

Jef Verschueren, Jan-Ola Östman,  
Jan Blommaert & Chris Bulcaen (eds.)  
*Handbook of Pragmatics 1996*  
© 1996. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publ. Co

## PRAGMATIC PARTICLES

Ad Foolen

### 1. Introduction

#### 1.1. Function and form

Pragmatic particles do not contribute to the propositional content of an utterance. This important (negative) property of pragmatic particles is not sufficient as a defining characteristic, though, because it also holds for a number of focus particles and emotional interjections. A short positive definition of pragmatic particles is, however, not easy to give, because the items involved fulfill a whole array of functions: they can modify the illocutionary force, indicate the beginning, continuation and end of a turn, they can indicate a coherence break in the ongoing discourse, or signal the background or foreground status of a stretch of discourse. In general, pragmatic particles help to structure the communication process and to embed utterances into their communicative context.

We call the linguistic forms that fulfill the function of communicative embedding and organization 'pragmatic *particles*', because they typically are uninflectable, short, monosyllabic, unaccentable forms. From a morphological point of view, particles are intermediate between full words and affixes (cf. Zwicky 1985; Léard 1996; van Baar 1996, 1997: ch. 6). Other types of expressions, like polysyllabic words (*moreover*), phrases (*you know*), tags (*isn't it*) and enclitic forms (*-han/-hän* in Finnish) can fulfill the function of pragmatic embedding and organization as well. Even suprasegmental, paralinguistic and non-verbal expressive means could be added to this list. The term 'particle' is

thus used here in a prototypical way. If one wants to avoid the phonological-morphological association of the term 'pragmatic particle,' one could use the more neutral term 'pragmatic marker' instead (cf. Hölker 1990:80; Fraser 1996). See for the use of the term 'particle' in the history of linguistic thought Schenkeveld (1986) and Gully (1995).

A linguistic form that can function as a pragmatic particle typically fulfills other functions as well. English *well* can be used as a pragmatic particle, in which case it is parenthetic (*I have the feeling that he's - well - not too keen on the idea*) or in utterance-initial position (A: *What does your daughter in law call you?* B: *Well that's a sore spot*, Schifffrin 1987:109), but in other positions it can function as a 'normal' adverb (*John doesn't feel very well*). Thus, instead of saying "Form A is a pragmatic particle in language X" it is more appropriate to say "Form A *can function as* a pragmatic particle in language X". If we keep in mind that we actually mean 'use as a pragmatic particle', then there is no objection to the term 'pragmatic particle' as a shorthand.

It is not always easy to decide whether we should consider a certain use of a form as a pragmatic particle use. Whereas Brausse (1991) argues that the German negation particle *nicht* should be considered as a pragmatic particle in examples like *Mußt du nicht gehen?* ("Don't you have to go?"), and Wegener (1989) considers the German pronominals *mir* and *dir* (known as 'ethical dative') in *Fall mir nicht!* ("Don't fall!") as pragmatic particles, Meibauer (1994:43) does not agree with Brausse's and Wegener's view.

### 1.2. Examples

Before we continue with a few more introductory remarks, it might be helpful to provide some examples containing pragmatic particles. For ease of reference, the examples have all been chosen from papers in Weydt (1989).

- (1) Sedni be! (p. 108, Bulgarian)  
Sit down *part.*  
Do sit down' (impatient).
- (2) Nani iorun zo. (p. 121, Japanese)  
What are you saying *part* (negative tone)

- (3) Er kommt *doch* heute? (p. 285, German)  
He comes *part* today  
'He is coming today, isn't he?'
- (4) A: Est-tu capable de faire ça? B: *Ah bien* moi certain. (p. 594, French).  
Are you able to do that? *part* Me, sure!
- (5) *Anyway*, we'll try it for a few minutes (p. 612, English).
- (6) ɔn *baa* lɔmɔ má weri. (p. 418, Sissala).  
Monkey *part* quick also very  
'Moreover, the monkey is also very quick'.
- (7) Ty *ved'* pojdeš s nami. (p. 629, Russian).  
You *part* are coming with us  
'You are coming with us, aren't you?'
- (8) Pu ton ides *de?* (p. 547, Modern Greek)  
Where him saw-you *part*  
'Where did you see him?' (dissatisfaction about not giving an answer more quickly)

As these examples show, the pragmatic particles can occur utterance-initially, sentence-internally, and sentence finally. Languages seem to have individual preferences for the placement of pragmatic particles, but these preferences are not absolute. In the Dutch utterance "*Overigens is de soep wel heet hoor!*" ("By the way, the soup is hot, you hear!"), the beginning, middle and end of the utterance contain a pragmatic particle. Vedic Sanskrit puts its pragmatic particles in a second, clitic, position (see Schäufele 1996).

### *1.3. Definitions and terminology*

The literature that deals with pragmatic particles is, unfortunately, not very consistent in terminology. The term 'pragmatic particles' is used by, among others, Östman (1982, 1995), Fillmore (1984), Gupta (1992) and Meyerhoff (1994). Fillmore (1984:132-133) states that

their role ... is more to 'fit' the context than to communicate new information ... Pragmatic particles ... reflect choices among the numerous ways in which individual utterances can be situated in their discourse context.

Other authors use a different term, but the definitions they give are often very similar to that of Fillmore. Hansen (1996:292) defines what she calls discourse particles as

non-propositional connective items of variable scope, whose meaning is entirely procedural, and which function as instructions from speaker to hearer on how to integrate their host unit into a coherent mental representation of the discourse.

With 'variable scope' Hansen means that besides (parts of) individual utterances longer stretches of discourse can be the 'host' of a pragmatic particle.

Fernandez (1994:5) uses the term 'particules énonciatives', and her definition is as follows:

Une PEN [particule énonciative] doit être dépourvue de sens propositionnel, qualifier le processus d'énonciation plutôt que la structure des énoncés, et ancrer les messages du locuteur dans ses attitudes (/sentiments) de façon indirecte ou implicite.

[A pragmatic particle must be void of propositional meaning, qualify the process of communication rather than the structure of the utterance, and anchor the message of the speaker in his attitudes (/sentiments) in a direct or implicit way].

With 'façon indirect ou implicite' Fernandez probably wants to point out the deictic character of pragmatic particles: They do not *describe* an aspect of the context, they only *indicate* that a contextual aspect of a certain type should be taken into consideration by the hearer in the interpretation process (cf. Petrič 1996). Hentschel (1986) uses the term 'metakommunikative Deixis' for this property of pragmatic particles.

