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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this study is to investigate modal particles and discourse markers in Luxembourgish through a study of a Luxembourgish email word-corpus, and a Luxembourgish word-corpus of plays and film scripts.

Design/methodology/approach – This study uses an approach based on the pragmatisation of words with propositional meanings into pragmatic markers with non-propositional uses. The polysemy of modal particles, discourse markers, and their propositional counterparts, which are found in a corpus of Luxembourgish emails and a corpus of Luxembourgish plays and film scripts, is analysed with a concordancer.

Findings – Apart from the modal particle *alt*, pragmatic markers with Germanic origins have propositional counterparts. Those with French origins only have non-propositional uses. *Zwar* is found to have modal particle usage, which is absent from German. *Ma* is the most commonly used discourse marker in Luxembourgish and seven different uses can be identified.

Research limitations/implications – The research focuses on the study of two word-corpora under 500,000 words. Based on integrating a qualitative and quantitative analysis of modal particles and discourse markers, it offers a model for future research on pragmatic markers in Luxembourgish.

Originality/value – Modal particles have been intensely investigated in German and Dutch, and discourse markers have been examined in French, English, and other languages. However, academic literature concerning Luxembourgish, dictionaries and learning materials have largely ignored pragmatic markers until this present study, which analyses frequencies of modal particles and discourse markers, their propositional and non-propositional distributions, and their pragmatic features. The study will be of particular interest to both linguists and persons involved in Luxembourgish language learning.
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### 5.1.4 The MP *dann*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.1.5 The MP *eben*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.1.6 The MP *emol*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.1.7 The MP *jo*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.1.8 The MP *roueg*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.1.9 The MP *zwar*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2 Summary of MPs

#### 5.2.1 Percentages of MPs

#### 5.2.2 Frequencies of MPs

### 5.3 Analysis of DMs

#### 5.3.1 The DM *ben*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3.2 The DM *bon*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3.3 The DM *enfin*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3.4 The DM *héier(t)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3.5 The DM *lauschter(t)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3.6 The DM *ma*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3.7 The DM *mā bon*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3.8 The DM *ok(ay)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3.9 The DM *so(t)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3.10 The DM *(e)sou*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1: Introduction

1.1 Preliminary Definitions

In this thesis, modal particles and discourse markers are understood as hyponyms for pragmatic markers, i.e. categories of words that ‘are not part of the propositional content of the sentence’ (Fraser 1996: 169).

Four remarks about pragmatic markers by Fraser (ibid.) are worth reiterating. First, ‘there is no overlapping of functions’ (ibid.: 169), by which he means that a word or an expression is either meant propositionally (example 2.1) or used non-propositionally (example 2.2), although both can occur in the same sentence.

(2.1)

So et nachemol.

[Say it once again.]

‘Say it again.’
(LPWC 5886)

(2.2)

So, bréng mer e puer Prospekter fir en neien CD-Player mat, do ginn et haut ganz nei Saachen.

[DM, bring me a few brochures for a new CD-player with, there exists it today very new things.]‘

‘Listen, bring me some brochures for new CD player, there are some new things around nowadays.
(LPWC 8079-8081)

Second, they ‘carry meaning’ (ibid.: 170), although not a ‘content meaning’, but rather a ‘signalling meaning’ (ibid.). Third, they ‘signal messages that apply only to the direct basic message’ (ibid.) and ‘apply to the figurative, direct

---

1 Examples are provided with an English gloss (italicised and in square brackets) and are then followed by an English target translation (in single quotes).

2 ‘LPWC’ refers to the Luxembourgish Plays Word-Corpus, while the numbers refer to the line numbers in the corpus; see subsection 4.4.1 for more information.
interpretations, but not to any indirect interpretations’ (ibid.). Pragmatic markers do not affect the indirect interpretation of a message. Further on, Fraser (ibid.) adds that pragmatic markers ‘are drawn from all segments of the grammar’, and hence have their origins in verbs, adjectives, nouns, and other expressions.

Modal particles are understood as words occurring in the West-Germanic *Mittelfeld* ‘middle field’ (example 1.3) and provide a comment about the speaker’s utterance. German examples include *ja, aber, mal, doch, and eben*.

(1.3)

Komm, heen ass dach cool, ech hunn heen emmer witzeg fonnt.

*Come, he is MP cool, I have him always funny found.*

‘Come on, he’s cool, though, I always thought he was funny.’

(LEWC³ 1680-1681)

Discourse markers precede or follow a clause or sentence, and are used by the speaker to indicate how a segment of discourse links with a segment uttered before or after (1.4). Discourse markers also include attention-grabbing signals (1.5). English discourse markers include *well, alright, okay*; French discourse markers include *bon, ben, and quoi*.

(1.4)

Daat ass jo schein fir heen, freen mech och, mee lo sin ech nach mei verzweifelt dass ech anscheinend keen mei ofkreien op deser Welt. Nu bon, sou lo hun ech rem main weekly soul cleansing gemaacht.

*That is MP pretty for him, rejoicing myself too, but now am I even more desperate that I apparently nobody anymore get on this world. DM DM, DM now have I again my weekly soul cleaning made.*

‘That’s all nice and good for him, glad for him, but now I’m even more desperate that apparently I can’t find someone anymore on this planet. Oh well, right, now I’ve done my weekly soul cleansing again.’

(LEWC 5470-5473)

(1.5)

Lauschter, ech hu mam K Punkt P Punkt geschwat bei de Puppfesch.

³‘LEWC’ refers to the Luxembourgish Email Word Corpus.
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[DM, I have with-the K Dot P Dot spoken by the pupfish.]

‘Listen, I’ve spoken with K.P. near the pupfish pond.’
(LPWC 18358-18359)

1.2 Data
The data used in my thesis is taken from two word-corpora created specifically for this project. The first one is the Luxembourgish Email Word-Corpus and the second one is the Luxembourgish Plays Word-Corpus. The nine modal particles investigated in the two word-corpora are: alt, awer, dach, dann, eben, (e)mol, jo, roueg, and zwar. The ten investigated discourse markers are: ben, bon, enfin, héier(t), lauschter(t), ma, mà bon, ok(ay), so(t), and (e)sou.

1.3 Motivation
Nübling (2005: 147) writes of the “Notwendigkeit einer umfassenden linguistischen Beschreibung” for Luxembourgish. One particular area of Luxembourgish linguistic research that has been neglected so far is modal particles and discourse markers. Whereas German linguists have been writing about modal particles since the seminal work of Weydt (1969), except for a few paragraphs in Schanen’s general work on Luxembourgish syntax (Schanen 1980), no documents have come close to providing an analysis of Luxembourgish modal particles and discourse markers. The primary motivation was that studying these two types of pragmatic markers would shed light on an unexplored area in Luxembourgish linguistics that could be of particular use for language learning materials, as both modal particles and discourse markers were found being used in Luxembourgish as a foreign language textbooks and dictionaries, but were neither explained nor translated.

The secondary motivation was the data-driven approach, which required creating two Luxembourgish word-corpora for this study, which enabled efficient data analysis by means of a concordancer. Once anonymised and made available online, the two corpora would become a durable resource accessible to the entire academic research community.
1.4 Aims and Structure

The main aim of this study is to provide both a quantitative and a qualitative analysis of modal particles and discourse markers in Luxembourgish, and we ask the following five questions:

1. What is the frequency per 1,000 words for modal particles and discourse markers in Luxembourgish?
2. What are the propositional and non-propositional proportions for each modal particle and discourse marker?
3. Which modal particle in Luxembourgish is found in which sentence type?
4. What are the (non-propositional) uses of modal particles and discourse markers in Luxembourgish?
5. How different are the uses of modal particles and discourse markers in Luxembourgish to the uses in German and French?

On a narrower level, Chapter 2 provides a summary and analysis of literature about modal particles and discourse markers. Chapter 3 focuses on a linguistic description of Luxembourgish on the one hand, and on presenting readers with information on modal particles and discourse markers in Luxembourgish linguistic academic literature, learning materials, and dictionaries on the other hand. In chapter 4, the methodology of the study’s data-driven approach will be clarified. Chapter 5 reveals the quantitative data regarding modal particles and discourse markers in Luxembourgish. A qualitative analysis is offered in both chapters 6 and 7; the former deals with modal particles, the latter with discourse markers. Finally, chapter 8 discusses the results in relation to previous literature and provides a conclusion for this study.
2: Literature Review

2.0 Introduction
Chapter 2 discusses the general nature of modal particles and discourse markers. Section 2.1 gives a brief overview of the research field covering modal particle and discourse marker literature and related remarks on linguistic purism. Section 2.2 provides information on the classification of properties of modal particles and discourse markers. Section 2.3 describes how they developed and under which perspectives of meaning they are perceived. Section 2.4 discusses the frequencies and prevalence of modal particles and discourse markers in spoken and written language. Finally, section 2.5 provides a summary of this chapter.

2.1 Brief Overview of the Research Field

2.1.1 Linguistic purism
It is only from the second half of the 20th century that MPs have been seriously and systematically linguistically investigated and allocated neutral names and connotations. Earlier grammars or books on stylistics referred to them as *Flickwörter* ‘patch words’, *Füllwörter* ‘fillers’ (Weydt 1969: 9), or even *Beiwörter* ‘attributive adjectives’ (Reiners 1959: 124-131), which illustrates a pejorative view, this being that MPs were unnecessary words that garnished the language and drifted around ‘wie Läuse im Pelz [der] Sprache’ (ibid.). As Weydt (1969: 9) himself vividly remembers from his schooldays:


Weydt (1969: 86-87), however, notes further that MPs seem to have been used consciously by some German authors, such as Fontane, Goethe, Kafka, and Thomas Mann.

The main reasons for this *Abneigung* lie in the prevalent occurrence of MPs in spoken discourse, their use on a non-propositional level, and their possible exchangeability (and combination) with other MPs. No author other than Weydt
has, in mentioning the linguistic purism that surrounds MPs, given reasons why MPs were stigmatised. Schubiger (1980: 282), for example, states of the use of MPs: ‘[i]n writing, moderation in this respect is said to be a sign of good style’. She does not, however, provide any references to underpin her argument. Similarly, Burkhardt’s (1989) study of participants’ views on and understanding of MPs found only a few cases where they thought of MPs as ‘filler-words’.

One possible explanation could lie in the gap of 20 years between Weydt’s work and that of Burkhardt, during which language attitudes may have grown laxer on the use of MPs. One argument for such a change is Luchtenberg’s observation (1984) that MPs were found (and partially accepted) in school essays. However, the picture remains unclear, and Braber (2001, 2007) writes that those participants in her study who were in the teaching profession were aware that in their language usage they were expected to use fewer MPs.

It is, however, unclear whether German MPs are still as stylistically marked as they were when Reiner’s guide on stylistics, *Stilkunst* (1959; 1st edition 1943), was published or even when the teachers were interviewed in the early 1990s (Braber 2001, 2007). It is worth considering how much the emergence of computer-mediated communication (email, SMS, etc.) has blurred some of the differences between ‘good writing’ and *Umgangssprache*, and whether MPs are more willingly accepted in some types of text than they would previously have been.

Not many linguistic puristic attitudes have been expressed towards DMs, perhaps because discourse markers, unlike MPs, are never considered to be an aspect of written language. Three examples are given in the DM literature, the first observation being made by Östman (1982: 171, author’s emphases), who writes:

[S]ome words and expressions have been stigmatized through negative connotations (for whatever reasons). This is what has happened to [discourse markers], and this is why we try not use *you know, I guess, I mean*, and *like* in expository prose. So, when we say that the use of [discourse markers] implies impromptu discourse, this is a necessary consequence of the associations and connotations that these particles give birth to.
A second example of purism is observed in Chanet (2001: 56), where she observes in her introduction to the French DM *quoi*:

We might as well say it right away, the particle *quoi*, characteristic of spoken French, does not have a good press. Neither the public who see it as a way of ‘speaking badly’, nor as an indicator of some kind of underevaluated sociolinguistic membership; nor the linguists who curiously keep clear of it or who only see it as a verbal mannerism, and of which some go as far as claiming (orally) that it ‘does not serve any purpose’. It is rather disturbing to think that we can perhaps mobilise a considerable number of muscles, a fair amount of energy, and no doubt a few billion neurons to trouble ourselves to produce something that is ‘useless’. I do therefore cherish the hope that the particle *quoi* might indeed be used to serve for some purpose in speech.\(^4\)

The third example of linguistic purism is found in Soares da Silva (2006: 2202-2203, emphasis mine), who writes that the Portuguese adjective *pronto* has pragmaticalised into ‘a filler and/or a marker of *oral incompetence*’, but fails to develop this claim any further.

2.1.2 Interest in pragmatic markers

Hansen and Rossari write that ‘[i]n the past twenty-five years or so, the linguistic study of “pragmatic markers” has exploded’ (Hansen and Rossari: 2005: 177). Attitudes towards modal particles were not always positive. Braber (2001: 134) writes that before the second half of the 19th century German modal particles were usually ignored or left in a ‘neglected state’ by linguists and authors of stylistics. They were felt to be *Parasiten* or *Läusen im Pels der Sprache* (sic, ibid.), or at best ‘fillers’. These attributes clearly reveal the prejudice that language authorities had towards spoken German. Weydt (1981) provides five reasons accounting for a recent interest in modal particles: (1) modern description

\[^4\] Autant le dire, la particule *quoi* spécifique du français parlé n’a pas très bonne presse. Ni auprès du public, qui y voit une manière de « mal parler », ou un indice de je ne sais quelle appartenance sociolinguistique pas très valorisée ; ni non plus auprès des linguistes, qui un peu curieusement la boudent, ou qui y voient parfois un tic langagier, et donc certains vont jusqu’à affirmer (oralement) qu’elle ne « sert à rien ». Il est assez troublant de penser que nous pouvons peut-être mobiliser un nombre conséquent de muscles, une certaine énergie, et sans doute quelques milliards de neurones, pour nous fatiguer à produire quelque chose qui ne « sert à rien ». J’ose donc espérer que la particule *quoi* devrait servir à quelque chose dans le discours. (Chanet 2001: 56)
procedures, (2) improved methods in linguistics, (3) empirical, authentic, and oral
data, (4) the development of speech act theory and conversation analysis, and (5)
the interest in ‘interpersonal and cooperative aspects’ (Weydt 1981: 46).

The first linguist to write about modal particles was probably Hoogvliet in 1903,
who discussed the ‘Dutch invoegselwoorden (“insertion words”)’ and examined
their elusive meaning as well as the clustering of MPs in, for example imperatives

As for German MPs, the first linguist was probably W.E. Collinson (1938), who
mentions ‘nuancing expressions or “attitude words” [that] indicate the speaker’s
reaction to what he is communicating’ (Collinson 1938: 106). It is worth
mentioning that Collinson does indeed use the phrase ‘modal particles’ (Collinson
1938: 109) throughout his article. About the development of modal particles from
non-propositional meanings, he (Collinson 1938: 107, author’s italics) writes that
‘[w]hole groups of words may become detached from their original setting and
crystallized or stereotyped (grammatikalisiert) to render explicit a definite
attitude’. He points out that ‘little attention has been devoted to them’ (Collinson
1938: 108) and that contemporary bilingual dictionaries treat modal particles very
‘cavalierly’ (Collinson 1938: 138). W.E. Collinson’s article not only makes him
one of the precursors of modal particle research, in it he also raises research
questions that are still valid to this day, such as dialectal differences, particle
combinations, and frequencies.

As for modal particle literature written in German, Krivonosov (1963, published
in the German Democratic Republic as ‘Kriwonossow’) wrote his dissertation on
modale Partikeln ‘modal particles’. Six years later in the German Federal
Republic, Weydt published his book on Abtönungspartikel5 ‘mitigation particles’
and how they are used in literature and remain largely absent in translations. Both
Krivonosov’s 1963 dissertation (published as Kriwonossow 1977), and especially
Weydt (1969), are identified as the initiators of research carried out on modal
particles. In an online call for papers, Hentschel (2008) writes:

---

5 In Weydt (1969), the author pluralises Partikel without –n.
In 1969, Harald Weydt's PhD thesis on German modal particles was published. In its wake, a surge of research and conferences took place, concerning not only modal particles, but to [sic] all other kinds of particles, as well.

2.1.3 Particle fever

From the 1960s onwards, a ‘particle fever’ (Vismans 1994: 37) broke out among linguists in Germanic languages. The two main languages investigated were German and Dutch, although languages typologically close, such as Swedish or Danish were investigated as well. The ‘particle boom’ peaked in the 1980s, and by the early 1990s many edited volumes by Weydt were entirely dedicated to MPs. Research into modal particles, or Partikelforschung, was so prevalent that Abraham (1991b: 10) even coined the term ‘modal particle linguistics’ along with its acronym ‘MPL’ (Abraham 1991b: 10). However, his term ‘MPL’ had little chance to become widespread, as the research interest regressed in the mid-1990s. From then onwards, there have been fewer edited volumes dealing solely with modal particles.

A significant offspring from research into modal particles was the interest in how MPs are learnt or can be taught to learners of German as a foreign language (e.g. Kemme 1979). Weydt not only dedicated an entire edited volume to particles in the language classroom (Weydt 1981), but he and other authors compiled MP dictionaries in which each particle is explained in context (see, for instance, Weydt et al. 1983, Helbig and Helbig 1995).


As for discourse markers, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2004: 1782) write: ‘[t]he study of pragmatic markers has recently expanded both from an empirical point of view (in-depth analyses of particular items) and theoretically (studies on tendencies in meaning developments, such as Brinton, 1996)’. Indeed, in conjunction with what has been written in the section above, Waltereit and Detges
write (2007: 62) that ‘[r]ecent years have seen an increasing interest in all sorts of pragmatic markers, such as discourse markers and modal particles’.

Contrary to modal particles research, which began in the 1960s, research into discourse markers only gained impetus in the 1980s, with such studies as the non-propositional uses of French mais by Bruxelles et al. (1980), or the work on discourse markers by Schiffrin (1987). The 1990s saw an increase in research into discourse markers, which since that time have sometimes also been called ‘discourse particles’ (Gupta 2006), ‘discourse items’ (Altenberg 1990) and even ‘pragmatic markers’ (Brinton 1996, Gonzáles 2005). French research has labelled discourse markers particules ‘particles’ (Chanet 2001), and marqueurs discursifs ‘discourse markers’ (Chanet 2004, Dostie 2004, Bertrand and Chanet 2005, Waltereit 2006a), whereas in German this category of pragmatic markers has been called for instance Gliederungssignale ‘structuring particles’ (Rath 1990, Dudenredaktion) or Sprechersignale ‘speaker signals’ and Hörersignale ‘hearer signals’ (Rath 1990, 1992). These studies concentrated among other phenomena on question tags. Although there is a growing interest in French and English discourse markers, German linguistics seems to concentrate rather more on modal particles, than on discourse markers.

2.2 Definitions and Properties

2.2.1 Classification

In her introduction to a corpus-based approach to teaching German modal particles, Möllering (2001: 130) writes:

The term particle stems from a structural approach to categorising the various parts of speech into word classes based on the inflexional properties of words. In accordance with this morphological criterion, the term particle is often used to refer to ‘non-declinables’, that is, in German, the large group of words that cannot be considered as part of the word classes noun, adjective, verb, article, or pronoun. In this sense, particles may be adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions, interjections (Helbig, 1994), sentence adverbs (Thurmair, 1989), and particles in a narrower sense. (Thurmair 1989)
This makes the word class of particles a rather large one, comprising residual and unrelated words, of which one understands ‘particle’ in a broad sense, describing any word of that word class, and ‘particle’ in a narrow sense, describing one word category of that word class. Hentschel and Weydt (1989: 5) also point out that this categorisation of particles according to their criterion of inflection is valid only for a certain number of languages:

Flektierbarkeit ist indessen ein unsicheres Kriterium der Wortklasseneinteilung, bei dem man in Kauf nehmen muß, daß die erarbeiteten Definitionen jeweils nur für einzelne Sprachen Gültigkeit haben.

If particles are uninflected words, then German, Dutch, and Luxembourgish have fewer particles than English, where the non-inflecting adjectives and articles can be classified as particles. As for Chinese, almost every word, including verbs and nouns would thus qualify as particles (Hentschel and Weydt 1989: 5).

According to Möllering, the category ‘particles’ and its subdivided categories can be represented as the following:

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 2.1 The ‘non-declinables’**
(adapted from Möllering 2001: 131)

On the other hand, for *Duden* (Dudenredaktion 2005), particles are only one subcategory of a main category of *Nichtflektierbare* ‘uninflecting words’. The authors divide this category into adverbs, prepositions, *Junktionen* (coordinating and subordinating conjunctions), and particles. This latter category shares properties with Möllering’s narrow sense of particles, insofar as they regroup all remaining word classes: intensifiers, focus particles, negation particles, modal particles, conversation particles, interjections, and onomatopoeias. Figure 2.2 below represents the *Duden*’s categorisation of non-inflecting words
As Rudolph (1979: 140) points out:

\[ \text{Die Problematik der Klassifizierung zeigt sich u.a. in den terminologischen Diskrepanzen, die sich durch die Geschichte der Grammatikschreibung ziehen. Auf der einen Seite wird der Begriff „Adverb“ sehr weit gefaßt, auf der anderen Seite dehnt sich die Bezeichnung „Partikel“ immer mehr aus, so daß man bereits zwischen Partikeln im weiteren und engeren Sinn unterscheiden müßte.} \]

Modal particles have been difficult to classify because they have homophonic counterparts in a variety of other word classes. German \textit{doch}, for instance, can be a conjunction, a modal particle, and a conversation particle, but not an adjective. German \textit{eben} is a modal particle, an adjective, a conversation particle, but not a conjunction. This has led to two representations of their relations with other categories: the minimalist view and the maximalist view (see subsection 2.2.6).

Whereas modal particles are more readily integrated into grammar books, only \textit{Duden} (Dudenredaktion 2005) mentions discourse markers. As already mentioned in figure 2.2 above, \textit{Gesprächspartikeln} are part of the \textit{Partikeln}-category, which is part of the \textit{Nichtflektierbare}. The classification of discourse markers in German is illustrated in figure 2.3 below.
Duden (Dudenredaktion 2005: 601) differentiates between Sprechersignale ‘speaker signals’ and Höhrsingale ‘hearer signals’. The hearer signals are roughly classified into verbal ones, such as jaja ‘yeah yeah’ and genau ‘right’ (ibid.: 602), and into non-verbal signals, such as hmhm and mhm, where Dauer ‘length’ and Tonhöhenverlauf ‘pitch range’ play a major role (Dudenredaktion 2005: 603). The speaker signals are discourse structuring on the one hand (start, pause, end), or they are question tags to confirm the hearer has understood the message on the other hand.

2.2.2 Phonology

Vismans (1994) and Duden (Dudenredaktion 2005) both write that MPs generally occur in unstressed position. Van Baar (1996: 263) links their lack of stress to the tendency ‘to be or become monosyllabic’. Although generally unstressed, some German MPs can take a stressed form (marked in Dudenredaktion (2005: 597) by <‘> in imperatives and directives (2.1), or in emphases (2.2).

(2.1)
Mach ‘ja/bloß keinen Unfug!

[Make stressed-MP/stressed-MP no nonsense!]

‘Don’t you start any bother!’
(Dudenredaktion 2005: 597)
Er arbeitet ‘doch fleißig.

[He works stressed-MP diligently.]

‘But he does work hard, you know.’
(Dudenredation 2005: 597)

There is generally little on the intonation of MPs. Regarding the prosody of sentences incorporating MPs, Schubiger (1980: 281-282) writes that if a stressed finite verb (e.g. hab) precedes the stressed remainder of an utterance, the MP following the finite verb (e.g. ja) carries the same tone as the finite verb (2.3). If on the other hand nothing follows the MP, then the MP will have a falling (i.e. lower) tone (2.4):

(2.3)

_______________________________
Ich hab es ja gleich gesagt.

[I have it MP same said.]

‘That’s just what I said, didn’t I?’
(Schubiger 1980: 282)

(2.4)

_______________________________
Was fehlt ihm denn?

[What lacks him MP?]

‘What’s up with him, then?’
(Schubiger 1980: 282)

As for the phonological properties of DMs, Fraser (2006: 193) writes that they ‘are not normally unstressed but they may be, especially when they are monosyllabic’. Furthermore, he observes that they are ‘often followed by a pause’ (ibid.) in initial position. However, Pons Bordería (2006: 81) writes that the Spanish DM bueno is not followed by a pause, but significantly followed by a falling pitch (see Hidalgo Navarro and Pons Bordería 2001, cited in Pons Bordería 2006).
2.2.3 Morphology

As seen above, MPs are traditionally classified as non-inflecting words, along with adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions. Kosaka (1989: 161) writes that one of the properties common to all MPs is their absence of morphological suffix, which may, however, be present in the case of their homophonic counterparts. The German adjective *ruhig* ‘quiet’, for instance, can take the following suffixes: –e, –em, –en, –er, –es, –ere, –eren, –erer, –eres, –ste, –stem, –sten, –ster, and –stes. The MP *ruhig* is, on the other hand, non-inflecting.

Regarding the morphology of DMs, Fraser (2006: 194) writes that while many DMs are monosyllabic, others are polysyllabic, such as ‘alright’, or even ‘consist of an entire phrase’, such as ‘alright then’. As with modal particles, DMs are described by Waltereit (2006b: 64) as having no morphological inflection. However, some exceptions refute this rule; the French DM *dis* (literally ‘say’), aimed at obtaining a person’s attention, inflects according to the hearer and can thus take a plural verbal inflection, such as in (2.5). Despite some inflecting DMs, more pragmatised forms tend to take no inflections; the more pragmatised a DM becomes, the less likely that its inflections will be used (see Dostie 2004).

(2.5)

Dites donc, on est pressé!

*[DM DM, one is in-a-hurry!]*

‘Why, we are in a hurry, aren’t we!’

(Hansen 2006: 27)

2.2.4 Syntax

Because MPs mostly appear in a specific topological field in both German and Luxembourgish, this section confines itself to aspects of German syntax, which can applies to Luxembourgish syntax. In Helbig and Buscha (1972), Eisenberg (1999), Durrell (2002), and Duden (Dudenredaktion 2005), word order is classified into different positions or ‘fields’ in which word classes appear. For unmarked declarative main clauses, the main fields are *Vorfeld* ‘prefield’, *Mittelfeld* ‘middle field’, and *Nachfeld* ‘postfield’. Before and after the middle
field are the *linke Satzklammer* ‘left verbal bracket’, in which the finite verb occurs, and the *rechte Satzklammer* ‘right verbal bracket’, in which non-finite verbs (would) occur. Verb first sentences, such as interrogatives and imperatives have no *Vorfeld*. This is also the case for Luxembourgish. MPs mostly appear in the middle field of a sentence. The Luxembourgish examples (2.6), (2.7), and (2.8) illustrate MPs occurring in the middle field in main clauses.

(2.6)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vorfeld</th>
<th>linke Satzklammer</th>
<th>Mittelfeld</th>
<th>rechte Satzklammer</th>
<th>Nachfeld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Cabaret</td>
<td>ass</td>
<td>dach keen Bordell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A cabaret]</td>
<td><em>is</em></td>
<td><em>MP no brothel</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘A cabaret is certainly not a brothel’  
(LEWC 3438-3439)

(2.7)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vorfeld</th>
<th>linke Satzklammer</th>
<th>Mittelfeld</th>
<th>rechte Satzklammer</th>
<th>Nachfeld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Also do</td>
<td><em>muss</em></td>
<td>dach eng faul</td>
<td>sinn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[DM there]</td>
<td><em>must</em></td>
<td><em>MP one foul</em></td>
<td>be.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘There’s got to be something fishy there.’  
(LEWC 4912)

(2.8)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vorfeld</th>
<th>linke Satzklammer</th>
<th>Mittelfeld</th>
<th>rechte Satzklammer</th>
<th>Nachfeld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ech</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>jo net gepuddert an a faarwegen Hiemer mat Pashmina-Schale</td>
<td>ronderem lafen</td>
<td>wei de S--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[I]</td>
<td><em>can</em></td>
<td><em>MP not powdered and in colourful shirts with pashmina shawls</em></td>
<td>around run</td>
<td>like the S--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I can’t just walk around with powder on my face, wearing coloured shirts with pashmina shawls like S--, can I?’  
(LEWC 1982-1985)

In the Luxembourgish examples (2.9) and (2.10) below, the MP occurs in the middle field in subordinating clauses. As the subordinating conjunction is the *linke Satzklammer*, there is no *Vorfeld*. 
Audehm (2006) writes that although in most cases MPs appear in the middle field, this usually coincides with a sentence-medial position (2.11). On some occasions, MPs occur sentence-finally, but still in the middle field (2.12). This is usually the case when the finite verb carries the ‘highest information value’ (den höchsten Mitteilungswert) (Audehm 2006: 176).

(2.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>linke Satzklammer</th>
<th>Mittelfeld</th>
<th>rechte Satzklammer</th>
<th>Nachfeld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dass</td>
<td>et dach egal</td>
<td>wäer</td>
<td>op ech lo schüchtern wäer oder net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[that]</td>
<td>it MP equal</td>
<td>would-be</td>
<td>whether I now timid would-be or not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘that it really doesn’t matter whether I’m timid or not’
(LEWC 2701-2702)

(2.10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>linke Satzklammer</th>
<th>Mittelfeld</th>
<th>rechte Satzklammer</th>
<th>Nachfeld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ob</td>
<td>ech dat dann och</td>
<td>geing schreien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[whether]</td>
<td>I that MP also</td>
<td>would write</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘would I write it as well, then’
(LEWC 580-581)

(2.11)

Wou gees du dann an d’Vakanz?

[Where go you MP in the holiday?]

‘Where are you going on holiday, then?’

(2.12)

Wou gees du dann?

[Where go you MP?]

‘Where are you going, then?’

An English translation without a reference beneath it indicates that the example has been constructed.
Abraham (1991c: 205) links the occurrence of MPs in the middle field with the assumption that MPs occur only in languages that have this middle field. This property of MPs occurring in the middle field is also found in Dutch, Frisian, and mainland Scandinavian (Abraham 1991c: 205). This would thus exclude English (see Winters 2009) and French. Although both these languages have few MPs, they do not lack them completely. Bublitz (1978: 202) for instance writes that the particle just can be used to mitigate directives, in a way similar to German MPs:

In [englischen] Aufforderungssätzen kann just, das hier mildernd und abschwächend wirkt, im Deutschen mithilfe der MPn nur, bloß, ja, mal, ruhig und schon wiedergegeben werden [...].

Two of his English examples are ‘Could you just lay the table?’ and ‘Could I just use your phone, please?’ (Bublitz 1978: 202).

As for French, Hansen (1998: 41) writes that ‘a very few items […] appear to qualify for inclusion in the category [of MPs], such as bien, déjà, donc, peut-être, and seulement […]’. A good example of hers is Regarde donc où tu vas! (ibid., emphasis mine), which translates easily into German using an MP as well: Kuck doch, wohin du gehst! ‘Just look where you’re going, will you!’.

The middle field is also the hub where ‘the properties of thematic and rhematic functions meet in an ‘undecided’ area’ (Bublitz 1978). As for the position of MPs within the middle field, both Hentschel (1983) and Audehm (2006) write that they appear before the rheme, but after the theme of a sentence. Under ‘theme’ one is to understand the already known information or the topic of a sentence, which is usually found in the Vorfeld (cf. Götze and Hess-Lüttich 1999: 483). While information in the Nachfeld, or nach dem finiten Verb (Götze and Hess-Lüttich 1999: 483), is the rheme or the focus, the comment, or rheme, is the newly added information given in the sentence. MPs thus occur after the already known information, but before the new information. This is best illustrated in example (2.10), where the thematic dat ‘that’ occurs before MP dann. Replacing dat with e Buch ‘a book’ would require moving the now rhematic noun phrase to the Nachfeld. The usage of ‘topic’ and ‘comment’ is, for instance, found in Hockett (1958) and in Functional Grammar (see Dik 1997a, 1997b), whereas ‘theme’ and
‘rheme’ appear in the terminology of traditional grammars, such as in Helbig and Buscha (1972), Eisenberg (1999), and Dudenredaktion (2005).

Another property of MPs is their inability to be the single-word answer to a question, (Abraham 1991b: 5). Whereas most parts of a sentence can be triggered as an answer to an open question, an answer consisting solely of an MP is ungrammatical. See the following constructed Luxembourgish examples below:

(2.13)
Dat ass dach schlëmm.

[That is MP terrible]

‘That’s really terrible.’

(2.14) Focussing on the subject dat:
Wat ass schlëmm? Dat.

‘What is terrible? That [is].’

(2.15) Focussing on the complement schlimm:
Wéi ass dat? Schlëmm.

‘How is that? Terrible’.

(2.16) Unable to focus on the MP doch:

‘How terrible is that? *MP.’

Another related property of MPs is their inability to become topicalised: they cannot be emphasised and moved to the head of a sentence. Whereas schlëmm is topicalised in (2.17), dach cannot be topicalised in (2.18) below.

(2.17)
Schlëmm ass dat dach.

‘That is rather terrible.’
(2.18)  
*Dach schlëmm ass dat.

‘MP terrible that is’.

Both characteristics can be explained by MPs not referring ‘to individual sentence constituents, but rather to the whole sentence’ (Hartmann 1979: 126).

Another syntactic property of MPs is their frequent combining with each other. This is discussed in more detail in 2.1.5 below.

Concerning the syntactic properties of DMs, ‘some [DMs] are to a certain extent free to appear clause-internally or clause-finally’ (Hansen 1998: 66). Traugott and Dasher (2002: 156) write that they ‘occur in syntactically marginal positions in the clause; whether it is the right or the left margin depends in part on the word of the language in question’. Later in their study, they observe the fact that English DMs tend to appear clause-initially, whereas Japanese DMs (called joshi) occur clause-finally. I myself am in agreement with Hansen and Traugott and Dasher and consider DMs to appear both clause-external. The French utterance in (2.5) above exemplifies the argument for preceding a clause. Conversely, the same utterance could have both DMs following the clause as in (2.5’) without any further change of meaning:

(2.5’)

On est pressé, dites donc!

*[One is in-a-hurry, DM DM!]*

‘Why, we are in a hurry, aren’t we!’
(adapted from Hansen 2006: 27)

2.2.5 Combinations

Although two MPs cannot be joined by a conjunction, they can follow each other, and often produce a chain of MPs such as exemplified in the title of an article by Thurmair (1991, emphasis mine) ‘Kombinieren Sie *doch nur ruhig auch mal* Modalpartikeln’. Rudolph (1983: 54-55) observes that the more spontaneous a
conversation is, and when held in an everyday atmosphere, the more MPs are produced; and the more difficult the topic is on an emotional or factual level, the more MP combinations occur in that spoken text. In contrast, fewer particles and combinations of particles occur the more familiar the topic and the more formal the atmosphere of the conversation (Rudolph 1983: 54-55).

Moreover, Rudolph writes that combinations are found in 20 of the 50 most common MPs, and a third of the combinations comprise three of those 20 particles (Rudolph 1983: 57). The 20 MPs Rudolph found to be most frequent in combinations were:

auch, so, ja, also, doch, mal, noch, dann eben, jetzt, immer, nur, aber, ein bißchen, da, eigentlich, nun, ganz, vielleicht, wieder (Rudolph 1983: 56)

She also writes that the sentences in which MP combinations are found are short statements, and these combinations occur only in mid-sentence position and almost never in sentence-final position (Rudolph 1983: 66). As for the combination rules of MPs, Rudolph did not find any combination doublets in her data, and concludes that the combining of MPs is a spontaneous procedure, inasmuch as there is no fixed order within a sequence of two or more MPs.

This latter observation, however, is in contrast to Thurmail’s research (1991) on MPs and their combinatorial rules. The author observes two main rules: the first rule states that “[a] modal particle A is compatible with a modal particle B if and only if A appears in at least one sentence mood alone in which B also appears alone’ (Thurmail 1991: 21). With sentence moods, Thurmail refers to Altmann’s (1987: 47-48, author’s italics) seven ‘Grundtypen’. These German examples are referred below alongside Luxembourgish examples.

1) *Aussagesatz*: Die Bayern spielen (doch/eben/einfach/halt/ja) schlecht) – D’Jeunesse⁷ spilt (MP) schlecht;
2) *V-1-Frasesatz*: Spielen die Bayern (auch/denn/eigentlich/etwa/mal/ woh) schlecht? – Spilt d’Jeunesse (MP) schlecht?;
3) w-V-2-Frasesatz: Wie spielen die Bayern (bloß/denn/eigentlich/ mal/nur/schon/wohl)? – Wéi spilt d’Jeunesse (MP)?;

⁷ The full name of the football club based in Esch-zur-Alzette is ‘A.S. la Jeunesse d’Esch’.
4) **V-1/-V-2-Imperativsatz**: Spielt (bloß/doch/eben/einfach/halt/ja/mal/nur/ruhig/schon) schlecht, ihr Bayern! – Spillt (MP) schlecht, d’Jeunessé!;

5) **V-1 Wunschsatz**: Ach würden die Bayern (bloß/doch/nur) schlecht spielen! – Oh géif d’Jeunessé (MP) schlecht spillen!;

6) **V-1/-V-2-Exklamativsatz**: Spielen die Bayern (aber/vielleicht/aber auch) schlecht! – Spillt d’Jeunesse (MP) schlecht!;

7) **w-V-2/-V-L-Exklamativsatz**: Wie schlecht spielen (aber auch/doch) die Bayern! – Wéi schlecht spíllt (MP) d’Jeunesse!

It is such compatible MPs that can form MP combinations. As an example, Thurmair writes that because the MPs *denn* and *eigentlich* both occur in yes/no-questions and WH-question, the combination *denn eigentlich* can correctly be used in both above-mentioned sentence moods. However, *aber denn* or *denn aber* is not a possible combination, because *aber* occurs in exclamatives and *denn* in yes/no-questions and in WH-questions. The second conclusion in Thurmair (1991: 25) is that ‘[a] combination of modal particle A with modal particle B is only possible if the meaning of A is compatible with B’. If for instance one particle has a permissive use and another particle has a threatening use, then a combination of both particles is unacceptable, since the force and the meaning of the sentence will become unclear.

