

## Discourse variation analysis of the Hungarian discourse markers *no~na* 'now, so, well' and their combinations with other markers and insubordinate clauses

Dér, Csilla Ilona (Nyelvtudományi Kutatóközpont, Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary)

Keywords: interjection, discourse marker, insubordination, discourse variation analysis

The use of interjections as discourse markers (DMs) is a well researched area in many languages of the world (see Schifffrin 1987 about the role of *oh* in information management; Montes 1999, Norrick 2009, etc.), but the number of diachronic case studies is smaller (e.g. Onodera 2004). This is especially true for interjections as DMs in Hungarian, despite the fact that this language also had and has many of these elements and their combinations serving several pragmatic functions.

The present study focuses on the pragmaticalization of two markers, *no* and *na* which are of common origin, *na* is a latter development (TESz. II: 1020). They typically have topic and speech managing function (mark the focus of attention, start a new topic or subtopic), express emphasis, contrast, addition, besides that they can give back multiple emotions (surprise, joy, anger, etc.). They also create combinations with other DMs, like *no/na most* 'now then', *no/na ugye* 'there now!', *no lám* 'come on, why, well' in spoken registers.

They can also be combined with insubordinate clauses starting with *hogy* 'that' as the following cases show:

(1) *Na hogy ez mekkora marhasag, asszem nem kell magyarázni.* (MNSz2, #131651112, doc#1029, pers-forum) 'Well, that's bullshit, 'guess, it doesn't need to be explained'

(2) *No hogy mik vannak.....* (MNSz2, #958829717, doc#2668, pers-social) 'You don't say' (literally: Now that what [things] are....)

Using the methods of discourse variation analysis (Pichler 2010, 2013) – which allows us to grasp the polysemy and multifunctionality of discourse variables – we try to detect the similarities and differences of *na* and *no* and their constructions. We investigate the typical genres and contexts of these DMs since the Old Hungarian period to the present day on large diachronic and synchronic corpora (see below). Our main research questions are the following:

- How has changed the single and combined usage of *no* and *na* over time?
- Are there differences in the frequency of use by area and by genre? What decides which form to choose from *na* and *no*?

### Corpora

Ómagyar Korpusz [Old Hungarian Concordance]. 1192 – 1526. Genres. Size: 3.2 million word tokens.  
<http://omagyarkorpusz.nytud.hu/en-search.html>

TMK = Történeti Magánéleti Korpusz [Historical Corpus of Personal Life]. End of the 15th c.–1772. Genres: witness testimonies of witch trials and private letters. Size: 1 million word tokens.  
<http://tmk.nytud.hu/3/>

MTSz = Magyar Történeti Korpusz [Hungarian Historical Corpus]. 1772–2010. Genres/registers: *fiction and press language*, legal, professional, personal texts, Size: 30 million word tokens.  
[http://clara.nytud.hu/mtsz/run.cgi/first\\_form](http://clara.nytud.hu/mtsz/run.cgi/first_form)

BEA = Magyar Spontán Beszéd Adatbázis [Hungarian Database of Spontaneous Speech]. Subcorpora of 40 conversations with 3 speakers. Size: ~12 hours long. <http://www.nytud.hu/adatb/bea/index.html> [gender, age]

MNSz2 = Magyar Nemzeti Szövegtár 2. változat [Hungarian National Corpus 2nd edition]. Size: 1 billion word tokens. <http://clara.nytud.hu/mnsz2-dev/> [subcorpora by region (Hungary, Slovakia, Subcarpathia, Transylvania, Vojvodina), by register (spoken press language – news&reports, written press language, fiction, academic, political, private)]

## References

- Montes, Rosa Graciela 1999. The development of discourse markers in Spanish: Interjections. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31(10): 1289–1319.
- Norrick, Neal R. 2009. Interjections as pragmatic markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(5): 866–891.
- Onodera, Noriko 2004. *Japanese discourse markers. Synchronic and diachronic discourse analysis*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pichler, Heike 2010. Methods in discourse variation analysis: Reflections on the way forward. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 14: 581–608.
- Pichler, Heike 2013. *The structure of discourse-pragmatic variation*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam–Philadelphia.
- Schiffrin, Deborah 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TESz. = Benkő, Loránd (ed.) 1967–1984. *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára II. kötet*. [The historical-etymological dictionary of Hungarian language] Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.