Harris (1951) claimed that discourse is “a higher level in a hierarchy of morphemes, clauses and sentences” (cited in Schiffrin, 1995, 52). According to Harris’s view the difference between discourse and a random sequence of sentences is denoted by the fact that discourse has structure: a pattern by which segments of the discourse occur relative to each other. What is still critical to structural views of discourse is that discourse is comprised of units. Although Harris considered the morpheme (and their combination into sentences) to be the unit, more recent approaches have claimed that a clause, a proposition or a sentence held a unit of which discourse was comprised.
Holker (1989) suggested that the linguistic structures of an expression, including both form-based (morphological and syntactic) and meaning-based (referential and conjunctive) relations, create connexity and cohesion (in Schiffrin, 1995).

Consistent with the definition of discourse as language above the sentence, many contemporary structural analyses of discourse view the sentence as the unit of which discourse is comprised. Yet several problems appear here. One immediate problem is that the units in which people speak do not always look like sentences. Another problem of the view of discourse as language above the sentence is that people may begin to accept the structure of discourse the same as the structure of sentences of which discourse is comprised. Structurally based definitions of discourse lead to analyses of constituents that have particular relationships with one another in a text and that can occur in a restricted set of text level arrangements. Also, it is often a difficult task to identify structural constituents of discourse.

Another definition of discourse given by Schiffrin (1995) is discourse as language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions that they serve in human affairs. So, the analysis of language use cannot be independent of the analysis of the purposes and functions of language in human life. Discourse is assumed to be interdependent with social life. It is viewed as a system (a socially and culturally organized way of speaking) through which particular functions are realized.

Discourse - language beyond the sentence - is simply language as it occurs, in any context, in any form, including two made-up sentences in sequence, a tape-recorded conversation, a meeting or an interview, a novel or a play (Tannen, 1989). Following Schiffrin (1987), defining discourse as language use depends upon broader assumptions about the relevance of language to meanings, activities, and systems outside of discourse itself. The main point of this definition is that functionally based approaches view discourse as a socially and culturally organized way of speaking.

The third definition of discourse according to Schiffrin (1987) is discourse is utterances. This view captures the idea that discourse is larger than other units of language. However, by saying that utterance (rather than sentence) is the smaller unit of which discourse is comprised, can be suggested that discourse is not a collection of decontextualized units of language structure, but a collection of inherently contextualized units of language use. The main problem with this definition is that the notion of
"utterance" is not really that clear. For many linguists, utterances are contextualized sentences, i.e. they are context bound.

As it is evident from the above, discourse is a wide notion that is divided into two broad units – the spoken and the written discourse, which then fall into registers – variations of language depending on the situation. A few words should be said about spoken and written discourse because in our research corpus collected from drama stands closest to spoken discourse, i.e. it represents some features of spoken discourse.

1.1.1. The Spoken and the Written Discourse

Traditionally, discourse is divided into two major categories, the spoken and the written, which is clearly based on difference in production and reception: we use our mouths and ears for one, and our hands and eyes for the other. Spoken discourse is considered to be less planned and orderly, more open to intervention by the receiver. Following McCarthy (1991, 118), some different types of spoken discourse might be distinguished:

- Telephone calls (business and private)
- Service encounters (shops, ticket offices, etc.)
- Interviews (jobs, journalistic, in official settings)
- Classroom (classes, seminars, lectures, tutorials)
- Rituals (church prayers, sermons, weddings)
- Monologues (speeches, stories, jokes)
- Language-in-action (talk, accompanying doing: fixing, cooking, assembling, demonstrating, etc.)
- Casual conversation (strangers, friends, intimates)
- Organising and directing people (work, home, in the street)

Spoken language emerged before written language. As many scholars have noted before, written language emerged to satisfy new communicative needs - in particular the need for permanent records, which could be referred to again and again. The contexts, therefore, for using written language are very different from those in which spoken language is used. The reader is, in most cases, removed in both time and space, i.e. s/he reads the text at a different time from when it was written, and in a different place. As a result, the language of the written text has to make greater allowances for the reader in order to facilitate understanding.
Written language, in fact, performs many of the same functions as spoken language - to get things done (e.g. public signs, product labels), to inform (e.g. newspapers, advertisements), to entertain (e.g. fiction books, comic strips).

There are also some kinds of spoken discourse, like lessons, lectures, interviews, and trials, which have significant features in common with typical written discourse.

The characteristics associated with written text occurring in spoken language and vice versa totally depend on the purpose of the text and the context it occurs in.

What are the features that make written discourse different from spoken language? Linguistically, written text tends to be more complex, with longer sentences, more complex clauses, greater information load, with the higher number of lexical or content words per clause. What are the reasons for this? Unlike spoken interaction, in written discourse there is no common situation: the situation has to be inferred from the text. The words themselves must carry all the shades of meaning which, in spoken discourse, could be conveyed by non-verbal behavior. The writer must make assumptions about the reader’s state of knowledge. If incorrect assumptions are made, the communication may be hindered. By analyzing written discourse we are able to see the decisions that the writer has made, with regard to how sentences are formed internally and combined with each other externally, and how assumptions regarding the reader’s knowledge of the subject and ability to interpret the text will play an important part in this process.

There are certain rules or regularities that people follow when creating written texts. According to Nunan (1993), these rules depend on the context, or the situation that gives rise to the discourse, and within which the discourse is enclosed. He refers to two different types of context: the linguistic context - the language that surrounds or accompanies the piece of discourse under analysis - and the non-linguistic context within which the discourse takes place, e.g. the type of communicative event (newspaper report, letter, note), the topic, the purpose, the participants and the relationships between them, and the background knowledge and assumptions underlying the communication.

Context and text are aspects of the same process. There is text and there is other text that accompanies it; text that is “with”, namely the con-text. This notion of what is “with the text”, however, goes beyond what is said and written: it includes other non-verbal goings-on – the total environment in which a text unfolds. In real life, contexts precede texts (Halliday and Hasan, 1989).
The above said leads to the conclusion that discourses vary according to the situations they appear in.

1.2. The Notion of Register

Halliday (1985) gave the name “register” to a variety of a language distinguished according to use. His theory of register attempts to uncover the general principles which “govern the way the language we speak or write varies according to the type of situation” (de Beaugrande, 1993, 8). When we observe language activity in various contexts in which it takes place, we find differences in the types of situation. Indeed, language varies as its function varies; it differs in different situations. So, registers are varieties of language associated with different circumstances and purposes. (Biber et al., 2002)

Another approach to “register” was to circumscribe it by comparing and contrasting it with “dialect”. Dialects and registers are two sorts of variety of a language (Halliday, 1978). Dialect was defined “according to user”, and register – “according to use”. The dialect is what a person speaks habitually, depending in principle on who he/she is: where he/she comes from, either geographically (regional dialects) or socially (social dialects). In modern urban life, the social dialect dominates. The register is what a person is speaking at the time, depending on what he/she is doing and the nature of the activity in which the language is functioning.

Any individual might speak only one dialect throughout the whole life (which used to be a norm), whereas it would be impossible to use only one register as it reflects the different types of social activity that people commonly engage in (Halliday, 1989). So, dialects differ not in the meanings they express (like registers do) but in the realizations of these meanings at different levels – in grammar, vocabulary, phonology and phonetics. Both dialects and registers may overlap in various areas and at varying degrees.

It is by their formal properties that registers are defined. Registers may be distinguished according to field, mode and tenor – terms used by Halliday (1989) both as underlying concepts and as descriptive categories. As concepts they help to explain how language users interpret the social contexts or textual environments in which meanings are made. As descriptive terms, field refers to the topic, to what is happening in a discourse, tenor refers to the roles of the participants and the mode refers to what the
language is doing itself as a channel of communication (spoken or written) (Halliday, 1989).

FIELD OF DISCOURSE refers to what is going on: to the area of the operation of language activity. Under this heading registers are classified according to the nature of the whole event of which the language activity is a part. In the type of situation in which the language activity accounts for practically the whole of the relevant activity, such as an essay, a discussion or an academic seminar, the field of discourse is the subject matter. On this dimension of classification, we can recognize registers such as politics or personal relations, and technical registers like biology or mathematics.

There are, on the other hand, situations in which the language activity rarely plays more than a minor part; here the field of discourse refers to the whole event. In this sense there is, for example, a register of domestic chores: ‘dusting the furniture’ may involve language activity, which, though marginal, is contributing to the total event.

Registers, classified according to field of discourse thus include both the technical and the non-technical: shopping and games playing as well as medicine and linguistics.

MODE OF DISCOURSE refers to the medium or mode of the language activity, and it is this that determines, or rather correlates with, the role played by the language activity in the situation. The primary distinction on this dimension is that into spoken and written language, the two, having by and large, different situational roles. In this connection, reading aloud is a special case of written rather than of spoken language.

The extent of formal differentiation between spoken and written language has varied very greatly among different languages communities and at different periods. But spoken and written English are by no means formally identical. They differ both in grammar and in lexis.

Within these primary modes, it is possible to recognize further registers such as the language of newspaper, of advertising, of conversation and of sports commentary. Like other dimensions of variations in linguistics, the classification of modes of discourse is variable in delicacy. For example, what is first recognized as the register of journalism is then sub classified into reportage, editorial comment, feature writing and so on.

Some modes of discourse are such that tend to be self-sufficient, in the sense that they account for most or all the activity relevant to the situations. In literature particularly the language activity is as it were self-sufficient. The grammatical and lexical distinctions between the various modes of discourse can often be related to the variable situational role assigned to language by the medium.
TENOR OF DISCOURSE refers to the relation among the participants. To the extent that these affect and determine features of the language, they suggest a primary distinction into colloquial and polite. This dimension is unlikely ever to yield clearly defined, discrete registers. There is a possibility to have a more delicate division with categories such as ‘casual’, ‘intimate’ and ‘deferential’. But until we know how languages vary with style, such categories are arbitrary and provisional.