However, Vismans (1994: 164, author’s translation), shows that reinforcing and mitigating MPs can indeed cluster and occur in the same sentence. Hoogvliet’s (1903: 98) example of a directive *Geef de boeken dan nu toch maar ’es even hier.* ‘Just give me the books, will you?’ incorporates the mitigators *maar* and *even*, which are reinforced by *nu* and *toch*, and ’es respectively. It is hence possible to ‘reinforce a mitigator, but not vice versa’ (Vismans 1994: 163, author’s emphasis). On their own, reinforcing MPs ‘impose the speech act more strongly upon the addressee’ (ibid.: 34), whereas mitigating MPs ‘reduce the force of a speech act’ (ibid.). Dutch, German (2.19), and Luxembourgish (2.20) thus can have MP combinations in which the first MP is reinforcing and the second one is mitigating.
As for the position of an MP within the cluster, Thurmair writes that ‘[t]he particle with the most non-specific meaning occurs in first place in the combination’ (Thurmair 1991: 30, author’s emphasis), whereas the most weakening or strengthening particles mostly occur in final place in the cluster. Therefore, there is a fixed order of MPs. Lastly, Thurmair (1991: 31) observes that those MPs found in first cluster position tend also to be conjunctions or discourse particles as their homophonic counterparts, while those found in medial position tend also to be sentence adverbs as their homophonic counterparts, and those MPs found in final position tend also to be adverbs and focus particles as their homophonic counterparts.

2.2.6 Pragmatics
As already stated, MPs are commonly analysed as pragmatic markers. They do not contribute towards the propositional meaning of the sentence, but rather comment about the sentence proposition. Weydt compares the propositional and non-propositional content to levels: ‘Bei der Abtönung, das ist das Entscheidende, verläßt der Sprecher die Ebene des Gesagten und zeigt in einer zweiten Ebene sein Urteil über dies Urteil’ (Weydt 1969: 64).

The non-propositional content expressed through MPs can vary, and different judgments can be passed. Duden notes: ‘[Abtönungspartikeln] drücken sehr

In modal particle research, some linguists have analysed MPs as illocutive indicators. Heggelund (2001) writes that Helbig (Helbig 1994, Helbig and Buscha 1972) is one of the most prominent advocates of this. Helbig’s (1994: 58) argument is that a sentence such as ‘Du kannst das Fenster schließen’ would be interpreted as a *formaler Aussagesatz* ‘formal statement’, but becomes a *schwache Aufforderung* ‘weak demand’ (Helbig 1994: 59) when the MP *mal* is added to the sentence: ‘Du kannst mal das Fenster schließen’ (Helbig 1994: 58). König (1997: 59), on the other hand, argues that although MPs contribute to the illocutive power of an utterance, this contribution is not a central function:

Ihre zentrale These, nämlich daß Modalpartikeln den Illokutionstyp, wie er von Satzmodus und Intonation festgelegt [sic] wird, modifizieren, so daß ein spezifischer Illokutionstyp bzw. Beschränkungen für mögliche Illokutionen festgelegt werden, trifft m.E. nicht den wesentlichen Punkt.

Whether they change the illocution type of utterances or not, this thesis takes the position that MPs certainly do at least change the illocutive power of an utterance, as reinforcers strengthen speech acts and mitigators weaken them (Vismans 1994: 34).

Similar to modal particles, discourse markers do not contribute towards the propositional content of a sentence (Hansen 1998: 65). Schiffrin (1987: 31) defines DMs as ‘sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk’. By this, the author means that DMs organise utterances coherently and show how these utterances relate to one another. Fraser agrees with Schiffrin’s idea of the ‘bracketer’ and defines these as ‘one type of commentary pragmatic marker […] signal[ling] how the speaker intends the basic message that follows to relate to prior discourse’ (Fraser 1990: 386-387). Redeker (1991: 1168), on the other hand, introduces the listener into her definition of ‘discourse operators’, which are ‘uttered with the primary function of bringing to the listener’s attention a particular kind of linkage of the upcoming utterance with the immediate discourse.
context’. Hansen (1998: 71) observes in her study on the grammaticalisation of French DMs that ‘[they] are basically connectives, but they also make additional assumptions’ that a speaker has about a hearer or a situation. Discourse markers thus help the speaker to signal to the hearer how the previous utterances are linked to the subsequent ones, and they let the speaker express an assumption regarding this utterance at the same time.

Zeevat distinguishes six marking strategies (Zeevat 2006: 138-139) that show how the previous utterance is (not) linked to the following one:

1) ‘old marking’: ‘the content is already part of the common ground’ (Zeevat 2006: 138);
2) ‘adversative marking’: the content has been suggested to be false in the context’ (Zeevat 2006: 138);
3) ‘corrective marking’: ‘the content was denied in the common ground’ (Zeevat 2006: 138);
4) ‘additive marking’: ‘the topic has been addressed before but the content gives an expression of the earlier answer’ (Zeevat 2006: 138);
5) ‘substitution marking’: ‘the topic has been addressed before, but this contribution needs to be replaced’ (Zeevat 2006: 138);
6) ‘contrastive marking’: ‘the new content addresses the inversion in polarity of the old topic’ (Zeevat 2006: 139).

Zeevat’s examples, however, not only include DMs in the sense in which I use them in the present dissertation, but also include modal particles (e.g. German ‘ja’ and Dutch ‘toch’) and other connectives, such as conjunctions. Examples of DMs such as ‘well’ in English are not given.

However, a second function of those pragmatic markers is that they show how the present discourse is mentally conceived. Hansen writes: ‘[DMs] function as instructions from the speaker to the hearer how to integrate the host unit into a coherent mental representation of the discourse’ (Hansen 1998: 75). Travis writes in similar words that DMs are a ‘heterogeneous group of linguistic items that act on (or “mark”) segments of discourse and function to indicate how those segments
are to be understood in the context of the surrounding discourse’ (Travis 2006: 219).

Furthermore, Lewis (2006) writes that DMs perform three pragmatic functions. The first is politeness: because DMs express a subjective attitude, some meaning is ‘safely’ inferred by the hearer, thus saving face and ‘avoiding potential conflict’ (Lewis 2006: 57). The second function, which is related to politeness, is called ‘argumentation strategy’: ‘[a] message that induces the hearer to draw his or her own conclusions to match those of the speaker will be more powerful’ (Lewis 2006: 57). As a third pragmatic function, Lewis suggests economy: because DMs are used to implicitly show the relation of propositions, only ‘short forms’ (Lewis 2006: 57), such as adverbs, particles, affixes, tend to be used.

Dostie (2004: 46-48) provides a much more elegant description of the pragmatic functions of DMs. Firstly, however, she strictly distinguishes DMs from *connecteurs textuels* ‘textual connectors’ (akin to the term ‘connectives’), both groups being hyponyms of *marqueurs pragmatiques* ‘pragmatic markers’ (Dostie 2004: 43). Dostie categorises DMs as follows:

![Figure 2.4 Draft of a DM typology (adapted from Dostie 2004: 46)](image)

Dostie (2004: 47) writes that illocutionary markers (*marqueurs illocutoires*) ‘accompany one or several illocutionary acts’ and ‘perform entire acts’, whereas interaction markers (*marqueurs d’intéraction*) ‘perform subtle, small acts’. The interpretation markers (*marqueurs d’interprétation*) guide the interpretation or the reading of illocutionary acts (Dostie 2004: 47). Dostie’s examples include *écoute,*
t’sais, remarque, and tu vois. A Luxembourgish example of an interpretation marker is example (2.21) below.

(2.21)
Ech soen der sou eppes net güren, mee herno bass du nach iwwerqualifizéiert. Soss énnerichs du nach besser wéi d’Proffen herno! Géi dach net an de Lycée, héier! Fro mol um Centre de Langues no.

[I say you so something not willingly, but afterwards are you even overqualified. Otherwise teach you even better than the teachers afterwards! Go MP not in the secondary-school, DM! Ask MP on-the Centre of Language after.]

‘I don’t like to tell you this, but you’ll end up overqualified. Otherwise you’ll be teaching better than the teachers afterwards! Listen, you can’t go to secondary school! Why don’t you ask the Language Centre.’
(LEWC 8279-8283)

Dostie’s markers performing illocutionary acts (marqueurs de réalisation d’un acte illocutoire) perform illocutionary acts that are very often expressive, directive, or assertive (Dostie 2004: 47). She also writes that these markers indicate the psychological state of the speaker. French examples of that type of illocutionary marker are je comprend que, en tout cas, de toute façon, quand même, and par exemple. A Luxembourgish example of such a marker is example (2.22)

(2.22)
Hues du welles ganz an E== ze bleiwen oder kennst de eng Keier ganz zreck?
Ech sin op jidde Fall frou wann den Stage eriwer ass, mee den schlemmsten Deel kennt jo reicht am September.

[Have you intention complete in E== to stay or come you one time complete back?
I am on every case glad when the placement over is, but the worst part comes MP only in-the September.]

‘Do you intend to stay in E== for ever or will you ever come back for good? In any case I’ll be glad when the work placement will be over, but the worst part is only coming up in September.’
(LEWC 6650-6653)
As for Dostie’s category of interaction markers, her examples of attention calling markers (*marqueurs d’appel à l’écoute*) include *t’sais?, hein?*, *OK?*, and *n’est-ce pas?* (Dostie 2004: 47). These markers are used to get the attention of the hearer or to make sure the hearer is still listening. A Luxembourgish example would be the question tag *gell* as in (2.23). Furthermore, these markers can take pronominal endings in Luxembourgish depending on whether the speaker uses the T-form *du* or the V-form *dir* when speaking to the hearer: *net* becomes *neddu* and *nediert*; *gell* becomes *geddu* and *geddiert*, and *gelldu* and *gelldiert*.

(2.23)


[And you make now your BA Hons? I hear already the people in L==, “Yes, but that is MP then no Master’s then, *isn’t-it*? And may-live back on the-university, the Shakespeare upwards and downwards learn-by-heart!”]

‘And you’re doing your B.A. honours? I can already hear people in L== saying “Yes, but’s no Master’s, then, is it? And off you go back to university learning Shakespeare off by heart!”’

(LEWC 7204-7208)

Dostie’s listening markers (*marqueurs d’écoute*) are used by the hearer to indicate to the speaker that they are listening to what is said and whether they agree or disagree with the speaker. Her examples are *oui* and *OK*, and in Luxembourgish they include *jo* ‘yes’ and *sécher* ‘sure’. Many languages, such as French, English and Luxembourgish also share the vocal (non-verbal) listening marker sometimes transcribed as *uh-huh*, *hum hum* or *m-hm*. Definitely found in (2.24) below is an English example found in an instant messaging conversation between the author of this study and his friend, A--:
Dostie’s last interaction markers are signposting markers (*marqueurs de balisage*), which ‘enable speakers to convey texts in chunks and hearers to allow the assimilation of what has just been said’ (Dostie 2004: 48). This is the only category of DMs where the author provides the additional data that they are used very infrequently and often appear in a sequence. Her French examples include *t’sais, OK*, and the mainly Québécois French particle *là*. A Luxembourgish example signposting usage is *bon* found in (2.25):

(2.25)


[And the T-- said I could MP MP simply try my hair sometimes to comb. **DM.** And that schizophrenic girl said to me: “You are pretty dressed. (Pause.) In the primary-school have I me also so dressed.”]

‘And T-- said perhaps I should consider combing my hair every so often. Okay. And that schizophrenic girl told me: “I like your clothes. (Pause.) I used to wear clothes like that in primary school.” ’

(LEWC 1866-1871)

According to Dostie, DMs can belong to several categories, such as with *t’sais* ‘you know’, this being found in three subcategories of DM. This suggests that the meaning or the function of a DM can therefore change according to the context in which it is used. Zevat (2006), Lewis (2006) and Dostie (2004) present different functions of discourse markers. Although these functions are certainly pragmatic and interactive, their categorisations seem somewhat idiosyncratic and their sub-

---

8 ‘*Ils émettent à l’énonciateur de livrer son texte par épisodes, et au coénonciateur d’assimiler ce qui vient d’être dit*’ (Dostie 2004: 48).
functions do not necessarily overlap. In this thesis, preference is given to Dostie’s classification (see the discussion of DM in chapter 7).

2.3 Word Origins

2.3.1 Chronological developments

Abraham (1991a) writes that the development and the abundant existence of MPs in Germanic languages arise in conjunction with the Germanic Mittelfeld. For mainland Scandinavian languages ‘the occurrence of MPs [is restricted] to what is called the nexus field, which is comparable to the German [middle field]’ (Abraham 1991a: 348, author’s emphasis). The emergence of MPs present in the middle field and in the nexus field has been summarised by Abraham as follows: ‘both the [middle field] and the nexus field are the locus of prominently rhematic as well as illocutive material’ (Abraham 1991a: 350).

In her recent case study on German modal particles, Molnár (2002: 119-120) concludes her analysis by suggesting that the oldest MP is ja (je), whose emergence dates around the 15th century, whereas schon, wohl and denn appeared around the 16th century. This confirms Abraham’s correlation of the development of MPs with the with the development of the middle field, a process which Schildt dates to between 1470 and 1530 (Schildt 1981: 282, cited in Molnár 2002: 4). However, Molnár also finds that doch functioning as an MP was already used in the Old High German (OHG) period (750-1050), as illustrated in the Hildebrandslied (dated 830):

(2.26)

‘der sî doh nû argöstu [quad Hiltibrant]

‘he would indeed be the most cowardly’, said Hildebrand
(Das Hildebrandslied (line 58). Braune 1907: 81, translation mine)

Another example (2.27) of doch can be found in the Old Saxon epic of the Heliand (first half of the 9th century). Behaghel (1928: 160, author’s emphasis) writes that ‘doch dient der Verstärkung der Aufforderung; die Aufgabe der Satzverbindung ist ganz zurückgetreten’.
A final example of Old High German MPs in the Hildebrandslied appears to be the MP cluster combination ‘dana halt’ (New High German *denn halt*), as illustrated in example (2.28) below.

(2.28)

‘wêttu irmingot [quad Hiltibrant] obana ab hevane,
dat dû neo dana halt mit sus sippan man
dinc ni gileitôs’ . . . . .

‘May the universal god know [said Hiltibrant], down from heaven that you never then more greatly with so closely related a man conducted proceedings’.

(*Das Hildebrandslied* (lines 30-32). *Braune* 1907: 81, translation mine)

In Dutch, Vismans (1994: 82) found that *toch* is the earliest example of a MP found in directives in the Middle Dutch farce *Een Clujte van Plaijerwater* (around 1500).

Waltereit and Detges (2007: 72) write that ‘[d]iscourse markers arise because lexemes are used for argumentational procedures which are helpful in […] negotiations’. They ‘arise in contexts where speakers negotiate their further verbal interaction (“What are we going to do next?”)’ (Walter and Detges 2007: 78). They argue that Spanish *bien* has become a DM used ‘for the repair of “medium-size” coherence problems, which should be recognized but need not be explicitly addressed’ (Walter and Detges 2007: 67). They also observe that the Spanish DM changed through synechdochical or metonymic development. Previously, *bien* would have been used by the speaker to ‘first concede the validity of an argument [made by the hearer] but then [the speaker] goes on to put forward a much stronger counter-argument’ (Walter and Detges 2007: 68):
2. Literature Review

Borderó: [T]engo aquí una letra aceptada por vuestra señora y endosada a mi favour, cuyo término ha expirado.

Bernardo: [...] Bien, cierto; pero ¿qué tengo yo que ver con esto? Es verdad que yo he contraído la deuda, pero ¡qué! ¿Quiere usted que yo también la pague?

‘Borderó: I have here a promissory note signed by your grace and made out in your name, and which has expired.

Bernardo: Good, certainly; but what have I got to do with this? It’s true that I contracted the debt obligation, but what! Do you want me to pay it, too?’

(Larra 1831, cited in Walte and Detges 2007: 68, authors’ emphases)

2.3.2 Grammaticalisation

Mortelmans and Leuschner (2005: 1) define grammaticalisation as ‘die Entstehung grammatischer Formen und Konstruktionen in der Sprachverwendung’. The origins of those grammatical forms are lexical forms which develop into ‘grammatical forms and from grammatical to even more grammatical forms’ (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 2).


Step 1: negation is accomplished by placing the negative particle ne before the verb:

‘I don’t see. I don’t eat. I don’t walk.’

Step 2: optionally, ‘pseudo-object nouns’ are placed after the verb to reinforce the negation:

Je ne vois point. Je ne mange mie. Je ne marche pas.
‘I don’t see mark. I don’t eat crumb. I don’t walk step.’

Step 3: pas, the noun used when negating verbs of movement, is then used for other verbs as well:

Je ne vois pas. Je ne mange pas.
‘I don’t see (step). I don’t eat (step).’
'In step 3, *pas* has been fully grammaticalised into the second negation particle. Step 4 illustrates Heine and Kuteva’s claim that grammatical forms become more grammatical.

Step 4: *ne* becomes optional in colloquial French; negation is accomplished by placing the now obligatory *pas* after the verb:

   Je vois pas.
   ‘I don’t see.’

Thus *pas* has lost its meaning of ‘step’, in a mechanism called ‘semantic bleaching’. The second mechanism is ‘extension’, where the use of the lexical form appears in new contexts. *Pas* is therefore not only used with verbs of motion, but also with other verbs. The third one is ‘decategorialization’: the morphosyntactic properties that are characteristic of the lexical forms become lost. As for the negation example, *pas* is now no longer considered as a noun, but is interpreted as a particle. The last mechanism is ‘erosion’, in which there is a loss of ‘phonetic substance’, i.e., although *pas* is still pronounced as /pl/, some accents seem to pronounce *pas* as /pl/, hence the sometimes written form <pÔ>. ‘Whether the open-o vowel is a weaker form of pronunciation or is related to [a specific French accent], remains, however, unclear’ (Krummes 2004: 23).

The grammaticalisation of the verb *ginn* ‘give’ (see Krummes 2004, Lenz 2007) will act as an example in Luxembourgish, as is shown in the examples below (*ginn*-constructions in bold). *Ginn ‘give’* (2.30) is grammaticalised into the existential construction (2.31), which also took place in German. Further on, *ginn* is grammaticalised into a copula (2.32), a passive auxiliary (2.33), and into a conditional mood auxiliary (2.34).

(2.30)

   Ech **ginn** dir e Stéck Kuch.
   *[I give you a piece cake.]*
   ‘I give you a piece of cake.’
(2.31)
Zu Sheffield ginn et zwou Universitéiten.

*[In Sheffield exist it two universities.]*

‘There are two universities in Sheffield.’

(2.32)
De Prënz Charles gëtt Kinnek.

*[The prince Charles becomes king.]*

‘Prince Charles becomes King.’

(2.33)
De Kuch ass giess ginn.

*[The cake is eaten become.]*

‘The cake has been eaten.’

(2.34)
Wann ech de Premier wier, géif ech de Pond ofschafen.

*[If I the Prime Minister were, would I the pound abolish.]*

‘If I were the Prime Minister I would abolish the pound.’

2.3.3 Unidirectionality

Another important theoretical aspect of grammaticalisation is the concept of unidirectionality. As Heine and Kuteva (2002: 4) write, ‘[g]rammaticalization is a unidirectional process; that is, it leads from less grammatical to more grammatical forms and constructions’. Grammaticalisation is thus perceived as an ongoing process that, once started, will not revert. Literature usually describes the development of grammaticalised forms as a cline, in which the development of a lexical item can be schematically characterised as: ‘lexical item […] > syntax > morphology’ (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 100). A lexical item would first become a syntactical item, such as a preposition, a determiner, or an auxiliary. In a second instance, those syntactical items can become morphological affixes. Dostie (2004: 25) writes that ‘grammaticalisation [is] always linked to an increase in
morphological fusion and loss in syntactic freedom'. Unidirectionality, however, is not only a morphosyntactic feature, but also exists in the meaning of the grammaticalised item.

Dostie (2004: 25) continues by saying that a concrete meaning grammaticalises into an abstract meaning, but never an abstract meaning into a concrete one. Similarly, a spatial meaning can become temporal and then concessive or conditional, but, as a rule, this grammaticalisation path does not happen the other way around. Dostie (2004: 25) does, however, mention the term ‘light-year’ as an exception, where a temporal notion gets a spatial meaning.

The unidirectionality hypothesis, suggesting that there are no backward clines, has been the subject of debate since the 1990s (Dostie 2004: 99), and counter-examples have been pointed out. Lexicalisations are a good counter-example, such as the lexicalisation of ‘Mrs’ to ‘missus’ in Meet the missus, or the Luxembourgish morphological numerical decimal suffix –zeg (i.e. 50, foffzeg) having developed into the adjective zeg meaning ‘many’.

2.3.4 Pragmaticalisation
Whereas the development of modal particles and discourse markers has sometimes been labelled as a process of grammaticalisation, some authors researching discourse markers, prefer on the other hand to describe their development as ‘pragmaticalisation’. The term was coined by Erman and Kotsinas (1993) in discussing the Swedish discourse marker ba ‘just’. The authors write that some lexical items ‘result[...] in discourse markers mainly serving as textstructuring [sic] devices at different levels of discourse’ (Erman and Kotsinas 1993: 79) and they call this path ‘pragmaticalisation’ (Erman and Kotsinas 1993: 80). Whereas ‘grammatical markers [function] mainly sentence internally’ (Erman and Kotsinas 1993: 79), discourse markers, also understood as pragmatic markers in general, serve as ‘textstructuring devices at different levels of discourse’ (Erman and Kotsinas 1993: 79).

2 ‘la grammaticalisation serait toujours associée à une augmentation de la fusion morphologique et à une perte de liberté syntaxique’ (Dostie 2004 : 25).
Taking a similar stance, Aijmer (1997: 2) writes that grammaticalisation ‘is concerned with the derivation of grammatical forms and constructions (mood, aspect, tense, etc.) from words and lexicalized structures’, whereas pragmaticalised items ‘involve the speaker’s attitude to the hearer’. Furthermore, pragmatic or pragmaticalised elements cannot be analysed in truth-conditional terms (Aijmer 1997: 3). The last difference between grammaticalised items and pragmaticalised items is that ‘pragmatic elements tend to be optional in the sentence while grammaticalization results in forms which are an obligatory part of the grammatical “core” such as tense and mood’ (Aijmer 1997: 3).

Although the term ‘grammaticalisation’ is more ubiquitously used to describe the development of DMs, Traugott (1995, cited in Dostie 2004: 25) mentions two reasons why some linguists prefer the term ‘pragmaticalisation’. The first reason is that DMs challenge the unidirectionality hypothesis, and the second reason is that some linguists do not view discourse markers as ‘grammatical’ markers, since they do not ‘function[...] mainly sentence internally’ (Erman and Kotsinas 1993 79-80), in the way that grammaticalised markers of tense, aspect, or modality do.

Because the term was coined only sixteen years ago, some linguists feel the need to justify their usage of ‘pragmaticalisation’, and thus compare it to the process of grammaticalisation. Frank-Job (2006), however, does not justify her usage and does not refer to the term grammaticalisation and simply writes: ‘DMs evolve out of a process of “pragmaticalisation” ’ (Frank-Job 2006: 359).

Going back to MPs, previous literature does not mention pragmaticalisation, as the term only entered use when MP research started to decline in the 1990s. In the present dissertation, it is argued that both MPs and DMs contribute to the non-propositional content of an utterance and that they are therefore not grammatical markers. For these reasons, the stance taken is that MPs and DMs have pragmaticalised from their homophonic (propositional) counterparts.

2.3.5 From propositional to non-propositional
German MPs have become pragmaticalised from six different propositional word classes: ‘Adverbien, Adjektive, Kommentaradverbien, Fokuspartikeln,
Konjunktionen, Subjektionen’ (Dudenredaktion 2005: 598). One adverb that has pragmaticalised into an MP is erst ‘first’:

(2.35) erst as an adverb:

Er geht erst in die Stadt, dann zur Arbeit.

[He goes first to the city, then to the work.]

‘First he goes to the city, then to work.’
(Helbig and Helbig 1999: 59)

(2.36) erst as an MP:

Er ist sehr lebhaft, aber erst sein Bruder!

[He is very lively, but MP his brother!]

‘He is very lively, but his brother leaves him standing!’
(Helbig and Helbig 1999: 60)

An example of an adjective that has pragmaticalised into an MP is ruhig ‘quiet’:

(2.37) ruhig as an adjective:

Sei bitte ruhig.

[Be please quiet.]

‘Be quiet, please!’

(2.38) ruhig as an MP:

Komm ruhig herein.

[Come MP in.]

‘Come in! Make yourself at home.’

Vielleicht ‘maybe’ can either be an MP or a Kommentaradverb (‘comment adverb’ or ‘sentence adverb’):

(2.39) vielleicht as a comment adverb:

Er hat vielleicht Grippe.
‘Perhaps he’s got the flu.’
(Helbig and Helbig 1999: 111)

(2.40) vielleicht as an MP:
Das war vielleicht anstrengend!

‘Boy, was that exhausting!’
(Helbig and Helbig 1999: 112)

*Nur ‘only’ is an example of a focus particle that also exists as an MP:

(2.41) nur as a focus particle:
Er verdient nur 1900 Mark im Monat.

‘He only earns 1,900 DEM per month.’
(Helbig and Helbig 1999: 88)

(2.42) nur as an MP:
Warum bist du nur so aufgeregt?

‘Why on earth are you so worked up?’
(Helbig and Helbig 1999: 89)

As for coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, examples such as auch ‘as well’ and doch ‘yet’ can be given. However, these words are also used as adverbs, focus particles, or Antwortpartikeln ‘answer(ing) particles’. One can add that many homophonic counterparts of German MPs also exist in a few word classes: the MP eben has for example homophonic counterparts that mean ‘flat, even’ (adjective) or ‘just now’ (temporal adverb).

2.3.6 Monosemy and homosemy
In order to account for MPs having equivalents in other word categories, Posner (1979: 380) coined the two terms Bedeutungsminimalist ‘meaning minimalist’ and
Bedeutungsmaximalist ‘meaning maximalist’ to account for the two streams postulated by particle researchers in the 1970s and 1980s. Hansen speaks of ‘meaning minimalism’ and ‘meaning maximalism’ (Hansen 1998: 85). Vismans writes that ‘[i]n its extreme form, minimalism was said to try to reach one overarching description of the meaning of the various uses of a particle as well as its homophonic counterpart(s) in other word classes’ (Vismans 1994: 50). Hansen writes that minimalism aims ‘to isolate a unitary core meaning, usually of a highly abstract and schematic nature, from which all uses of a given item can be derived’ (Hansen 1998: 86). For Abraham (1986: 44), who takes a ‘kritisch minimalistische Position’, two levels come in question: the semantic level covering a unified meaning of the MP and the non-MP(s), and a pragmatic level for variations of meaning. Waltereit (2006a) illustrates the monosemy approach (figure 2.5 below), although the author himself favours the polysemy approach (see figure 2.7 below).

One central argument against this point of view is the pragmaticalisation that MPs have undergone. Vismans (1994: 52) observes that because of the process of ‘bleaching’ (loss of semantic properties of a lexical word), MPs have lost ‘at least part of the meaning associated with the “original” ’. Furthermore, Hansen (1998: 85-86) writes that the minimalist approach fails to explain any pragmaticalisations, something that makes diachronic research impossible. A minimalist position can thus lead to an oversimplified semantic common denominator of a word, and its meaning is at risk of being obscure and purely synchronic.
Whereas the minimalist view is concerned with constructing a single meaning for a particle, the maximalist view, homonymy, endorses the cataloguing of all its various and different meanings. Foolen (1989) writes of maximalists that they tend to proceed with inductive reasoning: first they collect variants and then they try to find a unified or core meaning. This can, however, present problems, as Weydt (1986: 430, cited in Foolen 1989: 310) points out that the MP *denn* expresses both the pragmatic meaning of ‘Erstaunen’ and ‘Freundlichkeit’, for which one cannot construe a common denominator. Two other risks of maximalism are that such an approach can ‘confus[e] the meaning of particles with that of the contexts in which they occur’ (Hansen 1998: 86-87) and that ‘[it] is unable to show the relations between “homonymous” items’ (Hansen 1998: 87).

As opposite as both minimalist and maximalist views are, they have in common the search for a core meaning. They differ, however, through their procedure. As seen above, maximalists favour an inductive reasoning by formulating laws based on limited observations, whereas minimalists prefer a deductive reasoning, and only reach a conclusion after they have concluded that all their premises have been verified. Figure 2.6 below illustrates the homonymy approach.

![Figure 2.6 The homonymy approach](image)

There is, however, a third way to approach the meaning of particles, which is discussed in the subsection below.

2.3.7 Polysemy

Whereas both minimalism and maximalism aim to find one core meaning (although the procedure is different), the polysemic approach acknowledges the coexistence of multiple meanings and uses of a word. Hansen writes that
polysemy ‘allows for a certain indeterminacy of meaning [...] insofar as the senses instantiated in particle contexts may overlap’ (ibid.: 87). By overlap Foolen (1993: 71) means *familiegelijkenissen* ‘family resemblances’, as defined by Wittgenstein in 1953 (Wittgenstein 1971; cited in Hansen 1998): members of a family (i.e. a particle and its non-particle counterparts) share some properties, yet do not belong to the same group. In this approach, meaning is not found in a core, but rather in a web of meanings and uses or in a ‘chain-like model’. Figure 2.7 illustrates the polysemy approach.

Polysemy thus recognises the heterosemy of a particle and its potential various meanings. A comparison of the three approaches can be found in Table 2.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>number of meanings</th>
<th>notion of meaning</th>
<th>reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>minimalism</td>
<td>one core meaning</td>
<td>abstract</td>
<td>deductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximalism</td>
<td>one core meaning</td>
<td>context-specific</td>
<td>inductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polysemy</td>
<td>multiple meanings</td>
<td>context-specific</td>
<td>inductive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Comparing the three approaches to form and meaning

This section explored how development of MPs and DMs and how their meanings and uses can be explained. The next section is interested in the occurrence of MPs and DMs by reviewing their frequencies and by observing their prevalence in spoken in written language.
2.4 Prevalence in Language

2.4.1 Frequencies

Because this study aims to provide a quantitative analysis of MPs and DMs, it is worth describing the few pieces of research that present quantitative data in their analyses. Most research so far, however, has concentrated on a qualitative analysis.

Weydt provided only a basic view of the frequency of MPs, as he was more interested in comparing the frequency of German MPs with that of French MPs in an extract from Kafka’s *Der Bau* (‘The Burrow’) (Kafka 1931). The German version revealed a frequency of 13.02 particles per 100 words. The French translation revealed only 7.12 particles per 100 words (Weydt 1969: 11). When comparing these figures with the ones found below in Möllering (2004), one notices a higher density of figures in Weydt (1969). This could be explained by suggesting that Weydt’s Kafka-extract is not a representative sample of the German language; Weydt might have chosen this extract precisely because of its high number of MPs.

Möllering (2001, 2004) does not show such high frequencies. Basing herself on four German corpora, the author determines the frequency of MPs in spoken and written texts. She analysed (1) the *Freiburger Korpus* (FKO), a collection of 224 radio and television broadcasts, with a total of 700,000 words, (2) the *Dialogstrukturenkorpus* (DSK) of 200,000 words, comprising radio and television interviews and discussions, (3) the PFEFFER-Korpus (PFE, 650,000 words), consisting of dialogues gathered from Germany, Austria and Switzerland, and (4) a corpus of telephone conversations (BRO) gathered and published by Brons-Albert (1984) and totalling a number of 44,000 words. Whereas Weydt indicates frequencies per 100 words, Möllering’s frequencies are per 1,000 words. Her article reveals the highest frequency for an MP to be *doch*, which has 19.5 occurrences per 1,000 words (2001: 136). This is followed by the second most frequent MP, *auch*, which had only 8.9 occurrences per 1,000 words (ibid.). Möllering drew her data from four different German word corpora, spoken and written, which encompass a total of 1,594,000 words (2001: 134-135).
Möllering investigated the most frequent modal particles as estimated by Weydt (1979, 1981, 1983, 1989), Helbig (1994) and Thurmair (1989). Frequencies of these MPs in table 2.2 below are provided on samples of 1,000 words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP</th>
<th>freq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ja</td>
<td>19.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. auch</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. aber</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. mal</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. doch</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. schon</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. denn</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. nur</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. eben</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. vielleicht</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. eigentlich</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. überhaupt</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. wohl</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. erst</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. einfach</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. etwa</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. halt</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. sowieso</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. bloß</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. eh</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. ruhig</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Frequency per 1,000 words of MPs in German word-corpora, using Möllering’s data (2004)

With the help of the numbers that Möllering provides in her appendix (2004: 270), frequencies are calculated as the average of the frequencies of each MP occurrence in each word corpus. *Ja*, for instance, appears 9,348 times in FKO, 3,955 times in DSK, 7,077 in PFE, and 1,481 in BRO. Thus for *ja* this results in an average frequency of 19.42, which Möllering renders as 19.5. The frequency per 1,000 words has been chosen in the present thesis for easier comparison with Möllering’s frequencies of modal particles.

Incidentally, the first nine MPs were selected by Möllering in order to design corpus-based teaching materials as ‘[f]requency of occurrence has been advanced as one grading criterion […] for the teaching of modal particles’ (ibid.).

As for the frequency of discourse markers, linguistic research has mostly concentrated on qualitative analyses. One author to analyse DMs quantitatively is Altenberg (1990), who determines the frequency of ‘discourse items’ as found in 10 conversations, a sample of 50,000 words from the *London-Lund* corpus. Altenberg’s usage of ‘discourse items’ includes 13 different functional types: ‘responses, hesitators, softeners, initiators, hedges, expletives, thanks, apologies, attention signals, response elicitators, politeness markers, orders, and others (greetings, etc.)’ (Altenberg 1990: 183). Altenberg’s discourse items make up
9.4% of the corpus (Altenberg 1990: 185), whereas verbs make up 20.1% of Altenberg’s 50,000-word corpus. Still lower than discourse items, prepositions and adverbs have a frequency of 9.2% and 9.0% respectively. In a table of ‘distribution of discourse items’ (Altenberg 1990: 183), the DM now appears 35 times in the author’s sample, corresponding to a frequency of 0.7 per 1,000 words. There are 212 occurrences of the discourse marker you know in the sample, which equals 4.24 per 1,000 words. As for the DM well, this is found 365 times in the sample, which amounts to 7.3 per 1,000 words.

In French, a quantitative analysis of discourse markers was conducted by Chanet (2003), who determines the frequency of four DMs and their propositional counterparts. She uses the Corpus de Référence du Français Parlé (CRFP), a word corpus of 450,000 words, 134 recordings, and more than 36 hours of data. Chanet found 19 instances of the DM bien, the equivalent of 0.04 per 1,000 words. The DM enfin was found 1,109 times in the CRFP, a frequency of 2.46 per thousand. There are 1,134 occurrences of quoi in the corpus, resulting in a frequency of 2.52. Finally, the discourse marker bon was counted 1,824 times in the CRFP, yielding 4.05 per 1,000 words. As for the percentages of propositional and non-propositional usage, it is interesting to note that the DM bien makes up 10.2% of all occurrences in the CRFP. This stands out against the other three DMs: quoi is a DM in 76.31% of all cases, while the DM bon occurs in 86.54% of all usages, and the non-propositional usage of enfin is 98.24%.

As Möllering (2001, 2004) shows in her analysis, the frequency of MPs varies from one corpus to another, depending whether the language is spoken or written. Any normalised figures in this thesis need to be put into perspective and cannot be considered on par with quantitative data from Möllering (2001, 2004), Altenberg (1990), or Chanet (2003). Möllering and Chanet will act, however, as reference points, as they provide figures for pragmatic markers, of which some are also analysed in this study. Furthermore, this study shows normalised figures (per 10,000 words) as seen in Möllering (2001, 2004) and percentual distributions seen in Chanet (2003).
The aim of the following sections is to explain the difference between spoken and written language, to provide a schematic platform on which different genres can be added, and to add two genres, emails and plays, to this platform (see figure 2.9 and 2.10 below). By explaining that email and plays are border-line media between spoken and written and part of language of proximity, we justify the methodology (chapter 4) used in the present study.

2.4.2 Spoken/Written feature
The frequency of MPs differs very much depending on whether they occur in spoken texts or written ones. Weydt, as early as 1969, wrote that MPs occur more frequently in the Umgangssprache ‘colloquial’, and even within spoken texts their frequency increased, the more private the conversation became. In a table comparing frequencies taken from spoken texts, newspapers, and Schriftsprache ‘literary language’, Weydt (1969: 98) observed that there were twice as many MPs in spoken texts as in newspapers and three times as many MPs in spoken texts as in written texts. Rudolph (1991: 210-211) confirms this observation and finds more MPs in conversations than in the press, and more MPs in the press than in literature.

Molnár writes that MPs are ‘under-represented’ in the Schriftsprache (2002: 21). She explains this by describing how the particles are undervalued through being considered superfluous by some authors. More on the condemnation of MPs by linguistic purists may be found in subsection 2.7.2 below.

Most authors agree that MPs are ‘an inherent and important characteristic of spoken genres of German’ (Vyatkina 2007: 77). When MPs are thus found in literary works, they are used either to ‘render speech of a personage’ or to ‘invoke the impression of a dialogic interaction with an imaginary interlocutor’ (ibid.: 95). Written genres include, for instance, novels, film scripts and plays (Audehm 2006: 147), computer-mediated communication (i.e. emails, Vyatkina 2007: 99), or even 12 reformation dialogues (or Gesprächsbüchlein, Lenk 1968), which date from around 1521-25, and which Molnár investigated. These were intended to address theological positions in a ‘natural’, conversationalist style, and as Lenke (1968: 9) writes:
Ein so bedeutendes Dichtungsgenre wie der Dialog, der im Humanismus und in den Reformationsjahren eine einzigartige Blütezeit erlebte, blieb bisher in der Masse publizistischer Schriften verborgen und konnte nicht den ihm gebührenden Rand und die Zuordnung innerhalb der Literaturgeschichte dieser Periode einnehmen.