In the literature, there are many terms used to refer to the class of pragmatic particles as a whole or to a functionally or formally defined subclass, among which are the following: Discourse particles (Abraham ed. 1991, Kroon 1995, Hansen 1996), discourse markers (Schiffrin 1987, Miracle 1989, Fraser 1990, Traugott 1995), pragmatic markers (Fraser 1996), pragmatic operators (Ariel 1994), pragmatic expressions (Erman 1992), non-referential indexes (Cook 1992), void pragmatic connectives (Even-Zohar 1982), inference particles (Fretheim 1989), 'mystery' particles and affixes (Longacre 1976), semantic constraints on relevance (Blakemore 1987), apposition markers (Blakemore 1996), phatic connectives (Bazzanella 1990), utterance particles (Gibbons 1980, Luke 1989, 1990), punctors (Vincent and Sankoff 1992), attitude markers (Dimmendaal 1996), connecteurs pragmatiques (Rubattel 1987), connecteurs phatiques (Davoine 1980), marqueurs de structuration de la conversation (Auchlin 1981), marqueurs de la reformulation paraphrastique (Gülich & Kotschi 1983), Gesprächswörter (Burkhardt 1982), Gliederungssignale (Gülich 1970), Pragmalexeme (Rathmayr 1985), redecharakterisierende Adverbiale (Niehüser 1989), Abtönungspartikeln (Weydt 1969, Burkhardt 1994), Modalpartikeln (Jacobs 1991, Lindner 1991), minimale interactieve taalvormen ('minimal interactive language forms', Mönnink 1988), etc. This terminological variation reflects a variation in approaches and viewpoints which makes it difficult to compare and evaluate the different results of research.

#### 1.4. Other categories

In order to get a clearer view on the specific properties of pragmatic particles, they are often contrasted with interjections, conjunctions and certain subclasses of adverbs. Some of these other classes are:

- Focus particles (like English *only* and *even*, cf. König 1991). Some forms that function as a focus particle can also be used as a modal particle (German *auch*, *nur*, *schon*), which might be an indication of a certain affinity. Like the modal (and other pragmatic) particles, the focus particles have an embedding or integrating function, but what they integrate is part of the propositional content into the referential domain. Pragmatic particles, on the other hand, integrate the utterance into the communicative process.
- Sentence adverbs which express the speaker's epistemic or emotional attitude towards the propositional content, like English *probably* and *unfortunately*. For their proper interpretation it is not necessary to take the communicative context into consideration.
- Purely emotional interjections, like English *ouch* or *yow* for expressing pain. Some pragmatic particles can be categorized as interjections, like *well* and *anyway*, but not all interjections function as pragmatic particles. See on interjections Ehlich (1986), Ameka (1992) and Wilkins (1995).
- Conjunctions, in case they relate the propositional content in a purely conceptual way. English *and*, *because* and *after* indicate additive, causal and temporal relations respectively. But pragmatic research has made clear that many of these items can be used in a pragmatic way. In the latter case, we will consider them as pragmatic particles, cf. Hansen (1996:76). One of Sweetser's (1990:126) examples of the pragmatic use of *because* is '*What are you doing tonight, because there's a good movie on*'. The distinction between the semantic and pragmatic uses of a conjunction is accepted by many authors (see, for example, Van Dijk 1979, Petter 1985, Schiffrin 1986, Sweetser 1990, Sanders et al. 1993, Vandepitte 1993, Snoeck Henkemans 1995, Nølle 1995, Lamiroy & van Belle 1995, Rudolph 1996).

Although this listing of categories might give the impression that we have to do with strictly discrete categories, in practical analysis we often see that they shade into one another.

## 2. Synchronic analysis

### 2.1. Frameworks

Many pragmatic concepts and theories have been used in some way or other in the analysis of pragmatic particles: speech act theory, maxims, contextualization cues, text theory, politeness theory, relevance theory. This section gives an idea of the application of the general pragmatic notions and theories in the research on pragmatic particles.

In the seventies, the notion of 'illocutionary force indicating devices' ('ifids') was popular, and the pragmatic particles were considered good candidates for being ifids (Helbig 1977, Gibbons 1980). In Bublitz's (1978) analysis Grice's maxims played an important role, whereas Brown and Levinson (1987:146-162) analyzed Tzeltal and Tamil particles from the perspective of their politeness theory. Schiffrin (1987) developed a discourse model especially for the description of English discourse markers. The approach in this book has been widely applied, often in an eclectic way, for example in Luke (1989, 1990), Maynard (1989, 1992) and Schleppegrell (1991). Unger (1996) discusses the relevance of different discourse models for the analysis of discourse connectives.

Relevance theory has been applied both in the analysis of English discourse markers (Blakemore 1987, 1988; Jucker 1993) and in the study of particles in other languages: Blass (1990) on Sissala; König & Requardt (1992) on German modal particles, Itani (1992, 1993) on Japanese sentence-final particles. See also the special issue of *Lingua* 90:1/2 (1990) on 'Relevance Theory'.

In French linguistics, the argumentation theory of Oswald Ducrot (Ducrot et al. 1980; Anscombre & Ducrot 1983) has been influential (cf. Nyan 1991 as an example). The discourse model that was developed by the Genevan research group under the direction of Eddy Roulet (the 'Geneva School') can be seen as an elaboration of the Ducrot-Anscombre model. In the *Cahiers de Linguistique Française*, which has appeared from 1980 onwards, many analyses of French pragmatic particles can be found. The Genevan model has found a wide reception outside French linguistics (Egner 1989, Kroon 1995:50-54). Kroon (1995) combines the Genevan model with Schiffrin's approach into a framework of her own, which she applies to Latin pragmatic particles, and which Wakker

(1995) in turn applies to Classical Greek particles. Hansen (1996) analyzes French discourse particles on the basis of her own framework, developed in critical discussion with the many models and frameworks that are available.

Some authors, like Doherty (1987), Jacobs (1991) and Lindner (1991) have used formal semantic models for explicating the meaning and function of modal particles. Ormelius-Sandblom (1997) integrated this approach into a modular (syntactic-semantic-pragmatic) framework. The framework of Functional Grammar was used by Vismans (1994) for the analysis of Dutch modal particles and by Davidsen-Nielsen (1996) for the analysis of Danish discourse particles.

As a general trend in the research on pragmatic particles, a shift in preference can be noticed from static (speech act theory, text theory) to more dynamic models (conversation analysis, instructional semantics). The insight that verbal interaction is not pre-planned but is under permanent ad hoc construction, has become more and more important. Both for the speaker and the hearer, the pragmatic particles function as indicators in an interactive construction process. Spontaneous conversation is constructed ad hoc and this property could explain the high frequency of pragmatic particles in impromptu speech.

## *2.2. German modal particles*

The research on German modal particles deserves special mention, because of its boom in the seventies and eighties. The class of German modal particles can be considered a subclass of the German pragmatic particles. They can be defined by formal properties (occurrence in the so-called 'middle field' of the sentence, not accented, not co-constituent of a phrase), but authors often give a functional characterisation of this group of particles (to which *ja*, *doch*, *eben*, *nur*, *wohl*, *denn*, etc. belong), cf. Burkhardt (1994:133):

Generell drücken diese Partikeln die subjektive Einschätzung des Sprechers hinsichtlich verschiedener Elemente der Kommunikationssituation aus. Zu dieser Situation gehören das Wissen und die Wünsche des Hörers, die Art der Anknüpfung an vorher Gesagtes oder Getanes und die Meinungen und Präferenzen des Sprechers. [In general, these particles express the subjective judgment



of the speaker regarding different aspects of the communicative situation. To that situation belong the knowledge and the preferences of the hearer, the way of linking to what was said and done before and the opinions and preferences of the speaker].