The participants’ relations that determine the style of discourse range through varying degrees of permanence. Most temporary are those, which are a feature of the immediate situations, as when the participants are at a party or have met on the train. At the opposite extreme are relations such as those between parents and children. Various socially defined relations, as between a teacher and a pupil or an employer and an employee, lie somewhere intermediately. Some such registers may show more specific formal properties than others: by linguistic evidence it is easier to identify a situation in which one participant is serving the others in a shop than one involving lecturer and students in a university classroom.

Which participant relations are linguistically relevant and how far these are distinctively reflected in the grammar and lexis, depends on the language concerned.

Register can be best defined and identified as the product of these three dimensions of classification.

According to Halliday (1989), the category of register varies from something that is closed and limited to something that is relatively free and open-ended. He distinguishes closed registers and open registers. Closed registers are also called restricted language. These registers give no scope for individuality or creativity, the messages are fixed and finite. Here belong languages of games, menus, telegrams, faxes, and so on. To the open varieties of registers the languages of minor documents (like tickets) and official forms can be ascribed. Also, there is a special register of verses on greeting cards. More open are registers of headlines and of recipes, still more open are those of technical instructions, of legal documents, various transactional registers (buying and selling at an auction, in a shop/market) and the communication between doctor and patient. A special attention is now being paid to the language of the classroom in primary and secondary schools, as the transition from primary to secondary school implies the necessity for pupils to learn new registers. The most open are registers of informal narrative and spontaneous conversation. However, these registers are not totally open-ended. Even the most informal spontaneous conversation has its strategies and styles of meaning. Users of
languages are never selecting with complete freedom from all the resources of the linguistic system.

Johnstone (2002) defines register as a set of lexical and grammatical features that accompany and help to identify discourse that occurs in a particular recurrent situation. The scholar also says that it is difficult to separate register from style, since the term “style” has been used in many different ways. Some scholars use the term “style” instead of “register”. For some of them, as Johnstone (op.cit.) states, style refers to a speaker’s level of self-consciousness. Some linguists say that style is one aspect of register, since style often refers mainly to choices of vocabulary and grammar, while knowing how to function in a register also includes knowing the ways of interacting and general strategies for interpretation that are characteristic of a situation.

According to Leckie-Tarry (1993), both situational and linguistic variables should be an essential part of the process of register characterization. These situational variables determine the function of the utterance, that specify register as a variety according to use. She (Leckie-Tarry, 1993) also claims that to specify the identifying features of the registers of written language from those of spoken one, the scholars need to have a basis for comparison common to all. As the scholar mentions, discussions of literary texts were traditionally based on the specification of genre. The French word “genre” means “kind”, and in English it has been used in literary studies for such categories as poem, myth, tale, etc. (Hymes, 1974). Recently the terms “register” and “genre” have become used for the analysis of written and spoken, literary and non-literary texts.

The concept of “genre” is more effective in representing that theoretical construct which intervenes between language function and language form. There are some basic differences and some degree of overlap between the definitions and the conceptualization of the two terms. Halliday (1978) differentiates between the two terms as well. In his understanding, genre is more limited. He sees “generic structure” as a single characteristic of a text, its organizational structure. Generic structure, textual structure and cohesion distinguish text from non-text, and as such they are brought within the framework of register. The genre therefore, according to the scholar, contributes to its register.

As Leckie-Tarry (1993, 31) writes, Australian genre theorists “see register theory as placing too little weight on social processes and hence functional aspects of texts”. They claim, that “register theory privileges linguistic features of texts over social context, and context of situation over the broader social context” (op.cit., 31). So, assuming their
point of view, genre pays more attention to social context, whereas register – to linguistic features.

The concept of genre has been associated with whole interactions (or whole texts), whereas register is frequently used to refer to sections within a text which are characterized by certain linguistic forms (Leckie-Tarry, 1993). This is due to the fact that, according to Leckie-Tarry (1993), register patterns may be borrowed into a shorter stretch of a longer text, so that the shorter stretch is marked by features other than those that characterize the text as a whole.

Bakhtin (1979) also makes the distinction between whole texts and sections of texts, although he universally applies the term “genre”. According to Bakhtin (2000), “genres are relative “stable” uses of language with common characteristics that are constructed by historic human interactions in a situation relatively structured” (cited in Thaiane da Silva Socoloski, 2004). He distinguishes between primary (simple) and secondary (complex) genres. Everyday dialogue contained within a novel is an example of primary and secondary genres respectively.

To sum up, the terms “register” and “genre” describe similar generalizations about discourse, and not all discourse analysts use these terms in the same ways. Register is a variety of language (or “style”) associated with a recurrent communicative situation or set of communicative roles. The examples are scientific discourse, medical discourse and legal language. Genre is a recurrent verbal form (or “text type”) associated with a recurrent purpose or activity; “genre knowledge” is the procedural competence required to produce a form and use it. Here belong wills, research reports, medical consultations, etc.

In fact, a great diversity of registers throughout various languages can be observed. In this particular paper the attention is concentrated on four registers: dialogue in drama (which is closest to spoken discourse), academic prose, legal documents, and newspaper articles. These four varieties, as mentioned by Biber et al. (2002), differentiate according to several circumstances that they appear in. The most general distinction is made on the basis of mode: dialogue in drama (text written to be spoken) could be attributed to spoken register, whereas all the rest are written. According to the main communicative purpose, dialogue focuses on personal communication, legal documents are part of formal legal language, and newspapers and academic prose comprise an informative function. Nevertheless, there are some significant differences between the last two registers. Academic prose has a more specialized audience and is more
concerned with building an argument, while newspaper style is aimed at a wider audience and is used for a more informational purpose. The registers also differ according to the level of interactiveness they possess. Dialogue in drama is the most interactive, as it focuses on personal communication. This feature is completely different in the case of the two informational registers. Newspaper writing is not interactive, as it is not addressed to a concrete individual reader but to the whole range of different personalities differing according to their lifestyle, occupation and preferences. Academic style is restricted to the members of academic society.

Registers differ primarily in form. Some registers have distinctive features at other levels, such as the voice quality associated with the register of church services. But the crucial criteria of any given register are to be found in its grammar and its lexis. Lexical features are the most obvious. Some lexical items suffice almost by themselves to identify a certain register: ‘cleanse’ puts us in the language of advertising, ‘probe’ of newspapers, especially headlines, ‘tablespoonful’ of recipes or prescriptions, ‘neckline’ of fashion reporting or dress-making instructions. The clearest signals of a particular register are scientific technical terms except those that belong to more than one science, like ‘morphology’ in biology and linguistics.

Often it is not the lexical item alone but the collocation of two or more lexical items that is specific to one register. For example, ‘kick’ is presumably neutral, but ‘free-kick’ is from the language of ‘football’.

Purely grammatical distinctions between different registers are less striking, yet there can be considerable variation in grammar also. Extreme cases are newspaper headlines and church services, but many other registers, such as sports commentaries and popular songs, exhibit specific grammatical characteristics. Sometimes, for example, in the language of advertising, it is the combination of grammatical and lexical features that is distinctive.

Registers are not marginal or specific varieties of language. Between them they cover the total range of our language activity. It is only the reference to the various situations, and situation types, in which language is used that we can understand its functioning and its effectiveness. Language is not realized in the abstract: it is realized as the activity of people in situations, as linguistic events, which are manifested in a particular dialect and register.

A great deal of grammatical and lexical material is common to many of the registers of a given language, and some perhaps to all. Cohesion is the term used to
describe the structural, grammatical and lexical means by which sentences and paragraphs in the texts are linked and relationships between them established. Halliday and Hasan (1992) define cohesion as the set of possibilities that exist in the language for making text hang together. It is a semantic relation between an element in the text and some other element that is crucial to the interpretation of it, which is expressed partly through the grammar and partly through the vocabulary.

In English, the basic means of establishing cohesion are through the use of pronouns, determiners, conjunctions, conjuncts and adverbials to substitute, repeat, refer or omit items across a text. Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by shift to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text. Essentially coherence is concerned with the content of a text, the meaning it is attempting to convey. When texts are not coherent, they do not make sense or they make it difficult for the reader to follow and understand (Halliday and Hasan, 1992).

Formal links between sentences and between clauses are known as cohesive devices, single instances of which are called ties. Trujillo Saez (2001) separates different types of cohesive ties, such as: reference, substitution, ellipsis, lexical cohesion, conjunction and discourse markers. The last group of cohesive ties and their functions across registers are of the main interest in this paper.
PART 2. DISCOURSE MARKERS

2.1. Definition and Delimitation

Discourse markers as a subject of study were first mentioned by Levinson (1983), but only briefly. The first serious examination of these linguistic elements was carried out by Schiffrin (1987). She analyzed such items as *and, because, but, I mean, now, oh, or, so, then, well, and y’know*, which occurred in unstructured conversations and spontaneous speech. The scholar proposed that these markers mainly serve three functions:

1) as contextual coordinates for utterances by locating them on one or more planes of discourse;
2) they index adjacent utterances to the speaker, the hearer, or both;
3) they indicate the utterance to prior and/or subsequent discourse.

In her view, discourse markers serve an integrative function, contributing to discourse coherence. As a result of her work, discourse markers were defined as “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk”, for example, sentences or speech acts (Schiffrin, 1987, 1).

At about the same time, and probably unaware of Schiffrin (1987), Blakemore (1987) discussed some discourse markers like *and, after all, you see, but, moreover, furthermore* and *so*. She called them “discourse connectives”. She proposed that these expressions are used to indicate how the relevance of one discourse element is dependent on another.