Östman (1982: 173) writes that DMs ‘have a tendency to occur in spoken impromptu discourse’. Watts (1989: 208) agrees with this claim and considers DMs as ‘one of the most perceptually salient features of oral style’, while Östman (1982: 170) argues further that ‘the occurrence of [discourse markers] in a discourse turns out to be a sufficient condition for regarding that discourse as having a high degree of impromptuness’. DMs are thus inseparable from oral texts, and the use of DMs makes the text oral. Koch and Oesterreicher (1994: 590, authors’ italics) summarise the paucity of pragmatic markers in written language as follows:


Although Koch and Oesterreicher (1985) agree that there is dichotomy of a phonic and a graphic code, speaking and writing are conceptualised as a continuum. They (1985: 17, author’s emphases) write:


The authors provide examples for both the spoken-written continuum and the graphic-phonic dichotomy, which are reproduced in figure 2.8 below.
proximity | spoken
---|---
a. intimate chat  
b. telephone chat with a friend  
c. interview  
g. job interview  
h. sermon  
i. presentation

distance | written
---|---
d. printed interview  
e. diary entry  
f. private letter  
j. article in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine*  
k. administrative regulation

Figure 2.8 Examples on the spoken-written continuum  
(adapted from Koch and Oesterreicher 1984: 18)

Additionally, the authors observe that the more closely language reflects ‘spokenness’, the more it becomes *Sprache der Nähe* ‘language of proximity’ (Koch and Oesterreicher 1984: 21); conversely, language closer to the written side of the continuum becomes *Sprache der Distanz* ‘language of distance’ (ibid.). The characterisation of both ends of the continuum are illustrated in table 2.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of proximity (spoken side of continuum)</th>
<th>Language of distance (written side of continuum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dialogue</td>
<td>monologue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free speaker change</td>
<td>no change of speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intimacy of partner</td>
<td>alienation of partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face-to-face interaction</td>
<td>spatial and temporal detachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free topic development</td>
<td>fixed topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not public</td>
<td>completely public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spontaneity</td>
<td>contemplation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy involvement</td>
<td>little involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interleaving of situation</td>
<td>confinement of situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3 Characterising language of proximity and distance  
(adapted from Koch and Oesterreicher 1985: 21)

To these above characteristics, Hård (2002: 40) adds that spoken language is produced sequentially in a ‘linear time’, thus creating a certain time pressure, whereas written language is produced non-sequentially, where there is less or no time pressure. Hård (2002: 40) also adds that speech uses ‘multi-modal channels’ (e.g. speech, gaze, gesture, posture), which has been dubbed as a ‘rich mode’, whereas, conversely, writing uses a ‘monomodal channel (“lean channel”)’ (Hård 2002: 40). Finally, in a table in which she contrasts speech and writing according to means of expression (Hård 2002: 40), she contrasts the ‘ephemeral’ and
‘fleeting’ nature of spoken language with the ‘persistent’ (see Herring 1999) and ‘permanent’ nature of written language.

2.4.3 Borderline medium: emails

Herring (2001) defines computer-mediated communication (hereafter ‘CMC’) as ‘the communication produced when human beings interact with one another by transmitting messages via networked computers’. Examples of CMC include, for instance: emails, mobile phone text messages (‘SMS’), instant messaging (‘IM’), Internet Relay Chat (‘IRC’), blogs, and bulletin board messages. Hård (2002: 261) observes that computer-mediated communication incorporates features from both spoken and written texts. This supports Audehm’s (2006: 95) claim of a ‘cline of “writtenness” and “spokenness” ’, which weakens the dichotomy of spoken and written language.

As for sharing features of both spoken and written language, as early as in 1985, Koch and Oesterreicher (1985: 18) were reporting that it is always possible to transpose utterances into their converse medium. As Lyons (1981: 11) observed:

[I]t is possible to read aloud what is written and, conversely, to write down what is spoken […] we will say that language has the property of medium-transferability. This is a most important property - one to which far too little attention has been paid in general discussion of the nature of language. It is a property which, as we shall say, depends upon others and which, with them, contributes to the flexibility and adaptability of language-systems.

Taking into account this ‘Medienwechsel’ (Koch and Osterreicher 1994: 587), it is easy to map CMC on to the spoken-written continuum of figure 2.8 as below in figure 2.9. However, CMC can also be very formal, especially in business emails, which is why the dotted lines indicate indicate how CMC incorporates formal and informal styles.
Although Koch and Oesterreicher write that ‘eine familiäre Gespräch verbleibt eben normalerweise im phonischen Medium’ (1994: 587), CMC enables speakers to have an intimate conversation in the written medium, either synchronously via instant messaging, for instance, or asynchronously, for example, via emails. As an illustration of language of proximity in CMC, the news service Reuters reported that the then Finnish Prime Minister Matti Vanhanen broke up with his girlfriend in 2006 by sending her a text message⁹ (Torma 2008).

In 1994, Koch and Oesterreicher wrote that ‘in jüngster Zeit ist nun gar der Verfall einer Kultur des Privatbriefs als Folge einer medialen Innovation, des Telefons, beklagt worden’ (1994: 593). Similarly, the British crisis line Samaritans saw a decrease of 50.51% in their correspondence by letter from 1994 to 2007 (Information Resource Pack 2008 2008: 13), whereas over the same time period, email correspondence increased from 214 emails to 137,627. Telephone calls, however, have only slightly increased by 6.06%. The demise of a letter-writing culture can be linked to the preferences of each generation. Hamlin (2006: 37), for instance, writes that people born between 1946 and 1960 find landlines ‘essential’, whereas people born between 1961 and 1978 find emails ‘[t]he best way to stay in touch’ (ibid.), and people born between 1978 and 2000 think mobile phones are their ‘lifeline’ (ibid.). This suggests that different people not only have different attitudes towards using emails, but the styles used are different as well. Indeed, Hård (2002: 65-66) writes:

⁹ Delivering bad news via text messages is, however, considered bad etiquette (Webb 2006).
Danet points out that when composing email messages, we draw on templates of many genres of both oral and written communication, including not only the business letter and the personal letter, but also face-to-face conversation, telephone conversation, intra-organizational memo, telegrams, postcards, and greeting cards. Danet’s research shows evidence for blurring of genres of personal and business letters, and for a new acceptability of speech-like features in digital letters (Danet 2001).

Indeed, Danet (2001: 37) writes of a ‘drift toward partially speech-like patterns, with consequent erosion of the traditional business letter template’. This stylistic diversity found in emails and their high usage means that emails, and CMC in general, are part of language. To put it in the words of Koch and Oesterreicher (1994: 600-601, emphasis mine), this leads to ‘einer vorbehaltlosen Anerkennung der gesamten Skala zwischen Nähe und Distanz’.

2.4.4 Borderline medium: plays

Through Lyons’ concept of ‘medium-transferability’ (Lyons 1981: 11), it is possible to write down speech (such as CMC) and to write a text that is intended to be spoken, such as is the case with plays or film scripts. Plotting these on the spoken-written continuum of figure 2.8, one would find both genres on the graphic as well as on the phonic side, which can be seen in figure 2.10 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity</th>
<th>Spoken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. intimate chat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. telephone chat with a friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. printed interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. diary entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. private letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plays and film scripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g. job interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. sermon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. article in the Frankfurter Allgemeine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. administrative regulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 2.10 Plays and film scripts on the spoken-written continuum (adapted from Koch and Oesterreicher 1984: 18)
In terms of the language used in plays and film scripts, there are differences with spontaneous dialogue. As Sanger (2000: 2) observes:

Dramatic dialogue rarely contains false starts, hesitations, overlaps, fillers. The sense of the conversation would be difficult to follow and it would be difficult to hear each actor if there were constant bids to enter the conversation from the other participants. So even though the dialogue may appear to be realistic to an audience in the theatre, or at home in front of the TV, it never really is.

However, realistic theatre, and, by its extension, films present[s] honestly and openly real concerns for ‘real’ characters and using ‘real’ language. Differences between [naturalism and realism] are marginal and as the term realism easily conjures up something being realistic, then this seems a more obvious label to apply to drama which tries to ‘tell it like it is’. (ibid.: 20)

It is this realism that has led linguists to use plays to research spoken language diachronically. Hansen and Rossari (2005: 181) point to dramatic texts as one example of a ‘speech-like genre’:

Hence, depending on the nature of the marker(s) under investigation, it becomes more or less essential to use diachronic sources containing the most “speech-like” genres. […] There appears to be widespread agreement that where diachronic data are concerned, drama texts, personal correspondence, novelistic dialogue, and trial documents constitute valid sources for the investigation of more speech-like usage.

Vismans (1994: 76), for example, uses mainly comedy drama to investigate Dutch modal particles and reasons: ‘For earlier stages of the [Dutch] language we have to look at written texts that are by their very nature representative of the spoken language, or at least approximations to spoken Dutch. Dramatic texts, and in particular plays with a down-to-earth subject matter such as comedies, farces and the like offer the best possibilities’.

Molnár uses the Reformationsdialoge to research the development of German MPs. She writes:

Not only MPs have been analysed in plays, but also DMs, such as in Bruxelles et al. (1980), who write about the oral character of plays for their analysis of mais:

Although the chosen [plays] corpus belongs to a literary genre endowed with its own laws, it is treated as a direct document on French usage. We behave as if the speakers and hearers of the dialogue were the characters of the play, but forget that through them an author is speaking to an audience. This abstraction has appeared innocuous, inasfar as the objective of boulevard theatre is precisely to move away from being a literary genre, which leads it to use a language as near as possible to the one used by the people to whom it is speaking (Bruxelles et al. 1980: 93).

There is thus no doubt that pragmatic markers such as MPs and DMs can be and have been found in texts that aim to resemble speech, such as plays or written dialogues. By analogy, these same markers can thus also be found in film scripts.

2.5 Summary of Chapter
This chapter has shown that despite linguistic purism labelling modal particles and discourse markers as ‘fillers’, the last 50 years have seen these develop into a

---

10 Examples of spoken Old High German are found in in the dialogues of *Aus den Kasseler Glossen* and *Aus Paris bzw. Rom* (Braune and Helm 1958: 12-15). No particles are, however, present.

11 Bien que le corpus choisi appartienne à un genre littéraire pourvu de lois propres, il est traité comme un document direct sur l’usage du français. On fait comme si les locuteurs et destinataires du dialogue étaient les protagonistes de la pièce, en oublant qu’à travers eux, un auteur s’adresse à un public. Cette abstraction a paru inoffensive, dans la mesure où la comédie boulevardière a justement pour ambition de s’effacer en tant que genre littéraire, ce qui l’amène à utiliser une langue aussi proche que possible de celle des personnes à qui elle s’adresse. (Bruxelles et al. 1980 : 93)
research area in linguistics which mainly encompasses their pragmatic properties and the diachronic changes they underwent.

In exploring the different semantic views of them, polysemy is considered the best approach towards modal particles and discourse markers. This study does therefore not presuppose or try to expose a basic meaning for each particle or marker. Instead, related uses and extensions of these will be assumed.

The present thesis follows Dostie (2004) and Hansen (1998, 2008) and assumes that modal particles and discourse markers have pragmatised from their propositional counterparts.

In terms of frequency, Möllering (2004) has given the frequency per 1,000 words for German modal particles. The proportion of discourse markers in relation to their propositional counterparts has been indicated by Chanet (2001, 2003) and Bertrand and Chanet (2005). The present thesis will follow Möllering and Chanet by determining the frequency per 1,000 words of modal particles and discourse markers in Luxembourgish and the proportion of their (non-propositional) uses and their propositional counterparts.

Modal particles and discourse markers are likely to occur in computer-mediated communication and plays and film scripts due to their spoken language nature and because those types of texts are often close to informal spoken language. The use of an email word-corpus and a plays word-corpus as a source of Luxembourgish data turned out to be justified.

As for the linguistic characteristics of modal particles, it is taken as sufficiently shown that they do not carry stress, that they are uninflected, that they are found in the Germanic middle field, and that although they convey speakers’ attitudes, they can be left out completely, since they have no propositional meaning.

Similarly, discourse markers are used non-propositionally as well. They can be inflected, although more pragmatised markers cannot. They are found either sentence-initially or finally, and they are used by speakers to inform the listener
how the sentence containing the marker is integrated within the whole conversation.

More information on the word-corpora used in this thesis is found in chapter 4. However, chapter 3 will first provide information about the language under investigation, Luxembourgish.
3: Luxembourgish

3.0 Introduction
Chapter 3 discusses Luxembourgish, the language under investigation. Section 3.1 introduces aspects of Luxembourgish grammar and its uses in Luxembourg. Section 3.2 explores what previous academic literature, dictionaries, and learning materials have written about MPs in Luxembourgish. In 3.3, the same sources are consulted for DMs. A summary of this chapter is provided in section 3.4.

3.1 Introduction to Luxembourgish
3.1.1 Language classification
In this subsection, Luxembourgish will be classified from three different perspectives: genetic, typological, and social.

In terms of language family, Luxembourgish is a West Germanic language. Although the language can also be analysed as a Central Franconian (Mittelfränkisch) dialect (Newton 1990: 136), Nübling (2005: 247) writes that because Luxembourgish has undergone a process of standardisation and is academically described and taught as a foreign language, Luxembourgish broadens the number of living Germanic languages from 11 to 12: Afrikaans, Danish, Dutch, English, Faroese, Frisian, German, Icelandic, Norwegian, Swedish, Yiddish, and Luxembourgish.

Languages cognate with Luxembourgish are German and Dutch, although closer varieties include other Central Franconian dialects, such as the German dialects of Cologne, Aachen, Trier, and the northern Saarland. This is because, like its cognate dialects, Luxembourgish has only partly undergone the Second Sound Shift (Keller 1961: 265-268), which means that, unlike German, West Germanic /p t k/ have not in all instances become fricatives or affricates. Shifted examples in Luxembourgish include Zäit ‘time’ (German ‘Zeit’), maachen ‘make’ (German ‘machen’), and Duerf ‘village’ (German ‘Dorf’). Non-shifted plosives in
Luxembourgish include *Apel* ‘apple’ (German ‘Apfel’), the demonstrative pronoun *dat* ‘the’ (German ‘das’), and *op* ‘on’ (German ‘auf’).

Typologically speaking, Luxembourgish is similar to German and Dutch, in that it is a verb-second language with subject-verb-object word order in main clauses and subject-object-verb word order in subordinate clauses.

(3.1) SVO word order in a main clause:

Cool ech liesen dei Artikel herno emol.

*[Cool I read those articles later once.]*

‘Cool, I’ll read those articles later, then.’

(LEWC 4961)

(3.2) Verb-second word order in a main clause:

Muer gesin ech fir d'eischt meng Klassen.

*[Tomorrow see I for the first my classes.]*

‘Tomorrow, I’ll see/meet my classes for the first time.’

(LEWC 5225)

(3.3) SOV word order in a subordinate clause:

datt ech keng emailen fun hinne kreien

*[that I no emails from them get]*

‘that I don’t get any emails from them’

(LEWC 8731)

Subsection 3.1.2 provides further information on linguistic properties of Luxembourgish.

A latter type of classification of Luxembourgish is concerned with providing a description of the language in its social or sociological context. In 1952, the German linguist Heinz Kloss (1904-1987) described Luxembourgish as a *Halbsprache* ‘half-language’, which, despite efforts, was failing to become a *Kultursprache* like other Germanic languages, such as German, Dutch, or
Swedish. His reasons were that Luxembourgish was generally not written, not sufficiently taught in schools, and was not used in sermons at that time (Kloss 1952: 110). Newton, however, disagrees with the negative view of Luxembourgish taken by Kloss. Using the terminology set forth by Kloss (1952, 1976), Newton writes that Luxembourgish ‘was already by 1952 at the stage of Ausbausprache’ (Newton 1996: 56), with which is meant ‘a language […] with a guaranteed claim to be recognised as such because of its “distance” from any similar language, e.g. Frisian compared with both Dutch and English’ (Newton 1996: 55) or Luxembourgish compared with German and Dutch. The criteria proposed by Kloss (1976: 307) to distinguish a dialect from an Ausbausprache (‘developing, expanding language’) is that an Ausbau language not only produces literature in its language variety, but also produces non-fiction. Ausbau languages are also used in churches and in public broadcasting; they are not only used in entertainment programmes, but also in serious programmes, such as debates, news, and reports.

In terms of the definitions of High Languages and Low Languages proposed by Charles A. Ferguson (1959), Auer (2005: 13) acknowledges that Luxembourgish has undergone a recent standardisation, that ‘there is a consensus of opinion today that it is a language of its own’, and that it is now officially recognised as the national language of Luxembourg. Nevertheless, Auer (2005: 9) finds it ‘at least doubtful whether [Luxembourgish] fulfils [its] criteria for a standard language, since it is not a H-variety in Ferguson’s [(1959)] sense’. To support his argument, Auer (2005: 9) refers to Gilles (1999: 8-9) and states that Luxembourgish is ‘almost exclusively spoken’. More on the actual use of Luxembourgish, including written uses, is found below in subsection 3.1.3.

In terms of classifying Luxembourgish, issues therefore still exist as to whether it is a language or a dialect, a high variety or a low variety. Phylogenetic arguments have given way to sociolinguistic arguments based on the use of Luxembourgish. A closer look at how the language is used is found below in subsection 3.1.3.
3.1.2 Salient linguistic features

The purpose of this subsection is to introduce essential features of Luxembourgish in order to allow readers to familiarise themselves with the language. A primary linguistic property, vital to MPs and DMs in Luxembourgish, is the phonological feature called ‘mobile-\(n\) deletion’ in English (Keller 1961: 268, Newton 1990: 195, Krummes 2006), or -\(n\)-Tilgung ‘-\(n\)-cancellation’ (Gilles 1999: 221) or Eifler Regel ‘rule of the Eifel’ (Bruch 1954: 25) in German. Mobile-\(n\) deletion cancels the pronunciation of /\(n\)/ at the end of words or in compounds when the following word does not start with a vowel, a dental, or /\(h\)/. The /\(n\)/ can be morphological or lexical. The retention of /\(n\)/ in ‘hunn’ and ‘scho\(nn\)’ is indicated in bold in (3.4) and its cancellation is marked by ‘\(\emptyset\)’ in (3.5).

(3.4)
\[\text{des Nuecht hunn ech scho\(nn\) iergendwéi dervu\(\emptyset\) gedreemt}\]

[this night have I already somehow of-it dreamed]

‘Somehow I already dreamt about it last night.’
(LEWC 1747, emphases mine)

(3.5)
\[\text{Ech hu\(\emptyset\) mech scho\(\emptyset\) laang net méi gemellt.}\]

[I have myself already long not more been-in-touch]

‘I haven’t been in touch for while.’
(LEWC 780)

A more detailed analysis of mobile-\(n\) deletion can be found in Gilles (1999) and Krummes (2006). This phonological feature is of importance, because some MPs in Luxembourgish, such as \(eben\) and \(dann\) can also appear as \(ebe\) and \(da\) depending on the words that follow. With this in mind, however, it is worth mentioning that although mobile-\(n\) deletion is an oral feature that has been integrated as an orthographic rule, many native speakers of Luxembourgish ignore this rule when writing, possibly due to hypercorrection from German. Similarly, Malané (1980: 31) claims that news speakers and politicians who had taken elocution lessons in German ‘insert’ an /\(n\)/ where none would be pronounced in Luxembourgish.
Bruch (1953: 44) suggests a link between the potential loss of morphological –n through mobile-n deletion in Luxembourgish and the syncretisation of the nominative and accusative case, which is only marked on determiners (i.e. articles, demonstrative pronouns, and possessive pronouns) and adjectival suffixes. The only exceptions of nouns taking a nominative case suffix on determiners are *der Däiwel* ‘the Devil’ and *eiser Herrgott* ‘our Lord’. Except for the genitive singular, masculine and neuter, however, case is not indicated on nominal suffixes. Consequently, unlike German where the subject and object of a sentence can be established through case marking, Luxembourgish relies on word order.

(3.6) Luxembourgish:

*Den eeklege Prof foltert den aarme Schüler.*

*[the nasty teacher tortures the poor schoolboy]*

‘The nasty teacher tortures the poor schoolboy.’

(3.7) German translation:

*Der eklige Lehrer foltert den armen Schüler.*

*[the nasty teacher tortures the poor schoolboy]*

‘The nasty teacher tortures the poor schoolboy.’

A fronting of the object in the German sentence (3.8) would not be interpreted as a fronting in Luxembourgish, but as an inversion of subject and object (3.9).

(3.8) Fronting of the object in German:

*Den armen Schüler foltert der eklige Lehrer*

*[the poor schoolboy tortures the nasty teacher]*

‘It’s the poor schoolboy that the nasty teacher tortures.’

(3.9) Reversal of subject and object in Luxembourgish:

*Den aarme Schüler foltert den eeklege Prof.*
[the poor schoolboy tortures the nasty teacher]

‘The poor schoolboy tortures the nasty teacher.’

(3.10) Reversal of subject and object in German:
Der arme Schüler foltert den ekligen Lehrer.

[the poor schoolboy tortures the nasty teacher]

‘The poor schoolboy tortures the nasty teacher.’

Luxembourgish is further distinguished by the almost exclusive use of the perfect auxiliary and past participle in reference to past events. German has the choice of using both the preterit and perfect tenses. However, apart from a small number of frequently used verbs such as auxiliaries (3.11), modals (example 3.12 and 3.13), and locatives (example 3.14 and 3.15), most Luxembourgish verbs have recourse only to their perfect forms, because the majority of them have lost their preterit forms (Newton 1990: 196), which is also the case for Afrikaans. For instance: whereas German can use both schrieb and hat geschrieben, Luxembourgish can only use huet geschriwwen ‘has written’. A preterit form, schrouf ‘wrote’, does exist and native speakers could recall (or construct) this form by applying the rule that most preterit forms use the stem vowel(s) –ou–. However, schrouf is probably perceived as archaic, or belonging to the dialect spoken in the north of Luxembourg.

(3.11) Using the preterit war and haten of the auxiliary sinn ‘be’ and hunn ‘have’ respectively:

Den eenzeg Ennerscheed zu deem Owend zu L-- war, dass d’Leit mei un haten.

[the only difference to that evening to L== was, that the people more on had]

‘The only difference to that evening in L== was that people were wearing more clothes.’
(LEWC 1292)

(3.12) Using the preterite form wöllt of the modal verb wëllen ‘want’:

Ech wollt de just besheed soen dass d’Buch aus H-- schon ukomm ass.
[I wanted you just let-know say that your book from H== already arrived has]

‘I just wanted to let you know that your book has already arrived from H==.’
(LEWC 6975)

(3.13) Using the preterite form konnt of modal kênnen ‘can’:
Sief mer w.e.g. net bèis, dass ech et net konnt maachen.

[be me please not angry that I it not could make]

‘Please don’t be angry with me because I couldn’t do it.’
(LEWC 7109)

(3.14) Using the preterite form stoung of stoen ‘stand’:
Ech stoung do mam Rescht vun der Classe an hun dunn mat hinnen weidergemacht.

[I stood there with-the rest of the class and have then with them carried-on]

‘I was standing there with the rest of the class and carried on with them.’
(LEWC 5506-5507)

(3.15) Using the preterite form louch of leien ‘lie’:
Ech louch do an der Sonn.

[I lay there in the sun]

‘I was lying there in the sun.’
(LPWC 13305)

Another significant linguistic property of Luxembourgish, which also marks it off from German, is the heavy influence exerted on it by the French lexicon. Some French words have been in the language for such a long time that they have lost their French spellings and have acquired a Luxembourgish spelling reflecting their adapted pronunciation. The French word boutique has become Buttik ‘shop’, chantier has become Schantjen ‘construction site’, adieu ‘farewell’ has become Äddi ‘good-bye’. Braun et al. describe these as mots intégrés complètement dans la langue luxembourgeoise ‘completely integrated words in the Luxembourgish
Other Luxembourgish words borrowed from French have retained their original spelling, such as *Trottoir* ‘pavement’, *Lavabo* ‘washbasin’, or *Merci* ‘thank you’, although these words are capitalised and bear initial stress and not final stress as in French. Braun *et al.* label these words as *mots empruntés intégralement* ‘integrially borrowed words’ (ibid.: 22). There is, however, no clear distinction as to which category borrowed words belong, as some words can be pronounced or written in a more assimilated or less assimilated way. The word ‘pavement’, for instance, is either *Trottoir* or *Trëttoir*, ‘building site’ is either *Chantier* or *Schantjen*, and *Zerwiss* means ‘tableware’ for the author of this present study, whereas *Service* means ‘service’.

The French lexicon is not only found in nouns, but also in verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and phrases. In many cases, Luxembourgish has duplicates (or triplets) for words, from which speakers choose between French, German, and/or Luxembourgish words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English translation</th>
<th>borrowed from French</th>
<th>borrowed from German or native Luxembourgish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aircraft</td>
<td>Avion</td>
<td>Fliger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choice</td>
<td>Choix</td>
<td>Wal, Wiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decide</td>
<td>décidéieren</td>
<td>entscheeden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fees</td>
<td>Fraisen</td>
<td>Käschten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invite (verb)</td>
<td>invit’éieren</td>
<td>alueden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>money</td>
<td>Suen</td>
<td>Geld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepare</td>
<td>préparéieren</td>
<td>virbereeden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>printer</td>
<td>Imprimante</td>
<td>Drucker, Drocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronounce</td>
<td>prononc’éieren</td>
<td>ausschwätzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shop</td>
<td>Buttik</td>
<td>Geschäft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>show (verb)</td>
<td>présentéieren</td>
<td>weisen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>television</td>
<td>Télee( visioun)</td>
<td>Fernseh( er)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.1 French and Germanic doublet-forms in Luxembourgish**

Also illustrated in table 3.1 is the Luxembourgish feature of taking any French verbal suffix in its infinitival form –*er* and turning it into a Luxembourgish verb ending in –*éieren*. 
3.1.3 Uses of Luxembourgish

Luxembourgish is spoken by some 300,000 speakers (Gordon 2005). However, due to a ‘medial diglossia’ (Gilles and Moulin 2003: 304), where the language varies according to the milieu, the language situation in Luxembourg needs also to be borne in mind. By ‘diglossia’ is meant a dichotomy of languages used within one community. Ferguson, who originated the term in 1959, defines diglossia as:

[...] a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation (Ferguson 1959: 336).

In those communities, Ferguson argues (1959), the high variety and the low variety are not only used in different situations, but also vary in their prestige, how they are used in literature, whether or not they are standardised, and if so, to what extent. In addition, whereas children acquire the low variety implicitly, they learn the high variety explicitly in education.

However, just as much as low variety Haitian Creole is not a sub-variety of high variety French, but rather a distinct language from it, the same can be argued for Luxembourgish being perceived as a distinct language from German. Horner and Weber (2008: 70, authors’ italics) write that ‘[t]he language situation in Luxembourg is frequently referred to as “triglossic” in reference to the three languages recognised by the language law of 1984: Luxembourgish (Lëtzebuergesch), French and German.

Knowles (1980: 304-305) writes that ‘Luxembourgish is the only means of oral communication between native Luxembourghophone speakers’, French, German or English is used with speakers of other languages. Unlike the divisions of diglossia set out by Ferguson (1959), Luxembourgish is not only used between friends and relatives, but also to address figures of authority. It is also the language or the co-
language of instruction in schools, even though the Luxembourg Government requires lessons to be taught either in German or French (Gilles and Moulin 2003: 305). Radio stations, too, aimed at a Luxembourgish audience, broadcast in Luxembourgish. It is on the written level, however, that the situation changes.

Newspapers are predominantly published in German, followed by French, leaving Luxembourgish used only in personal columns (e.g. obituaries, births, and weddings), letters to the editor and a few articles concerning local culture. Administrative letters are usually in French, as are questionnaires, although some can be in French and German. As far as culture is concerned, there is a literature written in Luxembourgish, but it is only one part of Luxembourgish literature as a whole, which covers writing in three languages: Luxembourgish, French, and German. The most popular genres of literature written in Luxembourgish are plays, cabaret sketches, and revues. This is also reflected in F. Hoffmann (1996: 118, author’s emphasis), who writes that “[Luxembourgers] attend the theatre in large numbers whenever the performance is in [Luxembourgish]: they do not, however read [Luxembourgish]’. With ‘reading’ Luxembourgish, F. Hoffmann means reading literature.

However, the written situation has changed in the last decade. As Gilles and Moulin (2003: 313) point out:

> Since 1994, the rapid development of the electronic media ([the Web], e-mail, chat) has led to a significant increase in the use of written Luxembourgish. Many internet websites are written in Luxembourgish or offer the user the possibility to choose between languages. […] Furthermore, the use of Luxembourgish to send SMS (Short Message System) over mobile phones is quite frequent.

On the web, Luxembourgish is also used in blogs, video logs and podcasts, and is used on popular social networking websites, such as Facebook or MySpace. Although there is a difference between the spelling of Luxembourgish used in literature and in computer-mediated communication (CMC), not dissimilar to English used in CMC, Luxembourgish is nowadays a language that is being read and written. Indeed, CMC bears strong resemblances to both written and spoken
ones, depending on the situation and the interlocutors. Hârd (2002: 53) argues for a ‘third medium’ (see subsection 2.7.4 above).

This therefore reveals a slow increase in the use of Luxembourgish, not only in the spoken domains, but also in the written ones. This increase is likely seen to correlate with the ‘emancipation’ or increase of prestige of Luxembourgish as a language. Adolf Bach (1934, revised 1950), for instance, still wrote of a Luxemburger Mundart ‘Luxembourgish dialect’, whereas Bollendorf (1946), in an article on teaching of Luxembourgish as a school subject, wrote that ‘most literary historians agree in regarding [the Luxembourgers’] homeland dialect as a language’ (Bollendorf 1946: 7)\textsuperscript{12}. One milestone in the acknowledgment of Luxembourgish is the Languages Act of 1984 (Loi 1984), which officially recognises Luxembourgish as the national language of Luxembourg, and sets it alongside French and German as one of the administrative languages of the nation.

As for the name used in academia, English research mostly uses the term Luxembourgish, or occasionally Luxembourgian, whereas papers written in German speak either of Luxemburgisch or even Lëtzebuergesch (e.g. Berg 1993, Gilles 1999), where the use of the actual Luxembourgish term suggests a strong political desire to recognise the identity of the language. It also dates back from 1984, when Lëtzebuergesch was the name of the language registered by the United Nations. The spelling lëtzebuergesch is first found in the 1970 publication of the Luxemburger Wörterbuch as a co-entry alongside the adjective lëtzebuurgesch (1995b: 46, reprinted).

3.2 Previous Literature on Modal Particles in Luxembourgish

3.2.1 Modal particles in academic literature and grammars

It was decided that the following MPs were to be looked up in previous Luxembourgish literature (and later on analysed in LEWC and LPWC): alt, awer, dach, dann (and da), eben (and ebe), emol (and mol), jo, roueg, and zwar.

\textsuperscript{12} Haut sinn de’ mêscht Literaturhistoriker d’accord, eisen Hemechtsdialekt als Sprôch unzegesinn (Bollendorf 1946: 7).
Of these MPs, *dach, dann, emol, jo, and roueg*, were chosen because native speaker intuition suggested similar non-propositional uses in Luxembourgish than in German, especially because they have cognates in German: *dach/doch, dann/denn, emol/mal, jolja, and roueg/ruhig*. *Alt* was chosen, because it has no propositional meaning in Luxembourgish, although it shares characteristics of the German MP *halt*. *Awer* and *eben* were chosen, because they share similarities with their German MP cognates, but they differ from their respective German propositional counterpart cognates. In the case of *svar*, whereas German only has propositional meanings, Luxembourgish has developed non-propositional uses. The DMs will be treated in the following section 3.3.

Bruch (1955) does not mention any MPs in his ‘outline’ (*Aufriss*) of Luxembourgish grammar, but there are some sentences that do contain MPs. However, Bruch’s Luxembourgish examples are translated into neither French nor German.

(3.11)

**Wat leefs de dann esou séier, ’t leeft dach keen der no.**

*What runs you MP so fast, it runs MP nobody you after.*

What are you running so fast for, there’s nobody’s running after you.’ (Bruch 1955: 75)

Pierre Schmitt, in his investigation of Luxembourgish syntax (1984), does however acknowledge the existence of modal particles (*Modalpartikel*), writing that they have a *geringe denotative Bedeutung* (‘low denotative meaning’) and have sometimes been labelled as fillers because of their frequent occurrence in everyday dialogues (ibid.: 114). His examples of MPs in Luxembourgish include *jo, nawell, alt, and wuel* (ibid.: 116).

(3.12) Luxembourgish *jo* translated as German *ja*:

**Mir versti jo all…**

*We understand MP all…*
‘It’s clear that we all understand…’
(Schmitt 1984: 116)

(3.13) Luxembourgish *nawell* translated as German *nun eben einmal*:

Et gët nawell dacks doriwwer geschwat…

*It gives MP often about-it spoken*

‘It is something that is talked about a lot…’
(Schmitt 1984: 11)

(3.14) Luxembourgish *alt* translated as German *halt*:

Wat derbäi erauskönnt wann déi plangen, dat hu mer och alt scho gesinn

*What of-it comes-out when they plan that have we also MP already seen.*

‘We’ve already seen what comes out of it when they’re planning, haven’t we.’
(Schmitt 1984: 11)

(3.15) Luxembourgish *wuël* translated as German *wohl*:

Dât war wuel well eppes nët séier genuch changéiert huet!

*That was MP because something not fast enough changed has*

‘I guess that was because something didn’t change quickly enough!’
(Schmitt 1984: 11)

In trying to explain the uses of modal particles, Schmitt (ibid.: 116-117) writes that they express the speaker’s perception, a reaction to a condition, or a guess. This is in line with previous literature on MPs, where authors have written that MPs provide comments about an utterance without adding any new information to it (cf. chapter 2 above).

In his PhD thesis on the syntax of the Luxembourgish variety of Schengen (Moselle area of Luxembourg), Schanen mentions the pragmatic function of MPs. More specifically, he calls this function *rhétorique, emphatique ou de fonction de connivance* ‘rhetorical, emphatic or function of complicity’ (Schanen 1980: 937). They are used by the speaker to indicate an understanding with the hearer, to
allow the hearer to be ‘in on it’, to mitigate or reinforce the impact of the utterance’ (ibid.). Although Schanen does not call them modal particles by name, he mentions a grammar by Helbig and Buscha (1972) and an article by Helbig (1977) that refer to them. As for Luxembourgish examples, Schanen mentions among others the MPs *dann, dach, eben, jo, ämol,* and *ma.* This latter, ‘[a]lways in the beginning of an utterance, is an interjection and is used by the speaker to share their reproachful feelings or their shocked attitude’ (Schanen 1980: 937).


> Generally not stressed in the middle of a verbal utterance, these elements relate to the relationship established between the speaker and his message (the intention of the utterance) or between the speaker and his communication partner (the perlocution or the effect of the utterance). They accompany and highlight the interactive effects of the utterance.\(^{14}\)

This is in accordance with what has been said before: MPs contribute towards the non-propositional meaning of an utterance (see sub-section 2.5.5), and they are found in the middle field before the rheme (see sub-section 2.5.3), but after the theme. Examples of Luxembourgish MPs in Schanen (2004) include *dann, dach,* and *mol,* although the MP *dach* used in example (3.18) does not clearly illustrate middle field occurrence.

(3.16)

> Firwat bass du dann sou béis?

[Why are you MP so angry]

\(^{13}\) Toujours en tête de l’énoncé, *ma* est une interjection et sert au locuteur à faire partager ses reproches ou son attitude scandalisée! (Schanen 1980: 937).

\(^{14}\) Généralement non accentuées au milieu de l’énoncé verbal, ces éléments portent sur la relation établie entre le locuteur et son message (l’intention de l’énoncé) ou entre le locuteur et son partenaire de communication (la perlocution ou l’effet de l’énoncé). Ils accompagnent et soulignent les effets interactifs de l’énoncé (Schanen 2004: 208).
‘Why are you so angry?’
(ibid.)

(3.17)
Looss mech dach roueg!

[Let me MP quiet]

‘Just leave me in peace!’
(ibid.)

(3.18)
Komm dach!

[Come MP]

‘Come on!’
(ibid.: 209)

(3.19)
Komm mol heihin!

[Come MP to-here]

‘Come here, please!’
(ibid.)

Although the above examples present three different MPs in Luxembourgish, Schanen’s French translations offer only one MP: the French modal particle donc, which is one of the few French MPs (Hansen 1998: 41).

Braun et al., in their Luxembourgish grammar book of 2005, refer to MPs as particules d’intention ‘intention particles’. As in the rest of the book, the metalanguage is French and the Luxembourgish examples are left untranslated. Unlike other sections of the book, however, their subsection on MPs is not accompanied by any general explanation, but provides only individual descriptions for the examples illustrated: jo, alt, dann, and dach (Braun et al. 2005: 149). Also, too, is mentioned, although as an adverb and not a modal particle.
(3.20) *Jo* is used in the sense of: ‘it is that, indeed’ (Braun et al. 2005: 149):

> Ech konnt net schaffe goen, ech war jo krank.

[I could not work go I was MP ill.]

‘I couldn’t go to work because I was ill, wasn’t I.’

(Braun et al. 2005: 149)

(3.21) With regard to *alt*, the authors write that this ‘has no equivalent in French, but provides a nuance of acceptation, resignation, and of excuse’ (Braun et al. 2005: 149).

> Well s du sou spéit komm bass, hu mir alt ugefaangen.