After some early publications like Arndt (1960) and Krivonosow (1963) it was the publication of Weydt (1969) on modal particles, or 'Abtönungspartikel' as he called them, which was influential. Later, Weydt organized several congresses on particle research, the papers of which were published in a series of books, for example Weydt (1989). Van der Merwe (1993:29) calls Weydt "the father of modern German particle research".

The German particle research had its influence in Belgium and the Netherlands (cf. Van der Auwera & Vandeweghe 1984; Foolen 1993, 1995), and in Scandinavia (cf. Fretheim 1989 and Andvik 1992 on Norwegian; Aijmer 1996 on Swedish; Kärnä 1983 on Finnish).

Surprisingly, the boom in German particle research has not led to a specific theoretical model of German origin. Maybe the points of interest were too diverse. Weydt and his students were oriented to structural semantics, whereas for example Franck (1980), a rather influential publication, had a strong conversational orientation.

The fact that German modal particles are syntactically integrated in the sentence, stimulated a strong attention for syntactic and semantic questions which was absent in the study of English and French discourse markers. Distributional properties of modal particles like the following were studied: The actual position of these particles in the middle field of the sentence (cf. Hentschel 1986, ch. 5), the constraints on their occurrence in different sentence types (cf. Ott 1990, Thurmair 1993; Abraham 1995), the linear order in clusters of particles (cf. Thurmair 1989, 1991). The linear order of particles was also studied by De Vriendt et al. (1991) for Dutch, Wills (1993) for Classical Greek, Vicher & Sankoff (1989) for French. Ickler (1994) argues that the syntactic behavior of the modal particles should be understood from their semantics, cf. also Brown & Levinson (1987:259-260), who suggest that "at least some of the structural properties of these items are being contextually determined".

An important aspect of (modal) particles is their interaction with intonation, cf. Fretheim (1989), Östman (1990), Ormelius (1993), Kirsner et al.

(1994), Kirsner & Van Heuven (1996). The function of intonation is partly the same as that of pragmatic particles, namely embedding the utterance in its conversational context.

### *2.3. Other languages*

Fernandez (1994) devotes one chapter (ch. 3) to an overview of the research on pragmatic particles in European languages and another (ch. 4) to the research on non-European languages. Whereas there is a systematic stream of research on English, French and German, the publications on many other languages are more incidental. In addition to Fernandez' overview, the following references can be given as a first orientation.

Varieties of English: Miller & Weinert (1995) on Scottish English, Gupta (1992) on Singapore English, Meyerhoff (1994) on New Zealand English. Bazzanella (1990) is one of the studies on Italian, Briz (1994) and Díaz Tejera (1995) on Spanish, Silva & Macedo (1992) on Brazilian Portuguese, Risselada (1994, 1996) and Kroon (1995) on Latin. On Russian, see Rathmayr (1985) and Zybatow (1987). For Semitic languages see Mansour (1985), Van der Merwe (1993), for African languages see Blass (1990) on Sissala, Dimmendaal (1996) on Turkana. Examples of studies on American-Indian languages are Longacre (1976) on Cueblo, Hoff (1986) on Carib. For East-Asian languages, sentence-final particles are typical. On Japanese, see Uyeno (1971), Cook (1992), Itani (1992, 1993), Junko (1994), Maynard 1989, 1992), on Chinese see Gibbons (1980), Miracle (1989), Luke (1989, 1990), on Korean see Kyu-Hyun and Kyung-Hee (1994), on Khmer see Schiller (1995). Particles in Australian languages are studied in Haviland (1987) (Guugu Yimidhirr) and Wilkins (1986). A cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of particles and interjections can be found in Wierzbicka (1991, ch. 8 & 9). In spite of the growing attention for pragmatic particles in the languages of the world, a systematic cross-linguistic study is still to be done.

### *2.4. Polyfunctionality*

A researcher who enters upon a synchronic description of pragmatic particles unavoidably encounters the problem that these items are typically poly- or

multifunctional. They often can fulfill different pragmatic functions, at the same time having meanings that are propositional in nature. French *alors* fulfills different pragmatic functions (cf. Hansen 1996, ch. 12), English *now* functions as a discourse marker and as a temporal adverb, etc. The question of how this polyfunctionality is best accounted for in a synchronic description has aroused a lot of discussion. Homonymy, monosemy, polysemy, heterosemy, minimalism and maximalism, are the general notions that structure the debate (cf. Posner 1979, Ruhl 1989, Lichtenberk 1991, Tuggy 1993, for general discussion).

Advocates of a maximalistic, homonymous, description are rare, because this position is theoretically unattractive. This is not to say that a careful analysis which leads to an exhaustive inventory of the different functions a particle can fulfill, is not a useful start for further research (cf. Franck's 1980 inventory of the different functions of German *doch*). It would be a methodological mistake to assume that the different functions or meanings of a particle can be simply read off the data.

There are, in contrast, many advocates of a minimalist, monosemous, description of particles. Strong minimalism implies that all the functions, propositional and non-propositional, can be unified (Zybatow 1988, Blass 1989, Ormelius 1993, Meibauer 1994). In a less strong version of minimalism, only the pragmatic uses are unified into one overarching function (Ormelius-Sandblom 1997, Östman 1995), cf. Fraser (1990:394-395):

On my analysis, discourse markers have a core pragmatic meaning, a meaning separate from any content meaning of the homophonous form, and a meaning which signals how the speaker intends the message following to relate to the foregoing discourse.

In still another version of minimalism different levels of description are distinguished, a unified abstract one and a more concrete level on which the variation in meaning is accounted for (cf. Foolen 1989, Janssen 1995, Kroon 1995).

A description in which the different functions are related to each other in a polysemous way can be considered as an intermediate position between homonymy and monosemy. Such a view is in accordance with the cognitive view on lexical meaning in general (cf. Tuggy 1993). In recent years, particle research

tends to orient itself more and more to this cognitive-linguistic position, cf. Hansen (1996, ch. 5).

### *2.5. Methodology*

The functional and distributional properties of pragmatic particles seem to be hardly accessible to native speakers' intuitions, cf. reports like the following: "Typically, the native speaker uses such affixes and particles with complete assurance but is unable to verbalize anything very concrete as to their meaning and function" (Longacre 1976:468). Or Mansour (1985:62): "The particle *baqa* is used with some frequency in the Judeo-Arabic dialect of Bagdad, but if one asks a native speaker to translate it or describe its functions, he will find it difficult to do so". This means that empirical particle research must be based on corpus study. As pragmatic particles are found first and foremost in informal spoken conversation, the corpus must focus on that type of language use (cf. Stenström 1990a, 1990b for an example of an English corpus study).