However, Halliday and Hasan (1992) argue that linguistic items discussed by Schiffrin (1987) and Blakemore (1987) belong to the group of conjunctions, which are those words and phrases that explicitly draw attention to the type of relationship, which exists between one sentence (or clause) and another, providing a type of formal relation between sentences:

- add more information to what has been said (*and, furthermore, add to that*)
- elaborate or exemplify it (*for instance, thus, in other words*)
- contrast new information with old one, or put another side to the argument (*or, on the other hand, however, conversely*)
- relate new information to what has already been given in terms of clauses (*so, consequently, because, for this reason*) or in time (*formerly, then*)
- may indicate a new departure or a summary (by the way, well, to sum up, anyway)

At the time Halliday and Hasan analyzed conjunctions the notion of discourse markers has just been starting to be discussed and it was difficult for linguists to find any particular place for them in linguistics.

In the work of Halliday and Hasan (1992) particular attention is given to the six items: now, of course, well, anyway, surely and after all. They claim that due to their phonological reduction these words acquire significant meaning.

If it is reduced, now means the opening of a new stage in the communication:

- e.g. Are you ready? Now when I tell you to jump, close your eyes and jump. (Halliday and Hasan, 1992, 268)

Of course is used to “make someone accept something the speaker knows he is likely to reject” and to “suggest that something should have been obvious “but” was overlooked” (Halliday and Hasan, 1992):

- e.g. “Everything’s just as it was!” “Of course it is,” said the Queen. (Halliday and Hasan, 1992, 269)

They were going to come to the meeting. Of course they may have changed their minds. (Halliday and Hasan, 1992, 269)

As Halliday writes (op.cit.), well occurs at the beginning of a response in dialogue. It means either the acknowledgement of the question and readiness to give an answer or a pause:

- e.g. 1) Mitch: I’m surprised to hear that. (Blanche is telling him how rude her sister’s husband is to her.)

Blanche: Are you?

Mitch: Well, I – don’t see how anybody could be rude to you. (TW, 1425)

2) Blanche: You haven’t asked me how I happened to get away from the school before the spring term ended.

Stella: Well, I thought you’d volunteer that information – if you wanted to tell me. (well is a hesitation mark) (TW, 1389)

Anyway indicates cohesion with the preceding sentence by “simply brushing it aside”:

- e.g. They changed over to a most peculiar kind of train which you don’t see now. I’ve forgotten what it was called. Was it called a “steam coach”? I can’t
remember. **Anyway** it was just one coach but it ran by steam and it made a funny noise. (Halliday and Hasan, 1992, 270)

**Surely** has the meaning of “am I right in my understanding of what’s just been said?”:

e.g. They’ll think you’re serious. – Nobody could be so stupid as to think that, **surely**. (Halliday and Hasan, 1992, 270)

**After all** is used to denote the following meaning “after everything relevant has been considered, what remains is…”:

e.g. You needn’t apologize. **After all** nobody could have known what would happen. (Halliday and Hasan, 1992, 271)

As it is clear from the above stated, Hallidayan (1992) framework does not ascribe any other term except for “conjunctions” to the items actively participating in discourse as elements contributing to cohesion and interpretation of the text.

Over the last several decades not only Schiffrin (1987), Blakemore (1987) and Halliday and Hasan (1992) but also some other linguists (Fraser, 1993; Andersen, 2001; Aijmer, 2002; Trujillo Saez, 2003) have contributed to the research of pragmatic/discourse markers.

Various linguists differently label the phenomenon: pragmatic markers, discourse markers, pragmatic particles, interactional signals, connectives, pragmatic expressions, smallwords, and so on. Linguists are still doubtful about giving one universal term for these linguistic units. Each of the terms has its own peculiar nuance that separates it from the rest. For example, the term “pragmatic marker”, suggested by Andersen (2001), describes a class of short linguistic elements that usually do not have much lexical meaning but serve significant pragmatic functions in conversation. The scholar believes that the term “pragmatic” denotes the quality of “low degree of lexical specificity” and a “high degree of context-sensitivity” (op.cit., 40). In other words, he proposes that pragmatic markers help readers/listeners “see” the communicative aspects that go beyond the propositional meaning of an utterance. They are called “pragmatic” because they add an inferential trace to the proposition itself, making the interpretation of it easier and narrowing the contextual background.

Many linguists prefer the term discourse markers for such linguistic elements. For instance, Fraser (1993) acknowledges that discourse markers are expressions that signal the relationship of the main proposition to the prior discourse, which in Andersen’s (2001) view is just the textual function of pragmatic markers. The linguist (op.cit.) also
claims that the term “pragmatic” better describes the whole range of functions filled by these items.

Still another linguist, Aijmer (2002), gives the name of “discourse particles” to this category of linguistic elements and defines them as “dispensable elements functioning as signposts in the communication facilitating the hearer’s interpretation of the utterance on the basis of various contextual clues” (op.cit., 2).

Fraser (1993) proposed an analysis of discourse markers as members of a pragmatic category. His definition of discourse markers was somewhat narrower than the one given by Schiffrin (1987). According to him, each marker occurs in certain situations in a text or a conversation, each of them has a core meaning signaling how the speaker intends the role of the utterance to relate to the prior discourse. Relationships that discourse markers signal include the speaker’s intention to change the topic, an expression of dispreferred response (well), a repair of the phrase or clarification of the meaning (I mean), and so on.

According to Fraser (1993), for each sentence there are potentially three types of messages. First, there is the basic message, which is the message conveyed when the sentence is used in direct, literal communication. The message type is signaled by basic pragmatic markers (Please sit down). Second, there are commentary messages, signaled by commentary markers (Frankly, you are mistaken). Frankly signals that the speaker recognizes that the message content following will be viewed unfavorably by the addressee. And third, there are parallel messages accompanied by parallel markers (He put his damned shoes on the table). Damned signals that the speaker is angry. The scholar (Fraser, 1993) argues that discourse markers do not participate in discourse as a part of the propositional content of the sentence. They are detachable and may be deleted without changing the content meaning. He believes that they are commentary and separates the following types: discourse topic markers, discourse activity markers and message relationship markers.

Discourse topic markers denote “what the discourse participants are talking about at any given time, including various subtopics as they arise” (op.cit., 9). Some of these markers signal a different discourse topic (an initial, a previous one) (before I forget, by the way, speaking of, in any case) while others signal the “reemphasis” on the current topic (again, in fact, now, OK, well).

Another type of discourse markers according to Fraser (1993, 10) are discourse activity markers which “signal discourse activity relative to some part of the foregoing
discourse” (explaining, summarizing). The scholar has identified seven such activity types:

- clarifying: by way of clarification, to clarify
- conceding: after all, all the same, at any rate, etc.
- explaining: if I may explain, by way of explanation, to explain
- interrupting: if I may interrupt, to interrupt, not to interrupt
- repeating: at the risk of repeating myself, once again, to repeat
- sequencing: finally, first, in the first place, lastly, next, to begin, to continue, etc.
- summarizing: in general, in summary, overall, so far, summing up, to sum up, etc.

The last type of discourse markers, that Fraser (1993, 11) has pointed out, are message relationship markers, which “signal the relationship of the basic message being conveyed by the current utterance to some prior message”. These markers fall into four groups: parallel, contrasting, elaborative and inferential. Parallel markers are the most general and show that the basic message is somehow parallel to some aspect of the prior discourse (also, alternatively, and, likewise, otherwise, similarly, too, equally, etc.).

e.g. A: John is sleeping in the den and I’m in the kitchen.
   B: And where am I sleeping? (Fraser, 1993, 11)

Contrastive markers belong to the second group (all the same, but, despite, instead, never/nevertheless, on the contrary, otherwise, rather, regardless, still, though, well, yet, etc.).

e.g. Son: I can’t do it.
   Father: But I know that you CAN do it. (Fraser, 1993, 12)

Elaborative markers signal that the current utterance constitutes an elaboration of an earlier one (above all, also, besides, better, for example, for instance, furthermore, in addition, in fact, moreover, indeed, in other words, etc.).

e.g. He was fairly scared. Indeed, he was scared silly. (Fraser, 1993, 13)

The final group is inferential markers which signal that the current utterance conveys a message which is, in some sense, consequential to some aspect of the foregoing (accordingly, then, therefore, as a result, of course, so, then, therefore, consequently, hence, etc.).

e.g. John is remaining. So I am leaving. (Fraser, 1993, 14)
One more linguist who contributed to the problem of discourse markers should be mentioned here. A Spanish linguist Fernando Trujillo Saez (2003) has studied these items from a functional-communicative perspective in both English and Spanish student writing. The scholar uses the definition, where discourse markers are defined as linguistic items, with no syntactic function at the sentence level, which serve, according to their morphosyntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties, as a guide for the interpretation of utterances. According to the linguist, discourse markers are linguistic items used by the speakers to ease the interpretation of utterances by providing contextual information easy to decode which will be used by the hearer to enrich the sentence meaning. He prefers the term “discourse markers” because it is “neutral between the function of connection” and the function of “the expression of modality as a way of leading the hearer towards a certain interpretation.” Following Halliday’s (1994) thought that “modal” and “conjunctive” adjuncts provide the hearer with information to enrich the word meaning, Trujillo Saez (2003, 4) divides discourse markers into two groups: conjunctive and modal. Tables 1 and 2 of the Appendix introduce a possible bilingual classification of discourse markers, presented by the scholar. Conjunctive discourse markers (e.g. *that is, in other words, therefore, nevertheless*, etc.) represent the group of linguistic items expressing textual function and modal discourse markers (e.g. *to my mind, frankly, evidently, seriously*, etc.) resemble those with interactional function, both functions being discussed later on in the paper.

The questions of the research conducted by the linguist (Trujillo Saez, 2003) were whether there is any significant difference in the number of discourse markers between the texts in Spanish and the texts in English, and whether there is any significant difference in the types of discourse markers used in the texts in Spanish and the texts in English. According to the research, Spanish and English-speaking writers are similarly explicit in the use of discourse markers, and if there are differences, they are governed by style, or, in Halliday’s terms, by register and genre.