[Because you so late come are, have we MP begun.]

‘Because you arrived so late, we decided to start.’

(Braun et al. 2005: 149)

*Dann* and *dach* ‘correspond to French *donc*, but with different nuances’ (Braun et al. 2005: 149).

(3.22)

> Wat ass dat dann?

[What is that MP?]

‘What’s this then?’

(Braun et al. 2005: 149)

(3.23)

> Komm dach endlech!

[Come MP finally!]

‘Come here, will you!’

(Braun et al. 2005: 149)

(3.24)

> D’Liewen ass dach schéin!
The life is MP pretty!

‘Life is beautiful, isn’t it?’
(Braun et al. 2005: 149)

In their examples throughout the book, the authors provide only a small selection of other examples with MPs. Most of these are with dach, which the authors explain in a subsection. However, there are two examples which use wuel and roueg, MPs left unexplained:

(3.25)
Bass de wuel roueg!

[Are you MP quiet!]

‘Will you be quiet!’
(Braun et al. 2005: 57)

(3.26)
Laf roueg mam Kapp widder!
[Run MP with-the head against!]

‘Go on then, you just go ahead.’
(Braun et al. 2005: 47)

Apart from indicating the type of sentence (e.g. interrogative) in which the MPs are used, Braun et al. do not provide any further information on how and when to use them.

As is apparent from Bruch (1955), Schanen (1980, 1987, and 2004), Schmitt (1984), and Braun et al. (2005), modal particles have not been completely ignored by grammars and linguistic analyses of Luxembourgish. However, it is apparent that MPs have not been widely discussed in Luxembourgish linguistics. All the above authors have included modal particles in their Luxembourgish examples; however, Bruch is the only author not explaining MP usage. The information on MPs gathered from the other authors reveals that MPs are frequent in everyday speech, and that some of them have equivalents in German, some of them even having an equivalent in French. Some MPs appear in specific sentence types and
appear in the middle field after the theme and before the rhyme. They do not contribute to the propositional meaning of the sentence, but rather denote an attitude conveyed by the speaker.

3.2.2 Modal particles in dictionaries

This section aims to show the different dictionary entries of a selection of modal particles as found in Gangler’s *Lexicon der Luxemburger Umgangssprache* (1847), the *Wörterbuch der Luxemburgischen Mundart* (1906, hereafter shortened to WLM), the *Luxemburger Wörterbuch* (1950-1977, reprinted 1995a and 1995b as *Lëtzebuergischer Dixionär*; hereafter shortened to LWB), and the *Lëtzebuergler Online Dictionnaire* (2009, hereafter shortened as LOD). The MPs in question are *alt*, *awer*, *dach*, *dann*, *eben*, *(e)mol*, *jo*, *roueg* and *zwar*. These MPs are furthermore examined in chapter 6 and the reason for their selection is explained in subsection 4.4.3.

Whereas Gangler’s entry *alt* (1847: 17) translates this word as German *als* ‘as’ and *manchmal* ‘sometimes’, the WLM translated *alt* as the German adverb *schon* and the German *Einschiebewort* ‘filler’ *halt* (WLM 1906: 6). The LWB provides two meanings for *alt* (1995a: 21): the first meaning is ‘again’ or ‘sometimes’, whereas the other is *ein altägliches Wort in abschwächender [Bedeutung] mit reichen Schattierungen [und] Gefühlstönen, je nach Geste [und] Satzton* (Müller et al. 1928: 104, cited in LWB 1995a: 21). Meanings include German *wenigstens* ‘at least’, as in (3.27), German *leider* ‘unfortunately’, as in (3.28), and German *sogar* ‘even’, in (3.29). The Rheinisches Wörterbuch’s (Müller et al. 1928) entry for *alt* (I) provides the meanings ‘immer, schon, bisweilen’ and refers to the entry *all*. This would suggest that the etymology of Luxembourgish *alt* is related to German *alles*. Similarly, the *Wörterbuch der deutsch-lothringschen Mundarten* (Follmann 1909) has an entry for the doublet *alslalt*, where the former one is used ‘fast allg[emein]’ (Follmann 1909) apart from in Diedenhofen, Sierck, and Bolchen.15 The adverbian meaning for Lorraine Franconian *alslalt* is ‘als, manchmal, zuweilen, einstweilen, immer’ (Follmann 1909). In Alsatian, the *Wörterbuch der elsässischen Mundarten* (Martin and Lienhart 1899-1907) writes

15 The French names for these places are Thionville, Sierck-les-Bains, and Boulay-Moselle respectively.
that \(all(e)s\) has the meanings ‘immer, jedesmal’, but also ‘früher’. A link between Luxembourgish \(alt\) and German \(halt\) through \(h\)-deletion sounds thus improbable, particularly because Luxembourgish shows no other instance of such a deletion.

(3.27)

\[
\text{Komm du alt, wann hien nèt wëllt}
\]

[Come you MP, if he not wants]

‘Well, you come, then, if he doesn’t want to’

(LWB 1995a: 21)

(3.28)

\[
\text{‘t geet alt nèt aneschter}
\]

[it goes MP not otherwise]

‘unfortunately, it’s not working otherwise’

(LWB 1995a: 21)

(3.29)

\[
\text{vu lauter Honger hu mer alt Schongneel giess}
\]

[of so-much hunger have we MP shoe nails eaten]

‘we were so hungry we even ate shoe nails’

(LWB 1995a: 21)

In the LOD (2009), \(alt\), labelled as an adverb, is given the meaning of ‘sometimes’, ‘again’, ‘already’, ‘at least’, but is also translated as another MP \(eben\) or paraphrased, as in (3.30) below:

(3.30)

\[
\text{wëlls de wierklech an de Kino goen? dajee alt!}
\]

[want you really into the cinema go? c’mon MP]

‘do you really want to go to the cinema? oh, go on, then!’

(ibid.)
As for the MP *awer*, neither Gangler (1847) nor the WLM (1906) mentions the particle or the adverb. The LWB does mention the adversative adverb *awer* with the German meaning *aber* ‘but, however’ (1995a: 177), yet the MP meaning is absent. In the LOD (2009), the adverb *awer* is translated as German *trotzdem, dennoch* ‘nevertheless, however’, and the examples with the MP are followed by the explanations *dréckt d’Iwweraschung aus* ‘expresses surprise’ and *dréckt den Ierger aus* ‘expresses anger’ (LOD 2009), such as in the sentence (3.31) below.

(3.31)

ma dat do géif awer nach just feelen!

[DM that there would MP more only miss]

‘Great, that’s just what we needed!’

(ibid.).

As with *awer*, *dach* is absent from Gangler (1847); the WLM only mentions *dach* as a conjunction (WLM 1906: 51); however, the LWB entry *dach* (1995a: 176) gives plausible constructed examples of *dach* as a MP. It is, however, labelled as an adverb. The meaning of *dach* (German *doch*) as an answer particle to a negative question or to a ‘persistent’ (*hartmäckig*, ibid.) argument is only found as a secondary meaning. The LOD (2009) mentions the use of answering particle, but not the MP use.

The MP (or even adverb) *dann* is not listed by Gangler (1847) either, but is present as the adverb <*dann*> in the WLM (1906: 53), where the macron below indicates the *Schwebelaut*. The MP use is found as a secondary meaning in the LWB (1995a: 182).. The four examples of MPs given are all questions, and in accordance with the rule of mobile-*n* deletion, *dann* loses its final-*n* in the sentence (3.32) below.

(3.32)

bas de da verréckt?

[are you MP mad]
‗are you mad or something?‘
(ibid.)

As for the LOD (2009), dann is only found in the temporal or circumstantial meaning (‗then‘), but the MP meaning is absent.

As for the MP eben, it is found neither in Gangler (1847) nor in the WLM (1906). It is, however, found in two entries in the LWB, in which eben (1995a: 240) and ewen (1995a: 290) appear, the latter as a dialectal variant of eben in Echternach, in the east of Luxembourg. Eben and ewen are used as a temporal adverb, a causal one, and as an answer particle. The MP use is missing. As of July 2009, although the entries in the LOD (2009) are compiled alphabetically, no entry of eben can be found.

As with eben, the MP (e)mol is not found in Gangler (1847), but is found in two adverbial entries in the WLM and the LWB, where the entry êmôl (probably pronounced /eːmôl/, WLM 1906: 84) or ämol/eemol (probably pronounced /ɛːmol/ and /ɛːmol/, LWB 1995a: 57) denote the meaning of ‗once‘, whereas the analogous entry for ‗unstressed‘ (nabentonig[..], ibid: 264) emol or emôl (probably pronounced /ɔːmol/) denotes not only the idea of ‗once‘, but also has use as an MP. All examples are given in the expression ma so emol ‗oh, I say/c‘mon!‘, such as in (3.33).

(3.33)

ma so emol, hues du se nach all?

[DM say MP, have you them [= your senses] still all]

‗are you mad or what?‘
(ibid.).

No entry of the contracted form mol has been found in Gangler (1847), nor in the LWB (1995b).

The MP jo is not found in Gangler (1847), but is found in the WLM (1906: 201) as an answer particle, as a schwachbetonte Verstärkungspartikel ‗unstressed
emphasising particle’, and as a starkbetonte Partikel corresponding to the German stressed modal particle. In the LWB (1995a: 238-239), jo is also an answer particle, a stressed MP, and an unstressed MP. The former one is beschwörend, bekräftigend in Aufforderungen und Absichtssätzen ‘adjuratory, reinforcing in orders and requests’ (LWB 1995a: 238), such as in dut et jo nêt ‘don’t you do that’ or bleif mer jo nêmme mat dénger nues do ewech ‘will you keep your nose out of it!’ The LWB also points out that stressed jo appears frequently with nêt ‘not’ and nêmme ‘only’. Unstressed jo is used in a mannigfache[…] einräumende[…] oder einwendende[…] Verwendung (LWB 1995a: 239) ‘manifold, concessive, or objecting usage’. An example of this usage is seen in (3.34). Another usage is Ausruftungen, zum Ausdruck des Verdrusses, des Erstaunens, des Unwillens ‘exclamations to express displeasure, surprise, reluctance’ (LWB 1995a: 239), such as in (3.35) and (3.36).

(3.34)  
sief dach roueg, du kriss jo gläich z’iessen

[be MP quiet you get MP soon to eat]

‘will you be quiet, you’ll be getting something to eat’
(LWB 1995a: 239)

(3.35)  
dat as jo nêt méiglech

[that is MP not possible]

‘that’s just not possible’
(LWB 1995a: 239)

(3.36)  
’t huet jo dach kee Wäert

[it has MP MP no value]

‘it’s just not worth it’.
(LWB 1995a: 239)
As for the MP *roueg*, the entry is not found in Gangler (1847), but the WLM (1906: 362) and the LWB (1995b: 64) have entries under *<ro*euch>* and *roueg/rouig* respectively, in which most meanings denote the adjective and adverb ‘quiet(ly)’. Although not generating a separate sub-meaning, two examples of MP use (3.37) and (3.38) are found.

(3.37)

loos et roueg drop ukommen

*[let it MP on-it arrive]*

‘just bring it on!’

(LWB 1995b: 64)

(3.38)

géi du roueg heem, mir brauchen dénger nêt

*[go you MP home we need of-you not]*

‘you just go home, we don’t need you’

(LWB 1995b: 64)

The final MP needing to be analysed, *zwar*, has no entry in Gangler (1847), the WLM (1906) or in the LWB (1995b). The *dtv Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen* (Pfeiffer 2000: 1627) states that this conjunction with an ‘*einträumende[...]* Funktion’ has its origins in the Old High German phrase *zi wäre* ‘in truth, truthfully, indeed’. In one of the entries of German *zwar* in the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Grimm and Grimm 1854-1960: line 949 onwards), *zwar* has a *beständigend* and *versichernd* meaning: *der mûszt zwar fruû aufstohn, der nu sein nachbaurn wolt recht thûn* ‘the man ought indeed to rise early who would wish to do right by his neighbour’ (Franck 1541, vol. I: 28a).

By reading through Luxembourgish dictionaries, we can observe that some modal particles are present in these, and although they are labelled as adverbs, they often accurately describe modal particles expressing the views and attitudes of a speaker. This runs parallel to the ways in which modal particles are analysed in Dutch (Vismans, personal communication), or in German dictionaries.
3.2.3 Modal particles in learning materials

As above in subsection 3.2.1, academic descriptions of Luxembourgish and grammars have modal particles in their examples, but not all of them explain how they are used. This subsection focuses on whether materials for learning Luxembourgish as a foreign language do use and explain MPs. The materials examined are the two phrasebooks by Christophory (1979a and 1979b), Parler luxembourgeois (Sondag et al. 2002), the classroom textbooks Da Lass (Braun et al. 2000) and Lëtzebuergesch fir all Dag (Bentner: 2000), and the self-study textbooks Lëtzebuergesch schwätzen (Schiltz 2004a), and Le luxembourgeois sous la loupe (Schiltz 2004b). Interestingly, most Luxembourgish learning materials assume learners are already familiar with French and less so with German (Krummes 2005).

Christophory (1979a), which is intended as a primer offering a Luxembourgish-French-English phrase book and a grammatical survey, does not explain MPs, but does give a few examples including MPs, such as sentences (3.39), (3.40), and (3.41) below. As for Mir schwätze Lëtzebuergesch (Christophory 1979b), no MPs are found in this work.

(3.39)

a wéi geet et dann?

[and how goes it MP?]

‘and how are you?’
(Christophory 1979a: 19, author’s translation)

(3.40)

Dir hutt jo keng Féiwer

[You have MP no fever]

‘You have no fever’ [= You are not running a temperature.]
(Christophory 1979a: 23, author’s translation)

(3.41)

Dat geet awer schlecht, well mir hu schrecklech vill Aarbecht.
[hat goes MP bad because we have awfully much work]

‘It will be difficult, as we have an awful lot of work.’
(Christophory 1979a: 52, author’s translation)

The other trilingual phrasebook, the French-Luxembourgish-English *Parler luxembourgeois* (Sondag et al. 2002), does not provide grammatical explanations, and only a few sentences, such as (3.42) and (3.43), appear.

(3.42)

En ass dach krank!

*[He is MP ill!]*

‘But he’s crazy!’
(Sondag et al. 2002: 213, authors’ translation)

(3.43)

Du kënns dach, oder?

*[You come MP or?]*

‘You are coming, aren’t you?’
(Sondag et al. 2002: 213, authors’ translation)

In *Da Lass* by Braun et al. (2000), over 50 MPs were counted. Across the two small-sized volumes, they are found mostly in dialogues and texts representing natural speech; however, no translation or explanation is given for them. Examples include (3.44), (3.45), (3.46).

(3.44)

Wie geet dann vun hinne schaffen?

*[Who goes MP of them work]*

‘So who of them is working, then?’
(Braun et al. 2002: 53, volume 1)
Wibbel mol eng Grëtz

[Move MP an oat]

‘Just move a bit, please.’
(Braun et al. 2002: 99, volume 1)

Do ass dach nach eppes dran.

[There is MP still something in-there]

‘There’s still something in there.’
(Braun et al. 2002: 156, volume 2)

Similar to Braun et al. (2000), Bentner et al. (2000) uses a total of 50 MPs in the material’s dialogues, but no translations or explanations are given. Sentences with MPs include examples (3.47), (3.48), and (3.49) below.

Dofir hunn ech jo bei iech bestallt.

[That’s-why have I MP with you ordered.]

‘That’s the reason why I placed the order, isn’t it?’
(Bentner 2000: 134)

Ma da komm dach bei mech, ech sinn eleng.

[DM then come MP to me, I am alone]

‘Well, in that case, come to my place, I’m on my own.’
(Bentner 2000: 135)

Pierre, kuck mol wat do läit.

[Pierre, look MP what there lies.]
‘Pierre, just have a look what’s lying there.’
(Bentner 2000: 136)

Schiltz (2004a) neither explains MPs nor does he use any in his examples. His French-language grammar and language booklet (Schiltz 2004b), does however mention the MP dach as an adverbe de manière ‘adverb of manner’ (Schiltz 2004b.: 28), alongside other non- MPs gären ‘willingly’ and och ‘also’.

It is apparent from examining Luxembourgish learning materials that although some dictionaries do sometimes describe modal particles, these remain absent in the textbooks as syllabus topics. Although they can be found in some dialogues or other texts that reflect speech, they usually remain untranslated, and it is up to the learner and teacher to clarify the meaning of modal particles.

3.3 Previous Literature on Discourse Markers in Luxembourgish

3.3.1 Discourse Markers in academic literature and grammars

The following DMs were looked up in previous Luxembourgish literature and later on analysed in LEWC and LPWC: bon, ben, enfin, héier (and héiert), lauschter (and lauschtert), ma, mä bon, okay (and OK), so (and sot), and sou (and esou).

For the DMs, bon, ben, enfin, were chosen because they appear in French as well, with both propositional meaning and non-propositional uses. Ma was chosen because it is closely related to the Luxembourgish conjunction mä ‘but’, which is linked to the French conjunction and DM mais. Héier, lauschter, so, and sou were chosen because they have correspondences in German and Dutch. Okay was chosen because it has been documented in English as a discourse marker. All pragmatic markers thus exist in Dutch, English, French, and German, but yet remained to be analysed in Luxembourgish.

Bruch (1955) neither mentions nor uses DMs in his outline. Schanen (1980: 943), on the other hand, does mention them, and writes that there are signes ‘signals’ or a ‘series of signals’ that belong to a ‘pragmatic function that Jakobson [1963, cited in Schanen 1980: 943] called phatic function […]. With Vahle [1978, cited
in Schanen 1980: 943], we shall speak of contactive function\textsuperscript{16} (ibid., author’s emphasis). Further on, he observes that they have ‘four essential functions’ (Schanen 1980: 943): they ‘introduce at the beginning of an utterance a communication or establish contact’ (Schanen 1980: 943), they ‘resume a communication after an interruption’ (Schanen 1980: 943), they ‘resume a subject after a digression’ (Schanen 1980: 943), and they ‘appeal to the reaction of others at the beginning of an utterance’ (Schanen 1980: 943). Examples include also ‘so’, sou ‘right’, and nêt ‘isn’t it’ (Schanen 1980: 943). Moreover, Schanen (1980: 943-944) continues:

‘[A]ll these linguistic units, that can be complete utterances, generally do not convey any statement, any information […], with the risk of giving rise to laughter: these are reoccurring expressions and sequences with a strategic and social value, which are moreover the last to disappear amongst many people with aphasia’.\textsuperscript{17}

To what odd extent these linguistic units are laughable is left unexplained by Schanen. In the article following up his thesis, Schanen (1987: 75) speaks of Kontaktive ‘contactives’, which, he explains, are ‘Lexeme, bisweilen auch Funktionsgruppen, die dazu dienen, den Kontakt zwischen Gesprächspartnern herzustellen, wieder aufzunehmen oder zu brechen’ (ibid.). In addition, they are ‘Zeichen und Signale, die vor allem neben dem Begriffsausdruck eine diskurs-, bzw. textstrukturierende Funktion haben (s. die Stellung des ausgeklammerten esou)’ (Schanen 1987: 75).

In his later publication, Schanen (2004: 207) mentions contactifs again, which are now a subcategory of particules dites du discours ‘particles known as discourse particles’.

Schmitt (1984) does not mention DMs explicitly; however, he illustrates the use of the DM so as in examples (3.50) and (3.51), of which he explains that the

\textsuperscript{16} Une […] fonction pragmatique […] est celle que JAKOBSON appelait la fonction phatique […]. Avec F. VAHLE (cf. bibliographie), nous parlerons de fonction phatique (Schanen 1980: 843).

\textsuperscript{17} Toutes ces unités linguistiques, qui peuvent être des énoncés entiers, n’apportent en général aucun communiqué, aucune information […] sous peine de prêter à rire: ce sont là des expressions et séquences ritournelles à valeur stratégique et sociale qui sont d’ailleurs les dernières à disparaître chez un grand nombre d’aphasiques (Schanen 1980: 943-944).
'Imperativ dient zur Konzentrierung der Aufmerksamkeit des Hörers auf die beginnende Kommunikation (formelhafter Appell)' (Schmitt 1984: 124). This ‘formulaic appeal’ seems to be comparable to Schanen’s ‘contactives’.

(3.50)
Sô Emelie …

[DM Emelie…]

‘Say/Listen, Emelie…’
(Schmitt 1984: 124)

(3.51)
Ma so, fir zwiellef Frang wärten se engem jo keen Dreck dohinnersetzen.

[DM say, for 12 francs will they one MP no dirt over-there-place.]

‘Oh c’mon, they won’t serve you any dirt for 12 francs.’
(Schmitt 1984: 124)

Similar to Bruch (1955), Braun et al. (2000) do not explain DMs as a grammatical or functional feature, nor do they give any examples of them.

3.3.2 Discourse markers in dictionaries
This subsection aims to establish whether the dictionaries of Gangler (1847), the WLM (1906), the LWB (1995a, 1995b), and the LOD (2009) have any entries and details on the DMs bon, enfin, (e)lo, héier(t), lauschter(t), ma, mä bon, ok(ay), so(t), and sou. Additionally, because bon, enfin, ma, and mä bon have French origins, the two unidirectional French-Luxembourgisch dictionaries by Rinnen (1988) and Derrmann-Loutsch (2006) will be consulted as well. These ten DMs are furthermore examined in chapter 7 and the reason for their selection is explained in subsection 4.4.3.

Gangler (1847: 52) mentions Bon only as a noun meaning ‘voucher’, and not as a DM, the LWB, while also giving the meaning ‘voucher’, follows the WLM (1906: 40), and introduces the DM bong (LWB 1995a: 131), the spelling of which reflects the nasal quality and the denasalisation of the French nasal vowel /õ/ to
Luxembourgish /oŋ/. The DM is described in the LWB as an interjection and translated into German as ‘gut, wohlan, es sei’ (ibid.), although further explanations of its use are absent. The WLM simply translates bong! as gut!, which suggests an interjectory and possible DM character. In the nursery rhyme in (3.52), the DM bong is used to rhyme with Schong ‘shoes’. In sentence (3.53), the LWB explains in brackets that the sentence relies on a pun between Boun ‘bean’ and the DM bong, which elicits the response Ierz ‘pea’.

(3.52)

bong bong, fléck mer méng Schong

[DM DM, mend me my shoes]

‘Alright, alright, repair my shoes for me’

(ibid.)

(3.53)

bong sot de Fransous, du gouf et eng Ierz

[DM said the Frenchman, then existed it a pea]

‘Alright, said the Frenchman, then he got a pea’

(ibid.)

As for the LOD (2009), the DM is absent. In Rinnen (1988: 108), the French ‘interjection’ bon is translated as gutt: bon, si vous le croyez becomes gutt, wann dir et mengt ‘Alright, if that’s what you believe’. In Derrmann-Loutsch (2006: 65), no DM usage is found. Propositional uses are translated in both dictionaries as gutt.

As for the DM enfin, no entry is found in the three Luxembourgish monolingual dictionaries. In Rinnen (1988: 376), the propositional meaning is translated into Luxembourgish as endlech ‘finally’, whereas the non-propositional use is left out or translated as nu gutt, i.e. enfin, nous verrons is nu gutt, mir gesinn emol (dat) ‘Alright, we’ll see’, enfin, ça va is kuurz, nu gutt, et geet ‘well, it’s ok’, and elle est blonde, enfin plutôt rousse is hatt as blond, éischter rout ‘she’s blond, or, properly speaking, red-haired’. In Derrmann-Loutsch (2006: 209), the French DM is left
out in Luxembourgish: *ce n’est certes pas beaucoup, mais enfin, c’est toujours ça* is translated as *et ass sécher net vill, mä et ass èmmerhin dat* ‘it’s certainly not much, but yeah, it’s at least something’.

The DM *héier(t)* is absent from Gangler (1847) as the entry *héieren* ‘listen’, does not exist. In the LWB, however, *héieren* is found (1995a: 144), but only the meaning ‘to hear’ is present, whereas its use as a DM at the end of an utterance is absent.

Regarding the DM *lauschter(t)*, Gangler has an entry on *lauschteren* ‘listen’ (1847: 264), although he only provides translations into German, French, Dutch, and English, without any further explanations. The LWB, on the other hand, provides translations and explanations of the meaning of *lauschteren* ‘listening’ (1995b: 20), but also gives one sentence (3.54) where a DM use can be inferred. The LOD (2009), again, has no entry for this DM.

(3.54)

> nu lauschter emol, dat do kann nêt esou weider gon!

> [now DM MP, this there can not so continue]

‘Right, listen, this cannot continue like that.’
(LWB 1995b: 20)

For the next DM, *ma*, there is no entry on it in (Gangler 1847). The WLM and LWB, however, have entries on this *Ausruf des Erstaunens* (WLM 1906: 278) or ‘interjection’ (LWB 1995b: 73). In its initial meaning, its use is *kurz, emphatisch, abweisend* (ibid.). As a secondary meaning, it is used as a *Verstärkungspartikel im positiven oder negativen Sinn* (ibid.) and can be found in expressions like *ma jo* ‘of course’ or *ma neen* ‘of course not’. Furthermore, it is synonymous with the adversative conjunction *mä* (< French *mais* ‘but’). In Rinnen (1988) and Derrmann-Loutsch (2006), however, although French *mais* is initially translated as both Luxembourgish *mä* (or *mee*), *ma*, and *awer*, Luxembourgish *ma* is only used in examples where the French DM *mais* is used, and not the conjunction. In Rinnen (1988: 607), *mais non* is translated into *ma neen* ‘of course not’, *mais si*
into ma dach and ma sécher ‘of course it is’. Rinnen (1988: 607) translates one DM as mä or ma, such as mä sécher and ma dach for mais oui ‘of course’. In Derrmann-Loutsch (2006: 363), the division is sharper: the conjunction is translated as mä, the DM as ma: mais bien sûr que c’est vrai is ma sécher as dat wouer ‘of course that’s true’, mais non is ma neen ‘of course not’, and mais oui is ma sécher ‘of course it is’. The use of the conjunction and the DM mais is also documented in Fox (1927: 154-156), in which the ‘napoleonischer Grenadier François Bamberger aus Saarlouis’ uses his native Moselle-Franconian ‘Saarlouiser Deitsch’ in relating his army exploits, e.g.: et dut mer läd, mais, dau muscht noch e besselche wa’rten ‘I am sorry, but you have to wait a bit longer’ and Mais, François, wat hann dir lo for’n a’rtlich Tabatière! ‘Oh, François, what a lovely little snuff box you have there’ (Fox 1937: 156). However, it is worth keeping in mind that the language might have been ‘francified’ at times for humorous effects, as the introduction to the soldier’s tale promises a köstliche und viel gesuchte Unterhaltung (ibid.: 154).

As for the DMs mä bon and ok(ay), no entry is found in Gangler (1847), in the WLM (1906) in the LWB (1995a, 1995b), or in the LOD (2009). French mais bon has no separate entry in Rinnen (1988) and Derrmann-Loutsch (2006).

Concerning the DM so(t), the entry soen ‘say’ is found in Gangler (1847: 418) and <sôen> in the WLM (1906: 410), but DM use is not explained. The entry for soen in the LWB (1995b: 225), however, offers some DM illustrations, such as sentences (3.55) and (3.56). As for the LOD (2009), no entry for soen can be found.

(3.55)
so, ech hätt der dat gesot!

[DM, I would-have to-you that said]

‘Say, I would have told you that!’
(LWB 1959b: 225)
so, wat geet dat dech un!

[DM, what goes that you on]

‘That’s none of your business!’
(LWB 1959b: 225)

Regarding our final DM *sou*, Gangler (1847) has no entry in his dictionary either for *sou* or for *esou*. The WLM (1906: 96) only translates *(e)so*³ as German *so*, but does not provide any example. The LWB (1995b) on the other hand has an entry *sou*, linked to its similar entry, *esou*. Although the main meaning throughout the entry is explained as ‘so’ (in such a manner), one example (3.57) is given, in which one can extrapolate a DM use.

(3.57)

*sou*, lo geet et duer!

[DM, now goes it enough]

‘Alright, now is enough!’
(LWB 1995b: 230)

What one can observe from analysing Gangler (1847), the WLM (1906), the LWB (1995a, 1995b), and the LOD (2009) is that our selection of DMs is even less illustrated, let alone labelled, in the dictionaries than the MP selection discussed earlier. If a dictionary has an entry, this entry will define and provide information about the propositional meaning of that word and will ignore the non-propositional use. Only the DMs *bon* and *ma*, which are not derived from other words in Luxembourgish, are explained as having a non-propositional use.

3.3.3 Discourse markers in learning materials

Similar to subsection 3.2.3 above, the purpose of 3.3.3 is to observe whether discourse markers occur in the learning materials presented by Christophory (1979a, 1979b), Sondag et al. (2002), Braun et al. (2000), Bentner et al. (2000), and Schiltz (2004a, 2004b).
Bearing in mind that Christophory (1979a) contains phrases that are meant to be spoken in conversations, it is remarkable that the book contains only one DM. The only DM, *tja*, related to *jo*, is found in sentence (3.58), where it is translated as French *ah oui* and has the connotation of summarising and reinforcing what has been said previously. On the other hand, DMs are completely absent in Christophory 1979b.

(3.58)

*Tja, déi gutt al Zäiten*

*DM these good old times*

‘Yes, the good old days’
(Christophory 1979a: 39, author’s translation)

As for *Esou schwätze mir* (Sondag et al. 2002), DMs are frequently used, such as examples (3.59), (3.60), and (3.61) that reinforce the spoken character of the phrasebook.

(3.59)

*Mä dir stéiert mech iwwerhaapt net!*

*DM you disturb me absolutely not*

‘You’re not disturbing me at all!’
(Sondag et al. 2002: 13, authors’ translation)

(3.60)

*Ma séc her kommen ech!*

*DM sure come I*

‘Of course I’m coming!’
(Sondag et al. 2002: 213, authors’ translation)

(3.61)

*Sou, endlech Feierowend!*

*DM finally finishing-time*
‘Phew, time to stop work at last!’
(Sondag et al. 2002: 148, authors’ translation)

In (3.59), mä could have easily been replaced by ma. This suggests that in some cases, mä can be used as a discourse marker.

In Braun et al. (2000), only a few DMs are found in dialogues. None of them is either explained or translated into French or German. Most of the occurrences are the DM ma, such as in examples (3.63) and (3.64). Other examples of DM include sentences (3.65) and (3.66).

(3.63)

Invité: Merci fir d’Invitioun.
Bomi: Ma sot emol! Wann een sech esou laang net gesinn huet.

[Guest: Thank you for the invitation.’
Granny: DM say MP When one oneself so long not seen has]

‘Guest: Thank you for the invitation.
Granny: Oh, don’t be daft. Especially when we haven’t seen each other for a long time.’
(Braun et al. 2000: 31, volume 1)

(3.64)

Wat heescht hei – “Wuer fuert der”? Ma an d’Vakanz.

[What means here – “where drive you”? DM in the holiday]

‘What do you mean, “where are you off to”? I told you, on holiday.’
(Braun et al. 2000: 91, volume 1)

(3.65)

Hei Mamm, lauschter emol!

[DM mother listen MP!]

‘Now, mum, listen, please.’
(Braun et al. 2000: 91, volume 1)

(3.66)

So, wéini kënnnt dann den Usträicher?
[DM when comes MP the painter?]

‘By the way, when’s the painter coming, then?’
(Braun et al. 2000: 36, volume 2)

Similar to the learning materials above, Bentner et al. (2000) has only a small number of DMs, these being found in dialogues, which are never explained or translated. The most common one is *ma*, as found in examples (3.67) and (3.68), but *so(t)* and *sou* can be found as well, such as in sentences (3.69), (3.70), and (3.71).

(3.67)

A: Wéi geet et Iech?
B: Ma gutt, merci.

[A: *How goes it you?*
B: *DM good, thanks*]

‘A: How are you?
B: Oh, I’m fine, thanks.’
(Bentner et al. 2000: 124)

(3.68)

A: An du, wat méchs du esou fréi an der Stad?
B: Ma ech komme vun der Aarbecht!

[A: *And you, what makes you so early in the city?*
B: *DM I come from the work*]

‘A: What about you, what are you doing so early in Luxembourg City?
B: Well, I’m coming from work.’
(Bentner et al. 2000: 128)

(3.69)

So, d’Hélène huet en neie Frënd.

[DM the Hélène has a new (boy)friend]

‘Listen, Hélène’s got a new (boy)friend.’
(Bentner et al. 2000: 131)
3: Luxembourgeois

(3.70)
Sot, entschëllegt Monsieur, wou ass Äre Billjee w.e.g.?

[DM excuse mister where is your ticket please]

‘Excuse me, sir, where is your ticket, please?’
(Bentner et al. 2000: 125)

(3.71)
Sou, an elo ginn ech an d’Bett.

[DM and now go I in the bed]

‘Right, I’m off to bed now.’
(Bentner et al. 2000: 128)

In the final selection of Luxembourgeois learning materials, Schiltz (2004a, 2004b) does not use any DM in his sentences. However, some DMs are found in his section D’Texter ‘the texts’, although it is not stated whether or not the collection of prose texts is the author’s own. As in other learning materials, the examples below, which were found in the texts’ dialogues, were neither translated, nor explained, since débutants ‘beginners’ are recommended to travailler avec un dictionnaire de préférence ‘work with their preferred dictionary’ (Schiltz 2004b: 60).

(3.72)
Elo frot dir iech sécherlech: Ma wat hunn déi Hennessen dann och esou gejaut?

[Now ask you yourselves surely: DM what have those idiots MP also so shouted]

‘Surely you’re asking yourselves now: So what were these idiots shouting for, then?’
(Schiltz 2004a: 68)

(3.73)
A: Ech kommen hei an d’Schoul fir Lëtzebuergesch ze léieren.
B: Ma dat ass schéin.
3: Luxembourgish

[A: I come here in the school for Luxembourgish to learn.  
B: DM that is pretty]

‘A: I come to school here to learn Luxembourgish.  
B: Oh, that’s nice.’  
(Schiltz 2004b: 62)

(3.74)

A: Ech schaffen an engem Garage. An du?  
B: Ma ech si Schoulmeeschter.

[A: I work in a garage. And you?  
B: DM I am schoolmaster]

‘A: I work in a garage. And you?  
B: Well, actually, I’m a primary school teacher.’  
(Schiltz 2004b: 63)

As observed from the examples above, discourse markers, similar to modal particles, are neither translated nor explained in learning materials. On occasions when they occur, they do so in dialogues or similar texts representing speech. The most common discourse marker found appears to be the versatile marker ma. Furthermore, contrary to what Schiltz (2004b: 60) suggests, discourse markers (and modal particles) are difficult to look up in dictionaries and thus leave learners of Luxembourgish with unknown, yet highly pragmatic words.

3.4 Chapter Summary

Luxembourgish has only recently been recognised as a West Germanic language and as the national language of Luxembourg. An important feature of the language was shown to be lexical flexibility, producing duplicates or triplicates for words, which thus allows speakers of Luxembourgish to choose between French, German, or Luxembourgish lexical items for one and the same concept (see J.-P. Hoffmann 1985, Newton 1987).

As for the use of Luxembourgish, it was indicated that although Luxembourgish is not the main or sole language used in literature or public writings, its presence in computer-mediated communication (e.g. emails, SMS text messages, or internet messaging) has become well established since 1993.
As for modal particles and discourse markers in Luxembourgish, both types of pragmatic, functional words figure very little in grammar books, dictionaries, and learning materials, although there seems to have been an increase in discussion of the markers and particles in Luxembourgish academic literature since the 1980s. The most unexpected observation arising from this chapter is the frequent appearance of the discourse marker *ma* in Luxembourgish learning materials. It was shown from translating the examples with *ma* into English just how versatile this marker is (see section 7.6 below).

Chapter 3 addresses the reiterated and emphasised goal of describing modal particles and discourse markers as they occur in Luxembourgish. There are two further goals towards a linguistic description: presentation of the quantitative data on the one hand (chapter 5), and analysis of the qualitative data on the other (chapters 6 and 7). First however, the methodology used for these analyses will be discussed in chapter 4.
4: Methodology

4.0 Introduction
Chapter 4 aims to present the methodology of this thesis. Section 4.1 gives details on using already available Luxembourgish word-corpora and reviews the research questions for this study. In section 4.2, details will be given on how data was collected from email participants, and in 4.3, how data was collected from authors of plays and filmscripts. Section 4.4 explains how the two new word-corpora were created, and details which searches were performed. Section 4.5 states the importance and limitations of this thesis, and section 4.6 summarises the chapter.

4.1 Research Desiderata

4.1.1 Choosing a corpus
This aim of this study is to describe MPs and DMs in Luxembourgish, to compare these with equivalents in other languages such as German and French, and to provide a data-driven analysis of their use. It was therefore decided to analyse MPs and DMs as they occur in Luxembourgish emails, plays, and film scripts.

Prior to creating two word-corpora for this thesis, consideration was given to the possible consultation of the Luxembourgish word-corpus lod.korpus\(^\text{18}\), owned by Actioun-Lëtzebuergesch. This comprises 7.8 million words, of which 60% are taken from Luxembourgish parliamentary debates, 35% literature, and 5% television transcripts. However, this corpus presented several problems that could not be overcome. Accessibility was only possible on-site, the search engine did not show examples from the TV transcripts, not enough co-text, and it is not permitted for results or quotes from the search engine to be published anywhere. Moreover, it was felt that parliamentary debates were not appropriate because they were not authentic, as the transcripts of the spoken speeches undergo some changes of sentence structure, text flow and vocabulary in the transcription to print. Further alterations are then suggested for inclusion by one quarter of the

---

\(^{18}\) I would like to thank Ralph Fichtner (Institut Grand-Ducal) for helping me access the lod.korpus onsite and providing me with all the information I needed.
deputies and one half of the ministers (Claire Garçon-Wio, personal communication to me).