The need for using corpus data does not mean that linguistic methodology that uses intuitions as its primary data is totally worthless. The influential study of Blakemore (1987) is solely based on the native speaker intuitions of the author. Kirsner et al. (1994) did experimental research using judgments on the proper use of the Dutch sentence-final particle *hoor*, and Vismans (1994, ch. 8) asked subjects for their judgments on directives with varying modal particles. Intuitions seem to be a suitable tool for those particles that are syntactically restricted in some way, like the modal particles. It is generally accepted nowadays that corpus analysis and systematic conversation and discourse analysis have primary roles among the methodologies used in the field of pragmatic particles research.

## **3. Diachronic research**

Empirical diachronic research is dependent on the availability of data. Diachronic data are primarily written data, whereas pragmatic particles typically occur in informal spoken conversation. Against this background, it is surprising that diachronic research on pragmatic particles has been able to produce interesting

results. Hentschel (1986, ch. 3) traces the Germanic origins of the German modal particles *halt*, *eben*, *ja* and *doch*, as does Wauchope (1991) for some other particles. Burkhardt (1994) shows that the German modal particles originated from adverbs, conjunctions and adjectives. Östman & Wårvik (1994) analyze the occurrences of pragmatic particles in an Old-English text. Simon (1996) studies the occurrence of German modal particles in a 15th century text. Vismans (1994: ch. 4) shows, on the basis of a corpus of written plays, that the emergence of reinforcing modal particles in Dutch directives preceded the emergence of mitigating particles. He suggests that the history of politeness might have played a role here. On the development of German *aber* and *nur* as discourse connectors see Eroms (1996).

Function words, or 'Synsemantika', diachronically originate from content words (Brausse 1994; Lehmann 1995). This holds for pragmatic particles as well. This insight has been formulated by several authors, cf., for example, Fábrićz (1989:378): "Modal particles have emerged from different classes of words, some elements of which have gradually become specialized for fulfilling a function that belongs to the domain of linguistic subjectivity". Grammaticalization theory thus seems to be one useful theoretical framework for the further study of the diachronic development of pragmatic particles, cf. Traugott & König (1991), Brinton (1996). Abraham (1991) applied grammaticalization theory to the German modal particles, and Traugott (1995) showed how the English discourse markers *indeed*, *in fact* and *besides* originated from prepositional phrases. Hakulinen & Seppänen (1992) traced the origin of the Finnish particle *kato*. The challenge in this type of research is to show what exactly the sources, paths and mechanisms are which played and play a role in the diachronic emergence of pragmatic particles. Much useful information is probably still to be found in the 19th century historical-philological literature, cf. Tobler (1878), to mention only one reference.

#### 4. Sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic research

##### 4.1. *Speech events and text types*

Pragmatic particles are sensitive to the speech event or text type, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Hentschel (1986, ch. 6) shows that the quantity of modal particles correlates with the degree of formality of the text type. Certain uses of pragmatic particles seem to occur typically in certain speech events, cf. the studies of Greasley (1994) on commentaries on a snooker game, and Heritage & Sorjonen (1994) on the use of *and* in medical interviews.

##### 4.2. *Social parameters*

Erman (1992) showed that the use of pragmatic expressions is sensitive to gender. Holmes (1986) found that men and women use *you know* in the same proportion, but with different functions. Meyerhoff (1994) studied the use of *eh* as a sign of ethnic identity in New Zealand English. Heisler (1996) analyzed the social distribution of *OK* as a discourse marker in Montréal French. A special issue of *Language variation and change* (4:2, 1992) demonstrates quantitative methods in the sociolinguistic study of the use of pragmatic particles (cf. also Vincent 1993 for an introduction to this type of research).

##### 4.3. *Acquisition*

As to first language acquisition of pragmatic particles, Östman (1981:45) claims that "... very few, if any, pragmatic expressions seem to emerge before the age of 2", whereas Gupta (1992:39) holds that "pragmatic particles are acquired early and easily". Although there is not necessarily a contradiction between these two findings, more research is clearly needed here. This holds as well for second language learning, both directed and undirected, the more so, as particles are a challenge to both teachers and students. One of the few studies is Kutsch (1985), who reports on the acquisition of German particles by a Turkish girl.

#### 4.4. Processing

Bayer (1991) studied German aphatic patients judging sentences that contained focus particles and modal particles. Patients with left hemisphere damage had difficulties with the sentences containing focus particles. For the sentences with modal particles, no hemispheric bias was found. This intriguing result needs to be followed up more systematically.

### 5. Lexicography, teaching and translation

As Brown & Levinson (1987:273) note, particles "are just the kind of thing that tends to escape the net of the grammarian and the lexicographer". German particle researchers in particular have tried to use their analytical findings for more practically oriented works. Helbig & Buscha (1984) devote a whole chapter of their reference grammar of German (ch. 9) to the particles. This is matched by Leech & Svartvik (1994) with a section on 'linking signals' (p. 177-184).

In the 9th edition of Paul's German dictionary (1992), the particles have been given special attention. Bastert (1985) and Wolski (1986) present lexicographic reflections on the proper treatment of particles. Helbig (1988) is a special lexicon on German particles. König, Requardt & Stark (1990) is a bilingual German-English dictionary devoted to particles, the theoretical background of which can be found in König & Stark (1991). A big German-French lexicographic project on 'les mots de la communication' is in progress at the University of Nancy, see Métrich, Faucher & Courdier (1996).

The insight that "each language makes use of its particular resources, and what one language marks with a particle can be marked by stress, intonation, word order, verb forms, modality, or longer, more explicit phrases in another language" (Östman 1981:43), has led to much contrastive research, mostly on German in relation to some other language, for example Schubiger (1965, 1980), Bublitz (1978), Heinrich (1981), Requardt (1992), Nekula (1996), Masi (1996).

Reliable dictionaries and contrastive studies are the best help for translators, but they could possibly also profit from studies on how translators have dealt with pragmatic particles in actual translations, cf. Beerbom (1992) and Burkhardt (1995).

Finally, there is the didactic problem of teaching pragmatic particles to learners of a second or foreign language, cf. the reflections in Jiang (1994). Weydt et al. (1983), Helbig & Helbig (1995) and Van de Poel & van Elst (1996) offer special teaching material, which is meant as an addition to the existing foreign language courses, which, in their view, do not pay enough attention to the particles.

## **6. Future research**

The systematic study of pragmatic particles still has a rather short history. After several rather isolated studies, particle research has flourished in the past 25 years. A lot of work still has to be done, however, in all the subfields that have been touched on in this overview. Besides descriptive and applied work, theoretical synthesizing is welcomed.