Having discussed the points of view of different scholars (Schiffrin, 1987; Blakemore, 1987; Halliday and Hasan, 1992; Fraser, 1993; Trujillo Saez, 2003), it is possible to draw a conclusion that linguistic devices, variously labelled in the works of the mentioned scholars, still have not been assigned their own niche in linguistics. Two of the discussed scholars, namely Fraser (1993) and Trujillo Saez (2003), give the name of discourse markers to these linguistic items, although the definitions they include are rather different. Thus, Fraser’s (1993) discourse markers are somewhat narrower in their
meaning signalling how the speaker intends the utterance to relate to the prior discourse, whereas Trujillo Saez (2003) defines the markers as linguistics items, which serve as a guide for the interpretation of utterances. Following this idea, we will adhere to the term “discourse markers” as the most relevant one for the research.

2.2. The Place of Discourse Markers in a Sentence/Utterance

Not only the use of proper terminology to name the linguistic items in question, but also their position in a sentence or an utterance has been of great concern in the works of some linguists (Fraser, 1993; Bravo Cladera, 2001). As they notice, discourse markers tend to take up the initial position in an utterance. This position is important as it:

- functions as a hint to the status of the discourse marker
- serves pragmatic and interactional purposes
- contains the theme of the sentence/utterance (introduces topics, relates what is being said to the preceding text) (Aijmer, 2002, 29)

Discourse markers can be found not only in the initial position. Depending on the information structure they can occupy several positions: at the beginning of an utterance, as “insertions” in the utterance or at the end.

e.g. a) Blanche: **Oh, I feel so good after my long, hot bath, I feel so good and cool and – rested!** (TW, 1432)

b) Blanche: **Of course he – he doesn’t know – I mean I haven’t informed him – of my real age!** (TW, 1419)

c) Blanche: **I’ve got to write it down – the message, I mean…**(TW, 1413)

Bravo Cladera (2001) analyzed the use of the discourse markers in the Spanish language dialogue. She found that discourse markers appear in three positions. They initiate the turn at talk – initial markers (IM), they mark the central part of the turn – corpus markers (CM), and they mark the end of the turn – terminal markers (TM).

e.g. Natalia: **But sure, we want to do it, aaand … I don’t want to start at the university at once, because I want to take it easy, for a year at least, aaaaand besides I don’t’ know what to study.**

Alcira: **And besides it’s difficult.** (translated into English, Bravo Cladera, 7)

In the example above and besides in Alcira’s turn is an IM, and, because and and besides in Natalia’s turn mark the central part of the turn. In the following example then marks the end of the turn.
e.g. Veronica: and you, what did you do?
Carlos: me, um... nothing. I stayed at home. The telephone was disconnected, so when my friends called they couldn’t reach me then. (translated into English, Bravo Cladera, 10)

The scholar (Bravo Cladera, 2001) has analyzed 367 minutes of spontaneous conversations and found that discourse markers indicating the central part of the turn have a major frequency of use and contribute in this way to the progression of the conversation. In the second place she put the initial markers, conversational role of which is that of being markers “of reinforcement of dialogical initiative or reactive connector of two acts or interventions in the dialogue” (op. cit., 11). The smallest amount of discourse markers was used in the final position.

The American linguist Fraser (1993) has also contributed to the analysis of the position of discourse markers in the English language. He found that these linguistic elements appear in three positions: each discourse marker may occur sentence initially, some may take up sentence-medial position and a few of them may occur in sentence final position.

2.3. Discourse Markers and Proposition

Andersen (2001) in his book “Pragmatic Markers and Sociolinguistic Variation” questions the assumption that the items that are usually taken to belong to the category of pragmatic markers (as he calls them) are external to propositions and do not contribute to truth conditions. He also shows that some pragmatic markers may affect the truth conditions of utterances and relates this observation to the grammaticalisation and diachronic development of the forms in question.

The scholar (op.cit.) argues that pragmatic markers are interpretable in relation to propositional meaning which is fundamental to the interpretation, analysis and understanding of pragmatic markers. It is not always easy to classify linguistic material as internal or external to propositions. He argues that some pragmatic markers affect the propositional meaning of utterances, though not necessarily as conceptual constituents of propositions but as constraints on their interpretation. The diachronic development of those items, which become pragmatic markers is relevant to this issue. The scholar suggests that their problematic status can be explained with respect to the processes of grammaticalisation which they are involved in.
From the point of view of grammaticalisation, pragmatic markers are seen as expressions which, through repetitive use and routinisation, have developed non-propositional meanings of a more abstract nature than their original lexical meanings through processes of conventionalization of implicatures and increased subjectification.

Diachronic aspects of pragmatic markers are highly relevant. The scholar (Andersen, 2001) gives pragmatic markers *but* and *like* as illustrations to prove this point. He writes, that the present day conjunction *but* has developed from the Old English adverbial and preposition *butan* with a spatial meaning of “on the outside, without”. This lexeme is the origin of both the pragmatic marker *but* and the preposition *but* in Modern English, although only the preposition has a lexical meaning that is similar to the original spatial meaning. The original lexeme has developed into two distinct lexemes, one of which encodes a procedure. That is, *but* represents a case of grammaticalisation. As the scholar claims, the diachronic development of *like* is analogous. It originates in a preposition with the meaning “similar to” and has developed into a pragmatic marker. The lexical predecessor of the pragmatic marker *like* still exists as a preposition.

*But* causes no problems of classification because its grammaticalisation has been completed: it has developed into clear polysemies. As regards *like*, the grammaticalisation is still an ongoing process.

Aijmer (2002) also argues that many of the features of discourse markers (especially their multifunctionality) can be explained as a result of grammaticalisation (either complete or ongoing). By grammaticalisation Aijmer (2002, 16) means the process “whereby lexical items or phrases come through frequent use in certain highly constrained local contexts to be reanalyzed as having syntactic and morphological functions, and, once grammaticalised, continue to develop grammaticalised functions”. The linguist illustrates the process of grammaticalisation by *indeed*. This word becomes “integrated into the relatively tight lexical field of epistemic sentence-adverbs” (op.cit., 17) with the meaning “certainly”. Then it acquires a contrastive function, especially after *but*. As a clause-initial discourse marker indeed has meanings involving elaboration and clarification of the discourse intent. The development from adverb to discourse marker, as the scholar writes, reflects a tendency to use propositional material for the purposes of creating texts and indicating attitudes in discourse situations and results in an increase of pragmatic significance and expressiveness.

Following the tradition of pragmatists such as Austin, Grice, Searle and Sperber and Wilson, Andersen (2001) maintains that utterances are accountable in terms of
propositions and attitudes towards them. Generally, problems arise with those markers which have a lexical history. Those pragmatic markers which have developed from the words with conceptual meanings and which have not been fully grammaticalised are the ones that are likely to be difficult to characterize in terms of propositionality (e.g. like, sort of, kind of, you know, you see and especially just).

The use of discourse markers for indicating various types of conversational moves is very common in dialogue although quite rare in expository text. While there is a distinction between a conversation and a written text, there is also a distinction between the domains of functions the markers have in these two discourses.

It is definitely understandable that a single discourse marker can have more than one function. Some surveys assign the role of cohesive devices to discourse markers (Schiffrin, 1987), others focus on their role as speaker attitude expressives (Andersen, 2001), yet others believe that they are devices for acknowledging and highlighting the speaker-hearer relationship and increasing politeness.

Some scholars tend to classify discourse markers in terms of sharply defined categories, which is not precise, as we know that the markers are multifunctional and are difficult to put in a particular category. Andersen (2001) claims that discourse markers are not only multifunctional in the sense that they can have different pragmatic functions in different contexts; they are also multifunctional in the sense that they can take up multiple functions in one and the same context. So, as any other structural words (e.g. conjunctions) discourse markers fulfil certain functions in discourse.

2.4. Functional Domains

From the above said it follows that classification of discourse markers according to their functions prevails. Aijmer (2002), for example, puts these linguistic elements into two groups on the basis of the functions, textual and interpersonal, they carry out in discourse.

However, Andersen (2001, 64) argues that the distinction of discourse markers according to textual and interpersonal functional domains would be “ineffectual as taxonomic framework, because the textual and interpersonal functions of markers can be shown to be concurrent”.

28
The scholar proposes a conceptualization of discourse markers in which the function of a particular item can be described as a synthesis of three basic aspects of pragmatic meaning: subjective, interactional and textual.

In this research we adhere to Andersen’s (2001) point of view because it gives the most extensively studied functional categorisation of pragmatic/discourse markers. Andersen (op.cit.) describes the functional complexity of this category in terms of the well-known notions of subjective, interactional and textual functions.

2.4.1. Subjective Function of Discourse Markers

Andersen (2001, 65) argues that a degree of subjectivity is a feature that all markers express, “since any utterance expresses a speaker’s intention to make something manifest to an individual”. The scholar (op.cit., 65) maintains that “discourse markers generally tell the hearer what sort of inferential processes the utterance interpretation involves and are used to manipulate the process of context selection”. They elucidate the relation that exists between a communicated assumption and the interlocutors’ cognitive environment. According to the linguist (Andersen, 2001), markers may be used not only to express how the speaker perceives the information encoded by a proposition but also how the speaker perceives the communicative situation and his/her conversational and social relation with the hearer. Sometimes, but not always, markers also express the relation that exists between units of discourse (e.g. propositions, sentences). The task of identifying which functions pragmatic/discourse markers perform requires pragmatic inference, which is governed by the relevance principle and may be constrained by procedural hints such as intonation and voice tone (Andersen, 2001).

Interactional functions cannot be separated from subjectivity. They both are part of communicative content of utterances and part of the speaker’s informative intention. As the scholar claims (op.cit., 66), “interactional features are to be understood as functional properties that concern the mutuality of context between speaker and hearer, and may be concerned with saving hearer’s face, drawing the hearer into the discourse and expressing empathy towards him/her.”