Taking into account that MPs and DMs are a feature of language of proximity (cf. sub-section 2.7.5 above), the present dissertation uses two corpora of different data. The first set of data uses Luxembourgish plays and film scripts, which, although written down, reflect characteristics of the spoken register. Bruxelles et al. (1980), Vismans (1994), and Molnár (2002) have successfully used written dialogues to research MPs and/or DMs in French, Dutch and German respectively (see chapter 2 above). The second set of data to be used in the present dissertation is a corpus of Luxembourgish emails. This was felt to be an untapped source of data. Not only would this corpus be innovative in itself, it would also be highly relevant, since emails, a type of computer-mediated communication, share characteristics with both language of proximity and language of distance (see subsection 2.7.4).

4.1.2 Research questions
Based on the literature review from previous chapters, the following research questions have emerged:

1. What is the frequency per 1,000 words of MPs and DMs in Luxembourgish? This is particularly relevant in view of and in comparison with frequencies found for German MPs in Möllering (2001, 2004)\textsuperscript{19}.
2. What is the percentage of propositional meanings and non-propositional uses of MPs and DMs in Luxembourgish? This is particularly relevant in view of and in comparison with frequencies found for French DMs in Chanet (2003).
3. Which MPs in Luxembourgish are found in which sentence moods? This is particularly relevant in view of German MPs occurring in Altman’s (1987) seven basic sentence moods.
4. What are the uses of MPs and DMs in Luxembourgish?
5. Do the uses of MPs and DMs in Luxembourgish differ from the uses of their cognates in German and French?

\textsuperscript{19} The differences of the data and the limitations of the comparison are set out in subsection 4.5.2.
In order to answer these questions, two Luxembourgish text word-corpora were created and a concordancer was used to analyse MP and DMs within these corpora.

4.2 Participants for Email Data

4.2.1 Selection process
Initial email participants were selected on the basis of having sent at least one Luxembourgish email to one of my email addresses. All initial 56 participants were either native speakers of Luxembourgish or had been speaking the language since entering pre-school education. These participants were then contacted by email on Monday, 3 April 2006, where it was explained why they had been contacted, why their emails were needed, and how their emails would be used (see Appendix 1). Participants were asked to reply to the email in order to indicate whether or not they wished to participate. Throughout the course of data collection, the research was carried out in accordance with the University of Sheffield and School of Modern Languages and Linguistics ethics policy.

4.2.2 Emailers’ consent
If the initial participants did not consent to take part in the study, they were thanked politely and contacted no further. When after a month some initial participants still had not replied, a further email was sent, requesting them to participate. If no interest was shown at this stage, no subsequent contact was made and those emails were eliminated.

When initial participants agreed to take part in the study, they were sent out a briefing (see Appendix 2) and consent form (see Appendix 3) in Microsoft Word format. For this, a locked form was created on which users could fill in only certain fields (e.g. name or boxes to tick). Because the form was to be received, filled out, and sent back electronically, no physical signature was necessary or possible. Instead, an 8-digit alphanumeric password (e.g. q1w2e3r4) was randomly generated for each participant. Participants were told their personal password when sent their consent form, and consent was only fully given when their password entered on to the consent form.
4.2.3 Participants and their emails

Out of a possible 57 participants, 22 returned a consent form (response rate: 38.59%) permitting their emails to be used anonymously in the present study: 9 participants were male and 13 were female. Regarding their emails, the oldest dated back to 21 June 2003, the latest was from 3 April 2006, and in total 407 emails were used. The male participants’ ages ranged from 26 to 59, with a median age of 31; the female participants’ ages ranged from 23 to 58, with a median age of 28. The median age including both genders is 28. Table 4.1 provides a break down of the participants’ genders and their ages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>male</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Ages of email participants according to their gender

4.3 Participants for Data on Plays

4.3.1 Selection process

Regarding the film scripts, two film directors were directly contacted by email. They were chosen because of their recent production of Luxembourgish-language feature films. As for the plays, the Luxembourgish writers’ guild (Lëtzebuerger Schrëftsteller Verband, LSV) was initially contacted by email in order to obtain a list of names and contact details for playwrights writing in Luxembourgish.

In order to increase the response rate from the playwrights, it was decided that my supervisor, Prof. Gerald Newton, would contact each of them individually via a letter on officially headed paper. In this letter (see appendix 4), the playwrights were asked to email me should they agree to submit any of their plays in electronic format.

4.3.2 Playwrights’ and directors’ consent

Obtaining consent from the playwrights (see appendix 6) was done in a similar way to that for the emailers, except for one playwright who did not have access to the Internet. Instead, a briefing and consent form was sent out in hardcopy, for which a physical signature, and no alphanumeric password, was needed.
4: Methodology

4.3.3 Participants and their texts
Out of a possible 17 (plays and film scripts) authors, 7 authors gave their consent for anonymised extracts of their plays or scripts to be published (response rate: 41.8%), and a total of 20 texts (16 plays and 4 film scripts) were submitted. Six authors were male and one was female. The male author’s ages ranged from 35 to 68 with a median age of 53. The median age of all authors was 52.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>female</th>
<th>26</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Ages of authors according to their gender

4.4 Procedure
4.4.1 Creating word corpora
Two word-corpora were created: the Luxembourgish Email Word-Corpus (hereafter shortened to LEWC) with 61,069 words, and the Luxembourgish Plays Word-Corpus (hereafter shortened to LPWC) with 208,283 words. It was decided for reasons of speed and convenience that the two corpora would be simple .txt files, with all texts one below the other. Regarding the emails, only the bodies were copy-pasted into LEWC, leaving out the email headers that include the sender, the receiver, the date, and the subject of the email. Any graphics were deleted apart from graphic emoticons (‘smileys’), which were rendered into ASCII format. Because LEWC consists of Luxembourgish emails, full sentences in other languages were excluded. This was also done when creating LPWC, where only Luxembourgish lines in the plays or the film script were kept. Stage directions outside characters’ lines of film scripts are absent from the corpus. For easy referencing, line numbers were added automatically to both corpora.

In order to guarantee the anonymity of participants in both corpora, a few anonymising measures were put into place when quoting from LEWC and LPWC. All names were anonymised by replacing all letters but the first by ‘--’, so that the name ‘Adam’ would, for example, become ‘A--’. Locations are similarly shortened to ‘==’, so the place name ‘Berlin’, for instance, would become ‘B==’. Sensitive numbers and passwords were abbreviated by three asterisks, so that
‘123456’ would become ‘***’. Workplaces and titles of books, films, etc. were shortened to ‘[…]’. Finally, when possible, the gender of the speakers remains undisclosed, and instead of using ‘he’ or ‘she’ the generic pronoun ‘they’ is used.

4.4.2 Instrument to analyse the word corpora

In order to analyse MPs and DMs, four aspects were taken into consideration for choosing the right analysis tool. Firstly, it was decided that generated key-word in context (KWIC) concordances of individual tokens of the selected words would be helpful, as each list would legibly and quickly indicate a necessary co-text for each relevant lexical item, in order to determine whether or not they were being used propositionally or non-propositionally. Secondly, it was predicted that the spelling of the MPs and DMs would sometimes deviate from the official orthography, so it would be necessary to generate a wordlist for LEWC and LPWC in order to log spelling deviations\(^{20}\). Thirdly, in the initial stages of the project, it was intended to compare the use of MPs and emoticons in emails. For this, it would have been necessary to use a concordancer capable of generating lists of non-alphanumerical strings, such as the ‘smiley’ :-). Finally, software user-friendliness was desired for proficient work levels.

After trying out and testing web-based and free operating system-based concordancers, it was decided to use the software Oxford WordSmith Tools 4.0 (Scott 2008) as it could generate wordlists necessary to detect variant spellings of the chosen MPs and DMs\(^{21}\) and it could generate concordances for MPs, DMs, and emoticons\(^{22}\). Furthermore, I had already used WordSmith Tools for a previous research project (Krummes 2006), so the necessary knowledge of and expertise in using the software already pre-existed.

4.4.3 Queries and calculations in WordSmith Tools

All queries in WordSmith Tools were categorised into four main sections: MPs found in LEWC, DMs found in LEWC, MPs found in LPWC, and DMs found in

\(^{20}\) No claim is made knowing whether participants and authors intentionally or unintentionally deviate from the official orthography.

\(^{21}\) By doing this, it was, for instance, found that eben was also realised as eeben, and roueg as rouheg and rouig.

\(^{22}\) Researching emoticons eventually fell outside the range of this thesis; the decision to use WordSmith Tools nonetheless remained unchanged.
LEWC. It was decided that concordances of the following MPs were to be carried out: *alt*, *awer*, *dach*, *dann* (and *da*), *eben* (and *ebe*), *emol* (and *mol*), *jo*, *roueg*, and *zwar*.

For the DMs, it was decided that concordances of the following DMs were to be carried out: *bon*, *ben*, *enfin*, *héier* (and *héliert*), *lauschter* (and *lauschttert*), *ma*, *mä bon*, *okay* (and *OK*), *so* (and *sot*), and *sou* (and *esou*).

Subsequently, a concordance was generated for each MP and DM alongside its variant spellings. Each word was tested whether or not it had any MP/DM characteristics summarised in section 2.5: occurrence in the middle-field for MPs and sentence/clause-externally for DMs, no contribution towards the propositional meaning of the utterance, impossible to be topicalised. Moreover, they could also be replaced by another MP or DM. If they failed this series of formal and functional tests, the search items were assigned to the propositional meaning word-category. Not counted in the list of search items were items quoted from other people, as were words from other languages (*dach* is an MP in Luxembourgish, but *Dach* means ‘roof’ in German), or deviant spellings (*ma* as a contracted form of *maachen* ‘to make, do’).

Each search item was then counted, which provided a percentage count of any propositional meanings and non-propositional uses that a given word may have (similar to Chanet 2003). The quantitative data is found in chapter 5, where the frequency per 1,000 words for each MP and DM (similar to Möllering 2001, 2004) is calculated. Moreover, chapter 5 reveals the proportions of propositional and non-propositional occurrences of each search item. A full qualitative analysis of MPs follows in chapter 6 and a qualitative analysis of DMs follows in chapter 7. Both chapter 6 and 7 provide examples of propositional meanings and non-propositional uses. Examples are provided from both LEWC and LPWC.

**4.5 Importance and Limitations**

*4.5.1 Importance of the present study*

The main aim of the present study is to provide an in-depth description of modal particles and discourse markers as they occur in Luxembourgish emails, plays,
and film scripts. The applications for such knowledge will be found in the provision of more comprehensive descriptions in grammars, dictionaries, and other learning materials.

Secondly, the existence of two word-corpora would encourage their use in further research. Once the word-corpora have served the purposes of the present dissertation, they will be published in anonymised form for easy public access, enabling other researchers to search LEWC and LPWC and quote passages from the corpora.

Thus the people targeted as beneficiaries from this study are primarily linguists and others concerned with teaching and learning Luxembourgish.

4.5.2 Limitations of the present study

The main limits to the present study lie in the word-corpora themselves. The Luxembourgish language analysed here is the language of written emails, plays, and film scripts; no naturally occurring spoken Luxembourgish (such as dialogues) was analysed or recorded for this study.\(^{23}\) Although Möllering (2001, 2004) analysed MPs occurring in spoken and written texts and Chanet (2003) examined DMs in speech, previous studies of MPs have already been analysed with corpora using written texts and scripts (cf. Vismans 1994, Molnár 2002). This study therefore aims only to describe MPs and DMs that can be found in the informal written medium of emails and in the idealised (and fictional) language of plays and film scripts, which attempts to reflect speech.

Another limitation of this study is the size of the word-corpora used. Whereas Möllering (2004) and Chanet (2003) use word-corpora totalling 1,594,000 words and 450,000 words respectively, this study, in comparison, uses word-corpora totalling slightly over a quarter of a million words. However, the size of LEWC is comparable to Frehner’s email word-corpus of 45,000 words (Frehner 2008).

\(^{23}\) Jaffe (2007) comments that a transcript of ‘verbal interactions would nevertheless be “reduced” to a written transcript and would therefore be a representation of spoken language’ (author’s emphasis).
The time constraints in which the research has been carried out can thus present the readers with results from two modestly-sized word-corpora of non-spoken texts.

Because this study is corpus-based, it is possible that the MP/DM uses described in chapter 6 and 7 respectively are not the only ones uttered by speakers. Speakers of Luxembourgish might use pragmatic markers, which are not found outside of spontaneous spoken language. This thesis only concentrates on data from LEWC and LPWC, however, and any other pragmatic marker uses found in spoken Luxembourgish are to be considered for future research.

### 4.6 Summary of Chapter

It was always the intention of this project to study modal particles and discourse markers in Luxembourgish on an empirical basis. This led to the establishment of LEWC, the Luxembourgish Email Word-Corpus (61,069 words), and LPWC, the Luxembourgish Plays Word-Corpus (208,283 words). In order to distinguish modal particles and discourse markers efficiently from their propositional counterparts, key-word in context concordances were generated with the software WordSmith Tools. Quantitative and qualitative analyses of the data obtained appear in the following chapters.
5.0 Introduction

This chapter aims to provide a quantitative analysis of the modal particles and discourse markers as found in the word-corpora LEWC (61,069 words) and LPWC (208,283 words). In 5.1, the frequency per 1,000 words of the MPs studied are revealed, and their occurrence proportional to their counterparts. A summary of these frequencies and proportions is presented in section 5.2. In 5.3, the frequency per 1,000 words of the DMs and their proportional occurrences are given. Section 5.4 presents a summary of these frequencies and proportions. Section 5.5 summarises this chapter.

5.1 Analysis of MPs

5.1.1 The MP alt

a) alt in LEWC

The MP alt is found 39 times in LEWC, with one occurrence where the MP is spelt as <allt>. No propositional use of alt is found, giving a 100% score as an MP. The frequency per 1,000 words for alt is 0.64.

b) alt in LPWC

As in LEWC, alt is found only as an MP, thus giving it a non-propositional occurrence of 100%. The MP is found 47 times in the word-corpus and its frequency per 1,000 words is 0.23.

5.1.2 The MP awer

a) awer in LEWC

The word awer can be found 248 times in LEWC, but only 69 occurrences correspond to its use as an MP, which makes up 27.82% of awer. As for the propositional meaning of awer, 168 occurrences are adverbial in use and make up 67.74% of all occurrences. The remaining 4.44% are provided by 11 instances where awer is used as a conjunction. The frequency per 1,000 words of the MP awer is 1.13.
b)  *awer* in LPWC

In the analysis in LPWC, *awer* was eliminated when the character in question was quoting someone else, or where there was an ungrammatical reduplication (*awer rawer*). The word is found 812 times; 44 occurrences are MPs, which is considerably less than in LEWC and only 5.42%. As a contrast, the adversative adverb is found 419 times (88.55%). A further use is found in a stressed adverb corresponding to the German *trotzdem* occurs 41 times (5.05%). The last use of *awer* is found only 8 times (0.99%) and occurs after greetings to mean ‘by the way’, or to remind the hearer they have not yet offered a greeting: *Moien awer* ‘Hello by the way’. The frequency per 1,000 words of the MP *awer* is 0.21.

5.1.3 The MP *dach*

a)  *dach* in LEWC

*Dach* is found 27 times, of which 17 are MPs (62.96%) and 10 are answer particles (37.04%). The frequency of the MP *dach* per 1,000 words is 0.28.

b)  *dach* in LPWC

In LPWC, <dach> was eliminated when the character in question was quoting another person and when the word meant ‘roof’ in German. After this elimination, *dach* was found 616 times, of which the non-propositional use made up 566 occurrences (91.88%). This is followed by the use of *dach* as an answering particle, which is found 33 times (5.36%). *Dach* is also used 16 times as a conjunction (2.60%) and once as a stressed adverb similar to German *trotzdem* ‘nevertheless’ (0.16%). The frequency per 1,000 words for the MP *dach* in LPWC is 2.72.

5.1.4 The MP *dann*

a)  *dann* in LEWC

*Dann* or *da* is found 655 times in LEWC, of which 71 occurrences are MPs found in questions (10.84%). Another 18 occurrences make up MPs found at the beginning of sentences (2.75%). The temporal adverbial use makes up the rest with 86.41% (566 occurrences). The frequency per 1,000 words for the MPs in question is 1.16, whereas the one for MPs at the beginning of sentences is 0.29.
b) *dann* in LPWC

In LPWC, *<da>* was eliminated from the analysis when occurring in the cluster *da’s* ‘that is’, when it was meant as *dat* ‘that’, German *da* ‘there’, Portuguese or Spanish *da* ‘from, of’, and when it was meant as *dajee* ‘c’mon’. In total, 1,724 occurrences of *dann* and *da* are found. As for MPs, 592 are found in questions, making up 34.34%. At the beginning of sentences, the MP *dann* is found 106 times (6.15%), whereas the temporal adverb account for 1,026 occurrences (59.51%). The frequency per 1,000 words for the MPs in questions is 2.84, whereas the one for MPs at the beginning of sentences is 0.51.

5.1.5 The MP *eben*

a) *eben* in LEWC

*Eben* is found in LEWC, together with *ebe* and *eeben*, 33 times, of which 32 instances are MPs (96.97%) and 1 occurrence is the answer particle (3.03%). The frequency per 1,000 words for this MP is 0.52.

b) *eben* in LPWC

In LPWC, *eben* appears alongside *ebe* 89 times; examples where the dramatic character quotes another character were removed from the results. As an MP, *eben* is found 83 times (93.26%), and as an answer particle *ebe* appears 6 times (6.74%). The frequency of the MP *eben* per 1,000 words is 0.40.

5.1.6 The MP *emol*

a) *emol* in LEWC

*Emol* is found 53 times in LEWC, whereas *mol* and its spelling variant *<mool>* are found 259 and 26 times respectively. In total, there are 51 MP instances of *mol* and *emol* (15.09%). Of these, 7 instances are found to be ambiguous and can be interpreted as either an MP or an adverb (2.09%). As an adverb, *mol* and *emol* is found 279 times in the corpus (82.54%). Finally, there is one occurrence of *mol* used as a (multiplication) conjunction meaning ‘times’ (0.30%). The frequency per 1,000 words of the unambiguous MP *emol* and *mol* is 0.84.
b) *emol* in LPWC

In LPWC, *<emol>* was removed when it is intended as *eemol* ‘once’ and *<Mol>* was removed when it means ‘instances, x number of times’. In total, *emol* and *mol* appear 378 times, of which 130 instances are found to be MPs (34.39%) and 237 are adverbs (62.70%). As a conjunction, *mol* is found 11 times (2.91%). The frequency per 1,000 words for the MP is 0.62.

5.1.7 The MP *jo*

a) *jo* in LEWC

In total, *jo* is found 342 times, of which 250 instances are MPs (73.10%), 88 instances are answer particles (25.73%), and 4 are quotative particles (1.17%). The frequency per 1,000 words of the MP *jo* is 4.09.

b) *jo* in LPWC

In LPWC, *<jo>* was eliminated when it was meant as the DM *majo* ‘well’. In total, *jo* is found 1,045 times, of which 748 instances are MPs (71.58%), 296 instances are answer particles (28.33%), and 1 is a quotative particle (0.10%). The frequency per 1,000 words of the MP *jo* is 3.59.

5.1.8 The MP *roueg*

a) *roueg* in LEWC

*Roueg* is found 8 times in total including a spelling variant *<rouheg>*. The MP is found 7 times (87.50%) and the adjective is found once (12.25%). The frequency per 1,000 words of the MP *roueg* is 0.11.

b) *roueg* in LPWC

*Roueg* is found 113 times in total including the spelling variants *<rouheg>* and *<rouig>*. The MP is found 43 times (38.05%) and the adjective is found 70 times (61.95%). Its frequency of the MP *roueg* per 1,000 words is 0.21.
5.1.9 The MP zwar

a) zwar in LEWC

In total, zwar is found 46 times, with 18 MP instances (39.13%), 16 instances with the adverbial meaning of ‘(al)though’ (34.78%), and 12 instances in the cluster an zwar ‘namely’ (26.09%). The frequency per 1,000 words of the MP zwar is 0.29.

b) zwar in LPWC

In total, zwar is found 26 times; taking into account that German zwar had to be removed. There are 2 instances where zwar is an MP (7.69%), 19 instances where it has the adverbial meaning (73.08%). 4 instances are found in the cluster an zwar (15.38%), and 1 instance is found in the cluster <zwar nēt> ‘oh no, it isn’t’ (3.84%). The frequency per 1,000 words of the MP zwar is 0.01.

5.2 Summary of MPs

5.2.1 Percentages of MPs

Table 5.1 below displays the propositional and non-propositional proportions for each MP found in LEWC and LPWC. Each word shows its propositional meaning(s) and its non-propositional use(s) alongside its proportions found in LEWC and LPWC. Further comments regarding the proportions are found below the table.
### Table 5.1 Propositional and non-propositional distributions of MPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP</th>
<th>meaning &amp; use</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>alt</strong></td>
<td>non-propositional MP</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>67.74%</td>
<td>88.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>awer stressed adverb</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘by the way’</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-propositional MP</td>
<td>27.82%</td>
<td>5.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dach</strong></td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answering particle</td>
<td>37.04%</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stressed adverb</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-propositional MP</td>
<td>62.96%</td>
<td>91.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dann</strong></td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>temporal adverb</td>
<td>86.41%</td>
<td>59.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-propositional MP</td>
<td>10.84%</td>
<td>34.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MP in middle field</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eben</strong></td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answer particle</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>6.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-propositional MP</td>
<td>96.97%</td>
<td>93.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(e)mol</strong></td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>82.54%</td>
<td>62.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>2.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ambiguous MP/adverb</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-propositional MP</td>
<td>15.09%</td>
<td>34.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>jo</strong></td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answer particle</td>
<td>25.73%</td>
<td>28.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-propositional MP</td>
<td>73.10%</td>
<td>71.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>roueg</strong></td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
<td>61.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-propositional MP</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>38.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zwar</strong></td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>34.78%</td>
<td>73.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an zwar</td>
<td>26.09%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zwar net</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-propositional MP</td>
<td>39.13%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the distributions of modal particles and their counterparts, *eben*, *roueg*, *jo*, and *dach* occur more frequently in LEWC as modal particles (%62.96%) rather than as their non-propositional counterparts. Similarly, *eben*, *jo*, and *dach* occur...
more frequently in LPWC as modal particles (≥ 71.58%) rather than their non-propositional counterparts. In both word-corpora, alt is always used as a modal particle, which suggests that it does not have any propositional counterpart. For awer, dach and zwar, there are more propositional meanings found in LPWC than in LEWC. Within the propositional meanings, it is worth noting that, overall, adverbs or answering particles are more frequent than any other propositional counterpart. The adverb awer, for instance, is more frequently used than the conjunction awer.

5.2.2 Frequencies of MPs

Table 5.2 below displays the frequencies per 1,000 words of the nine investigated MPs (in alphabetical order) in LEWC and LPWC. To compare these frequencies with German, Möllering’s (2004) frequencies are added as well. In comparison with Möllering, the frequencies of the Luxembourgish particles found in the two word-corpora are lower. There are two exceptions: roueg in LPWC has a slightly higher frequency than German ruhig in Möllering (2004) and German halt has a lower frequency than Luxembourgish alt in the email word-corpus. This might suggest that alt and halt are not the same MPs, especially if alt, unlike German halt, has no propositional counterpart. Note that zwar is found as a modal particle in Luxembourgish, but does not exist in German.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
<th>Möllering (2004)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alt</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>halt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awer</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>aber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dach</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>doch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dann</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>denn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eben</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>eben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)mol</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>mal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ja</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roueg</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>ruhig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zwar</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Frequency per 1,000 words of MPs

Tables 5.3 and 5.4 below display the same information as in table 5.2 above, but provides a ranking of the Luxembourgish frequencies in descending order. Whereas table 5.3 shows the ranking of the MP frequencies in LEWC, table 5.4 shows the ranking of the frequencies in LPWC. The most frequent modal particles
in LEWC are *jo*, *awer*, *dach*, and *(e)mol*, whereas the most frequent modal particles in LPWC are *jo*, *dach*, and *mol*. In comparison to Möllering (2004), most of the frequencies lie below 1.0; however, the first three in German are the same as in Luxembourgish emails, even though the frequencies are different: *ja*, *aber*, and *mal*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
<th>Möllering (2004)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. jo</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1. ja 19.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. awer</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3. aber 5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>(e)mol</em></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>4. mal 4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>alt</em></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>17. <em>halt</em> 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>eben</em></td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>9. <em>eben</em> 2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <em>dann</em></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>7. <em>denn</em> 2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>zwar</em></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <em>dach</em></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>5. <em>doch</em> 3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <em>roueg</em></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>21. <em>ruhig</em> 0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 Ranking of MP frequencies in LEWC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>Möllering (2004)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>dach</em></td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>5. <em>doch</em> 3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>(e)mol</em></td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4. <em>mal</em> 4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>dann</em></td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>7. <em>denn</em> 2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>eben</em></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>9. <em>eben</em> 2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <em>alt</em></td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>17. <em>halt</em> 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>awer</em></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3. <em>aber</em> 5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <em>roueg</em></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>21. <em>ruhig</em> 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <em>zwar</em></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 Ranking of MP frequencies in LPWC

Tables 5.3 and 5.4 only provide a comparison between the different frequencies, however, in order compare how different the frequencies differ between the corpora is more viable to calculate the proportionate distance in percentage. To to this, for each MP, the lowest frequency is divided by the highest one, multiplied by 100, and the result is subtracted by 100. The higher that percentage, the bigger there is a difference between the usage of the MP in the corpora. A ranking of these proportionate differences is found in table 5.5 below.
By comparing the Luxembourgish frequencies in the two corpora, *jo*, *eben*, *(e)mol*, *dann*, and *roueg* show similarities between the two corpora. The MP *jo* shows the least frequent distance between the corpora with a difference of 12.22%. The first three MPs also coincide with the MPs that share the same frequential ranking in both corpora: *jo* is the most frequent in LEWC and LPWC, *(e)mol* is 3rd, and *eben* is 5th in both corpora.

The MPs presenting bigger differences between the corpora are *alt*, *awer*, *dach*, and *zwar*, with *zwar* showing a difference in percentage of 96.55%. Further research needs to be carried out to explain the different frequencies between the MPs, especially the last four ones. It may be that there is an association between their usage and the ages of email speakers and plays’ authors, which might be particularly relevant to the MP *zwar*. The overall median age of emailers is 28, whereas the median age of the authors is 52. An explanation could lie in the text genres; whereas email tend to be spontaneously produced, authors would spend more time on their creative writing. This would also tie in with *zwar* being used in exclamations (see 6.10.2), which might be more spontaneous than intentional.

However, what motivates author is not obvious, so it is worth keeping in mind that the plays and filmscripts are ‘artistic’ texts, shaped by their authors.

The following section reveals the quantitative data of DMs and their propositional counterparts in LEWC and LPWC.
5.3 Analysis of DMs

5.3.1 The DM ben

a) *ben* in LEWC

*Ben* is found 6 times in LEWC and all occurrences are DMs (100%). The frequency per 1,000 words is 0.10.

b) *ben* in LPWC

*Ben* is found 4 times in LEWC, again all occurrences are DMs (100%). The frequency per 1,000 words is 0.02.

5.3.2 The DM bon

a) *bon* in LEWC

There are 25 instances of *bon* in LEWC, all of them used as a DM. The frequency per 1,000 words is 0.41.

b) *bon* in LPWC

*Bon* was removed from the concordances where it had been used in French sentences. This left 26 instances of *bon* in LPWC, of which 19 are DMs (73.08%). 5 are found in the cluster *ah bon* ‘really?, oh yeah?’ (19.23%), and 2 instances of *bon* are found in the cluster *bon sens* ‘common sense’ (7.69%). The frequency per 1,000 words for the DM is 0.09.

5.3.3 The DM enfin

a) *enfin* in LEWC

There are 6 instances of *enfin* found in LEWC, all of these used as a DM. The word frequency per 1,000 words is 0.10.

b) *enfin* in LPWC

There is only 1 instance found in LPWC, which is used as the adverb meaning ‘finally’.
5.3.4 The DM héliert(t)
a) héliert(t) in LEWC
In searching for this DM the forms with and without diacritics were checked for: <hélier> and <heier>, and <héliert> and <heier>. 5 instances are found of hélier ‘listen: singular’ or héliert ‘listen: plural’, of which 3 instances were the DM hélier (60%). Thus no instance was found with the plural suffix –t. The remaining 2 instances were used as the verb meaning ‘hear’ (40%). The frequency per 1,000 words for the DM is 0.05.

b) héliert(t) in LPWC
In LPWC, the query included looking up hélier and héliert with and without diacritics. 67 instances were found, but only 1 corresponding to a DM (1.49%). As in LEWC, this DM is hélier, deriving from the singular ‘hear’. The remaining 66 instances have the verbal use. The frequency per 1,000 words is 0.005.

5.3.5 The DM lauschtter(t)
a) lauschtter(t) in LEWC
There are 6 instances of lauschtter or lauschttert in LEWC, of which 1 is the DM with the singular form lauschtter (16.67%). The other 5 instances are the verb meaning ‘listen’ (83.33%). The frequency per 1,000 words for the DM is 0.02.

b) lauschtter(t) in LPWC
In LPWC, lauschtter was looked up along with lauschttert and the spelling variant <lauschtter>. Out of a total of 46 instances, 8 were DMs, including both singular and plural form (17.39%), and 38 were verbs (82.61%). The frequency per 1,000 words for the DM is 0.04.

5.3.6 The DM ma
a) ma in LEWC
<Ma> was removed from the concordances when it was meant as French ma ‘my’, Luxembourgish maach(en) or ma(n) ‘make, do’, and the acronym M.A. All of the remaining 50 instances of ma found in LPWC are DMs, and the frequency per 1,000 words is 0.82.
b) \textit{ma} in LPWC

Similar to LEWC, \textless ma\textgreater{} was removed when it was meant as French \textit{ma}, Luxembourgish \textit{maach\(\text{en}\)}, and also as Italian \textit{ma} ‘but’. Of the 170 instances found, 8 are adversative conjunctions (4.71\%) and 162 are DMs (95.29\%). The frequency per 1,000 words of the DM \textit{ma} is 0.78.

5.3.7 \textit{The DM mä bon}

a) \textit{mä bon} in LEWC

\textit{Mä bon} is found 21 times in LEWC spelt as \textless mee bon\textgreater{}. It is always used as a DM. The word frequency per 1,000 words for this DM is 0.34.

b) \textit{mä bon} in LPWC

In LPWC, \textit{mä bon} is not found at all.

5.3.8 \textit{The DM ok(ay)}

a) \textit{ok(ay)} in LEWC

Along with various variants in capitalisation, \textit{okay} and \textit{OK} are found 63 times in LEWC. There are 45 instances of DM use (71.43\%), and the other 18 instances are adjectives (28.57\%). The frequency per 1,000 words of the DM is 0.74.

b) \textit{ok(ay)} in LPWC

In LPWC, \textit{ok} and \textit{okay} are found 19 times, of which 16 instances are DMs (84.12\%) and 3 are adjectives (15.79\%). The frequency per 1,000 words of the DM is 0.08.

5.3.9 \textit{The DM so(t)}

a) \textit{so(t)} in LEWC

In the concordance for LEWC, \textless so\textgreater{} was discounted when it was intended as English \textit{so}, German \textit{so} ‘so’, and when \textless so\textgreater{} was a mis-entry for \textless si\textgreater{} ‘they, she’. As for \textit{sot}, another spelling variant is \textless soot\textgreater{}. There are 99 instances of \textit{so} and \textit{sot}, of which 13 are DMs (13.13\%) with 12 \textit{so} (singular form) and 1 \textit{sot} (plural form).

\textsuperscript{24}This discrepancy could be explained by speakers preferring \textless mee\textgreater{} to \textless mä\textgreater{} as \textless mee\textgreater{} reflects the Luxembourgish pronunciation of the conjunction /me\(\text{e}\)/. This is different from /me\(\text{a}\)/, the French pronunciation of the conjunction \textit{mais}. Another explanation could be that characters with diacritics are less easily produced on a computer than characters without.
The remainder comprises 86 instances which have verbal meaning (86.87%). The frequency per 1,000 words of the DM is 0.21.

b) \textit{so(t)} in LPWC
In the concordance for LPWC, <so> was removed when it was meant as English \textit{so}, German \textit{so} ‘so’, and when <so> was meant to be \textit{(e)sou} ‘so’. As in LEWC, \textit{sot} is found with another spelling variant <sot>. There are 513 instances of \textit{so} and \textit{sot}, of which 53 are DMs (10.33%). The remaining 460 instances have a verbal meaning (89.67%). The frequency per 1,000 words of the DM is 0.25.

5.3.10 The DM \textit{(e)sou}

a) \textit{(e)sou} in LEWC
Both variants \textit{esou} and \textit{sou} were looked up and a total of 539 were found. There are 33 examples of DM use (6.12%) and the remaining 393 are adverbs (93.88%). The frequency per 1,000 words of the DM is 0.54.

b) \textit{(e)sou} in LPWC
There are 1,058 instances of \textit{esou}, \textit{sou} and its variant <so> in LPWC, of which only 19 are DMs (1.80%) and the remaining 1,039 are adverbs (98.20%). The frequency per 1,000 words is 0.09.

5.4 Summary of DMs

5.4.1 Percentages of DMs
Table 5.5 below displays the propositional and non-propositional proportions for each DM found in LEWC and LPWC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>meaning &amp; use</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
<th>Chanet (2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ben</td>
<td>non-propositional DM</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ah bon</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bon sens</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bon</td>
<td>non-propositional DM</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>73.08%</td>
<td>86.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>héier(t)</td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>98.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>verb</td>
<td></td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lauschter(t)</td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>82.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>verb</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mä bon</td>
<td>non-propositional DM</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ok(ay)</td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so(t)</td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.87%</td>
<td>89.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>verb</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)sou</td>
<td>propositional</td>
<td></td>
<td>93.88%</td>
<td>98.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td></td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6 Propositional and non-propositional distributions of DMs

In terms of the distributions of discourse markers and their counterparts, ok(ay) and héier(t) appear more frequently in LEWC as DMs (≥ 60%) than their non-propositional counterparts. In LPWC, ok(ay) and bon appear more frequently as discourse markers (≥ 73.08%) than as their non-propositional counterparts.

With the exception of okay and héier(t) in LEWC, DMs with Germanic roots are more frequently used with their propositional meaning than non-propositionally: lauschter(t), for example, has a propositional proportion of 83.33%/82.61%,
whereas its non-propositional proportion is 16.67%/17.39%. Conversely, French/Romance DMs are rarely, if at all, used with a propositional meaning. *Ma*, for instance, occurs only as a DM in LEWC, and has a small propositional proportion in LPWC.

5.4.2 Frequencies of DMs

Table 5.6 below displays in alphabetical order the frequencies per 1,000 words of the ten investigated DMs in LEWC in LPWC. The Luxembourgish frequencies of *bon* and *enfin* are compared with the French ones in Chanet (2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
<th>Chanet (2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ben</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bon</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>héier(t)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lauschter(t)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mä bon</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ok(ay)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so(t)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)sou</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 Frequency per 1,000 words of DMs

In comparison with Chanet (2003), whose research finds *bon* occurring at a frequency of 4.05 per 1,000 words, the frequency of *bon* is 0.41 in LEWC and 0.09 in LPWC. As for *enfin*, Chanet’s frequency per 1,000 words is 2.25, whereas it is 0.10 in LEWC and 0.004 in LPWC. This striking difference of frequencies between one language and another could either be explained by the difference of medium in the corpora (spoken versus non-spoken) or *bon* and *enfin* having a reduced frequency of use in Luxembourgish because of their non-Germanic origins. This would require further research, certainly including an analysis of spoken Luxembourgish.

Tables 5.8 and 5.9 below display the same information as in table 5.7 above, but provide a ranking of the Luxembourgish frequencies in descending order. Whereas table 5.8 shows the ranking of the DM frequencies in LEWC, table 5.9 shows the ranking of the frequencies in LPWC.
Table 5.8 Ranking of DM frequencies in LEWC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
<th>Chanet (2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ma</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ok(ay)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (e)sou</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. bon</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. mä bon</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. so(t)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 7. enfin</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 7. ben</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. héier(t)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. lauschter(t)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9 Ranking of DM frequencies in LPWC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>Chanet (2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ma</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. so(t)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 3. bon</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 3. (e)sou</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ok(ay)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. lauschter(t)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ben</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. héier(t)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 9. enfin</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 9. mä bon</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discourse marker *ma* is by far the most frequent in both word-corpora and its frequencies per 1,000 words are very close: 0.82 in LEWC and 0.78 in LPWC. Whereas the DM frequencies in LEWC decrease gradually from 0.82 to 0.02, this is not the case for the frequencies in LPWC, where one notices an abrupt fall in frequency between *ma* at 0.78 and *so(t)*, the second most frequent DM at 0.25. This suggests that the DM *ma* is of particular interest in Luxembourgish.

Similar to table 5.5, table 5.10 below reveals the proportionate distance in percentage for each DM between LEWC and LPWC.
Whereas table 5.5 showed a roughly equal distribution of MPs that revealed a short frequential distance between the two corpora, table 5.10 shows that apart from *ma* and *so(t)*, all the other DMs have proportional distance greater than 50%.

To account for the difference in usage for the DMs with French origins, the use *bon*, *ben*, *enfin*, and *mä bon* could be explained by difference in usage between the recent developments employed by the statistically younger emailers of LEWC, and the absence of these forms amongst the statistically older authors of LPWC. Alternatively, these DMs might be perceived by the authors as too ‘French’. The higher frequency of the DM *ma* might suggest to be perceived as less ‘French’.

The two DMs *lauschter(t)* and *héier(t)* figuring towards the bottom of the ranking in tables 5.8 and 5.9. could be explained that their function is not particularly relevant in an email and they are not exploited enough in emails and plays; they might be found with greater frequency in spontaneously spoken Luxembourgish. Clearly, this needs to be investigated further with a possible addition of such a corpus of spontaneously spoken Luxembourgish.