Those who want to orient themselves on the research done could start with recent studies like Kroon (1995) and Hansen (1996). Besides their careful analyses of Latin and French discourse markers, respectively, they present extensive and critical overviews of the pragmatic models and notions in the study of pragmatic particles. Those with a specific interest in the research on German modal particles could start with Ormelius-Sandblom (1997). Fernandez (1994) is an informative overview of particle research in general. Hölker (1990), Hartmann (1994) and Ariel (1994) provide short encyclopedic overviews. Older literature can be found via the bibliography of Weydt & Ehlers (1977). Reading of still older literature can also be inspiring. Here, ch. 1 in Lütten (1977) can be used as a guide. It is, for example, interesting to see how Denniston (1934) and Pos (1933) dealt with particles. They distinguish rational and emotive meaning, and stress the emotional-expressive function of particles. The pragmatic research on particles can also profit from the literature on non-verbal communication, see Key (1975), as there is functional overlap between pragmatic particles and non-verbal signs.



## References

[BLS = Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society; CLF = Cahiers de linguistique française. Université de Genève; CLS = Papers from the Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society; JoP = Journal of Pragmatics.]

- W. ABRAHAM (1991) The grammaticization of the German modal particles. In: E.C. Traugott & B. Heine (eds.), Vol. I, 331-380. ----- (1995) Wieso stehen nicht alle Modalpartikeln in allen Satzformen? *Deutsche Sprache* 23:124-146. W. ABRAHAM (ed.) (1991) *Discourse particles*. Benjamins. K. AIJMER (1996) Swedish modal particles in a contrastive perspective. *Language Sciences* 18:393-427. N. AKATSUHA (ed.) (1994) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, Vol. 4*. CSLI Publications. F. AMEKA (1992) Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech. *JoP* 18:101-118 (Special issue on interjections). E. E. ANDVIK (1992) *A pragmatic analysis of Norwegian modal particles*. The Summer Institute of Linguistics/ The Univ. of Texas at Arlington. J.-C. ANSCOMBRE & O. DUCROT (1983) *L'argumentation dans la langue*. Mardaga. M. ARIEL (1994) Pragmatic Operators. In R.E. Asher (ed.), Volume 6, 3250-3253. J. ARNOLD ET AL. (eds.) (1996) *Sociolinguistic variation: Data, theory, and analysis. Selected papers from NWAV 23 at Stanford*. CSLI. W. ARNDT (1960) Modal particles in Russian and German. *Word* 16:323-336. R.E. ASHER (ed.) (1994) *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Pergamon Press. A. AUCLIN (1981) 'Mais hein, pis bon, ben alors, voilà, quoi!' Marqueurs de structuration de la conversation. *CLF* 2:141-160. T. van BAAR (1996) Particles. In B. Devriendt, et al. (eds.) *Complex structures: A functionalist perspective*: 259-301. de Gruyter. ----- (1997) *Phasal Polarity*. Foris. U. BASTERT (1985) *Modalpartikel und Lexikographie: Eine exemplarische Studie zur Darstellbarkeit von doch im einsprachigen Wörterbuch*. Niemeyer. J. BAYER (1991) German particles in a modular grammar: Neurolinguistic evidence. In W. Abraham (ed.), 253-302. C. BAZZANELLA (1990) Phatic connectives as interactional cues in contemporary spoken Italian. *JoP* 14:629-647. C. BEERBOM (1992) *Modalpartikeln als Übersetzungsproblem: Eine kontrastive Studie zum Sprachpaar Deutsch-Spanisch*. Lang. Y. BIQ (1990) Conversation, continuation, and connectives. *Text* 10:187-208. D. BLAKEMORE (1987) *Semantic constraints on relevance*. Blackwell. ----- (1988) 'So' as a constraint on relevance. In R. Kempson (ed.) *Mental representations*: 183-195. Cambridge Univ. Press. ----- (1996) Are apposition markers discourse markers? *Journal of Linguistics* 32:325-347. R. BLASS (1990) *Relevance relations in discourse: A study with special reference to Sissala*. Cambridge Univ. Press. BOLINGER (ed.) (1972) *Intonation*. Penguin. U. BRAUSSE (1991) Nicht-propositionales nicht oder Modalpartikel? *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft*

- und Kommunikationsforschung 44:439-453. ----- (1994) *Lexikalische Funktionen der Synsemantika*. Narr. L. BRINTON (1996) *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Mouton de Gruyter. A. BRIZ (1994) Hacia un análisis argumentativo de un texto coloquial. La incidencia de los conectores pragmáticos. *Verba* 21:369-388. P. BROWN & S. LEVINSON (1987) *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. : Cambridge Univ. Press. W. BUBLITZ (1978) *Ausdrucksweisen der Sprechereinstellung im Deutschen und Englischen*. Niemeyer. A. BURKHARDT (1982) Gesprächswörter: Ihre lexikologische Bestimmung und lexikographische Beschreibung. In W. Mentrup (ed.): *Konzepte zur Lexikographie: Studien zur Bedeutungsbeschreibung in einsprachigen Wörterbüchern*: 138-171. Niemeyer. ----- (1994) Abtönungspartikeln im Deutschen: Bedeutung und Genese. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 22:129-151. ----- (1995) Zür Übersetzbarkeit von Abtönungspartikeln: Am Beispiel von Hofmannsthals *Der Schwierige*. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 23:172-201. H.M. COOK (1992) Meanings of non-referential indexes: A case study of the Japanese sentence-final particle *ne*. *Text* 12: 507-539. N. DAVIDSEN-NIELSEN (1996) Discourse particles in Danish. In E. Engberg-Pedersen et al. (eds.): *Content, expression, and structure: Studies in Danish Functional Grammar*. 283-314. Benjamins. J.P. DAVOINE (1980) Des connecteurs phatiques. *Le discours polémique*. PUL, 83-107. J.D. DENNISTON (1954 [1934]) *The Greek Particles*. Oxford Univ. Press. S. De VRIENDT, W. VANDEWEGHE & P. VAN DE CRAEN (1991) Combinatorial aspects of modal particles in Dutch. *Multilingua* 10:43-59. T.A. DÍAZ (1995) Implicatura y sentidos en partículas conectivas. *Revista Española de Lingüística* 25:311-322. G.J. DIMMENDAAL (1996) Attitude markers and conversational implicatures in Turkana speech acts. *Studies in Language* 20:249-274. M. DOHERTY (1987) *Epistemic meaning*. Springer. O. DUCROT et al. (1980) *Les mots du discours*. Ed. de Minuit. I. EGNER (1989) Das Genfer Modell zur Gesprächsanalyse. In E. Weigand & F. Hundsnurscher (eds.): Band I: 3-18. K. EHLICH (1986) *Interjektionen*. Niemeyer. N.E. ENKVIST (ed.) (1982) *Impromptu speech: A symposium*. Åbo Akademi. B. ERMAN (1992) Female and male usage of pragmatic expressions in same-sex and mixed-sex interaction. *Language variation and change* 4:217-234. H.-W. EROMS (1996) De l'érosion des connecteurs et de la précession des ligateurs. *Études Germaniques* 1996: 329-378. I. EVEN-ZOHAR (1982) The emergence of speech-organizers in a renovated language: The case of Hebrew void pragmatic connectives. In N.E. Enkvist (ed.): 179-193. M.J. FERNANDEZ (1994) *Les particules énonciatives*. Presses Univ. de France. C.J. FILLMORE (1984) Remarks on contrastive pragmatics. In J. Fisiak (ed.) *Contrastive Linguistics: Prospects and Problems*: 119-141. Mouton. A. FOOLEN (1989) Beschreibungsebenen für Partikelbedeutungen. In H. Weydt (ed.): 305-317. ----- (1993) *De betekenis van partikels*. PhD. Diss Univ. of