Textual functions cannot be separated from subjectivity as well. A speaker who informs his/her hearer that proposition A should be interpreted as a premise while proposition B is a conclusion also expresses his/her subjective belief that such an
interpretation is the one which becomes highly relevant. It is possible to conclude here that subjectivity is of high importance both for interactional and textual functions.

Lyons (1982) has defined subjectivity as “the way in which natural languages, in their structure and their normal manner of operation, provide for the locutionary agent’s expression of himself and of his attitudes and beliefs” (cited in Andersen, 2001, 25). Any utterance is made up of a proposition and an expression towards it. The subjective functions of pragmatic markers capture and make explicit the attitudinal relation that exists between the speaker and the proposition contained in the utterance (Andersen, 2001). Subjectivity is a non-structural feature of pragmatic markers which comprises a number of different types of meaning, such as the speaker’s way of thinking, his/her affective attitude and his/her evaluation of the newsworthyness of the propositional content. For example, tentativeness or assertiveness can be expressed by such pragmatic markers as I guess, I mean, absolutely, which imply varying degrees of endorsement of proposition.

    e.g. Stella: And when he comes back I cry on his lap like a baby…
    Blanche: I guess that is what is meant by being in love… (TW, 1391)
    I guess is used in tentative terms to denote Blanche’s uncertainty.

Sometimes markers may signal not endorsement but rejection of a proposition. As if in the following example rejects the previous proposition and strengthens the idea that the loss is inevitable.

    e.g. Blanche: …Even the old, sometimes, say “Don’t let me go”. As if you were able to stop them. (TW, 1392)

2.4.2. The Interpersonal (interactional) Function of Discourse Markers

Particles with an interpersonal function express attitudes, feelings and evaluations. In other words, they are hearer-oriented (e.g. you know). In Andersen’s (op.cit.) terms, this notion includes several dimensions: “epistemic commitment”, ranging from full endorsement to full rejection of propositional meaning, “affective evaluation”, ranging from positive to negative evaluation of propositional meaning, and “newsworthiness”, ranging from predictable to unpredictable propositional meaning. To this domain can also be assigned the ability of discourse markers to signal the degree of shared experience and knowledge and logical relations between a communicated
assumption and a speaker’s knowledge, that is, whether he/she expresses an assumption that contradicts or supports the existing assumptions.

Interactional functions cannot be divorced from the understanding of the propositional meaning of the utterance. Proposition is the meaning of the sentence rather than the sentence itself. A proposition is based on the speaker’s presuppositions, and pragmatic inference is required to decipher the encoded linguistic content from the proposition expressed.

Grice (1975) (in Hatch, 1992) claimed that what is conveyed by an utterance falls into two parts: what is said and what is implied. So the sentence or the utterance meaning can be analysed into two types of encoded information: content meaning and pragmatic meaning (conversational implicature in Grice’s terms). Content meaning is sometimes referred to as “propositional meaning”. It includes the actual situation about which the speaker is talking. It is what the sentence is about. Pragmatic meaning, unlike the content meaning, provides additional signals for the interpretation of the direct communication. While discussing discourse markers we tend to pay more attention to the pragmatic meaning of an utterance. In other terms, the literal meaning of an utterance is its locutionary force, and the intended or understood meaning is the illocutionary force of the utterance. Discourse markers are considered to be illocutionary force indicating devices.

As it was mentioned above, discourse markers expressing the interactional function are hearer-orientated. They may express empathy towards the listener, happiness to see him/her (Oh, Stella!), an attempt to involve the hearer into the conversation (right?) and other functions.

Traditionally, most scholars usually describe discourse markers as not contributing to propositional meaning of an utterance. Nevertheless, some pragmatic markers have conceptual meanings (I mean, You know, I guess) which don’t let them to be omitted in the proposition.

e.g. a) Blanche: I meant to be nice about it and say – Oh, what a convenient location and such - Ha-a-ha! (TW, 1388)
b) Stanley: You know you can catch cold sitting around in damp things, especially when you been exercising hard like bowling is. (TW, 1394)

As discourse markers expressing subjective function, the ones with the interactional function may also denote the speaker’s affective attitude, i.e. the speaker’s positive or negative evaluation of the proposition expressed:
e.g. a) Stanley: *The Kowalskis and the DuBoises have different notions.*

Stella: *Indeed they have, thank heavens!* (TW, 1397) - the markers here help to express Stella’s irritation caused by her husband’s irony.

b) Blanche: *Do you remember Shep Huntleigh? Of course you remember Shep Huntleigh.* (TW, 1412) – Blanche is sure that everybody remembers the person she is talking about and does not bother to explain.

It is also important what the speaker believes the hearer’s relation to a proposition may be. So, we have to take into consideration the speaker’s attitude as well.

e.g. Stella: *[Vaguely.] Oh, it had to be - sacrificed or something.* (TW, 1395) – Stella is shocked about the loss of Belle Reve.

Discourse markers may signal degree of shared experience and knowledge and logical relations between a communicated assumption and a speaker’s knowledge, i.e. that an assumption contradicts or yields a contextual implication.

e.g. Stanley: *She didn’t show you no papers, no deed of sale or nothing like that, huh?* (Stanley ironises)

Stella: *It seems like it wasn’t sold.* (TW, 1395)

Discourse markers are also commonly associated with speech act functions and politeness functions. They may be used as:

- conversational openers (*well*)
  
e.g. *Well, well! What can I do for you?* (TW, 1420)

- turn-taking devices (*well, oh, I think*)
  
e.g. Mitch: *Put him on the bed and get a wet towel.*

Pablo: *I think coffee would do him a world of good, now.* (TW, 1408)

- hesitational devices (*well.., uh*)
  
e.g. *You – uh – didn’t get wet in the rain?* (TW, 1421)

*Can I – uh – kiss you – good night?* (TW, 1422)

- backchannels (*okay, mm, huh*)
  
e.g. *Some canary bird, huh!* (TW, 1429)

- markers of topic shift (*well, now*)
  
e.g. *Lower your voice! Now please tell me quietly what you think you’ve found out about my sister.* (TW, 1429)

- markers of receipt of information (*well, mm-hm*)
  
e.g. Blanche: *I’m very adaptable – to circumstances.*

Mitch: *Well, that’s a good thing to be.* (TW, 1406)
- markers of politeness (I’m afraid)
  e.g. I’m afraid you haven’t gotten much fun out of this evening, Blanche.
  
  (TW, 1422)

According to Andersen (2001), the interactional function of pragmatic markers can be associated with social functions of language, such as the interlocutors’ mutual recognition of the conversational relationship and the expression of solidarity and politeness. However, politeness functions cannot be categorically associated with the interactional function. For example, a speaker expressing him/herself in tentative terms may not be expressing strong commitment to the proposition expressed, but it may also be that he/she wants to avoid sounding too assertive and apply a non-imposing strategy, which is a case of negative politeness and concerns the speaker’s relation to the proposition expressed, i.e. it is subjective.

Interactionally meaningful markers like right?, huh?, you know have capacity for engaging the hearer and may be aimed at asking for his/her contribution.

  e.g. You didn’t eat your dinner yet, right? (Internet)

  Right can be considered “emphatic” in the sense of “involving” the listener” or “facilitative” in the sense of being “used to facilitate the participation of others”. In the example it is used to request confirmation.

  You know is frequently used without attempting to ask for the hearer’s contribution. In the following example the speaker is just telling about her meeting with the children she knew some years ago. The marker here communicates the speaker’s presumption that the information in her utterance is compatible with the hearer’s existing beliefs.

  e.g. You know, it was difficult to talk to them after so many years. Children could not remember much. (Internet)

  Because of its hearer-orientation, it is commonly the case that interactional meaning encourages the hearer to talk. Therefore pragmatic markers with interactional functions can frequently be associated with directive speech acts.

  According to Aijmer (2002), face-saving, politeness and indirectness are characteristic of everyday conversation and are therefore involved in the usage of discourse particles with interpersonal function. Sort of and tags like and that sort of thing, which have meanings like imprecision, approximation, seem to signal the speaker’s desire to reduce social distance between him/herself and the addressee.
Aijmer (2002) adheres to a point of view that discourse markers with an interactional function “perform a phatic function in the discourse, underlying the interactive structure of the conversation” (48). Phatic markers can be regarded as items expressing attitudes to or modes of knowledge (Aijmer, 2002). For instance, I think refers to the mode of knowledge (belief), actually shows that “something goes beyond expectation”, while sort of indicates that “knowledge has less than optimal codability” (op.cit., 48).

Andersen (2001) also pays attention to the relevance theory, where a person may distinguish between information that is relevant because it supports existing conceptual assumption and that which is relevant because it contradicts existing assumptions. Pragmatic markers help to reveal the occurrence of these inferential processes and provide explicit signals that the interpretation process involves. They can be used to express agreement or disagreement, belief or disbelief, endorsement or rejection, conviction or doubt, and they can mark information as new or old, surprising or trivial, etc. Common to all these dichotomies is that they may describe how a communicated idea relates to the cognitive environment of a speaker, whether it supports or contradicts his/her belief (Andersen, 2001).

Taking into consideration the points of view presented here, it can be concluded that the most typical discourse markers expressing interactional function belong to the register of conversation. Speakers use discourse markers to request attention, to assume shared knowledge (you know), to request confirmation (right, OK), or to clarify something (I mean), to introduce an elaboration or explanation as apart of an answer to a question (now). The hearer may respond using discourse markers signalling comprehension (OK) or a change of knowledge status (oh), to ironise (huh?).