### Table 5.10 Proportionate distances between the DMs in the corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>distance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ma</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. so(t)</td>
<td>16.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. lauschter(t)</td>
<td>57.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. bon</td>
<td>77.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ben</td>
<td>80.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (e)sou</td>
<td>83.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ok(ay)</td>
<td>89.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. héier(t)</td>
<td>90.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. enfin</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. mä bon</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Summary of Chapter

This chapter reveals a similar ranking of modal particle frequencies in both the Luxembourgish data and in Möllering (2004). In terms of proportions, *dach*, *eben*, *jo*, and *roueg* occur more often as modal particles than as their propositional counterparts. The modal particle *alt* was found to have no propositional counterpart. The modal particle *zwar*, non-existent in German, occurs more frequently in the email corpus than in the plays corpus, which suggests a more
recent usage associated with younger speakers found in the Luxembourgish Email Word-Corpus.

As for the discourse markers, *ma* is by far the most frequently used in Luxembourgish. The quantitative data also reveals a difference between discourse markers of Germanic origin and discourse markers of Romance origins. The propositional counterparts of Germanic discourse markers occur more often than the DMs, whereas Romance discourse markers have no propositional counterparts whatsoever, except for *enfin*. Since the discourse markers *enfin* and *mä bon* are not found in the Luxembourgish Plays Word-Corpus, it may be that the authors do not consider these markers to be ‘Luxembourgish’ discourse markers, or that the use of *enfin* and *mä bon* is associated with younger speakers of Luxembourgish. Author motivation and speaker motivation to use or avoid a specific MP/DM are a complex issue, which can be mentioned in this thesis, however, is not pursued as a research question.
6: Qualitative Analysis of MPs

6.0 Introduction
This chapter aims to provide a qualitative analysis of the modal particles found in LEWC and LPWC: *alt, awer, dach, dann, eben, (e)mol, jo, roueg* and *zwar*. The first subsection for each search item covers the propositional meanings, whereas the second subsection covers the non-propositional uses. For items that have no propositional meanings, such as *alt*, there is only one subsection. The search item, whether propositional or non-propositional, is highlighted in bold. As already pointed out in subsection 4.4.2, the spelling might deviate from the official orthography: the ‘mistakes’ in the examples are original ‘mistakes’. With the exception of the MP *zwar*, comparisons will be drawn with German by examining Durrell (2002), from which functions are drawn from. Not all occurrences of MPs and their propositional counterparts from the data are illustrated in this chapter and the examples illustrate only the clearest functions. Section 6.10 provides a summary of this chapter.

6.1 Alt
6.1.1 Non-propositional uses
a) the MP *alt*
As already pointed out in the previous chapter, *alt* is found in both corpora only as an MP, and there is thus no propositional meaning. *Alt* is primarily used when the speaker wishes to indicate that an alternative resolution has been or can be put into action. One could speculate that *alt* is linked to the German MP *halt*; Durrell (2002: 199) describes *halt* as ‘an alternative to *eben* in some senses’. As already argued in 3.2.2, Luxembourgish *alt* is cognate with German *alles*. The German MP *halt* is therefore not Luxembourgish *alt*.

(6.1)
Ech wollt dir se kafen a schécken, mee si kréien se net méi nobestallt an amazon hat déi leschte Keier wou ech gekuckt hunn och riese Delay’en. Dofir maachen ech dir dese Weekend eng Kopie, da kriss du *alt* dei.
[I wanted you them buy and send, but they get them not anymore reordered and Amazon had the last time where I looked had also huge delays. Hence make I you this weekend a copy, then get you MP that-one.]

‘I wanted to buy it [the CD] and send it to you, but they can’t get it reordered, and the last time I had a look, Amazon[.com] had huge delays. That’s why I’ll make a copy for you this weekend, so you’ll get that one instead, then.’

(LEWC 2633-2639)

(6.2)
BTw, hues de e multizone DVD player (aka een deen och zone 4 aczepteiert) dann haett ech jo scho mol eppes. Wann net da get et alt eppes aneschters…

[By-the-way, have you a multi-zone DVD player (i.e. one that also accepts zone 4)? Because I would then have something for you. If not, you’ll get something else, then.’

(LEWC 4847-4849)

(6.3)
Ech soen der, do sin der déi schwetze mat kengem soss wéi mat mir. Wéi soll ech déi all verstoen? Da maachen ech alt wéi wann.

[I say you, there are some they speak with nobody apart like with me. How should I them all understand? Then make I MP like if.]

‘I tell you, there are some that speak with nobody else than with me. How am I expected to understand them all? I just act as if I do.’

(LPWC 28589-28591)

(6.4)
E Kuer gëtt et net, dofir zéien ech mer de Kuer alt aus de Fangeren.

[A course exists it not, hence pull I me the course MP from the fingers.]

‘There’s no course/curriculum, so I make the course up out of thin air.’

(LEWC 7444-7446)

(6.5)
Main war e bessen bloed, meng Kusine hat den Dag virdrun Mogripp, an do si mer alt rem nees doheem bei him bliwen
[Mine was e bit naff, my cousin had the day before stomach-flu, and there are we MP again again home at hers stayed]

‘[My New Year’s Eve] was a bit naff, my cousin had gastric flu the day before, so once again we stayed at home at her place.’

(LEWC 5373-5375)

The overarching use for (6.1) to (6.5) is signalling alternative. In (6.1), the speaker initially intended to buy and send a CD, but because it cannot be reordered, their second option is to make a copy of the CD and to send that one instead. The speaker in (6.2) offers to buy DVD zone 4 for the listener, but alternatively might have to buy something else, should the listener not have a zone 4-compatible DVD player. In (6.3), the speaker is not able to understand all the people he’s talking to, so instead, as a substitute, he’s pretending to understand them. In first three examples in which alt means (mnemonically) ‘alternative’, it is preceded, for instance, by da(nn) ‘then’. Sentence (6.4) uses dofir ‘hence, that’s why’. In (6.5), the speaker states the alternative option (staying at home), but the initial plan is implicit; the speaker implies that they had plans for going out on New Year’s Eve. In this example, an do ‘and there’ is used instead of dann.

As a second use, alt refers to nostalgia or reminiscence of past things. Apart from using the past tense, a particular use is soss ‘otherwise, else’.

(6.6)

wann de jekel nit déit mat senger schéissbud kommen, wir iwwerhaapt keng kiirmes méi. soss hate mer alt e puer päärdcher. lo ass ët nämmen nach dem jekel seng schéissbud.

[if the Jekel not would-do with this shooting-gallery come, would-be at-all none fair anyway. else had we MP a couple-of horsies. now is it only still the Jekel his shoot-hut.]

‘If Jack did not come with his shooting gallery, there wouldn’t be any fair at all. We used to have a couple of merry-go-rounds. Now it’s just Jack’s rifle range.’

(LPWC 16693-16695)

(6.7) Commenting on having a family meal on the day the fairground is in town:

Soss hate már alt méi Leit.
Else had we MPs more people.

‘We used to have more people around.’
(LPWC 16833)

(6.8)
Ech haat dem M1-- wéi all Joers fir Niklosdaach eppes op sei Spuerkont iwerwisen. Soss hu mer eis alt oft gesin, an ech hun him et gesoot, mee vu que dass d’M2-- net méi bei eis ass, gesi mir eis nét méi.

[I had the M1-- like all year for St-Nicolas-day something on her savings-account transferred. Else have we us MPs often seen, and I have him/her it said, but seen that that the M2-- not anymore at us is, see we us not anymore.]

‘As in every year, I have transferred something into M1--’s savings’ account for St Nicolas Day. We used to see each other more often and I told him/her that, but because M2-- is no longer with us, we don’t see each other any more.’
(LEWC 6900-6903)

As seen in the examples above, in (6.6) the speaker is longing for the time when their fairground had hobby-horses, as opposed to just a rifle range. In (6.7), the speaker is remembering a time when they had family members around, visiting on the day the fair was in town, an old Luxembourgish custom. The speaker in (6.8), on the other hand, is reminiscing about times they spent together with M1-- before the death of M2--.

A third use of alt is a connotation of casualness or mitigation, which can be found in the cluster alt emol or alt mol, as in the examples below.

(6.9)
Dem M-- seng Bomi vun 80 Joer huet souguer gekrasch, well d’Stéck si hunn hir Jugend erennert huet, wou si alt emol de Kuerf krut :o)

[The M-- her grandma of 80 year has even cried, because the piece her to her youth reminded has, where she MPs the basket got]

‘M--’s 80-year old grandma even cried because the play reminded her of her youth, when one time she was left in the lurch.’
(LEWC 3921-3925)
(6.10)
Hallo! Schreiwen dir alt mol vun der Aarbecht zreck, well ech awer hu misste reagéieren, nodeems ech hei schon haart gelaacht hun weinst dem Vindaloo Find a loo truc.

[Hello! Write you MP MP from the work back, because I MP have had-to react, after I here already loud laughed have because-of the vindaloo find a loo thingy.]

‘Hi! I’m writing back to you from work because I just had to react after laughing out loud because of your vindaloo/find-a-loo thingy.’
(LEWC 226-231)

(6.11)
Moien, ok, dat do am Titel soll eng Imitatioun vum F-- S-- sengem Accent sinn, ech soen et alt mol, falls et net offensichtlich wäer.

[Hello, ok, that there an-the title should an imitation of the F-- S-- his/hers accent be, I say it MP once, in-case it not obvious would-be.]

‘Hello, ok, the thing in the email subject-box is intended to be an imitation of F-- S--’s accent, I’m just saying in case it’s not obvious.’
(LEWC 2339-2342)

The casualness expressed in (6.9) is about how somebody broke up a relationship with M--’s grandmother, by which the speaker means that there is nothing unusual about someone being dumped, even if that person happens to be elderly. In (6.10), the speaker introduces some casualness into an email written from work. Finally, the speaker in (6.11) mitigates the fact that they are giving an explanation about the subject of their email.

Another use is found in LPWC, where the expression Da meng alt can be found eight times:

(6.12) A couple have a discussion about never being invited by another couple for dinner:

J1--: [...] Vläicht ass et dem A-- an dem J2-- egal.
P--: Wat?
J1--: Ma datt d’V-- an de M-- ni een invitéieren!
P--: Dat weess du jo net!
J1--: Da ka jo awer nach kommen!
P-- Datt si äis invitéieren? Da meng alt!
[J1--:  […] Perhaps is it to-the A-- and to-the J2--regardless.
P--:  What?
J1--:  DM that the V-- and the M-- never one invite!
P--:  That know you MP not!
J1--:  That can MP MP still come!
P--:  That they us invite? Then think MP!]

‘J1--:  […] Perhaps A-- and J2-- don’t care.
P--:  About what?
J1--:  About V-- and M-- never inviting anybody!
P--:  You don’t know that!
J1--:  Well, it could still happen!
P--:  Them inviting us? Dream on!’
(LEWC 9713-9720)

(6.13) A couple are having a game of Nine Men’s Morris:

MANN:  Remis.
FRA:  Da meng alt!

[Man:  Put-back.
Woman:  Then think MP!]

‘Man:  Mill.
Woman:  Whatever!’
(LPWC 4064-4065)

(6.14) A discussion a with person from the employment agency:

Net datt s d’op domm Gedanke këhms an och mär eng Schaff siche wëlls.
Mir kréien se all un d’Schaffen.
Da meng alt.

[Not that you on stupid thoughts come and also me a work search want. We get them all to the working. Then think MP.]

‘You haven’t got this crazy idea getting me a job as well, have you? We’ll get them all a job. As if.’
(LPWC 28455-28457)

In the three examples, the speakers saying *da meng alt* are dismissive of what the hearer is saying to them. In (6.12), P-- dismisses J--’s optimism about being invited by V-- and M--. The man in (6.13) is dismissive about the woman’s winning move at their board game, whereas in (6.14), the speaker is incredulous that everybody can get a job. *Da meng alt* is a phraseology in Luxembourgish, and
the MP alt is essential, or else the sentence is ungrammatical; da meng and meng alt cannot occur on its own.

The last example of alt is found in the two-word expression dajee alt:

(6.15)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{j} & : \quad \text{Ech maache mech elo ewech.} \\
\text{h} & : \quad \text{drénk nach äe mat. op engem bäen gäet et sech schlecht.} \\
\text{j} & : \quad \text{dajee alt. ‘t ass nit all dag kiirmes.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
[J-] & : \quad \text{I make me now away} \\
[H-] & : \quad \text{Drink more one with. on one leg goes it itself bad.} \\
[J-] & : \quad \text{go-on MP. ‘t is not all day fair.}]
\]

‘J--: I’m off now.
H--: Have one more drink. You don’t want to go off at half-cock, do you?
J--: Go on, then. It’s not every day there’s a fair in town.’
(LPWC 16740-16742)

In (6.15), dajee alt illustrates how it expresses resignation (or capitulation) in the face of a stronger argument. Similar to English, dajee means ‘go on!’, which is used to incite another person into action. As in da meng alt, dajee alt needs the MP alt to have the appropriate use.

In conclusion, the MP alt is use to express that the speaker has come up with an alternative plan, to talk about things or events from the past, to express casualness. Furthermore, alt is found in the fixed expression of incredulousness da meng alt ‘as if’ or ‘you don’t say’ and in the resigning expression dajee alt ‘go on, then’, which has already been mentioned in subsection 3.2.2 in example 3.30.

In terms of Altmann’s Grundtypen (1987: 47-48) mentioned above in subsection 2.1.5, alt is found in an Aussagesatz ‘statement’ (type 1) and the two fixed expression Da meng alt and Dajee alt have the same structure of a V-1-V-2-Imperativsatz ‘verb first, verb second imperative’ (type 4).
6.2 Awër

6.2.1 Propositional meanings

a) the adverb awër

The adverb awër is used to express the adversative, i.e. what follows is in contrast with what precedes. Whereas Luxembourgish uses only awër, German can use aber and jedoch.

(6.16)

Muer gesinn ech fir d’eischt meng Klassen. AAHH! Ech sin awër ganz optimistesch. Meng 6e ass anscheinend ganz leif [...].

[Tomorrow see I for the first my classes. AAHH! I am but very optimistic. My 6th is apparently very nice [...]]

‘Tomorrow, I’ll see my classes for the first time. Ah! I’m optimistic, though. My second year pupils are apparently very nice.’
(LEWC 5225-5227)

(6.17) Commenting on a man flirtatiously rubbing his crotch against a woman’s buttocks involved in dancing:

Keng Schimmt an der Panz!
Hatt awër och net.

[No shame in the paunch!
She but also not.]

‘No shame, has he?
She’s got none either.’
(LPWC 28171)

(6.18) P-- can smell something burning in the air:

P--: [...] Du sees, et wier kee Wierder, fir eraus ze goen… Du waars awër laang dobaussen. Hues du eppes verbrannt?
M--: Verbrannt?
P--: Dee battere Geroch kënnit bis hei hin, et erstéckt ee bal.
M--: Ale Krom. Wann eng Patrouille soll kommen, ass et bësser, et huet ee sou eppes net am Haus.
[P--:  [...] You say, it would-be no weather, for out to go... You were 

but long outside. Have you something burned?

M--:  Burned?

P--:  That bitter smell comes until here to, it suffocates one almost.

M--:  Old stuff. If a patrol should come, is it better, it has one so such 
something not in-the house.]

‘P--:  [...] You say the weather is not fit to go out. But you were a long 
time out there, weren’t you? Were you burning something?’

M--:  Burning?

P--:  That bitter smell is coming inside, I’m almost choking.

M--:  Old stuff. If a patrol’s coming along, it’s better for us not to have 
things like those in the house.’

(LPWC 25928-25930)

In (6.16), the speaker expresses optimism, despite meeting their class for the first 
time the following day, for which the speaker shows their emotion through the 
interjection AAHH!. In (6.17), the first speaker assumes that the male person in 
the couple is the only one having no shame in flirting so much, whereas the 
second speaker points out that, contrary to that assumption, the woman in the 
party is shameless as well. In (6.18), P-- points out to the hearer that despite 
having said it was bad weather for going out, the hearer did nevertheless go out.

b) the stressed adverb awer

When awer is used as a stressed adverb, it has the meaning of ‘nevertheless’ and it 
is used as a concessive to introduce a clause or a sentence the meaning of which 
contradicts what precedes. The adversativity thus still remains. German does not 
use the cognate aber, instead, it uses trotzdem ‘nevertheless’. In Luxembourgish, 
the distinction between awer ‘but’ and awer ‘nevertheless’ is that the latter form 
is stressed. It is therefore difficult to assign the meaning of awer ‘nevertheless’ to 
written Luxembourgish, since stress is usually not indicated graphically.

(6.19)

Ech hunn eng Kola gedronk, d’Fläsche ware méi kleng wéi soss. An 
awer kaschte se nach emmer dräi Krullen.

[I have a cola drunk, the bottles were more small like else. And but 
cost them still always three Krullen.]

‘I drank a Cola, the bottles were smaller than they used to be. And 
yet they still cost three Krullen [= fictional currency].
(LPWC 17640-17642)
(6.20)

I know, you have big respect here, because this not your everyday-life is. mine also not. and but...

‘I know you have a lot of respect here because this is not your everyday life. Mine neither. And yet…’
(LPWC 15408-15410)

(6.21)

Then was the food but here?

‘Then the meal was here after all, wasn’t it?’
(LPWC 11286)

In (6.19), there is an assumption that because the bottles of Cola were smaller than they used to be, they ought to be cheaper. However, the price for them is still the same. In (6.20), it is ambiguous what the assumption is. Either the speaker assumes that although the hearer has a lot of respect, the speaker has none; or the speaker assumes that although this is not their everyday life, it might nevertheless be so. Either way, an awer presents a contradiction to what has been previously said. If translated into German, an awer becomes und trotzdem. In (6.21), there is a confusing situation for the speaker about where a meal is to take place. As a response to a comment by somebody else, the speaker assumes that despite what has been said initially, a meal did take place there after all. In German, stressed doch could also be used in this sentence.

c) the conjunction awer

Similar to the adverb, the conjunction awer introduces a new clause or sentence the meaning of which is in opposition to what has been said before. All instances of the adversative conjunction awer can be replaced by mà (also spelled <mee>), derived from French mais.

[I was in the best metrics-schools, I have courses in the most-highly rated rhyme-parlour followed. I have at the most-talented troubadours private-lessons in the versification received. But until now had I yet never the occasion my talent under proof to put.]

‘I was in the best school for metrics; I went to classes in the most highly rated rhyming parlour. I received private lessons in versification from the most talented troubadours. But until now I never had the chance to demonstrate my ability.’
(LPWC 1241-1249)


[DM then, hard-workingly Swedish learn. I have today the morning Pippi Longstocking on the TV seen. Yahoo. But of-course on German.]

‘Well, then, busy learning Swedish. This morning I was watching Pippi Longstocking on TV. Yahoo. But it was in German, of course.’
(LEWC 5412-5414)

(6.24) Ech soot awer zu hinnen, ech géif awer keng *** Stonnen d’woch maachen. Mol hei een Daach mol do een Daach, ok awer net all Daach.

[I said but to them, I would but no *** hours the week make. Once here a day once there a day, ok but not all day.]

‘I told them, though, I wouldn’t do *** hours a week. A day here, a day there, that’s alright, but not every day.’
(LEWC 7046-7048)

The adversative meaning in (6.23) is illustrated by the speaker’s statement that although they have gone through some considerable training as a poet, they have never proven their skills so far. In (6.23), the speaker brings up the context of learning the Swedish language and watching Pippi Longstocking. Their use of awer indicates that despite the television series having originally been produced in Swedish, the episode the speaker watched was dubbed in German. As for (6.24),
the speaker wants to make clear that although they are happy to work every so often, they have no intention of working every day, as others might want them to do.

### 6.2.2 Non-propositional uses

#### a) ‘by the way’ awer

The first non-propositional use of awer is the DM with the use of ‘by the way’ and indicates that the speaker should have said something to the hearer earlier on in the conversation. This use is not documented in German.

(6.25)

| J--: | Kann ee wuel soen! (seet dem P-- Bonjour) Salü awer! |
| P--: | Salü J--! Dat gëtt et dach net! (D’A-- gëtt dem P-- dräi Beessen) |
| A--: | ‘n Owend awer! |
| P--: | Salü A--! |

[J--: Can one well say! (says the P-- hello) hello but! |
P--: Hi J--! That exists it MP not! (The A-- gives the P-- three pecks) |
A--: [good] evening but! |
P--: Hello A--!]

‘J--: You can say that! (Says Hi! to P--) Hi, by the way! |
P--: Hi J--! Impossible! (A-- gives P-- three kisses.) |
A--: Evening, by the way! |
P--: Hi A--!’ |
(LPWC 10558-10562)

In (6.25), both J-- and A-- say ‘hi’ to P-- followed by awer, because P-- started to talk without previously greeting them.

(6.26)

| L--: | Ech man äis als schon en Aperitif. Schampes pur oder Kir, M1--? |
| [L-- prepares and serves the drinks while J--, M1--, M2--, and L-- talk] |
| M2--: | Prost awer! |

[L--: I make us MP already an aperitif. Champagne pure or kir, M1--? |
[...] |
M2--: Cheers but!]
‘L--: I’ll get us a quick aperitif. Pure Champagne or a kir, M1--?

M2--: Cheers, by the way!’

(LPWC 18870-18898)

Awer is used in (6.26) because M2-- had no opportunity of raising their drinks for a toast, since the characters were talking to each other. In both examples above, awer seems to imply a reproach: in (6.25) A-- reproaches P-- for not greeting A-- properly, and in (6.26) M2—mildly reproaches the others present for not taking the time to raise a toast.

b) the MP awer

Durrell (2002: 185) states that the MP aber is used to ‘express[…] a surprised reaction’. In Luxembourgish, the first non-propositional use of the MP awer is to indicate some emotion of the speaker to the hearer about the utterance. Whereas the adverb expresses a contrast between clauses, the MP does not refer to anything that has been mentioned before.

(6.27) A-- and J-- are getting ready to go out.

A--: Dat ass awer déi schappest Box déi s de hues! Wéi wann s de keng aner häss! Bass de?

J--: Ma neen!

[A--: That is MP the shabbiest trousers that you have! As if you no other have! Are you?

J--: DM no!]

‘A--: God, those are the shabbiest trousers you’ve got! Like you’ve got no other pair! You ready?

J--: No, I’m not!’

(LPWC 9403-9404)

E-- is taking a stolen necklace out of her handbag.

(6.28)

M--: Dat do… dat… dat ass eis gestuele Ketten!

E--: Weess ech och!

C--: Zum E--. Du hues awer vläicht Culot!

[M--: That there… that… that is our stolen chain!

E--: Know I too!

C--: To-the E--. You have MP MP cheek!]

146
‘M--: That’s, that’s our stolen necklace!
E--: Yeah, I know.
C--: (to E--) You’ve got some cheek!’
(LPWC 7328-7333)

The speaker mentions the death of a father and son who have died in the local
town:
(6.29)
Säi Papp war mengem Papp sii beschten Aarbechtskolleg an den D-- war bei
mir an der Klass, scho komesch. Mengem Papp ass lo agefall, dass een
d’Liewen muss notzen eess et ze spéit ass. Uff. Dat mecht mer awer och
Angscht...

[His father was to-my father his best work-colleague and the D-- was by me
in the class, already weird. To-my father is now occurred, that one the life
must use before it too late is. Phew. That makes me MP also fear…]

‘His dad was my dad’s work mate and D-- was with me in class, it’s weird,
though. It just occurred to my dad that you should make the most of life
before it’s too late. Phew. It scares the pants off me, though.’
(LEWC 1753-1759)

In (6.27), the speaker is indicating displeasure at the hearer’s choice of trousers,
whereas in (6.28) the speaker is showing indignation by stating that that the
character E-- has some cheek to steal a necklace. In (6.29), the speaker expresses a
fear of dying prematurely.

In the examples below, awer is also used in positive emotions expressed by the
speakers.

(6.30)
hues de se gelauschtet? Et ass awer schéin, oder? Si lo grat amgaang se um
I-pod ze lauschtener, ech fannen se awer méi spannend wéi d’N-- J--, mi
handgemacht…oder sou ähnlech…

[have you her listened? It is MP pretty, or? Am now just in-the-process her
on-the iPod to listen, I find her but more exciting than the N-- J--, more
handmade… or so similar…]

‘Did you listen to it? It’s nice, though, don’t you think? I’m listening to
songs on the iPod right now, I find it more exciting than [the artist] N-- J--,
more handmade… or something like that…
(LEWC 3892-3895)
6. Qualitative Analysis of MPs

(6.31)

Aha da wars du e klengen Abstecher op D== maachen. Ass awer cool op der uni ze sin, mega luxus, mol hei eng kleng Vakanz, schein... hach.

[Aha then were you a little detour on D== make. Is MP cool on the uni to be, mega luxury, once here a little holiday, pretty... ho-hum.]

‘Oh, right, so you made a little detour to D==. Well, it’s cool, isn’t it, being at uni, pure luxury, taking a little holiday here and there, lovely... Ho-hum.’

(LEWC 5493-5495)

(6.32)

schèin vun der ze héieren. ’t freet mech awer wierklech ze wëssen, dass du sou begeeschtert vu Sproochplanung bass.

[pretty of you to hear. It pleases me MP really to know, that you so enthusiastic of language-planning are.]

‘Nice to hear from you. I’m really pleased to know that you’re so enthusiastic about language planning’

(LEWC 8389-8390)

In (6.30), awer reinforces the speaker’s statement that they like a certain CD. The MP awer used in (6.31) reinforces the speaker’s opinion that university student life is some kind of luxury, if it entails holidaying every so often. Finally, the speaker in (6.32) uses the MP to reinforce their pleasure that the hearer likes issues dealing with language planning.

In conclusion, awer is used to reinforce positive and negative emotions that a speaker expresses in their utterance. This is in line with the LOD (2009) for example 3.31, which states that awer expresses surprise and anger. In the data, the MP awer is found in Altmann’s (1987) type 1 statements.

6.3 Dach

6.3.1 Propositional meanings

a) the answer particle dach

The answer particle dach is used as a positive reply to a negative question or sentence.
(6.32)

J--: (gräift déi plisséiert Jupe) Ech hu gعدuecht, du géifs déi undoen!
A--: Mengs d’ech soll?
J--: Déi geet der gutt! Has de der déi net zu Paräis kaf?
A--: **Dach**!
J--: Ma dann do déi un! A--, wann ech gelift!

[J--: *reaches that pleated skirt* I have thought, you would that-one wear!
A--: Think you-I should?
J--: That-one goes you good! Have you you that-one not to Paris bought?
A--: Yes!
J--: DM then do that-one on! A--, please!]

‗J--: (gets hold of the pleated skirt) I thought you’d wear this one!
A--: Do you think I should?
J--: It suits you! Didn’t you buy that one in Paris?
A--: I did!
J--: Well then wear it! A--, please!’
(LPWC 9587-9589)

(6.33)

Här W--: War Se net am Theater?
Mme W--: **Dach**. Duerno.

[Mr W--: *Was she not in-the theatre?*
Mrs W--: Yes. Afterwards.]

‗Mr W--: Was she not in the theatre?
Mrs W--: She was. Afterwards.’
(LPWC 13074-13075)

**Dach** expresses a positive reply to a negative question or a negative statement. In (6.32), speaker A-- confirms that they have bought the pleated skirt in Paris. Similarly, in (6.33) the speaker Mrs W-- does indeed confirm that some other person was in the theatre. These are common examples of *dach* found in the data. Less common examples are found below.

(6.34)

Mei hunn ech net ze soen. Ah **dach**, hellef mer wei ech deen T-- A-- kann ausschalten [...].
More have I not to say. Ah yes, help me how I that T-- A-- can switch-off [...].

‘I don’t have anything else to say. Oh yes, I do; help me to get rid of T-- A-- [...].

(LEWC 3171-3173)

(6.35)

Si huet et net gemiirkt. **Dach.** Si huet et gemiirkt [...].

[She has it not noticed. **Yes. She has it noticed [...]**.

‘She didn’t notice it. Hold on, she did. She did notice it.’

(LPWC 624-626)

(6.36)

**M--:** L1--, deng Zopp ass e Gedicht.
**L2--:** **Dach** L1--, wierklech!

[M--: *L1--, your soup is a poem.*
**L2--:** **Yes** L1--, really!]

‘M--: L1--, this soup is sheer poetry.
L2--: No, honestly, L1--, it’s true!’

(LPWC 19666-19669)

In (6.34), the speaker amends their own statement that they have nothing more to add in their email, which is similar to (6.35), where the speaker self-corrects. In (6.36), both M-- and L2-- congratulate L1--’s soup. One interpretation for L2--’s use of **dach** is that it is the reply to a possible, yet unuttered, denial that the soup is not ‘sheer poetry’.

b) the conjunction **dach**

The conjunction **dach** is similar to other adversative conjunctions such as **awer** or **mà**. Although it can stand on its own sentence-initially, it can also be preceded by **an** ‘and’, similar to **and yet** in English.
6: Qualitative Analysis of MPs

(6.37)

M--: Ech brauch nèmmen dech ze bekucken, an ech si voller Sënn – fènnef Mol den Dag.
P--: An **dach** wolls de ni mat mir schlofen.

[M--: *I need only you to look, and I am full-of sin - five times the day*
P--: *And yet wanted you never with me sleep.*]

‘M--: I just have to look at you and I’m full of sins - five times a day.
P--: And yet you never wanted to sleep with me.’
(LPWC 26069-26074)

(6.38)

Hie wollt guer net de Geck maachen. An **dach** ass hien doudgeschlo ginn.

[He wanted at-all not the fool make. And yet is he dead-beaten got.]

‘He had no intention at all of taking the piss. And yet he was beaten to death.’
(LPWC 11851-11852)

In (6.37), P-- indicates with *an dach* that despite M-- expressing her (sinful) desire for P--, M-- did not want to sleep with P--. Similarly, the male character in (6.38) was murdered regardless of having made only harmless fun. Sentence-initial *an dach* is translated as **und trotzdem** ‘and nevertheless’ into German.

c) the stressed adverb **dach**

The stressed adverb **dach** is used in Luxembourgish to express the meaning of ‘still’, i.e. that despite one thing, another (opposite) thing is the case. In example (6.39) below, the speaker thinks the ‘stupid boy’ should appreciate his life, but instead he is not satisfied.

(6.39)

Nee, du domme Jong... Du hues et sou gutt a bass **dach** ni zefridden.

[No, you stupid boy... You have it so good and are still never satisfied.]

‘Oh, you stupid boy... You’ve never had it so good and are still never satisfied.’
(LPWC 25035-25036)
6.3.2 Non-propositional uses

a) the MP *dach*

The MP *dach* is used by the speaker to indicate that their utterance is or should be obvious to both speaker and hearer. For Durrell (2002: 190), a similar use of German *doch* ‘appeals politely for agreement or confirmation’.

(6.40)

Joffer K--: Wou ass en dann op der Universitéit, S-- hiren?
A--: Ma zu Tréier! Wousst Der dat net? Sou eppes weess een *dach*! Dat weess *dach* d’ganzt Duerf!

[Miss K--: Where is he MP on the university, S-- theirs?]
A--: DM to Trier! Knew you that not? So something knows one *MP*! That knows *MP* the whole village!]

‘Miss K--: S--’s son, which university is he at?
A--: Trier of course! Didn’t you know that? That’s common knowledge, isn’t it? The whole village knows that, doesn’t it?’

(LPWC 21388-21392)

(6.41)

Sait de B-- fort ass (6 Meint hier) hun 5 Leit gekennegt. Also do muss *dach* eng faul sin.

[Since the B-- away is (6 months ago) have 5 people quitted. DM there must *MP* a rotten be.]

‘Since B-- left (6 months ago) 5 people have quit. There’s got to be something fishy there.’

(LEWC 4911-4912)

(6.42)

And I can you say, he has nagged and nagged: mistakes here mistakes there etc. and I would-have not enough the linguistics analysed How I MP there-to would-come “whore sow” with “dirty pig” to translate, that would-be lot to lot well-behaved I should MP “whore of cunt” or so write and a “arse-hole” would be no “dirty cunt” but more something whole different.

‘And I can tell you, he was nagging me and nagging me: mistakes here, mistakes there etc., and I haven’t analysed enough the linguistics of it. How dare I translate [Luxembourgish] “houer Sau” with [French] “sale porc” [= dirty pig], that’s too well-mannered, I should write [French] “putain de con” [= fucking bastard], or something like that, and a [Luxembourgish] “Aschlach” is not [French] “sale con” [= bastard], but something else altogether.’

(LEWC 107-112)

In (6.40), it is obvious to A-- that the son of S-- is at Trier University and is surprised that Miss K-- does not know it. A--’s use of dach marks that this knowledge is common throughout the village. In (6.41), the speaker expresses their doubt about B-- and five other people having left their workplace; the speaker thus desires the hearer to share this suspicion with them. In (6.42), the speaker refers to another male person who is correcting the speaker’s translations. In the speaker’s reported speech, the suggestion is to use one word for another, an obvious action for that third person to take, but maybe not obvious to the speaker. This idea of obviousness is also reflected in the LPWC in the frequent three-word clusters dat ass dach ‘that is MP’ which is found 23 times, ’t ass dach ‘it is MP’ which is found 11 times, and du weess dach ‘you know MP’, which is found 5 times in the corpus.

Example (6.42) is an interesting transition between two uses of the MPs. While the first use indicates something obvious, the second use emphasises directives. Sentence (6.42) shows this link between the two meanings: if it is obvious that something needs to be done, but has been omitted or neglected, then a directive needs to be expressed. Examples (6.43) to (6.46) are imperatives reinforced by dach. Durrell (2002: 191) writes that this use of German doch ‘adds a note of impatience or urgency’.

(6.43) The speaker has just heard some unexpected news:

Leck dach ee mech am Oasch. Dat do gëtt et dach net.
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[Lick MP one me in-the arse. That there exists it MP not.]

‘Fuck me! Would you believe that!’
(LPWC 27783)

(6.44)

Ma loss mech dach endlech a Rou!

[DM let me MP finally in calm!]

‘Will you just leave me in peace?’
(LPWC 25958)

(6.45)

fro dach eise parlamentarëschen nowuess hei, wee fir d’stadbild verantwortlech as!

[ask MP our parliamentarian offspring here, who for the cityscape responsible is!]

‘Just ask our parliamentarian offspring here who is responsible for the cityscape!’
(LPWC 15496-15497)

(6.46)

Maach der dach keng Gedanke wéinst deem blöde Soutien, D--!

[Make you MP no thoughts because-of that stupid bra, D--!]

‘Just stop worrying about that stupid bra, D--!’
(LPWC 8286-8287)

The four examples above are directives with dach using the imperative mood. Although the first one is not literally a directive for somebody to lick the speaker’s arse, the use of dach here expresses the speaker’s disbelief. The second example is a plea to be left alone, the third one a request to ask somebody something, and the final sentence is advice from the speaker for the hearer not to worry. Note that in example (6.44), dach can only be left out if the pronoun ee(n) is left out as well. Example (6.44’) below is thus ungrammatical without the MP,
but (6.43") below is correct, because both the MP *dach* and the pronoun *een* are left out. The meaning from (6.43) to (6.43") changes as well:

(6.43')

*Leck ee mech am Oasch.*

*[Lick one me in-the arse.]*

(6.43")

Leck mech am Oasch.

* [Lick me in-the arse.]*

‘Fuck you!’

The last example (6.44) in this subsection illustrates that MPs, such as *dach* can occur in verbless utterances.

Two women are talking about men being unfaithful:

(6.44)

F--: Gees du dengem Inspecter och d’Täschen inspizéieren?
C--: **Dach** net mengem D--, F--! Deen ass trei wéi Gold. Niewebai ass dee just mat sengem Ministère bestuet; fir eng Frëndin ass dee vill ze knéckeg.

[**G--:** *Go you the pockets scrutinise?*

**C--:** *But not my D--, F--! That-one is faithful like gold. Nearby is that-one only with his ministry married; for a female-friend is that-one lots too stingy.*]

‘F--: Do you go checking through your inspector’s pockets?
C--: Surely not the ones of my D--, F--! He’s true as gold. On top of that, he’s just married to his ministry; he’s too stingy to have a girlfriend.’

(LPWC 8324-8329)

In (6.44), *dach* is used by C-- to counter an assumption and indicates that she has no reason to distrust her husband for being unfaithful. This use is also found in German.
In conclusion, the MP *dach* is used in either indicative-mood statements (Altmann’s (1987) type 1 statements), where it confirms or reinforces the utterance as being obvious, or else with the imperative mood (type 4), where it reinforces the directive. This description of MP usage is undocumented in the dictionaries mentioned in subsection 3.2.2 above.

6.4 Dann

6.4.1 Propositional meanings

a) the adverb *dann*

The propositional meaning of *dann* is similar to English *then*, and is used in description of temporal sequences, in conditionals and consequentions. Since mobile-*n* deletion occurs in Luxembourgish (see subsection 3.1.2), *dann* can also be realised as /da/ and written as <da>.

(6.48) The hearer is considering going to study in L==:


[DM, L== is good. Big and has lots to offer. And you would-be then £*** from me away.]  

‘But yeah, L== is nice. Big and has lots to offer. And you’d only be £*** away from me.’  
(LEWC 7511-7513)

(6.49)  

Witzegerweis sot de R-- M1-- dem T-- A-- (de M1-- weess net dass den T.A-- mech kennt), jo wahrscheinlech géing de F-- lo Kulturminister ginn [...] an da géing et schweier ginn fir dat C—M2--, well dat wäer jo ömmer sou schei frech.  

[Funnily said the R-- M1-- the T-- A-- (the M1-- knows not that the T.A-- me knows), quot. probably would the F-- now culture-minister become [...] and then would it difficult become for that C—M2--, because that-one would-be MP always so pretty cheeky.]  