- Nijmegen. ----- (1995) Dutch modal particles: The relevance of grammaticalized elements. In Th. Shannon & J. Snapper (eds.): 57-70. D. FRANCK (1980) *Grammatik und Konversation*. Scriptor. B. FRASER (1990) An approach to discourse markers. *JoP* 14:383-395. ----- (1996) Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics* 6:2, 167-190. T. FRETHEIM (1989) The two faces of the Norwegian inference particle *da*. In H. Weydt (ed.): 403-415. J. GIBBONS (1980) A tentative framework for speech act description of the utterance particle in conversational Cantonese. *Linguistics* 18:763-775. P. GREASLEY (1994) An investigation into the use of the particle *well*: Commentaries on a game of snooker. *JoP* 22:477-494. E. GÜLICH (1970) *Makrosyntax der Gliederungssignale im gesprochenen Französisch*. Fink. E. GÜLICH & T. KOTSCHI (1983) Les marqueurs de la reformulation paraphrastique. *CLF* 5:305-351. A. GULLY (1995) *Grammar and Semantics in Medieval Arabic*. Curzon Press. A.F. GUPTA (1992) The pragmatic particles of Singapore Colloquial English. *JoP* 18:31-57. A. HAKULINEN & E.-L. SEPPÄNEN (1992) Finnish *kato*: From verb to particle. *JoP* 18: 527-549. M.M. HANSEN (1996) *The function of discourse particles: A study with special reference to spoken French*. PhD. Diss Univ. of Copenhagen. D. HARTMANN (1994) Particles. In R.E. Asher (ed.): Vol. 6: 2953-2958. J.B. HAVILAND (1987) Fighting words: Evidential particles, affect and argument. *BLS* 13:343-354. W. HEINRICH (1981) *Die Modalpartikeln im Deutschen und Schwedischen: Eine kontrastive Analyse*. Niemeyer. T. HEISLER (1996) OK: A dynamic discourse marker in Montréal French. In J. Arnold et al. (eds.): 293-312. G. HELBIG (1977) Partikeln als illokutive Indikatoren im Dialog. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 14:30-43. ----- (1988) *Lexikon deutscher Partikeln*. Verlag Enzyklopädie. G. HELBIG & J. BUSCHA (1984) *Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Deutschunterricht*. Verlag Enzyklopädie. G. HELBIG & A. HELBIG (1995) *Deutsche Partikeln - richtig gebraucht?* Langenscheidt/Verlag Enzyklopädie. C. HELLING (1983) *Deutsche Modalpartikeln im Übersetzungsvergleich: Deutsch-Italienisch/Italienisch-Deutsch. Eine kontrastive Mikroanalyse von Sprechakten*. Grafiche Nuova Del Bianco. E. HENTSCHEL (1986) *Funktion und Geschichte deutscher Partikeln: Ja, doch, halt und eben*. Niemeyer. J. HERITAGE & M.-L. SORJONEN (1994) Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: And-prefacing as a feature of question design. *Language in Society* 23:1-29. B.J. HOFF (1986) Evidentiality in Carib: Particles, affixes, and a variant of Wackernagel's law. *Lingua* 69:49-103. K. HÖLKER (1988) *Zur Analyse von Markern. Korrektur- und Schlußmarker des Französischen*. Franz Steiner. ----- (1990) Französisch: Partikelforschung. In G. Holtus et al. (eds.) *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik, Band V,1*: 77-88. Niemeyer. J. HOLMES (1986) Functions of 'you know' in women's and men's speech. *Language in Society* 15:1-22. T. ICKLER (1994) Zur Bedeutung der sogenannten 'Modalpartikeln'. *Sprachwissenschaft* 19:374-404. R. ITANI (1992)

Japanese sentence-final particle *ne*: A relevance-theoretic approach. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 4:215-237. Univ. College London. ----- (1993) The Japanese sentence-final particle *ka*: A relevance-theoretic approach. *Lingua* 90:129-147. J. JACOBS (1991) On the semantics of modal particles. In: W. Abraham (ed.): 141-162. T. JANSSEN (1995) Heterosemy or polyfunctionality? The case of Dutch *maar* 'but, only, just'. In Th. Shannon & J. Snapper (eds.): 71-85. M. JIANG (1994) *Deutsche Modalpartikeln als Lehr- und Lernproblem im Fach Deutsch als Fremdsprache für Ausländer, mit didaktischen Überlegungen*. Peter Lang. A. JUCKER (1993) The discourse-marker *well*: A relevance-theoretical account. *JoP* 19:435-452. M. JUNKO (1994) Functions of the connective *datte* in Japanese conversation. In Noriko Akatsuha (ed.): 147-163. A. KÄRNÄ (1983) Abtönung im Finnischen und im Deutschen. In H. Weydt (ed.) *Partikeln und Interaktion*: 85-95. Niemeyer. M.R. KEY (1975) *Paralanguage and kinesics (Nonverbal communication)*. The Scarecrow Press. R.S. KIRSNER et al. (1994) Interaction of particle and prosody in the interpretation of factual Dutch sentences. In R. Bok-Bennema & C. Cremers (eds.) (1994) *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1994*: 107-118. Benjamins. R.S. KIRSNER & V. VAN HEUVEN (1996) Boundary tones and the semantics of the Dutch final particles *hè*, *hoor*, *zeg* and *joh*. In: C. Cremers & M. den Dikken (eds.) *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1996*:133-146. Benjamins. E. KÖNIG (1991) *The meaning of focus particles*. London: Routledge. E. KÖNIG & D. STARK (1991) The treatment of function words in a new bilingual German-English dictionary. In W. Abraham (ed.), 303-328. E. KÖNIG & S. REQUARDT (1991) A relevance-theoretic approach to the analysis of modal particles in German. *Multilingua* 10:63-77. E. KÖNIG, S. REQUARDT & D. STARK (1990) *Adverbien und Partikeln: Ein deutsch-englisches Wörterbuch*. Groos. A. KRIVONOSOV (1977 [1963]) *Die modalen Partikeln in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. Göppingen. C. KROON (1995) *Discourse Particles in Latin: A study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*. Gieben. S. KUTSCH (1985) Zur Entwicklung des deutschen Partikelsystems im ungesteuerten Zweitspracherwerb ausländischer Kinder. *Deutsche Sprache* 13:230-257. K. KYU-HYUN & S. KYUNG-HEE (1994) The discourse connective *nikka* in Korean conversation. In N. Akatsuha (ed.): 113-129. B. LAMIROY & W. VAN BELLE (1995) Connectives of contrast and concession in Dutch and French. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 84:397-418. J.-M. LÉARD (1996) *Ti/-tu, est-ce que, qu'est-ce que, ce que, hé que, don*: Des particules de modalisation en Français? *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 24:107-124. G. LEECH & J. SVARTVIK (1994) *A communicative grammar of English*. Longman. C. LEHMANN (1995) Synsemantika. In J. Jacobs et al. (eds.) *Syntax: Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung, Band 2*: 1251-1266. Walter de Gruyter. F. LICHTENBERK (1991) Semantic change and heterosemy in grammaticalization. *Language* 67:475-509. K. LINDNER (1991) 'Wir sind ja doch alte