2.4.3. The Textual Function of Discourse Markers

The present study acknowledges textual function to be relevant in terms of the analysis of the corpus from written discourse. Halliday’s textual function is concerned with the textual resources the speaker has for creating coherence. Textual meaning is relevance to the context: to the preceding (and following) text, and the context of situation (Halliday, 1985). A very general characteristic of many discourse markers is their ability to mark explicitly how communicated ideas cohere with a context. As regards the textual functions, they contribute to coherence and textuality in discourse.
The textual properties of discourse markers refer to the relation between sequentially arranged segments in discourse (Schiffrin, 1987): between one proposition and the next proposition, between one utterance and the following utterance, between speakers’ turns, between discourse topics, etc. Discourse markers with textual functions, such as and, therefore and moreover can communicate how the speaker perceives the relation between propositions A and B.

e.g. a) Stella: And try to understand her and be nice to her, Stan.

And admire her dress and tell her she’s looking wonderful. (TW, 1395)
Repetition of and in the example makes us draw a conclusion that there is still more information to come.

b) This means that it can utilise indirect sunlight, for example on cloudy or rainy days, and even, indoor light. Moreover, it can release electrical energy anytime, even in the dark. (PH, 2) Moreover here adds more information to the previously expressed.

c) The device has a resonant frequency of 23.57 megahertz, which means that information can be read more than 20 million times per second, compared with the few hundred kilohertz rates that are possible in conventional computer hard drives. Nanomechanical memory elements could therefore overcome the superparamagnetic limits that apply to magnetic memories. Moreover, they could be packed together at densities that exceed the present maximum value of 100 gigabits per square inch. (PH, 6) Therefore functions as a device helping to draw a conclusion.

Textuality is most typically associated with discourse markers. Schiffrin’s (op.cit., 1) definition of them as “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk” defines only their function as “discourse glue” providing structure and coherence. Discourse marker and comprises predominantly textual meaning, coordinating linguistic units at various levels and indicating parallel processing:

e.g. Stanley: And what have we here? The treasure chest of a pirate!

Stanley: And diamonds! A crown for an empress! (TW, 1397)

It is natural that the main functions expressed by discourse markers may overlap in various contexts. Well is a good example of the interrelation. On the one hand, it functions as a text-structuring device on the textual level. On the other hand, it is used in conversation to indicate speaker/hearer relationship, the position of an utterance. The two functions appear simultaneously, but one of them predominates over the other.
e.g. a) Blanche: …Do you all like parrot stories? **Well, this one’s about the old maid and the parrot.** (TW, 1433)
b) Stanley: **You hens cut out that conversation in there!**
Stella: **You can’t hear us.**
Stanley: **Well, you can hear me and I said to hush up!** (TW, 1404)

There are some markers which slightly contribute to discourse structure, but whose main purpose is to contribute to subjective or interactional meaning (**I suppose**).

e.g. **I suppose, you are not ready for the lesson....** (Internet)

Whether discourse markers are defined as devices for marking transition points in discourse (Schiffrin, 1987, 1), as devices drawing hearer to a change in discourse structure, or as devices marking movement between two discourse units, they are the “conversational glue” that participants effectively use to hold the dialog or written text together at different communicative levels.

In the passages above, the functional complexity of discourse markers has been described. The three types of function (subjective, interactional and textual) are distinguished from each other according to the types of inferential processes. Discourse markers make explicit the relation existing between a communicated proposition and an interlocutor’s cognitive environment or the relation between propositions or other discourse units. Distinctively, discourse markers with a subjective function indicate the relations between the speaker and the communicated proposition; discourse markers with an interactional function indicate what the speaker perceives as the hearer’s relation to a communicated proposition and the degree of mutual manifestness; and discourse markers with a textual function describe what the speaker perceives as the relation between propositions or other discourse units.

Moreover, multifunctionality of discourse markers appears to be fundamental, although it would be wrong to claim that they always have textual, subjective and interactional functions simultaneously, or that the three meanings are inseparable. Discourse markers constitute a complex category, as they can be primarily associated with one of the three functions. That is, some markers have dominating subjective function, others – interactional, and still others – textual.

Some linguists argue that it is rather difficult to separate the subjective function from the interactional one because their meanings tend to overlap. Our analysed material also proves this fact. Consequently, here it is rather suitable to speak of two major
functional domains, interactional and textual, where there is a clear distinction between the two.
PART 3. DISCOURSE MARKERS ACROSS REGISTERS

Being consistent with the major aim of the research, the corpus from four types of discourse is analyzed in this part. The most frequently used discourse markers are revealed. The statistical analysis was performed in order to check whether discourse markers are evenly distributed across registers, and whether they fulfil the same functions in T. Williams’ drama “A Streetcar Named Desire”, academic prose (articles on Physics), legal discourse (legal documents) and newspaper articles.

3.1. Dialogue in drama

As it is generally known, language of drama is entirely dialogue, except for the playwright’s remarks and stage directions. Yet, although the playwright seeks to reproduce actual conversation, the language of the characters is in no way the exact reproduction of the norms of colloquial language (Galperin, 1977). The language of plays still retains the modus of literary English, where discourse markers help interpret the messages conveyed. Table 1 presents the most frequently used discourse markers in this register.

Table 1. Discourse markers in drama

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Marker</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Percental Representation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oh</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mean</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I guess</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of course</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individual elements like *now* *then*, *because*, *and when*, *you know*, *for instance*, *indeed*, *thank heavens*, *oh*, *yeah*, *oh*, *no*, *you see*, *on the contrary*, *whether*, *on the other hand* make up 24 occurrences (12.12%) of the total amount of encountered discourse markers.

As can be seen from the table, *oh* is the most frequently used discourse marker in drama. It indicates a shift in the speaker’s thinking, flow of information, or train of thought, as speakers think and plan what they are about to say.

- Speakers indicate realization, shifts of attention, and the need to make a sudden shift in the conversational topic:
  
  e.g. Blanche: *But funerals are quiet, with pretty flowers. And, oh, what gorgeous boxes they pack them away in!* (TW, 1392) With the help of *oh* Blanche shifts her attention from funerals to the beauty of flowers.
  
  Stella: *When she comes in be sure to say something nice about her appearance. And, oh! Don’t mention the baby.* (TW, 1395) Stella suddenly remembers the news which she is not ready to share with her sister yet.

- When a speaker realizes that s/he has made a mistake or has misspoken, s/he can quickly break and pause with *oh* to mark a correction.
  
  e.g. Blanche: *I’m looking for the Pleiades, the Seven Sisters, but these girls are not out tonight. Oh, yes they are, there they are!* (TW, 1422)

- Speakers use *oh* to ask for clarification or further information about something that they did not understand. Speakers also use it when they realize or understand something that they did not understand at first. That is, they clarify the information to themselves as they think through it, and indicate their realization by *oh*.
  
  e.g. Blanche: *You ought to save them [candles] for baby’s birthdays. Oh, I hope candles are going to glow in his life and I hope that his eyes are going to be like candles, like two blue candles lighted in a white cake!* (TW, 1434)
  
  Stella: *Stan, we’ve - lost Belle Reve!*
  
  Stanley: *The place in the country*
  
  Stella: *Yes.*
Stanley: How?

Stella: Oh, it had to be - sacrificed or something. (TW, 1395) Stella keeps thinking about the place. Oh indicates that she herself does not know how everything happened.

- Likewise, speakers may realize that their assumptions or expectations were incorrect about what was said or understood. For example, below oh is used to indicate that the speaker understood something, that something was unexpected and s/he had to think about it first to understand it, or s/he realized that s/he needed to clarify something.

  e.g. Blanche: How did he take it when you said I was coming?
  Stella: Oh, Stanley doesn’t know yet.
  Blanche: You – haven’t told him?
  Stella: He’s on the road a good deal.
  Blanche: Oh. Travels? (TW, 1390)
  Blanche: What a pretty case. Silver?
  Mitch: Yes. Yes; read the inscription.
  Blanche: Oh, is there an inscription? I can’t make it out. (TW, 1405)

Well is the second most frequently used discourse marker. It occurs at the beginning of sentences, clauses, or phrases, and it functions as a response marker. That is, it marks some kind of transition in a response to a question or to a preceding statement.

- Often what a speaker intends to say may be slightly different from what the hearer expects. It can also indicate a response that the speaker knows may be an insufficient response. It may even be a response that the hearer would not like. Thus, it often occurs in discussions in which people share viewpoints, communicate expectations, or even in disagreements and rejections to soften responses.

  e.g. Blanche: Traveling wears me out.
  Stanley: Well, take it easy. (TW, 1394)

Stanley’s response is definitely not sufficient in this case, as Blanche evidently is a kind of person who seeks other people’s sympathy. Stanley is not the one to give sympathy, he is a rough person.

- Sometimes speakers need a couple of seconds to pause to think of what to say. They may also need to hold their turn in the conversation so others won’t assume
they have finished speaking. So speakers fill the pause with a discourse marker, generally with *uh* for short pauses and *well* for longer pauses. This fits the idea of unexpected or less-than-preferred response, since listeners expect an efficient delivery of information and turn-taking, and *well* fills these gaps to make one’s delivery smoother and more polite.

e.g. Stella: *You’ll get along fine together, if you’ll just try not to – well – compare him with men that we went out with at home.* (TW, 1390)

By using *well* Stella makes a pause to think of how to express her idea.

- When speakers shift to a new topic or to a different aspect of a topic, they often begin with *well* to indicate such transitions.
  
e.g. Blanche: …*You haven’t said a word to me.*
  
  Stella: *You haven’t given me a chance to, honey!*
  
  Blanche: *Well, now you talk. Open your pretty mouth and talk while I look around for some liquor!* (TW, 1388)

  Blanche uses *well* to finish her own talk and let her sister say something as well.