‘Funnily enough, R-- M1-- said to T-- A-- (M1-- doesn’t know that T. A-- knows me) like, “F-- will probably become Minister of Culture [...] and then it’ll be difficult for that C-- M2-- because she’s always so damned cheeky”.’  
(LEWC 2126-2133)
(6.50) The speakers discuss their private lives being broadcast online:

 ech mengen, déi sech bei eis eraschalten, déi kucken einfach mol gír hei eran, a wa mer dann zoulfëllg sex hun, bon, da soen se eben: a tien, si hun haut sex, an eng aner kéier eben, da sëtze mer einfach do an tchatchen e bëssen oder kucken d’tele, an da soen s’ eben: ah, lo tchatchen se oder: ah, lo kucken se d’tele.

[I think, those themselves at our in-switch, those watch MP MP willingly here inside, and if we then random sex have, DM then say them MP: ah take, they have today sex, and an another time MP, then sit we MP there and chat e little or watch the telly, and then say them MP: ah, now chat they or: ah, now watch they the telly.]

‘I think those that log in to us, they just like to watch a bit, and if we just happen to have sex, right, they just say: oh right, they’re having sex today, and at another time we’re just sitting there chatting or watching telly and then they just say: right, now they’re chatting or: right, now they’re watching telly.’

(LPWC 26356-26361)

(6.51) Speaker and hearers are in a dangerous situation:

 Wann dier 2 hei krëpéieren wëllt, dann maacht esou weider! Mee ech wëll hei lieweg raus!

[If you 2 here die want, then make it further! But I want here alive out!]‘If you two want to die here, then keep on going like that! But I want to get out of here alive!’

(LPWC 28014-28015)

Sentence (6.48) uses dann to indicate that if the hearer chose to study in L==, the outcome would be that the speaker would only need to pay a certain amount of money in order to visit the hearer. In the next example, (6.49), the second speaker (R-- M--) quoted by the first speaker mentions a possibility of F-- being in power, which might might have consequences for C-- M--. In (6.50) and (6.51), dann is not used only as a temporal adverb, but also as a logical adverb, hence the occurrence of wa( nn)... dann...‘if... then...’ clauses. If the speakers in (6.50) have sex, chat, or watch TV, then their viewers comment that the speakers have sex, chat, or watch TV. Similarly in (6.51), if the hearers want to die, then they should continue doing what they are doing.
6.4.2 Non-propositional uses

a) the MP \textit{dann} in the middle-field

This section deals with the MP \textit{dann} as commonly found in the middle-field of direct and indirect questions. It has a close correspondence with English \textit{then}, and is cognate with the German MP \textit{denn}. A variant of the MP \textit{dann} in sentence-initial position is discussed in subsection 6.5.2.b) below. According to Durrell (2002: 189), German \textit{denn} ‘makes the question sound rather less blunt and more obliging’.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ôh nee, dat kennen ech net. […] Wat ass dat \textbf{da} genee, kinns du mir dat eemol erklären?}
\item \textit{[erm, no, that know \textit{I} not. What is that \textbf{MP} exact, could you me that \textit{MP} explain?]}
\item \textit{‘erm, no, I don’t know that. […] What’s that exactly, could you explain that to me, please?’}
\item \textit{(LEWC 4021-4023)}
\item \textit{Wéi laang woars du \textbf{da} bestuet?}
\item \textit{Ze laang. Ech sin elo dräi Joer gescheed.}
\item \textit{[How long were you \textbf{MP} married?}
\item \textit{Too long. I am now three year divorced.]}
\item \textit{‘How long were you married, then?}
\item \textit{For too long. I’ve been divorced for three years now.’}
\item \textit{(LPWC 28447-28448)}
\item \textit{Dat hei ass privat.}
\item \textit{Mär komme vum CNA fir eng Documentatioun iwwer d’Schmelz. E Film.}
\item \textit{Hutt där \textbf{dann} eng Erlaabnis?}
\item \textit{Den Här N-- huet eis opgespoart. Mär filmen schon d’ganz Woch.}
\item \textit{[That here is private. We come from the CNA for a documentation about the smelt. A film. Have you \textbf{MP} a permission?}
\item \textit{The Mr N-- has us up-opened. We film already the whole week.]}
\end{enumerate}
'It’s private here. We’ve come from the CNA for a documentary about the steel works. A film. Have you got a permit, then? Mr N-- opened up for us. We’ve been filming for a week now.' (LPWC 28391-28393)

(6.55)

Ech hun awer op dem Débat nom Steck erklärt wou d’Idee hirkiim, also deng Idee dass een e Steck misst schreiwen wat [...] heesch. Dem S-- T-- säi Brudder huech mech gefrot, wann hee geing soen et misst een e Steck heeschen wat “Zalot” heescht op ech dat dann och geing schreiwen. Iwwert dem S-- seng Ökozalot aus dem Naturpark U==.

[I have though on the debate after-the piece explained where the idea from-came so your idea that one a piece would-must write What [...] is-called. The S-- T-- his brother has me asked, if he would say it must one a piece be-called what “salad” is-called whether I that MP also would write. About the S-- his eco-salad from the nature-parc U==.]

‘I did explain, though, at the debate after the play, where the idea came from, i.e. your idea that somebody should write a play called “[…]”: S-- T’s brother asked me whether, if he were to say that someone ought to call [sic] a play that is called “Salad”, Would I write it too, then. About S--’s organic lettuce from the U== National Park.’ (LEWC 576-582)

In the questions above, the MP dann can be omitted, but it is used to reinforce the inquisitive nature of the questions and to weaken the intrusive force of them. Although the MP mostly appears in interrogative sentences, i.e. direct questions, sentence (6.55) shows that dann is also used in indirect questions, such as the one introduced by ob ‘whether’ (erroneously written as its homophone <op> ‘on’).

b) the sentence-initial MP dann

As seen in the literature review, MPs are defined as being positioned in the middle-field of a sentence, i.e. after the finite verb and before a potential non-finite verb in a main clause. This subsection shows a subset of uses of dann, where it occurs sentence-initially and non-propositionally. This use is undocumented in Durrell (2002), but modal uses of deictic adverbs in German jetzt, nun, da are treated in Weinert (2007). She mentions dann as well and correctly points out the ambiguity of resultative and modal initial-dann (Weinert 2007: 101).
6: Qualitative Analysis of MPs

(6.56)

G--:  Oh, ech wéisst guer net méi wéi dat geet.
PASCHTOUER:  Ma da sëtze mer just hei zesummen a poteren e bësse. Da so mer mol – wéi ass däi Numm?

[G--:  Oh, I would-know at-all not anymore how that goes.

Priest:  DM then sit we only here together and natter a bit. MP say me MP - how is your name?]

‗G--:  Oh, I wouldn’t know anymore how it’s done.
Priest:  Well, let’s just sit here together and have a natter. Tell me – what is your name?’

(LPWC 12396-12399)

(6.57) Before finishing an email:

Also, Da relax mol nach schein.

[So, MP relax MP still pretty.]

‗Alright, then, you take it easy a bit.’

(LEWC 5422)

(6.58)

L--:  M--! Da komm ran! ’t gëtt spatz hënt.

[L--:  M--! MP come inside! It becomes sharp tonight.]

‗L--:  M--! Come on in! It’s gonna be bitter cold tonight.’

(LPWC 18843)

(6.59)

Da kuck mech dach! Kuck mech dach! An e puer Méint gesäis de mech nët méi!

[MP look me MP! Look me MP! In a couple months see you me not more!]

‗Just look at me! Go on, look at me! In a couple of months you won’t see me any more!’

(LPWC 2872-2874)

It can be argued that dann found in the four examples above could be a conditional adverb introducing an imperative as a result of something that
happened before. However, these examples, especially (6.58) and (6.59) do not offer any previous context, but it is easy to construct one. In (6.58), the context is the cold weather outside, and in (6.59) it is the imminent absence of the speaker.

The suggested explanation of sentence-initial dann as an MP and its validity will be expanded in discussion chapter 8 below, section 8.3. What seems to be arising is, however, a possible pragmaticalisation from the conditional adverb dann ‘(if…) then’ into a reinforcing MP in imperatives. It is not possible to have the MP dann in the middle-field in Luxembourgish directives, where its propositional meaning would only be conditional.

In conclusion, the MP dann exists in two different positions in Luxembourgish with two different uses. The first use of dann is found in the middle-field and reinforces the inquisitive character of interrogatives, no matter whether formulated as direct or indirect questions. This corresponds for Altmann’s (1987) type 2 and 3 interrogatives, and type 1 in the case of indirect questions. This use was already documented in the WLM (1906: 53) and in the LWB (1995a). Undocumented in previous literature, however, is the second use of dann, which is found sentence-initially in imperatives (type 4 imperatives), where it has an additional reinforcing function.

6.5 Eben
6.5.1 Propositional meanings

a) the answer particle eben

The only propositional meaning of eben found in both word-corpora reflects the answer particle also found in German, whereas the German adjectival meaning of eben ‘flat, even’, and the German temporal adverb eben ‘just now’, have no cognates in Luxembourgish, which has instead the adjectives platt and flaach ‘flat’ and the adverbs elo grad and elo just ‘just now’.

(6.60)

c--: ech schweesse ganz normal, ouni ausbréch.
p--: vläicht well der angscht hut, hut der déi schweessausbréch.
c--: ech sot, ech hu keng schweessausbréch.
p--: eben. well der angscht hut virun den eegene schweessausbréch.
[C--: I sweat whole normal, without out-breaks.
P--: maybe because you fear have, have you those sweat-out-breaks.
C--: I said. I have none sweat-out-breaks.
P--: Exactly. because you fear have of the own sweat-out-breaks.]

C--: I sweat quite normally and don’t break out in it.
P--: It’s perhaps because you’re scared that you are breaking out in it.
C--: I said I don’t break out in it.
P--: Exactly. Because you’re scared of breaking out in it.’
(LPWC 15272-15276)

(6.61)

[DM, what happens here so. Not much. […] But exactly like said otherwise not much new.]

‘Okay, what else to tell? Not much. […] But exactly as I said, nothing much new besides that.’
(LEWC 4673-4681)

(6.62)
h--: eleng scho wéi s du dech do bewegs…
b--: ech? wat hues de géint méng bewegungen? ech bewege mech émmer sou!
h--: eben, du bas scho ganz do dran a mierks iwwerhaapt nét méi wéi s de dech gewéssermoosse virun der kamera verdréits.

[H--: alone already how you yourself there moves…
B--: I? what have you against my movements? I move myself always so!
H--: exactly, you are already whole there in-it and notice absolutely not more how you yourself to-some-extent in-front the camera twist.]

‘H--: I mean, it’s just the way you move…
B--: Me? What have you got against the way I move? I always move like that!
H--: Exactly, you’re completely absorbed in it. You don’t notice any more how to some extent you’re twisting yourself round in front of the camera.’
(LPWC 26593-26597)

As seen in the examples above, the answer particle eben is used to confirm and reflect the previous utterance, whether spoken by another person or the same speaker, as in (6.61). In sentence (6.60), the speaker P-- uses eben to confirm that they agree with this hearer’s statement that C-- does not break out in sweats.
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Speaker H-- in (6.62) agrees with the hearer B--, that B-- always has a certain way of moving. In sentence (6.61), the speaker is conducting an asynchronous conversation/monologue, so the speaker is confirming that they have nothing much to say.

6.5.2 Non-propositional uses

a) the MP eben

The MP eben is used to confirm the veracity or the self-evidence of the utterance used. Durrell (2002: 193) states that German eben ‘emphasises an inescapable conclusion’ or ‘typically expresses a confirmation that something is the case’.

(6.63)

Bei eis sinn déi onmotivéiert ebe voll an der Pubertéit a lehnen dofir einfach alles of, wat’s de hinne proposéiers, wells du eben en Erwuessene bass, dat ass eng aner Situatioun.

[By us are those unmotivated-ones MP full in the puberty and reject thus MP everything away, what you them suggest, because you MP an adult are, that is an other situation.]

‘Our unmotivated [pupils] are well into their puberty and so they simply reject everything that you suggest to them, precisely, because you’re just an adult, that’s another situation.’

(LEWC 4556-4561)

(6.64) A speaker talking about a father filming his wife, S--, giving birth:

op jidde fall huet d’š-- hanneno gekrasch, well ët sou frou war, datt säi mann eben alles gefilmt hat, [...].

[on every case has the S-- later-on cried, because it so glad was, that her man MP all filmed had, [...].]

‘in any case, S-- was crying later on because she was so happy that her husband filmed everything [...]’

(LPWC 26477-26479)

(6.65)

Als Presidentin vun der Kannercrêche Pippi Langfinger, ë... Pippi Langstrumpf... ass een eben informéiert.
As president of the children-crèche Pippi Long-finger, erm... Pippi Longstocking...is one MP informed.

‘As the president of the “Pippi Longfinger” crèche, erm... “Pippi Longstocking”... you just keep well up on those things.

(LPWC 7312-7313)

(6.66) After telling the hearer about a sitcom called Spaced:

Ganz witzeg, mee net all Mënsch si ëi Goût. “Spaced” humour eben...

[Whole funny, but not all person his tast. “Spaced” humour MP...]

‘Very funny, but not everybody’s taste. “Spaced” humour, I suppose...’

(LEWC 7757)

The MP eben is used by the speaker so that the utterance does not require any kind of proof or evidence, because it seems to be common knowledge. In (6.63), for instance, the speaker states that the pupils are unmotivated because they are ‘of course’ in their puberty; equally, they reject ideas coming from adults. In (6.64), the speaker describes how a husband filming his wife as she gave birth and her later reaction to the filming. The eben used here acts as a reminder to the hearer that the husband was doing the filming. The speaker in sentence (6.65) uses the MP to describe that it is obvious for somebody in her position as a head of a crèche to be well-informed about things. The speaker (6.66) uses eben to finish the utterance by reminding the hearer about the sitcom. Interestingly, (6.66) is also an example of sentences where the MP is used sentence-finally in a verb-less phrase, although ass eben ‘spaced’ Humor is grammatical as well.

To summarise, eben is used by speakers to mark that the fact that what is being said is true, obvious, and common knowledge. A description of such usage has not been found in the dictionaries mentioned in subsection 3.2.2. Finally, eben is found Altmann’s (1987) type 1 statements.
6.6 *Emol*

6.6.1 Propositional meanings

a) the noun *Mol*

The noun *Mol* (akin to German *Mal*) means ‘times’ and is used to indicate the frequency of an action happening.

(6.67)

Nach ***Mol*** ginn ech schlofen, dann ass de C-- do

[Still ***times go I sleep, then is the C—there]

‘Only ***more times to go to bed and C-- will be here’

(LEWC 6873)

(6.68) A couple discussing another couple who never invite them over for dinner:

Mir kéinten si zwanzeg *Mol* invitëieren, si géifen eis net eng eenzeg Kéier zréckinvitéieren.

[We could them twenty **times invite, they would us not one single time back-invite.]

‘We could invite them over twenty times, they wouldn’t invite us back one single time.’

(LPWC 9734-9735)

Unlike in English where the noun is used in the plural when the frequency is higher than 1, Luxembourgish *Mol*, like German *Mal*, remains in the singular. From this noun, originally meaning ‘point in time’, two further pragmatised forms emerged: adverbial *mol* and the conjunction *mol*.

b) the adverb *(e)mol*

The adverb *emol* or *mol* means ‘once’ and is used to denote that the frequency of an action is 1. It corresponds to the German *(ein)mal* ‘once’. In (6.69) and (6.70), the adverb can take a modal element.

(6.69)

Nach *emol* Merci fir den DVD (Gedankesprong), ech hu mech sou gefreet an de ganze Film auswenndeg mat opgesot.
[More _once_ thank-you for the DVD (thought-jump) I have me so pleased and the whole film by-heart with recited.]

‘Thanks again for the DVD (mental leap), I was so pleased and I joined in with the film, reciting it from memory.’
(LEWC 1732-1734)

(6.70)
Mee lo _mol_ eierlech, wee keeft da schon e Windows op Letzebuergesch. Sou nom Motto. Desen Internetsite well Kichelcher op aere Computer setzen.

[But now _once_ honest, who buys MP already a Windows on Luxembourgish. So after-the motto. This internet-site wants biscuits on your computer put.]

‘But seriously, who’s really going to buy Windows in Luxembourgish? Along the lines of, “This website wants to put a biscuit [= cookie] on your computer”.’
(LEWC 4823-4826)

(6.71)

[Mr K--, we have you last month two half-day-jobs offered. You have yourself not _once_ introduced. Yes, I was prevented. I had the Mr T-- notification said.]

‘Mr K--, we offered you two half-day jobs last month. You didn’t even show up once. Yes, I was busy, like. I did let Mr T-- know.’
(LPWC 28205-28208)

(6.72)
miih haten _mol_ schon sou eng geläänhäet, nit j--, äemol zu m==. do woulten s’aiis nit zerwéieren.

[we had _once_ already so a opportunity, not J--. _once_ to M==. there wanted they us not serve.]

‘We already had an opportunity like that before, didn’t we, J--? That was in M==. They didn’t want to serve us there.’
(LPWC 16966-16967)

In sentence (6.69), the speaker uses _emol_ to reiterate their gratitude for buying a DVD. In (6.70), _mol_ is used to express the idea of ‘at once’. In (6.71), the
expression is *net emol*, which denotes that something did not happen once. In (6.72), the speaker uses *mol* to indicate that they and another character (probably J--–) were given an opportunity that they did not take up.

c) the conjunction *mol*

The conjunction *mol* is used to mean ‘multiplied by’ or ‘times’ to indicate the frequency at which something happens; and also functions as the arithmetic multiplication operator <×>.

(6.73)

Wann heen an 2.5 Minutten 5 Kamellen aweckelt, da weckelt heen a 5 Minutten 10 Kamellen an. An an enger Stonn - 12 *mol* 5 Minutten - 120 Kamellen.

[If he in 2.5 minutes 5 caramels in-wraps, then wraps he in 5 minutes 10 caramels in. And in one hour - 12 *times* 5 minutes - 120 caramels.]

‘If he wraps 5 caramels in 2.5 minutes, then he’s wrapping 10 caramels in 5 minutes. And in one hour - 12 × 5 minutes = 120 caramels.’
(LPWC 18012-18014)

(6.74)

Oder schéiss Sténg op déi Dousen doënnen. An ziel wivill *mol* s de geréits.

[Or shoot stones on those tins there below. And count how many times you succeed.]

‘Or throw stones down on to those tins below. And count how many times you succeed.’
(LPWC 2076-2078)

The conjunction *mol* is best translated as ‘times’ in English, as it reflects the same meaning in various uses. In (6.71), *mol* is used as the arithmetic conjunction, whereas in (6.73) on the other hand, *mol* follows *wéivill* <wivill> and acts as a subordinating conjunction, such as Luxembourgish *wou* ‘where’, *wéi* ‘how’, or *deen* ‘who’. It is followed by the linking <s>, a feature common in some dialectal German, where subordinate conjunctions are ‘inflected’ (see Newton 1990: 174; for German examples, see Richter 1979).
6.6.2 Non-propositional uses

a) the MP (e)mol

The MP mol or emol is found in directives, especially in imperatives. German mal 'moderates the tone of a sentence, making it sound less blunt', however, it can also reinforce (Durrell 2002: 202).

(6.75)
[Album name]... hunn ech och. [music group] ass aus O==, et ass haapsächlech ee Sänger, de C-- O--, hir eischt CD “[album name]” ass villbesser, lauscht der déi mol un!

[...] have I too. [...] is from O==, is mainly one singer, the C-- O--, their first CD is lots better, listen you that-one MP on!]

‘I have [album name] as well…. [music group] is from O==, there’s mainly one singer, C-- O--, their first CD “[album name]” is much better, just have a listen to that!’
(LEWC 3760-3764)

(6.76) Commenting about proof-reading and checking a text:

Iwwerlies et mol nach eng Keier a Punkto Style.

[Over-read it MP more one time in point style.]

‘Just read it over again with the style in mind.’
(LEWC 5188)

(6.77)


[The first step is that you the newest firmwares from their homepage download and those install in-the router: here the address from the U== K== homepage [URL] And then load also the newest driver for the USB network adapter down. Important is also that your Windows XP Service Pack 2 on-it has. Try that MP.]
‘The first step is for you to download the latest firmwares from their website and that you install them in the router; here now the address of the U==K== website [URL] and then also download the latest driver for the USB network adaptor. It’s also important that your Windows XP has Service Pack 2. Try that.’

(LEWC 6223-6232)

In the examples above, mol is used to mitigate directives expressed in the imperative mood. In (6.75), the speaker suggests the hearer should listen to a CD, whereas in (6.76), the speaker tells the hearer to read a text over again. Finally in (6.77), the speaker advises the hearer to try out beforehand the instructions related to the IT. In the examples below, mol is used in non-imperative directives. It is worth raising the question, whether mol still mitigates below in examples (6.78)-(6.81) or whether it has a reinforcing effect.

(6.78)

Sot, frot der mol eng Kéier d’M-- ob et meng Emaile kritt huet.

[DM, ask you MP one time the M-- whether it my emails received has.]

‘Listen, will you ask M-- whether she’s received my emails.’

(LEWC 7537)

(6.79)

Kanns de mol d’Luten umaachen?

[Can you MP the lights on-make?]

‘Can you switch on the lights, please?’

(LPWC 28180-28181)

(6.80)

An elo maachen mer emol anstänneg Musék!

[And now make us MP decent music!]

‘And now, let’s do some proper music!’

(LPWC 27924)

25 I would like to thank Martin Durrell and Regina Weinert for pointing this out.
26 In Luxembourgish, the neuter pronoun et ‘it’ is also used to refer to (younger) women.
In sentences (6.78) and (6.79), the speakers phrase the directive as a question with subject-verb inversion, and use the MP *mol* to mitigate the requests to the hearers for them to do something for the speaker. In (6.80) and (6.81), the cohortative construction of verb + *mer* ‘us’ followed by the MP is used.

To conclude, the MP *mol* is used as a mitigator in directives that are imperatives, questions, or cohortatives; this explicit MP is undocumented in the dictionaries from subsection 3.2.2. In terms of Altmann’s (1987) sentence types, *mol* is found in type 4 imperatives and type 2 questions. Additionally, the most common expressions with this MP are *komm mol* ‘come’, *kuck mol* ‘look’, *lauschter mol* ‘listen’, and *so mol* ‘speak’. Interestingly, apart from *komm mol*, the other three collocations also exist as attention-grabbing discourse markers. The high frequency of *so mol*, for instance, is a good example of formulaic language (see Cowie 1988). Also designated as ‘formulaic sequence’, Wray (2002: 9, cited in Schmitt and Carter 2004: 3) defines this as:

> a sequence, continuous or discontinuous, of words or other elements, which is, or appears to be, prefabricated: that is stored and retrieved whole from memory at the time of use, rather than being the subject to generalisation or analysis by the language grammar.

Weinert (forthcoming) argues alongside Bybee (2002, cited in Weinert forthcoming) that phonological fusion can be a sign that a sequence is formulaic, which she illustrates with German *hörma* ‘listen’ and *sagma* ‘say’. Two Luxembourgish examples found via an online search engine are worth citing: *somol hun mech grad un eppes erennert* ‘listen, (I) just thought about something’, and *Somol ass den Thierry gefall* ‘listen, did Thierry fall down’. Here, it is the orthographical fusion that signals formulaic status.
The MP *mol* is a good example of pragmaticalisation. The noun *Mol* ‘point in time’ came to indicate frequency. With the frequency collocation of *een* ‘one’, the adverb *eemol* ‘once’ pragmaticalised, followed by the pragmaticalised frequency adverbial marker *emol* and the conjunction *mol*. This later pragmaticalised to the MP *(e)mol*. The process of phonological erosion (see 2.2.1) of pragmaticalisation is worth noting: *Mol > eemol > emol > mol*.

### 6.7 Jo

#### 6.7.1 Propositional meanings

a) the answer particle *jo*

The answer particle *jo* is used by the speaker to confirm or acquiesce in what has been said previously.

(6.82)

Prost Neijoer, du och, R--., a *jo*, deng 1. Mail war an der Poubelle, mee ech kucken d’Poubelle och êmmer duerch.

*[Cheers new-year you too, R--., and yes, your 1st email was in the bin, but I look the bin also always through.]*

‘Happy New Year, you too, R--., and yes, your first email was in the trash, but I usually also check my trash.’

(LEWC 7687-7689)

(6.83)

*Jo*, dat ass scho wouer mam Job fir d’Liewen, ech fäerten awer fir sou dacks ze wieselsen, well ech wees net ob d’Leit an de Chefetagen dat mat “Wiessel ass gutt” scho matkritt hunn…

*[Yes that is MP true with-the job for the life, I fear though for so often to change, because I know not whether the people in the boss-floors that with-the “change is good” already picked-up have...]*

‘Yes, that’s actually true about the job for life, I’m afraid, though, to change jobs so often, because I don’t know whether the people in the executive suites have heard about this “change is good” thing.’

(LEWC 4105-4111)

(6.84)

Deng Sue sinn ukomm, *jo*, villmols Merci. :)


[Your money are arrived, yes, lots-of-times thanks.]

‘Your money has arrived, yes, thank you very much.’
(LEWC 8138)

In the examples above, jo is used to answer questions or provide comments on something that the speaker’s correspondent has mentioned in their email. Hence the answer particle jo found in LEWC often refers to another email. In (6.82), the speaker could not find an initial message sent by the correspondent; the jo refers to a question regarding this email, e.g. ‘Did you find the first email I sent you?’; ultimately, the speaker did find the hearer’s first email. The speaker in (6.83) agrees with the correspondent about their opinion on having a job for life. In (6.84), the speaker confirms that the correspondent’s money has arrived, thus answering the correspondent’s question about whether it had or not. In the examples below, jo is found in prototypical question-answer pairs.

(6.85)

Géih mol kucken!
P--, alles an der Reih?
Jo, Fäertasch!

[Go MP look!
P--, all in the row?
Yes, fear-arse!]

‘Go and have a look!
P--, is everything ok?
Yes, coward!’
(LPWC 27839-27841)

(6.86)

Här W-- […]: Du has Besuch?
Mme W--: Jo! D’Madame B--.

[Mr W-- […]: You had visit?
Mrs W--: Yes! The Mrs B--.]

‘Mr W--: You had a visit?
Mrs W--: Yes! Mrs B--.’
(LPWC 13068-13070)
(6.87)

J-- (aus heiterem Himmel): Hues d’e frësche Kalzong un?
P--: Wat huet dat dann domat ze dunn?
J--: Näischt! Ech hunn dech gefrot, ob s d’e frësche Kalzong unhues!
P--: Jo!
J--: Eng Fro, eng Änwert! Hues d’e frësche Kalzong un, jo oder neen?
P--: Mengs de, mir géifen e Strippoker man?

[6.8 (from fair sky): Have you a fresh underpants on?
P--: What has that MP there-with to do?
J--: Nothing! I have you asked, whether you a fresh underpants on-have!
P--: Yes!
J--: A question, an answer! Have you a fresh underpants on, yes or no?
P--: Think you, we would a strip poker make?]

‘J-- (out of the blue): Are you wearing fresh underpants?
P--: What’s that got to do with it?
J--: Nothing! I’m asking whether you’re wearing fresh underpants!
P--: Yes!
J--: One question, one answer! Are you wearing fresh underpants, yes or no?
P--: Do you think we’re playing strip poker?’

(LPWC 9856-9863)

In these examples, one character is confirming what another character is asking. In (6.85), the speaker confirms to the hearer that, after having gone and checked something out, everything is fine. In (6.86), Mrs W-- answers Mr W--’s question whether she had a visitor. Finally, in (6.87), J-- is asking P-- several times whether he’s wearing underpants, to which P-- replies that he is.

6.7.2 Non-propositional uses
a) the quotative particle jo

The quotative particle jo is used by the speaker to indicate that the utterance following the particle is being quoted from another speaker. For German, this use of ja is undocumented in Durrell (2002).

(6.88)

du kanns jo mam e-- méi spéit nokomme, seet ët dann. jo, d’e-- as eis duechter, geet nét sou gär op sou gesellschaften, dat verstin ech jo, gutt, da gin ech nach e bësse mat him trëppelen.
[you can MP with the E-- more late near-come, says it then. Quot., the E-- is our daughter, goes not so willingly on so societies, that understand I MP, good, then go I still a bit with her walk.]

‘Then she says: “You can arrive later with E--”. Like, E--’s our daughter, of course, she doesn’t like going to those kind of parties, I do understand that. Right! I’ll go for a walk round with her, then.’
(LPWC 14693-14696)

(6.89)

Ech hat dir vergiess ze zielen, dass ech um […] en Uruff krut, jo ech sollt Inkognito an sou e Cafè kommen a kucken op kee mir nokiim an ech gin natierlech, mee et war mäi Laudator an den D--, déi wollte mech unheieren fir an de […] ze schreiven.

[I had you forgotten to tell, that I on-the […] a call received, quot. I should incognito and so a cafè come and look on nobody me would-follow and I go naturally, but it was my laudatory and the D--, who wanted me hire for in the [...] to write.]

‘I forgot to tell you I received a call at […], like, I should come incognito to some sort of cafè and make sure that nobody’s following and along I went of course, but it was my speech giver and D-- who both wanted to hire me to write in the [publication].
(LPWC 1788-1794)

(6.90)

Witzegerweis sot de R-- M-- dem T-- A-- (de M-- weess net dass den T.A-- mech kennt), jo wahrscheinlech géing de F-- lo Kulturminister ginn (lies: Reichspropagandamister) an da géing et schwieier ginn fir dat C-- M--, well dat wäer jo ëmmer sou schei frech.

[Funnily said the R-- M-- the T-- A-- (the M-- knows not that the T.A-- me knows), quot. probably would the F-- now culture-minister become (read: empire-propaganda-minister) and then would it difficult become for that C-- M--, because that-one would-be MP always so pretty cheeky.]

‘Funnily enough, R-- M-- said to T-- A-- (M-- doesn’t know that T. A-- knows me) like, F-- will probably become Minister of Culture (read: Nazi Propaganda Minister), and then it’ll be difficult for that C-- M--, because she’s always so damned cheeky.’
(LEWC 2126-2133)

(6.91)

De Mann huet awer sou em di *** Joer a geschter sot de K-- mer, jo ech soll oppassen, well deen hätt e Faible fir Meedercher tescht 18 an ***. Ma gudd dann.
In the four sentences above, the quote is not of what the speaker has said, but the words of another person. Three times jo is preceded by the verb soen ‘say’, whereas the other sentence introduces the quotative with en Uruff krut ‘received a phone call’. In spoken language, this jo would be stressed. As a last point, all four quotatives introduce an utterance with either a negative action or a negative attitude. In (6.88), the quoted speaker mentions that their daughter does not like socialising. The quoted speaker in (6.89) seems to have a suspicious attitude, telling the actual speaker to meet up secretly. In (6.90), the speaker warns that life might become more difficult for somebody else if there is a new minister of culture. Finally, the quoted speaker in (6.91) warns the actual speaker that they should be careful of a particular man.

b) the MP jo

In using the MP jo, the speaker tries to convey the message to the hearer that both share the speaker’s opinion. Durrell (2002: 199) writes that German ja ‘appeals to agreement’.

(6.92)

Ech hu mech just ugepasst, ech ka jo net gepuddert an a faarwegen Hiemer mat Pashmina-Schale ronderem lafen wéi de S--.

[I have me only accommodated, I can MP not powdered and in colourful shirts with pashmina-scarves round-and-round run like the S--.]

‘I just adapted; I can’t just walk around with powder on my face, wearing coloured shirts with pashmina shawls like S--, can I?’

(LEWC 1981-1985)
(6.93)

Ech wees ween ha as mee hun nie mat him mei wei 2 Wieder geschwaat. Pardon, mee et haat mir vill ze vill eng arrogant Attitude. Ausserdeem kennen dei mech jo iwwerhaapt net, D'g-- D-- war jo nemmen meng Moljoffer. An domat as alles gesoot.

[I know who she is but have never with her more than 2 words spoken. Sorry, but it had me lot too lot an arrogant attitude. Furthermore know those-ones me MP absolutely not, the G-- D-- was MP only my paint-Miss. And that-with is all said.]

‘I know who she is, but I’ve never spoken more than two words to her. Sorry, but she just had too much of an arrogant attitude for me. What’s more, they don’t even know me, after all, G-- D-- was only my art mistress. And that says it all.’
(LEWC 5071-5075)

(6.94)


[I have rendez-vous by-the hairdresser. The V-- becomes MP tomorrow on the town-hall married]

‘I have an appointment at the hairdresser’s. V--’s getting married at the town hall tomorrow, you know.’
(LEWC 802-803)

(6.95)

m--: datt s d’an déngem aulter nach dohäem bas. wou s de dach an der keess sëtz beim zupermatsch.
l--: dat gäet heiansdo droleg.
m--: wat häesch droleg? ech fannen dat nit droleg. mäe wanns de jo scho bestued wiirs, hätte mär äis jo nit fount. a wat hätt ech dau gemäet!

[M--: that you in your age still home are. where you MP in the till sit by-the zupermatsch [= fictional supermarket name].
L--: that goes sometimes funny.
M--: what is-called funny? I find that not funny. But when you MP already married would-be, would-have we ourselves MP not found. And what would-have I then made!]
As already mentioned, the MP jo is used to convey a common opinion about an utterance. In (6.92), for instance, the speaker expects the hearer to agree with them that they should not walk around looking like S--. In (6.93), the speaker uses the first jo in order to agree with them that G-- D-- and other people cannot judge the speaker, because they don’t know the speaker. The second jo is used to invalidate G-- D-- by making the hearer agree that she was ‘only’ an art teacher, which is reinforced with An domat ass alles gesoot ‘And that says it all’. In (6.94), the speaker implies that V--’s marriage the following day is common knowledge between the speaker and hearer. Finally, the speaker M-- in (6.95) wants L-- to agree that they would never have been together, if L-- had been married before.

To summarise, the modal particle jo is used by the speaker either to convey to the hearer that the hearer probably has or should have the same opinion about the speaker’s utterance, or that the speaker’s utterance is common knowledge to at least the speaker and the hearer. The stressed MP-usage found in directives mentioned in the WLM (1906: 201) and in the LWB (1995a: 238-239) is not indicated (typographically or otherwise) in the two corpora. In terms of Altmann’s (1987) Grundtypen, the MP jo is found in type 1 statements.

**6.8 Roueg**

6.8.1 Propositional meanings

a) the adjective roueg

The adjective roueg means ‘quiet’ or ‘still’ in Luxembourgish and as in German, where adjectives are also used as adverbs, roueg can also have an adverbial meaning.
(6.96)

[…] as eng roueg Klass. Sie sin net frech oder sou, mol bis elo nach net.

[...] is a quiet class. They are not insolent or so, once until now yet not.]

‘[They] are a quiet class. They are not naughty or anything like that, at least not until now.’
(LEWC 5238-5239)

(6.97)

Gell, hei as et roueg! Hei stëiert keen dech.

[Isn’t-it, here is it quiet! Here disturbs nobody you.]

‘It’s quiet here, isn’t it? Nobody disturbs you here.’
(LPWC 1967)

(6.98)

Lo hues de et sou laang ausgehal, de Rescht wäerts de dach och nach packen. Dir Männer kënnnt net ee Moment roueg sëtzen. Ma hut der dann alleguer der Däiwel am Leif?

[Now have you it so long endured, the rest will you MP also still succeed. You men can not one moment quiet sit. DM have you MP all the devil in-the belly?]

‘You’ve been doing so well so far, surely you’ll make it to the end. You guys cannot sit still for one moment. Have you all got the Devil inside?’
(LPWC 25873-25875)

As seen above, roueg means ‘quiet’ or ‘not noisy’ in (6.96) and (6.97), whereas in (6.98), roueg is used like an adverb meaning ‘still’.

6.8.2 Non-propositional uses

6.8.2 Non-propositional uses

a) the MP roueg

The MP roueg is used by the speaker to convey a friendly attitude in permissives. For Durrell (2002: 206), German ruhig ‘lends a reassuring tone to what the speaker is saying’.
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(6.99)

den ***ten ass iwregens mein gebuertsdag an dier sitt herzlech op d==
inviteiert (daat ass an der woch, dier kennt awer och roueg den we kommen)

[the ***th is by-the-way my birthday and you are heartily up-to D== invited
(that is in the week, you can however also MP the [weekend] come)]

‘The ***th is my birthday by the way, and you guys are welcome to come
over to D== (it’s during the week, but feel free to come up for the
weekend).’
(LEWC 8881-8885)

(6.100)

[…] also wanns du engkeier hei bass gin mir engkeier een drenken, als dank
dass du se bestallt hues, kanns dech roueg mellen wanns du loscht hues =)

[/...] so when you one-time here are go we one-time one drink, as thank that
you them ordered have, can yourself MP get-in-touch when you fancy have]

‘So, if you’re ever here, we’ll go for a drink, as a thank-you for having
ordered; don’t be shy about letting us know, if you fancy that.’
(LEWC 6714-6722)

(6.101)

An d’M--? ’t ass jo lo fort, dat duerfs de roueg beschäissen.

[And the M-- it is MP now away, that-one may you MP beshit.]

‘And M--? Well, since she’s not here now, you can go ahead and do
the dirty on her, no danger.’
(LPWC 12367-12369)

In the examples above, roueg is used in conjunction with permissive modals, such
as kënnen ‘can’ in (6.99) and (6.100) or düerfen ‘may, be allowed to’ in (6.101).
In (6.99) the speaker lets the hearers know that they can either arrive mid-week or
at the weekend. In (6.100), the speaker invites the hearer to get in touch with them
if the hearer wishes to, whereas the speaker in (6.101) gives the hearer the
opportunity to bad-mouth about M-- in her absence.

In the examples below, roueg still appears in its permissive character, but instead
of being used in sentences in the indicative mood, the imperative is used.
Heimatt sidd der alleguerten herzlech angelueden op mein B1==
Temoignage zu B2==, den ***ten december (attachement). Brengt roueg
sou fill Leit matt wei der welt.