- bekannte.' The use of German *ja* and *doch* as modal particles. In W. Abraham (ed.): 163-201. R.E. LONGACRE. (1976) 'Mystery' particles and affixes. *CLS* 12: 468-475. K.-K. LUKE (1989) The cantonese utterance particle *la* and the accomplishment of common understandings in conversation. *Papers in Pragmatics* 3:39-87. ----- (1990) *Utterance particles in Cantonese conversation*. Benjamins. J. LÜTTEN (1977) *Untersuchungen zur Leistung der Partikeln in der gesprochenen deutschen Sprache*. Kümmerle. J. MANSOUR (1985) The particle *baqa* in the Judaeo-Arabic dialect of Bagdad. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 14:62-75. S. MASI (1996) *Deutsche Modalpartikeln und ihre Entsprechungen im Italienischen. Äquivalente für doch, ja, denn, schon und wohl*. Peter Lang. S.K. MAYNARD. (1989) Functions of the discourse marker *dakara* in Japanese conversation. *Text* 9:389-414. ----- (1992) Speech act declaration in conversation: Functions of the Japanese connective *datte*. *Studies in Language* 16:63-89. J. MEIBAUER (1994) *Modaler Kontrast und konzeptuelle Verschiebung: Studien zur Syntax und Semantik deutscher Modalpartikeln*. Niemeyer. C.H.J. VAN DER MERWE (1993) Old Hebrew particles and the interpretation of Old Testament texts. *Journal for the study of the Old Testament* 60:27-44. R. MÉTRICH, E. FAUCHER & G. COURDIÉ (1996) *Les Invariables Difficiles. Dictionnaire allemand-français des particules, connecteurs, interjections et autres 'mots de la communication'*. tome 1: *aber-ausserdem*. Tome 2: *bald-geradezu*. Université de Nancy 2. M. MEYERHOFF (1994) Sounds pretty ethnic, eh?: A pragmatic particle in New Zealand English. *Language in Society* 23:367-388. J. MILLER & R. WEINERT (1995) The function of LIKE in dialogue. *JoP* 23:365-393. W.C. Miracle (1989) *Hao*: A Chinese discourse marker. *CLS* 25:213-227. J. MÖNNINK (1988) *De organisatie van gesprekken: Een pragmatische studie van minimale interactieve taalvormen*. PhD. Diss, Univ. of Nijmegen. M. NEKULA (1996) *System der Partikeln im Deutschen und Tschechischen, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Abtönungspartikeln*. Niemeyer. W. NIEHÜSER (1989) Zur Funktion von Redecharakterisierungen in Dialogen. In E. Weigand & F. Hundsnurscher (eds.): Band II: 377-391. H. NØLKE (1995) Contrastive and argumentative linguistic analysis of the French connectors *donc* and *car*. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 84:313-328. T. NYAN (1991) 'Maintenant': emploi pragmatique. *French Language Studies* 1: 157-177. E. ORMELIUS (1993) Die Modalpartikel *schon*. In I. Rosengren (ed.) *Satz und Illokution, Band 2*: 151-191. Niemeyer. E. ORMELIUS-SANDBLOM (1997) Die Modalpartikeln *ja*, *doch* und *schon*. Zu ihrer Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik. Almqvist & Wiksell International. J.-O. ÖSTMAN (1981) *You know: A discourse-functional approach*. Benjamins. ----- (1982) The symbiotic relationship between pragmatic particles and impromptu speech. In N.E. Enkvist (ed.): 147-177. ----- (1990) Particles and prosody. On the language-internal interactions of prosody and pragmatic particles. In J. Verschueren (ed.) *Levels of linguistic adaptation*: 5-35.

- Benjamins. ----- (1995) Pragmatic particles twenty years after. In B. Wårvik et al (eds.) *Organization in discourse. Proceedings from the Turku conference*: 95-108. Anglicana Turkuensia 14. J.-O. ÖSTMAN & B. WÅRVIK (1994) The fight at Finnsburch: Pragmatic aspects of a narrative fragment. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* XCV: 207-227. J.H. OTT (1990) *Les particules modales dans les énoncés impératifs: sens, fonctions illocutoires et stratégiques*. PhD. Univ. des sciences humaines de Strasbourg. H. PAUL (1992) *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Niemeyer. T. PETRIČ (1996) On some (non)-parallelisms in Natural Textlinguistics. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49:3, 312-317. Y. PETTER (1985) *Et und mais: Zur Verwendung von Konnektoren in Alltagsgesprächen*. *Papiere zur Linguistik* 33:31-44. K. VAN DE POEL & S. VAN ELST (1996) *De finesses van het Nederlands*. Acco. H.-J. POS (1933) Les particules: Leurs fonctions logiques et affectives. *Recherches philosophiques* 3:321-333. R. POSNER (1979) Bedeutungsmaximalismus und Bedeutungsminimalismus in der Beschreibung von Satzverknüpfern. In H. Weydt (ed.) *Partikeln der deutschen Sprache*: 378-394. De Gruyter. R. RATHMAYR (1985) *Die russischen Partikeln als Pragmalexeme*. Otto Sagner. S. REQUARDT (1992) *Vergleichende Untersuchungen der Funktionswörter im Deutschen und Englischen*. PhD. Diss., Univ. of Hannover. R. RISSELADA (1994) *Modo and sane, or what to do with particles in Latin directives*. In J. Herman (ed.) *Linguistic studies on Latin*: 319-342. Benjamins. ----- (1996) And now for something completely different? Temporal discourse markers: Latin *nunc* and English *now*. In R. Risselada et al. (eds.) *On Latin: Linguistic and literary studies in honour of Harm Pinkster*: 105-125. Gieben. E. ROULET et al. (1987) *L'articulation du discours en français contemporain*. Lang. C. RUBATTEL (1987) Actes de langage, semi-actes et typologie des connecteurs pragmatiques. *Lingvisticae Investigationes* 11:379-404. E. RUDOLPH (1996) *Contrast: Adversative and concessive relations and their expressions in English, German, Spanish, Portuguese on sentence and text level*. de Gruyter. C. RUHL (1989) *On monosemy: A study in linguistic semantics*. SUNY Press. T. SANDERS, W. SPOOREN & L. NOORDMAN (1993) Coherence relations in a cognitive theory of discourse representation. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4:93-133. S. SCHÄUFELE (1996) Now that we're all here, where do we sit? Phonological ordering in the Vedic clause-initial string. In A.L. Halpern & A.M. Zwicky (eds.) *Approaching second*: 447-475. CLSI Publications. D.M. SCHENKEVELD (1986) From particula to particle - the genesis of a class of words. In Rosier (ed.) *L'héritage des grammariens latin de l'antiquité aux lumières*: 81-93. Peeters. D. SCHIFFRIN (1986) Functions of *and* in discourse. *JoP* 10:41-66. ----- (1987) *Discourse markers*. Cambridge Univ. Press. E. SCHILLER (1995) Not yes, not no: The zen of Khmer discourse particles. *BLS* 21: 107-113 (Special issue on discourse in Southeast Asian languages). J.J. SCHLEPPEGREL (1991) Paratactic *because*. *JoP* 16:323-337. M. SCHUBIGER (1965)