- Speakers take turns in speaking up in conversation. The beginning of a speaker’s new turn may be begun with *well*. This may be especially so in a dynamic conversation where a speaker must compete with others for the chance to say something. *Well* allows a person to jump in at an appropriate pause, and buy a few seconds in order to think of what to say.
  
e.g. Stella: *You take it for granted that I’m in something that I want to get out of.*
  
  Blanche: *I take it for granted that you still have sufficient memory of Belle Reve to find this place and these poker players impossible to live with.*
  
  Stella: *Well, you’re taking entirely too much for granted.* (TW, 1414)

  Stella jumps in to defend herself.

- In some sentences like commands and disagreements, *well* more politely signals that what the other person has said, or his/her behavior, doesn’t fully meet the speaker’s desires, expectations, or preferences. Thus, it adds a nuance of impatience or other negative attitude, but more politely so.
  
e.g. Blanche: *I’m through dressing, honey.*

  Stella: *Well, you come out, then.* (TW, 1399)

  The phrase would sound too harsh if it didn’t contain *well*. The discourse marker here lets Stella sound more polite.

  **But** is mostly used to denote the speaker’s point of view:
e.g. Blanche: *Now don’t say it was one of those mysterious electric things between people! If you do I’ll laugh in your face.*

Stella: *But there are things that happen between a man and a woman in the dark – that sort of make everything else seem - unimportant.* (TW, 1414)

Blanche: *And men don’t want anything they get too easy. But on the other hand men lose interest quickly.* (TW, 1419)

*Now* indicates a shift in the conversation to a new topic, or a return to a previous topic, also a pause.

e.g. Blanche: *Now, then, let me look at you.* (TW, 1388)

Blanche: *You sit down, now, and explain this place to me.* (TW, 1388)

Blanche: *Let me see, now…* (TW, 1433)

*I mean* is roughly equivalent to “that is, in other words”. It allows the speaker to rephrase his/her words (for clarification or communication repair), to clarify his/her meaning, or to elaborate a point by adding additional explanation:

e.g. Blanche: *Give me a pencil. Where is a slip of paper? I’ve got to write it down first – the message, I mean…* (TW, 1413)

Stella: *You don’t have to worry about anything while you are here, I mean – expenses…* (TW, 1414)

*So* is traditionally used to mark main idea units. Here it provides conclusions, summaries or restatements.

e.g. Mitch: *She says to go out, so I go, but I don’t enjoy it.* (TW, 1402)

To summarise, the most frequently used discourse markers discussed in this section are representative of dialogues. They are used to indicate topic shifts, turn taking, clarify or explain ideas, indicate a response, a pause, add politeness to commands and disagreements. They also let speakers add more information or rephrase their words. Taking into consideration the use of discourse markers in this register, the most frequent of them fulfil interactional function helping addressees to coherently lay and interpret their ideas.

### 3.2. Academic prose

Generally, the aim of scientific prose register is to prove a hypothesis, to create new concepts, to disclose the internal laws of existence, development, relations between different phenomena, etc. Utterances are logically sequenced, and the language means
used tend to be objective, precise, unemotional, devoid of any individuality. As examples of academic prose, some texts about physics were taken into consideration. They contain quite a number of discourse markers carrying textual function. Table 2 gives a statistical account on discourse markers found in those texts.

Table 2. Discourse markers in academic prose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Marker</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Percental Representation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>However</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therefore</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For instance / for example</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectively</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreover</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this case</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the other hand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rest 11 occurrences (10.89%) belong to such markers as so, first, second, instead, though, perhaps, nevertheless, similarly, which appear only once.

As it is clear from the table, the most frequently used discourse marker is however.

- It usually follows a concession:
  e.g. Large numbers of electron neutrinos are produced by the Sun, and all three flavours are produced in supernova explosions. However, all three types of neutrino are extremely difficult to detect because they are electrically neutral, have very little mass and only interact with other matter through the weak interaction. (PH, 3)

- It can also function as a contrastive element:
  e.g. Solids usually melt when they are heated, and liquids turn into gas, although exceptions do exist when heating leads to chemical changes that cannot be
reversed, such as polymerisation. However, a reversible transition in which a liquid becomes a solid when heated has never been observed until now. (PH, 9)

**Therefore** is also quite often in the kind of texts we are talking about. It is used to introduce logical conclusion:

e.g. For the method of plasma heating suggested in Chen et al. (2001), low-frequency waves are of main interest. **Therefore**, below we analyze the frequency spectrum of the destabilized low-frequency waves. (KO, 183)

**Thus** is also used for the same purpose:

e.g. The chemical composition of the plasma was first obtained by solving the mass action laws combined with the gas law and the condition of large neutrality. **Thus**, with the partition functions for the various species in the plasma, the thermodynamic properties can be calculated in a straightforward manner using statistical mechanics. (BL, 229)

**For instance**/**for example** are used for the purpose of exemplification:

  e.g. **For example**, in a groundwater study of the Great Artesian Basin, Australia, scientists had to process 16 tons of water to generate sufficient krypton gas for analysis. (PH, 4)

**In addition** usually adds something to what has previously been said or written. In the following example the discourse marker used adds another important advantage of the formula:

  e.g. An advantage of the formula is that it can model the distribution function of the energetic ions in both space and fusion plasmas. **In addition** it enables to calculate the integrals in the dialectic permeability tensor analytically. (KO, 177)

To sum up, the language of academic articles is quite restricted. Discourse markers like however, therefore, in addition, respectively, moreover, but, etc. are used to create a cohesive scientific text, in which there is no place for emotions, sudden shifts of topic or pauses. So, the textual function of discourse markers is foremost in this type of discourse.

### 3.3. Legal Discourse

Legal language is described as a set of words, structural choices and interactional patterns that tend to occur in discourse in legal situations (Johnstone, 2002). Traditional legal English uses longer expressions, links two terms with and for a single meaning. Its
syntax is complex with a variety of archaic connectives (*hereby, hereafter, whereafter, herein, etc.*). Legal register is slow to change, compared to other registers that change quite fast over the time. It uses a special system of clichés, terms and set expressions (*the above-mentioned, hereinafternamed, etc.*).

The examples of discourse markers used in legal discourse remind of some archaic connectives. The statistical data is summed up in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Marker</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Percental Representation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>However</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For example</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such discourse markers as *first, second, third, generally, in this regard, obviously, as a result, because, therefore, lastly, additionally, accordingly* appear only once, totally making 12 occurrences, which is 27.9%.

According to the above chart, the most popular discourse marker in the legal discourse is **however**, which can be met in the last will and testament, in contracts for employment, in different kinds of trusts. It has the function of a contrastive item:

*e.g. If necessary, the Trustee may institute legal proceedings to enforce the payment of the policies or do any other acts necessary to collect under the policies. However, the Trustee shall not be required to maintain any litigation to enforce the payment of the policies until reasonably assured of indemnity against expenses and liabilities which may be associated with such litigation. (LT, 3)*

*The laws of each state differ slightly with the formation and interpretation of Wills. However, the basic principles set forth above are followed by each state... (LW&T basics, 2)*

**Thus** introduces logical conclusion:

*e.g. Every person is allowed each year to give the sum of $11,000 to another person without incurring any gift tax. Thus, you can give $11,000 this year to any*
one or more of your children, your grandchildren, cousins, etc., without incurring any adverse gift tax consequences, and at the same time reducing your taxable Estate upon your death. (LD, 7)

Such words as hereby, herein, hereafter, hereunder, thereof, thereby, etc. are characteristic of legal documents. They function as prepositions and conjunctions in the documents.

e.g. “Life-prolonging treatment” as used herein means “medication and artificially or technologically supplied respiration, nutrition, or hydration” that prolongs the life of the Grantor. (LT, 6)

As it has been said above, legal language has preserved the majority of its structures, compounds and archaic words from older times. It is known as a highly complicated language for an ordinary person. This register is also distinguished by the use of discourse markers. Minimum of them (hardly 50) has been found throughout the register. These elements contribute to cohesion of legal texts, i.e. they implement the textual function.

3.4. Newspaper articles

It is known that newspaper articles exert a constant influence on public opinion, convince the reader that the interpretation given by the writer is the only correct one and to cause him/her to accept the point of view expressed. This register uses coherent and logical syntactical structure, with an expanded system of connectives. Discourse markers play significant role here. Their occurrences are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Marker</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Percental Representation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Also</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Though</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even though</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For example 3 2.8
According to 3 2.8
For instance 2 1.86
Of course 2 1.86
Because 2 1.86
As a result 2 1.86
Indeed 2 1.86
Instead 2 1.86

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rest 11.22% are taken up by discourse markers like so that, so, ultimately, despite, moreover, in fact, however, as if, therefore, in that case, well, similarly, which are individual examples in the newspaper.

As can be seen from the distribution of discourse items in the chart, the most frequently met discourse marker on the pages of the newspaper is also, which is used for the purpose of adding more information to the previously discussed:

e.g. North Korea does not have a submarine capable of carrying the missile to within striking range of the continental United States. Also, officials expressed doubts that the North Korean government had developed the missile for the purpose of hiding it inside freighters to be sailed closer to this nation’s shores for launch. (NT, 14)

And is similar in its meaning to also:

e.g. The family got $3,100 in donations from local politicians, social workers, government officials and Sikh expatriates from this area. And thanks to the media’s reach, calls are coming in from around the world. (NT, A18)
“You stay in the street long enough, and you die. And nobody sees it.” (NT, A22)

But is used with the contrastive function in the register:

e.g. Anyone with sensitivity is potentially an artist. But then you must have concentration besides sensitivity. (NT, A20)

They even flirted with the idea that he would delay accepting the nomination so he could keep raising and spending millions of dollars on advertising throughout August. But August has brought a spate of what seemed to be Kerry advertisements every day. (NT, A24)

Though (even though) is used to contrast with what came before:
e.g. “**Even though** we were outspent and we had a national political machine descend on our state to try and defeat this,” Ms. Hartzler said, “people got out and worked and called neighbours and said a lot of prayers.” (NT, A4)

**Although**, meaning “despite the fact that”, seems to coincide with *even though*:

e.g. **Although** he never joined the party, his sympathy for the poor and downtrodden, and his dislike of class pretence became essential to the choice and content of his photographs. (NT, A21)

**Yet** is used in informal context to denote a contrast with what came before:

e.g. A year later, Nigeria and 15 other countries declared their independence. **Yet**, today, according to the non-profit organization Freedom House, only about a fifth of sub-Saharan Africa would qualify as “free.” (NT, A23)

As stated above, the main purposes of newspaper articles are to influence public opinion, to convince the readers and to make them accept the points of view given. To achieve these goals authors of the articles use a variety of discourse markers (*and, but, though, although, yet, as a result, indeed, etc.*). Yet, some discourse markers met in newspaper interviews belong to dialogue in drama register (*well, oh, I think, etc.*).

Summing up, the distribution of discourse markers across the discussed registers needs some generalisations. The registers are distinctively different according to their grammar, lexis, types of situations they occur in, and discourse markers used.

Dialogue in drama is distinguished from the other registers by the fact that it can be ascribed to spoken discourse, while the rest belong to written discourse. Spoken discourse is less planned and orderly, open to the addressee’s remarks, corrections and comments on just uttered ideas, whereas the language of the written discourse is precisely planned, complex and thoroughly organised in order to facilitate understanding and interpretation. In spoken discourse the participants share the same situation at a time. On the contrary, there is no common situation between the addressee and the addressee in written discourse, the situation being inferred from the text. Using Halliday’s (1989) terminology, who distinguishes closed (restricted) and open registers, dialogue in drama belongs to the most open registers, next comes the register of newspaper articles, then academic prose, and the most restricted ones are legal documents.

Being the most unrestricted type of discourse, dialogue in drama abundantly uses such linguistic items as *oh, well, but, now, I mean, huh, I guess, of course, in fact, I’m afraid, all right* and others. The total number of discourse markers here makes up 198 occurrences through fifty pages of written text, which makes the use of these linguistic
devices the most diverse in this register. These particles help interlocutors structure their propositions, indicate their turn taking, liven up the communication and help the interpretation of their utterances in accordance with the assumptions made. This way, the interactional function of discourse markers prevails here.

The situation is different with the academic prose register. For its realisation authors use discourse markers performing as textual cohesive devices: however, therefore, for instance, in addition, thus, respectively, moreover, but, though, etc. The amount of markers through fifty pages in total is 101, which is much smaller compared to the previously discussed register. It is hardly possible to have linguistic items expressing purely interactional function here due to the specific character of academic texts.

Newspaper articles use a slightly larger quantity of discourse markers than scientific texts (107 markers) through the same number of pages, although the markers themselves are rather different. Besides and, but, for instance, though (which are met in the academic prose), there are also such items as yet, even though, according to, because, indeed, instead, etc. This type of discourse uses a variety of forms to influence its readers, the most popular among which are articles and interviews. These two varieties comprise discourse markers that fulfil both textual and interactional functions, as newspaper interviews can be considered a close resemblance of spoken discourse. Though, we should not maintain that both functions are used simultaneously with equal “rights”.

Legal discourse, as a special type of language, is the most restricted and the most slowly changing register. Due to this fact discourse markers are least popular in this type of discourse. An extremely small amount of these linguistic items is found (43 per fifty pages of text), as compared to the three above mentioned registers. Such items as however, although, thus, in addition, for example, therefore, furthermore, etc. are used to help convey the message to the reader/listener. Here, again, the textual function is foremost and, a variety of conjunctions and prepositions such as hereby, whether, herein, hereinafter, therein, whereof, etc. help us prove this fact.
CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions presented here rest on the statistical analysis carried out on the basis of 50 pages of each text, which is in no way sufficient to claim the results to be universal.

Our investigation has shown that the problem of discourse markers, their functions and distribution across registers in the English language has been discussed from different angles in linguistic literature. Although they have been labelled and classified in many various ways, all their functions, properties and classification are still not well delimited by linguists.

Consistent with the aims of the investigation, we have defined the functions discourse markers play in a coherent text (including dialogue in drama) and proved that, although they fall into two domains, interactional and textual, they are not mutually exclusive. That is, they can appear simultaneously.

Discourse markers are essential in all registers. However, the choice of these linguistic items and their functioning depend on the specificity of register itself. Each of the discussed registers possesses a certain quantity of discourse markers. They are the most widespread in dialogue in drama register (198 per 50 pages of text). Newspaper and academic prose registers use a relatively smaller amount of these linguistic items: 107 and 101 per 50 pages of text respectively. The least number of these linguistic elements (43 per 50 pages) is found in the legal discourse.

Dialogue in drama register (being the closest to spoken discourse) is rich in repetition of such discourse markers as *oh, well, I mean, I guess*, etc. whereas the other registers use more strict expressions (e.g. *furthermore, thus, also, however*, etc.)

As it has been mentioned, the register itself determines the functioning of discourse markers in it. Thus, we found out that the interactional function of discourse markers is the most prominent in dialogue in drama, whereas the textual function prevails in the other three registers.
SANTRAUKA

Šio darbo tikslas – nagrinėti įvairiais aspektais diskurso žymeklių funkcijų ir jų pasiskirstymo registruose problemą dabartinėje anglų kalboje. Diskurso žymikliai/žymekliai suprantami kaip žodžiai ar žodžių junginiai, kurie nustato prasmines ribas tarp sakinių, frazių ar prozodinių vienetų kalboje. Darbe remiamasi įvairių kalbininkų teorijomis apie šių lingvistinių vienetų definicijas, klasifikavimą, funkcijas ir vartojimą registruose.

Kalbininkų nagrinėjami diskurso žymekliai nėra homogeniška grupė, todėl rišliame tekste jie atlieka skirtingas funkcijas.


Gautų duomenų pagalba mes sugebėjome pateikti diskurso žymeklių distribucijos statistinę analizę, kuri parodė, kad šie lingvistiniai vienetai nevienodai pasiskirsto keturiuose registruose: dramoje (kaip arčiausiai atitinkančioje kalbinį diskursą), akademinėje prozoje, teisiniuose dokumentuose ir laikraščio straipsniuose.

Taip pat padarėme išvadą, kad diskurso žymeklių funkcijos pakankamai dažnai susilieja. Be to, šių lingvistinių vienetų naudojimas/pasirinkimas priklauso nuo paties registro savybių.
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## APPENDIX


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Ejemplos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Appositive</td>
<td>“i.e., e.g.”</td>
<td>That is, in other words, for example, etc.</td>
<td>Es decir, a saber, o sea, por ejemplo, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>“rather”</td>
<td>Or rather, at least, to be precise, etc.</td>
<td>Mejor dicho, más bien, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive</td>
<td>&quot;in any case&quot;</td>
<td>In any case, anyway, leaving that aside, etc.</td>
<td>En cualquier caso, en todo caso, de todos modos, de cualquier forma, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>&quot;in short&quot;</td>
<td>Briefly, to sum up, in conclusion, etc.</td>
<td>En resumen, en definitiva, en fin, al fin y al cabo, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verifactive</td>
<td>&quot;actually&quot;</td>
<td>Actually, in fact, as a matter of fact, etc.</td>
<td>En realidad, en el fondo, de hecho, desde luego, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II Additive | "and" | Also, moreover, in addition, besides, etc. | Además, encima, aparte, incluso, es más, etc. |
| Adversative | "but" | On the other hand, however, conversely, etc. | Por otra parte, por otro lado, por su parte, etc. |
| Variative    | "instead" | Instead, alternatively, etc.                        | En cambio, por el contrario, etc. |

III Temporal | "then" | Meanwhile, before that, later on, next, soon, finally, etc. | Mientras tanto, con anterioridad, más tarde, etc. |
<p>| Comparative  | &quot;likewise&quot; | Likewise, in the same way, etc.                        | De igual forma, en el mismo sentido, etc. |
| Causal.-Consecutive | &quot;so&quot; | Therefore, for this reason, as a result, with this in mind, etc. | Así pues, por consiguiente, de ahí, etc. |
| Conditional  | &quot;(if...)then&quot; | In that case, under the circumstances,                   | En ese caso, ante tales |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Ejemplos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>I think</td>
<td>In my opinion, personally, to my mind, etc.</td>
<td>En mi opinión, personalmente, desde mi punto de vista, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>I admit</td>
<td>Frankly, to be honest, to tell you the truth, etc.</td>
<td>Francamente, para ser honrado, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>I assure you</td>
<td>Honestly, really, believe me, seriously, etc.</td>
<td>Hablando en serio, de verdad, en serio, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entreaty</td>
<td>I request</td>
<td>Please, kindly, etc.</td>
<td>Por favor, si es tan amable, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presumption</td>
<td>I presume</td>
<td>Evidently, apparently, no doubt, presumably, etc.</td>
<td>Evidentemente, sin lugar a dudas, sin duda, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirability</td>
<td>How desirable?</td>
<td>Unfortunately, to my delight/distress, regrettably, hopefully, etc.</td>
<td>Desgraciadamente, afortunadamente, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservation</td>
<td>How reliable?</td>
<td>At first, tentatively, provisionally, looking back on it, etc.</td>
<td>En principio, de forma provisional, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation</td>
<td>How valid?</td>
<td>Broadly speaking, in general, on the whole, strictly speaking, etc.</td>
<td>En general, en términos generales, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>How sensible?</td>
<td>Unwisely, understandably, mistakenly, foolishly, etc.</td>
<td>Sabiamente, de forma comprensible, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>How expected?</td>
<td>To my surprise, surprisingly, as expected, by chance, etc.</td>
<td>De forma sorprendente, por casualidad, como se esperaba, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Conjunctive discourse markers in English and Spanish.

Table 2. Modal discourse markers in English and Spanish.