English intonation and German modal particles: A comparative study. *Phonetica* 12:65-84. Also in D. Bolinger (ed.) (1972): 175-193. ----- (1980) English intonation and German modal particles II: A comparative study. In L. Waugh & C. van Schooneveld (eds.) *The melody of language*: 279-298. Univ. Park Press. T. SHANNON & J. SNAPPER (eds.) (1995) *The Berkeley Conference on Dutch Linguistics 1993*. Univ. Press of America. G.M.O. SILVA & A.T. MACEDO (1992) Discourse markers in the spoken Portuguese of Rio de Janeiro. *Language variation and change* 4:235-249. H.J. SIMON (1996) Zur Problematik einer Geschichte der deutschen Abtönungspartikeln: Fallstudien anhand eines Sprachlehrbuchs von 1424. *Sprachwissenschaft* 21:262-300. F. SNOECK HENKEMANS (1995) 'But' as an indicator of counter-arguments and concessions. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 84:281-294. A.-B. STENSTRÖM (1990a) Lexical items peculiar to spoken discourse. In J. Svartvik (ed.): 137-175. ----- (1990b) Pauses in monologue and dialogue. In J. Svartvik (ed.): 211-252. J. SVARTVIK (ed.) (1990) *The London-Lund corpus of spoken English: Description and research*. Lund Univ. Press. E. SWEETSER. (1990) *From etymology to pragmatics*. Cambridge Univ. Press. M. THURMAIR (1989) *Modalpartikeln und ihre Kombinationen*. Niemeyer. ----- (1991) Kombinieren Sie doch nur ruhig mal Modalpartikeln: Combinatorial regularities for modal particles and their uses as an instrument of analysis. *Multilingua* 10:19-42. ----- (1993) Äusserungsform oder Äusserungsfunktion? Zu den Bedingungen für das Auftreten von Modalpartikeln. *Deutsche Sprache* 21:22-43. L. TOBLER (1878) Conjunctionen mit mehrfacher Bedeutung. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 5:358-388. E. C. TRAUGOTT (1995) The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. Paper delivered at ICHL XII, Univ. of Manchester. E.C. TRAUGOTT & B. HEINE (eds.) (1991) *Approaches to grammaticalization*. Vol. I and II. Benjamins. E.C. TRAUGOTT & E. KÖNIG (1991) The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In: E.C. Traugott & B. Heine (eds.): Vol. I: 189-218. D. TUGGY (1993) Ambiguity, polysemy, and vagueness. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4:273-290. C. UNGER (1996) The scope of discourse connectives: implications for discourse organization. *Journal of Linguistics* 32: 403-438. UYENO (1971) *A study of Japanese modality: a performative analysis of sentence particles*. PhD. Diss., Univ. of Michigan. S. VANDEPITTE (1993) *A pragmatic study of the expression and interpretation of causality conjuncts and conjunctions in modern spoken British English*. Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie. J. VAN DER AUWERA & W. VANDEWEGHE (eds.) (1994) *Studies over Nederlandse partikels*. Antwerp Papers in Linguistics 35. T. VAN DIJK (1979) Pragmatic connectives. *JoP* 3:447-456. A. VICHER & D. SANKOFF (1989) The emergent syntax of pre-sentential turn openings. *JoP* 13:81-97. D. VINCENT (1993) *Les ponctuels de la langue et autre mots du discours*. Nuit Blanche Éditeur. D.

- VINCENT & D. SANKOFF (1992) Punctors: A pragmatic variable. *Language variation and change* 4:205-216. R. VISMANS (1994) *Modal particles in Dutch directives: A study in Functional Grammar*. IFOTT. G. WAKKER (1995) 'Welaan dan dus nu': Partikels in Sophocles. *Lampas* 28:250-270. M.M. WAUCHOPE (1991) *The Grammar of the Old High German modal particles thoh, ia, and thanne*. Lang. H. WEGENER (1989) Eine Modalpartikel besonderer Art: Der Dativus Ethicus. In H. Weydt (ed.): 56-73. E. WEIGAND & F. HUNDSNURSCHER (eds.) (1989) *Dialoganalyse II: Referate der 2. Arbeitstagung, Bochum 1988*. 2 Volumes. Niemeyer. H. WEYDT (1969) *Abtönungspartikel: Die deutschen Modalwörter und ihre französischen Entsprechungen*. Gehlen. ----- (ed.) (1989) *Sprechen mit Partikeln*. de Gruyter. H. WEYDT et al. (1983) *Kleine deutsche Partikellehre*. Klett. H. WEYDT & K.-H. EHLERS (1987) *Partikel-Bibliographie. Internationale Sprachenforschung zu Partikeln und Interjektionen*. Lang. A. WIERZBICKA (1991) *Cross-cultural pragmatics*. Mouton de Gruyter. D. WILKINS (1986) Particle/clitics for criticism and complaint in Mpartntwe Arrernte (Aṛanda). *JoP* 10:575-596. (Special issue on particles). ----- (1995) Expanding the traditional category of deictic elements: Interjections as deictics. In J. Duchan, G. Bruder and L. Hewitt (eds.) *Deixis in narrative: A cognitive science perspective*: 359-386. Erlbaum. J. WILLS (1993) Homeric particle order. *Historische Sprachforschung* 106:61-81. D. WILSON & N. SMITH (eds.) (1990) Special issue on 'Relevance Theory' (Vol. 2). *Lingua* 90:1/2. W. WOLSKI (1986) *Partikellexikographie: Ein Beitrag zur praktischen Lexikographie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. A.M. ZWICKY (1985) Clitics and particles. *Language* 61:283-305. L. ZYBATOW (1987) *Zu der Bedeutung einiger russischer Modalpartikeln und ihrer Wiedergabe im Deutschen: Eine konfrontative Studie der Partikeln že, ved', da, taki, už, i, -to*. PhD. Diss., Univ. of Leipzig. ----- (1989) Wider grammatische Abstinenz und pragmatische Euphorie bei der Partikelbeschreibung. In N. Reiter (ed.) *Sprechen und Hören: Akten des 23. Linguistischen Kolloquiums, Berlin 1988*: 489-499. Niemeyer.