[Herewith are you all-of-you heartily invited on my B1== testimonial to
B2==, the ***th December (attachment). Bring MP so many people with
like you want.]

‘You’re kindly invited to B1== to my testimonial about B2==, on the ***th
of December (see attachment). Feel free to bring as many people along as
you want.’
(LEWC 8521-8525)

v--: as äist c-- nach bei der aarbécht?
t--: jue, git roueg bis eraun. git rouig bis iwer an d’kichen. d’p-- as bei
him.

[V--: is our C-- still by the work?
T--: yep, go MP until inward. go MP until over in the kitchen. the P--
is by her.]

‘V--: Is our C-- still working?
T--: Yep, you go in, love. Pop into the kitchen. P--’s with her.’
(LPWC 16959-16961)

i--: wann êt iech nêt interesséiert, dann halen ech op. ech hun
heiandsdo d'bedierfnis, mech fräi ze schwetzen.
j--: schwetzt roueg! ech si gewinnt nozelauscheren.

[I--: when it you not interests, then hold I on. I have sometimes the
need, me free to speak.
J--: Speak MP! I am accustomed to-listen-to.]

‘I--: If it doesn’t interest you, I’ll stop. I sometimes feel the need to
speak freely.
J--: Carry on talking, I’m used to listening.’
(LPWC 14335-14337)

In these three examples above, the MP roueg is used in imperatives, although the
meaning is similar to the sentences where roueg is used with modals: the speaker
in (6.102) invites their hearers to bring further guests to the speaker’s testimonial,
the speaker T-- in (6.103) allows V-- to look for C--, and the speaker J-- in (6.104) assures I-- that they can speak freely.

To conclude, the MP roueg is used as a permissive or with an inviting meaning, which has already been documented in the LWB (1995b: 64) in subsection 3.2.2. Sentences are either (type 4) imperatives or (type 1 statement) indicatives with permissive modal verbs, all are nevertheless, directive illocutions.

6.9 Zwar
6.9.1 Propositional meanings
a) the adverb zwar

The adverb zwar is used by speakers to indicate that a clause contrasts with the following one, which starts with a contrastive conjunction: zwar x, mä y ‘although x, y’.

(6.105)
Bei eis get zwar vill Kaffi gedronk, mee Kaffispaus oder Kaffiskränzchen, kennen ech net (dach schon, heiansdo bréngt mäin Chef eis all Mëtschen mat, mee dat ass net all Dag).

[By us is in-truth lots coffee drunk, but coffee-break or coffee-party, know I not (yes already, sometimes brings my chef us all pastries with, but that is not all day.)]

‘Although we drink a lot of coffee I don’t know about coffee breaks or coffee parties (well, I do, my boss brings in pastries sometimes, but not every day).’
(LEWC 5977-5980)

(6.106)
merci fir d’URL, ech wees zwar net waat Wikipedia as, mee dann gin ech mer daat mol den owend ukucken mam sudoku

[thanks for the URL, I know in-truth not what Wikipedia is, but then go I me that MP the evening look-at with-the Sudoku.]

‘Thanks for the URL, I don’t know what Wikipedia is, but I’ll go and have a look tonight, this thing with Sudoku.’
(LEWC 6754-6756)
(6.107)

Souguer ee Pekinees hunn se sech ugeschaaft: Dee sécht engem zwar net d’Been voll, awer e sabbelt wéi ee leefgt Bëtschel.

[Even a Pekingese have they themselves acquired: That-one pisses one in-truth not the legs full, but he slobbers like a runny nanny-goat.]

‘They even got themselves a Pekingese: although it doesn’t piss all over your legs, it slobbers like a nanny goat on heat.’
(LPWC 25280-25281)

The contrastive adverb zwar is illustrated above, as in (6.105) where the speaker mentions drinking coffee, but denies knowing of any coffee parties at work. In (6.106), the speaker is not familiar with the logical puzzle game and the open content encyclopaedia project, but will endeavour to read up the article on the website. In (6.107), the character in the drama mentions a Pekingese dog and asserts that despite its not urinating on people, it slavers a great deal.

b) The expression an zwar

The expression an zwar means ‘(and) namely’ and similarly to German und zwar. It expresses elaborations or explanations.

(6.108)


[BSL makes me still always lots lots fun, but Urdu (Hindi on Arabic written) is boring. And namely not because the language itself, but because the method. He speaks the whole time on English, and we have the last week our body-parts made, so that I now know, that “calves” and “ankles” on Urdu is-called, but I know still always how one Sorry, You’re Welcome, or Bye says.]

‘BSL [= British Sign Language] is still a lot of fun, but Urdu (Hindi written in Arabic) is boring. It’s not the language, really, but the method. He speaks in English all the time, and last week, we did body parts, so that I now know how to say “calves” or “ankles” in Urdu, but I still [don’t] know how you say “sorry”, “you’re welcome” or “bye”.
(LEWC 7211-7219)
(6.109)

Ausserdem sot den T-- mer mettes heen hätt och scho mol eppes mat him gehat an ech fannen et berouegend, dass egal wou ech schaffen, emmer eppes konstant bleiwat an zwar dass den T-- eppes mat menger “Chefin” hat, dei duebel sou al ass wei ech an da fällt mir erem op, dass ech awer eng aner Generatioun sinn.

[Furthermore said the T-- me at-midday he would-have also already once something with her had and I find it calming, that regardless where I work, always something constant remains and namely that the T-- something with my “female-chef” had, who double so old is like I and then falls me again on, that I but an other generation am.]

‘Also, T-- told me today around midday that he already had had an affair with her and I find it reassuring that wherever I work there’s always one constant i.e. T-- has had a sexual relationship with my “boss”, who’s twice as old as I am, and then it strikes me again that I am of a different generation after all.’
(LEWC 1300-1305)

(6.110)

j--: du hüss rouig kéinte matgouen, l--, du bas nit ze schéin dofir.
l--: ech sin eng äenzeg doutsënn. da güët äien nit an d’kirich.
v--: da güët äë grad.
l--: ech gin. an zwar hei raus. an zwar fir zerguttst.

[J--: you would-have MP could with-go, L--, you are not too pretty that-for.
L--: I am one single death-sin. then goes one not in the church.
V--: then goes one especially.
L--: I go. And namely here out. And namely for to-best.]

‘J--: You could have come with us, L--, you’re not perfect either, are you?
L--: I’m one single deadly sin. People like that don’t go to church.
V--: That’s just when they should go.
L--: I’m off – out of here! – for ever!’
(LPWC 16816-16820)

An zwar is used to present further information on a subject. In sentence (6.108), the speaker explains why they initially say that their Urdu classes are boring. In (6.109), the speaker explains what they mean by having a ‘constant’ at their workplace. Finally, in (6.110), the speaker L-- uses an zwar to reformulate or improve their initial statement of departure. Note that L--’s sentences with an
zwar sounds rather colloquial and brisk; hence the dashes and exclamation marks were used in the translation.

c) The expression zwar net

The expression zwar net is used by speakers to indicate that they strongly disagree with and contradict what has been said previously. Below is the only example found in the corpora.

(6.111)

Schéi Geschicht! Dorop drénken ech!
Dann awer do bannen, well hei baussen huele mer ons nach d'Fräkescht. […]
Zwar nèt!

[Pretty story! On-that drink I!
Then but there inside, because here outside take we us still the death. […]
Namely not!]

‘Nice story! I’ll drink to that!
But inside, though, because outside here we’re gonna catch our death of cold.
No, we won’t!’
(LPWC 27891-27895)

Zwar net is used in (6.111) by the speaker to indicate that despite what has been said by the previous speaker, their health is not in danger.

Although not found in the corpora, there is also the similar zwar dach ‘yes, it is’, which is used to contradict previous negative statements, such as in the modified sentence (6.111’)

(6.111’)

Schéi Geschicht! Dorop drénken ech!
Dann awer dobaussen, well sou kal ass et awer och net virun der Dir…
Zwar dach!

[Pretty story! On-that drink I!
Then but there-outside, because so cold is it but also not in-front the door…
Namely yes!]
'Nice story! I’ll drink to that!
But outside, though, because it’s not that cold outside the house…
Oh, yes, it is!’

6.9.2 Non-propositional uses

a) the MP zwar

Although the propositional meaning of zwar exists in German, there is no present-day MP equivalent. In Luxembourgish, the MP zwar is used by speakers to add a further comment, usually with supplementary emotion, to a previous utterance. This use of zwar is undocumented in German.

(6.112)


[The ambiance is MP good think I, it is no taunting and it is also no so typical office-ambiance, that find I positive.]

‘The ambiance is good, I think, there is no gossiping and there’s also not that typical office atmosphere, I find that positive.’
(LEWC 1114-1116)

(6.113)

Majo, den armen R--… daat ass zwar schlem. all daat gehiews. eng keier falsch bewegung da bas de hin. ech hoffen en erhellt sech dann an fennt dann eppes bessers op der uni.

[Well, the poor R--… that is MP awful. all that lifting. One time wrong movement then are you over. I hope he recovers himself then and find then something better on the uni.]

‘Oh dear, poor R--… that’s awful, though. All this lifting. One wrong movement and that’s it. I hope he’ll recover well and that he’ll find something better at the university.’
(LEWC 5490-5492)

(6.114)

Thanks also for the article, I hope you know that I never do such a thing as publish an article without permission. C’mon, it’s only linguistics, not worth jeopardising a friendship for. Now, if you had a photo of the grand-duchess with A-- then that would be that, I wouldn’t have any scruples.

‘Thanks also for the article; I hope you know that I would never do such a thing as publish an article without permission. C’mon, it’s only linguistics, not worth jeopardising a friendship for. Now, if you had a photo of the grand-duchess with A--, then that would be that, I wouldn’t have any scruples.’

(LEWC 2398-2406)

Ech muss dir zwar soen, dass et mech awer déck freet, dass d’Mme G-- dir konnt hellefen, an dass se fein war mat dir, soss hätt se et mat mir ze dinn kritt...!!!

[I must you MP say, that it me MP thick pleases, that the Mrs G-- you could help, and that she nice was with you, otherwise would-have she it with me to do got...!!!]

‘Can I just say that I’m thrilled that Mrs G-- was able to help you, and that she was nice to you, otherwise she would have had to deal with me!’

(LEWC 5995-5997)

D’S-- geet mer zwar iergendwéi net aus dem Kapp, et war wierklech schlemm nozekucken, wéi hatt sech selwer a Saache ramanóvréiert huet an dann deenen anere Leit d’Schold dofir ginn huet.

[The S-- goes me MP somehow not from the head, it was really awful to-watch, how she herself in things manoeuvred in has and then those other people the fault that-for given has.]

‘Somehow, I can’t get S-- out of my head; it was really awful to watch her blundering into awkward situations and then blaming those other people for it.’

(LEWC 1760-1764)

Sentences like the ones above would only exist in German if they were followed by a contrastive conjunction, such as aber or jedoch. The MP zwar suggests to be similar to the MP awer and is found in indicative statements and exclamations. It occurs in sentences where a new idea or topic is introduced by the speaker, as in (6.112) where the speaker describes the mood in their workplace. In (6.113), the
speaker uses \textit{zwar} in an exclamation to express their concern over R--. The speaker in (6.114) uses \textit{zwar} to express the new idea that the speaker would have had no scruples if the hearer had had a certain photograph. In (6.115), the speaker uses \textit{zwar} with \textit{soen} ‘say’ to indicate that they wish to express their opinion. Similarly to (6.112), the speaker uses \textit{zwar} to introduce the new topic of S-- and the trouble she got into.

In conclusion, \textit{zwar} is found either in exclamations, frequently joined with \textit{sinn} ‘be’, or in indicatives, and speakers use the MP \textit{zwar} to indicate that the utterance or the idea in the utterance is new and was not brought in before. Although \textit{zwar} has no entry in Gangler (1984), the WLM (1906), or in the LWB (1995b), an MP use has been shown in 3.2.2, where Grimm and Grimm (1854-1960) talk of the \textit{beständigend} and \textit{versichernd} meaning of \textit{zwar}. The MP occurs exclusively in Altmann’s (1987) \textit{Grundtyp} 1 statements.

\textbf{6.10 Summary of Chapter}

Although previous literature has provided definitions and examples for some MPs, this chapter has provided a systematic description of MPs. As shown above, most modal particles in Luxembourgish with their non-propositional uses exist alongside a propositional use. However, there does not seem to exist any propositional meaning of \textit{alt}. The analysed MPs are used either to reinforce utterances, such as \textit{awer}, \textit{jo}, or \textit{zwar}, or to mitigate utterances, such as \textit{mol}, whereas others are used to express the veracity of the utterance, such as \textit{eben}. They are used either to reinforce or mitigate feelings and emotions expressed in an utterance, such as \textit{awer} and \textit{zwar}, or they reinforce or to mitigate directives, such as \textit{mol}, \textit{dach}, and \textit{roueg}. Other particles express casualness, such as \textit{alt}. \textit{(E)mol} is an interesting example of pragmaticalisation, since the erosion path is well illustrated from \textit{eemol} to \textit{mol} via \textit{emol}. Finally, there is an interesting case of sentence-initial \textit{dann} used in a similar way to modal particles found in the middle-field. Summarising information of uses of MPs and occurrence in their sentence moods is found in the discussion chapter 8.
7: Qualitative Analysis of DMs

7.0 Introduction
This chapter aims to provide a qualitative analysis of the following discourse markers found in LEWC and LPWC: bon, ben, enfin, héier(t), lauschter(t), ma, mä bon, ok(ay), so(t), and (e)sou. The first subsection for each search item covers the propositional meanings, whereas the second subsection covers the non-propositional uses. For items that have no propositional meanings, such as ben, there is only one subsection. The examples are provided with an English verbatim translation (italicised and preceded with an asterisk) and are then followed by an English target translation (in single quotes). The search item, whether propositional or non-propositional, is highlighted in bold. As already pointed out in subsection 4.4.2 and section 6.0, the spelling might deviate from the official orthography, i.e. the ‘mistakes’ in the examples are original ‘mistakes’. Section 7.11 provides a summary of this chapter.

7.1 Ben
7.1.1 Non-propositional uses
a) the DM ben
In French, ben derives from the adverb bien ‘well’ and if used as an adverb it has dialectal or at least stylistic undertones. As a DM, the use in both French and Luxembourgish does not suggest any dialectal variation. The DM is used to introduce answers or replies to previous utterances. They often indicate that the speaker is thinking about the answer (akin to example 7.1). In spoken Luxembourgish, the vowel can be lengthened to indicate that the speaker is pondering on an answer: /bɛː/. The Luxembourgish DM might occur more frequently in spoken language than in written texts. It is worth raising the question whether the participants and the authors consciously used ben to indicate reflection. Referring back to Dostie’s (2004: 46) DM typology mentioned above in subsection 2.1.6, ben is a sentence-initial signposting marker (marqueur de balisage).
(7.1)

Wat ech duerno wëll maachen? **Ben**, Unisprof am Fong.

[What I afterwards want make? **DM**, uni-professor in-the base.]

‘What I want to do later on? Well, basically be a university teacher. (LEWC 7364)

(7.2)

Hallo,
also dozuer soen ech lo mol naischt iwvert daat D--s do ier ech nach flippen. **Ben** dach, ech muss lo mol meng Roserei lass lossen.

[Hello, 
So there-to say I now once nothing about that D-- there before I else flip, **DM** yes, I must now once my anger loose let.]

‘Hello, 
Well, I’m not gonna say anything now about that D-- woman before I flip my lid. Well, alright, then, I just have to let off some steam now.’ (LEWC 5055-5058)

(7.3) Two people are talking.

An mengs de et ging klappen?
**Ben** ech hoffen, well e Plang B gët êt dës Kéier NET!

[And think you it would work-out? 
**DM** I hope, because a plan B exists it this time NOT!]

‘And you think this will work? 
Well I hope so, because as for a plan B, there is none’ (LPWC 28095-28096)

As seen above, *ben* is used as a DM introducing an answer or reply to a prior utterance and has not previously been documented in any literature on Luxembourgish.
7.2  
**Bon**

7.2.1  
**Propositional meanings**

a)  
the exclamative *ah bon*

The expression *ah bon* is used by speakers to express their surprise in respect of a previous utterance. In spoken language, this exclamative can be accompanied by a rising intonation (see example 7.5 below).

(7.4)

P1--:  
‘t ass wéi s d’et wélls huelen; ‘t ass ganz einfach d’Evolutiounstheorie, déi di al Griicche laang virum Darwin raushaten, mä iwwe déi zu Roum nach haut net gäre geschwat gëtt.

J--:  
À wat soen deng Konfrateren da sou, d’Land op, d’Land of?

P1--:  
Ech sinn iwwezet, datt déi meescht sech d’Buch kaaft hunn, mä…

P2--:  
An deng Meenong?

P1--:  
Ech soe jo: kale Kaffi!

L--:  
A **bon**! Da priedegs du deene Biischdrefere d’Evolutiounstheorie?

[P1--:  
*It is like you it want take; it is very easy the evolution-theory, that those old Greeks long before the Darwin out-had, but over those to Rome still today not willingly spoken is.*

J--:  
And what say your brothers MP so, the country up, the country down?

P1--:  
*I am convinced, that those most themselves the book bought have, but…*

P2--:  
And your opinion?

P1--:  
*I say MP: cold coffee!*

L--:  
**Exclamative!** Then preach you those B==.people the evolution theory?*

‘P1--:  
‘It depends how you see it; it’s simply the evolution theory which the Greeks put out, way before Darwin, but which the Vatican still doesn’t like to talk about these days.’

J--:  
And what do your confreres say, then, up and down the country?

P1--:  
I’m convinced that most of them bought the book, but…

P2--:  
And your opinion?

P1--:  
I told you: it’s an old chestnut!

L--:  
Oh right, so you’re preaching the theory of evolution to the people in B== [fictitious place].’

(LPWC 19846-19860)
Also, wann ech hei kucken, am Computer: Chauffeure gi gesicht. An net ze knapp. 

**Ah bon?**
A jo! Hei sinn der… 6... 7... 12... dräizeng Plazen als Chauffeur. Um camion. Véier um Bus.

*So, when I here look, in-the computer: drivers are searched. And not too scarce. Exclamative?*  
Ah yes! Here are of-those... 6... 7... 12... thirteen seats as driver. On-the truck. Four on-the bus.*]

‘So, if I have a look here on the computer: they are looking for drivers. There’s none too few positions either.  
Oh really?  
Oh yes! There are 6, 7, 12, 13 positions for drivers. On lorries. Four on buses.’  
(LPWC 27290-27294)

In (7.4), speaker L-- uses *ah bon* to express their surprise that that P1-- preaches about the evolution theory. In (7.5), the speaker expresses their surprise and perhaps also their disbelief that there are so many jobs available for drivers. Finally, in (7.6), the speaker M2-- expresses their surprise hearing that J-- owns a sauna.
b) the noun *bon sens*

*Bon sense* (‘good sense’) comes from French and means ‘common sense’. Another synonym in Luxembourgish is *Mënscheverstand* and German (*gesunder*) *Menschenverstand*. The word appears twice in one dialogue of the same dramatic character in the same play by the same author.

(7.7)

> U bon sens feelt et lech net, et steet lech am Gesicht geschriwen… […]
> A Leit mat *bon sens* verstinn sech êmmer, gell Dir…

[On good sense lacks it you not, it stands you in-the face written… […]
And people with *good sense* understand themselves always, isn’t-it you…]

‘You’re not without common sense, you know what’s going off…
And people with common sense understand each other, don’t they…
(LPWC 12173-12176)

7.2.2 Non-propositional uses

a) the DM *bon*

The discourse marker *bon* is used by speakers to indicate that the following utterance introduces a new topic or a new thought. It is a sentence-initial signposting marker.

(7.8) After complaining about a person:

> Also wann ech mech giert hun soll straiche mer des Konversatioun vun eiser Mémoire (distingueiert ausgedreckt!).
> *Bon* wei gesoot mir lossen daat Thema mol sou, a btw. beim B-- senger Infosprüfung haat ech herno eng an dei 50, also awer keng null :-D.

[So when I myself erred have should strike we this conversation from our memory (distinguished expressed!).
*DM* like said we let that theme once so, and *BTW* by-the B-- his info-test had I afterwards one in the 50, so but no zero :-D.]

‘But if I’m wrong we shall delete this conversation from our remembrance (to use a posh word).
Right, as I said, let’s just leave it like that, and *BTW* [=by the way] I got a mark in the 50s\(^\text{27}\) in B--’s IT test afterwards, so no zero as I thought.
(LPWC 5127-5132)

\(^{27}\) In Luxembourg, marks are given on a scale from 01 (worst) to 60 (best).
(7.9)
Hat haut rem [...] Réunioun a mäi Kapp ass geplatzt - ech muss Stonnepläng ausrechnen a sinn lo neierdengs do Chef Chantier vun den activités complémentaires - just well ech net um ***:00 already gone am and loud shouted have I would-have now migraine. ** Bon, do muss ech duerch, tässel roueg op d’C--.

[Had today again [...] meeting and my head is bursted - I must hour-plans calculate and am now recently there boss building-site of the activities complementary - only because I not on-the ***:00 already gone am and loud shouted have I would-have now migraine. DM, there I must I through, pile MP on the C--.]

‘Had a [...] meeting today again and my head burst - I have to work out time-tables and recently I’ve become the supervisor of out-of-school activities - only because I hadn’t already left at *** o’clock and hadn’t screamed that I’d got a migraine. Oh well, I just gotta get through this, feel free to pile things up on C--.’
(LEWC 4302-4310)

(7.10) The speaker is on the phone when two people enter the room:

…** Bon, ech ruffen iech dann nach eng kéier un. jo. awar. - ween hu mer dann do?!!

[...** DM, I call you then still one time on. yes. bye. - who have we MP there?!]

‘Alright then, I’ll call you another time. Yes. Bye. - And who have we got here?’
(LPWC 23570-23571)

(7.11) A teacher is talking in class about a murderer and his child victim, G--:


[Who calm watches how herself the G-- his mother the eyes of the head cries, how the G-- in-the grave lies and he, who the cause there-of is, runs free around. - ** DM, this is naturally all theory. Who that not concerns, that-one can MP already the irregular verbs for the next hour over-fly. Is there still a question of-that?]
'The one who’s cold enough to watch G--’s mother crying her eyes out over G-- lying in his grave, and who’s the cause of this, is running around free. Okay then, that’s all theory, of course. If that doesn’t concern you, you can, if you want, go over the irregular verbs for the next lesson. Are there any other questions about this?'
(LPWC 12116-12121)

As already pointed out, the speakers use bon to indicate that they are ‘moving on’ in the conversation. In (7.8), the speaker clearly indicates their desire to change the subject of the email conversation and introduce a new topic. In (7.9), the speaker uses bon to sum up that they have a lot of work to do and they will need to get busy with it. The speaker in A-- (7.10) uses bon to indicate that they wish to abruptly end the telephone call. In (7.11), the speaker uses bon to summarise their previous utterance by stating it is ‘only a theory’ and then to carry on by changing the subject.

To conclude, the discourse marker bon is used by speakers to finish one topic of conversation, sometimes unexpectedly, sometimes by also summarising what has previously been said, and by introducing a new topic of conversation.

7.3 Enfin

7.3.1 Propositional meanings

a) the adverb enfin

The adverb enfin means ‘finally’ and is used to indicate the end of something. In the only example found in (7.12) below, one is given to wonder whether the speaker is using the adverb taken idiosyncratically from the French. The Luxembourgish equivalent, endlech, which is similar to German endlich ‘finally’, is also used by the same speaker in the same example.

(7.12)
S--: Endlech! Do sid Der jo!
M--: Hei gët ee jo daf!
S--: Dir wollt jo nèt mat mir tauschen! Wou as d’Aaxt? (A-- mécht d’Wallis op, hèlt d’Aaxt eraus a gët dem S-- se)
S--: Enfin!
7.3.2 Non-propositional uses

a) the DM *enfin*

The DM *enfin* is used by speakers to wind up a previous topic and is thus a sentence-initial signposting marker. Although all instances of *enfin* in LEWC are uttered by the same speaker, a casual investigation using an online search engine reveals that *enfin* is used by other Luxembourghish speakers as well.

(7.13) After describing another city to the hearer who intends to go to L==.

> **Enfin, L== ass gutt. Grouss an huet vill ze bidden. An du wiers da £5 vu mir eweg. :-)**

> [DM, L== is good. Big and has lots to offer. And you would-be then £5 from me away.]

> ‘But yeah, L-- is okay. Big and has lots to offer. And you’d only be £5 away from me.’

(LEWC 7511-7513)

(7.14)

> Ech huelen un, du bass schon un d’Zäitschrëft [...] abonnéiert, nee? **Enfin, sou gutt ass se och warscheinlech net [...].**

> [I take on, you are already on the magazine [...] subscribed, no? **DM, so good is she also probably not [...]**]

> ‘I assume you’re already subscribed to the magazine […], aren’t you? Oh well, it’s probably not that interesting either […].’

(LEWC 8358-8360)
After reading that the hearer has got a new job:


[**Tip top, I am sure, that you now mega happy are, your place now official to have. Especially with the State-exam. DM, rather you than me.**]

‘Great, I’m sure you must be very happy now to have your job officially now. Especially with that state exam. Right, well, rather you than me.’

(LEWC 8229-8233)

*Enfin* not only concludes and wraps up a previous utterance, it is also used by the speaker to mitigate the previous utterance. What follows *enfin* is usually advantageous to the hearer. In (7.13), the speaker talks about the perks of S==, but concludes by saying that L== is good as well and has lots to offer. In example (7.14), the speaker assumes that the hearer has taken a subscription to a magazine, but mitigates this assumption with both *enfin* and *warscheinlich* ‘probably’, in case the hearer agrees with the speaker that the magazine is not very good. Finally in (7.15), the speaker mentions how the hearer had to pass an entry exam in order to get a job, and then mitigates the horrific feelings towards that exam by re-emphasising that the job is the hearer’s, not the speaker’s.

To summarise, *enfin* is used as a DM that introduces a conclusion to previous utterances while also mitigating any negative comments the speaker might have said. This DM use is exemplified in previous research mentioned in 3.3.2. However, Rinnen (1988: 376) and Derrmann-Loutsch (2006: 209) do not name or describe the phenomenon.

### 7.4 Héier(t)

#### 7.4.1 Propositional meanings

a) the verb *héieren*

In its propositional meaning, *héier* is the second-person singular imperative of *héieren* ‘to hear’, while *héiert* is the second-person plural imperative, as well as being third-person singular present.
et wonnert mech och net datt een duerchenee komme kann, wann een institut grand-ducal an europäescht parlament an engem otemzuch héiert.

[It wonders me also not that one confused come can, when one institute grand-ducal and European parliament in one breath hears.]

‘It’s no wonder you can get confused when you hear Grand-Ducal Institute and European Parliament in the same breath.’

(LEWC 5864-5866)

Hey cool, daat hériert sech gudd un, mengen daat get awer dann en patt wans du rem hei bass, dass du daat an d’rei gemaach hues fir mech!!

[Hey cool, that hears itself good on, think that exists MP then a glass when you again here are, that you that in the row made has for me!]

‘Hey cool, that sounds good, I think I’ll buy you a drink when you’re back here as a thank-you for fixing that for me!’

(LEWC 6732-3734)

Ech konnt d’Wierder, d’Sätz nêt versusuergen. Fest halen. Ech hun d’Erënnerung versusuert. Aus Gips… Gellt, Dir hériert et och nêt méi?

[I could the words, the sentences not take-care. Firm hold. I have the memory taken-care. From plaster… Isn’t-it, you hear it also not any more?]

‘I couldn’t provide the words, the sentences. Hold tight. I provided of the memory. Out of plaster…You don’t hear it any more either, do you?’

(LPWC 5081-5085)

In (7.16), hériert is used with the generic pronoun een ‘one’, in (7.17), hériert is used with the pronoun dat ‘that’ and the (separable) reflexive verb sech unhéieren ‘to sound good/bad’. In (7.18), hériert is preceded by the second-person plural pronoun.

7.4.2 Non-propositional uses
a) the DM héier

The DM héier is used by the speaker to signal the hearer to pay attention to the previous utterance and also marks it as important. According to Dostie (2004: 46),
héier would be classified as an attention-calling marker (*marqueur d’appel à l’écoute)*.

(7.19)

Aha, du kënnis also rëm heem op L==. Ben jo, wat soll ech och soen, ’t ass mol net sou eng domm Iddi, héier, well ech denken och dacks drun, fir eppes aneschters ze maachen wéi den MA.

[Aha, you come so again home on L==. DM yes, what should I also say, it is MP not so a stupid idea, DM, because I think also sometimes about-it, for something else to make than the MA.]

‘I see, so you’re coming back to L==. Well, yeah, what should I say, it’s not a silly idea, you know, because I sometimes think about it too, doing something other than an MA course.’

(LEWC 7898-7902)

(7.20)

Da geff dach Gaas. Dsei kreien eis, héier! Schäiss! Waat maache mer elo? Oh nee, net schon erem! Hei, mär hun e Breif kritt Geff Gaas, geff Gaas! Komm, komm, hopp!

[Then give MP gas. The-sows get us, DM! Shit! What make we now? Oh no, not already again! Here, we have a letter got give gas, give gas! Come, come, interj.!]}

‘C’mon, speed up. Those bastards will get us soon! Shit! What shall we do now? Oh no, not again! Look, we got a letter. Speed up, speed up! C’mon, c’mon, just do it! Quick!’

(LPWC 28789-28792)

(7.21)


[I say you so something not willingly, but later are you else over-qualified. Else teach you else better than the teachers later! Go MP not in the high-school, DM! Ask MP on-the […] after. Or ask MP after, how the formation continuous of the adults made is.]
‘I don’t like to tell you this, but you’ll be overqualified after all that. Otherwise you’ll teach better than the secondary-school teachers! Listen, don’t go into a secondary school! Why don’t you ask at the […] Or why don’t you find out how lifelong learning for adults is done.’

(LEWC 8279-8284)

(7.22)

Maach der opjiddefalls keng Suergen ob s du dat richtegt getraff hues oder net, héier, mír sinn all do wann s de eis brauchs.

[Make you by-all-means no worries whether you the correct struck have oder not, DM, we are all there when you us need.]

‘In any case, don’t worry whether you’ve decided the right thing or not, we’re all there if you need us.’

(LEWC 7930-7932)

From the examples above, only héier is used as a DM, whereas héiert is not. In the corpora, two sentence types use the DM héier. In sentences (7.19) and (7.20), héier is used in statements in which the speakers want to emphasise their utterance and reinforce the message. In sentences (7.21) and (7.22), the speakers use the DM in directives where attention is drawn to the directive.

To conclude, the DM héier is used by speakers to reinforce or emphasise their previous utterance, whether a statement or a directive. As already stated in 3.3.2, the DM héier(t) is undocumented in previous literature.

7.5 Lauschter(t)

7.5.1 Propositional meanings

a) the verb lauschteren

In its propositional meaning, lauschter is the second-person singular imperative of lauschteren ‘to listen’, while lauschtert is the second-person plural form imperative, as well as third-person singular present tense.

(7.23)

Bis dann a lauschter e besse […], dat berouegt

[Until then and listen a bit […], that calms-down.]
‘See you and listen to [music] for a bit, it calms down.
(LEWC 3096)

(7.24)
laufschter! héiers de? ech mengen, lo kënn nt en […] nee, ’t as en nach nët. ech hu mech geiirt.

[listen! hear you? I think, now comes he […] no, it is him still not. I have myself erred.]

‘Listen! You hear that? I think he’s coming now […] no, it’s not him yet. I was mistaken.’
(LPWC 23773-23775)

(7.25)
Lauschtert dach mol déi Musek!! Dat sin aner Sphären!

[Listen MP MP that music! Those are other spheres!]

‘Just have a listen to this music! That’s music of a different sphere!’
(LPWC 19953-19954)

Lauschter in (7.23) is used in an imperative and refers to listening to some music, whereas in (7.24), the speaker uses the imperative lauschter to instruct the hearer to pay attention to some noise. In (7.25), the speaker ask the hearers to listen to the music playing at that moment.

7.5.2 Non-propositional uses
a) the DM lauschter(t)
The DM is used by speakers to draw attention to their utterance. The German equivalent is hör(t) frequently followed by the German MP mal. In French, the cognate DM is écoute or écoutez, and in Quebec French there is the highly pragmaticalised DM coudon ‘listen’, which integrates both écoute ‘listen’ and the French MP donc (Dostie 2004). Lauschter(t) is found sentence-initially and is an attention-calling marker.
(7.26)

So **lauschter** mol!
Wat sinn dat fir Rotschléi a Saachen T-- A-- (oder “den Aasch mat Oueren” wéi mäi Papp seet). Ech hunn net welles mer mäi Ruff nach mei ze ruinéieren wéi e souwisou schonn hinüber ass am Moment.

[**DM DM MP!**
What are that for suggestions and things T-- A-- (or “the arse with ears” like my father says). I have not wanting me my call again more to ruin like it anyhow already over is in-the-moment]

‘Well excuse me!
What are those suggestions all about, and those things about T-- A-- (or “the arsehole with ears” as my dad says)? I have no intention ruining my reputation any further, since in any case at the moment it’s already done for.’

(LEWC 3183-3188)

(7.27)

De Pappa kann der de Bibbi lo net laanscht bréngen… Neen! D’Mamma och net!... **Lauschter** mol Spatz! Du bass e groust groust Meedchen, wann s du den Owend ouni de Bibbi schléifs!

[The daddy can you the Bibbi now not along bring... No! The mummy also not!... **DM MP** sparrow! You are a big big girl, when you the evening without the Bibbi sleep!]

‘Daddy can’t bring your teddy bear over to you now… No! Mummy can’t either!… Listen, pumpkin! You’ll be a big, big girl if you go to sleep without your teddy bear tonight!’

(LPWC 9371-9375)

(7.28) A necklace is mysteriously found in a pasta sauce.

Also **Kanner**, **lauschter** mol! D’Saach ass einfach.Wann d’E-- d’Kette wierklech net an Zooss geschmuggelt huet, - ech war et och net.

[So children, **DM MP!** The thing is easy. If the E-- the necklace really not in the sauce smuggled has, - I was it also not.]

‘OK, guys, listen. It’s simple: if E-- really didn’t smuggle the necklace in the sauce, - it wasn’t me either.

(LPWC 7536-7538)

Although initially an imperative, **lauschter** or **lauschtert** has become a DM, grabbing the attention of the speakers. In (7.26), the speaker draws attention to the hearer’s previous suggestion and also indicates their offence. In 7.27, the speaker
uses the DM to get the attention of his young daughter in order to explain that she has to sleep the night without her teddy bear. In (7.28), the speaker asks for the hearers’ attention to order to explain something about a necklace.

In conclusion, lauschter (one hearer) and lauschtért (several hearers) are used by the speaker to draw attention to what they have to say, a sense already mentioned in the LWB (1995b: 20). The words are frequently followed by the MP mol.

7.6 Ma

7.6.1 Propositional meanings

a) the conjunction ma

Only found in LPWC, the adversative conjunction ma is related to the conjunction mä (also spelt <mee> or <mais>), which appears more frequently than the latter one. Ma is used in the sentences below, but the synonym mä could equally well have been used, without change of meaning. Although it has been shown in subsection 3.3.2 that French mais can be translated into Luxembourgish mais or ma, much further evidence would be needed to confirm that the DM ma derives from French. It is worth wondering whether the Italian conjunction ma ‘but’ might have had an influence on Luxembourgish, taking into account the high percentage of Italian immigrants in Luxembourg and that ma is used as a DM in Italian (Carla Bazzanella, email communication).

(7.29) The speaker talks about how the hearer become subverted by eating illegal meat:

Ech hun dech kompromittéiert. Virdru wars du esou riicht wei e Biischtstill. Ma et as net meng Schold. Du hues Fleesch am Läif, wat soll ech do nach grousse eremräissen?

[I have you compromised. Before were you so straight like a broom-stick. But it is not my fault. You have meat in-the body. What should I there still big about-rip?]

‘I’ve compromised you. You were as straight as a ramrod before. But it’s not my fault. You have flesh inside you, what am I supposed to do to change anything much about that?’

(LPWC 6118-6121)
(7.30) G-- talks to M-- while F-- is listening:

G--: Also, M--, lo gi Neel mat Käpp gemaach. Datt dir d’Sfad mat äere Skateboards rebellesch maacht, Bauzegkeete op d’Eisenbunnswee schmiert an heiandso engem Vietnames d’Fënster ageheit, dat geet jo nach…

F--: (hemst geféierlerch)

G--: Ma datt dir am hellen Do op een Honnsfriemen andrescht, bis kee Liewenshauch méi an em ass… dat ass eng aner Saach, eng ganz aner Saach.

[G--: DM, M--, now become nails with heads made. That you the city with your skateboards rebellious make, loutishness on the railway waggons smear and sometimes to-a Vietnamese the window in-thrust, that goes MP still…

F--: (harrumphs dangerously)

G--: But that you in-the bright day on a dog-stranger trash, until no living breath any more in him is… that is another thing, a very other thing.]

‘G--: So, M--, let’s get down to business, shall we? It’s one thing to be a skateboard rebel in the city, to scrawl idiocies on railway carriages and now and again to smash in the window of some Vietnamese person…’

F--: (grunts menacingly)

G--: But for you to beat the living hell out of a complete stranger in broad daylight until there’s not a breath of life left in him… that’s a different matter, a very different matter.’

(LPWC 11631-11638)

(7.31)

Awer, M--, hien ass der Haarder een, oder mécht, wéi wann. Regelméisseg eng Datz28 am Franséische, ma de King am Aikido an am “Atelier”…

[But, M--, he is the hard-ones one, or makes, as if. Regularly a poor-grade in-the French, but the king in-the aikido and in-the “workshop”…]

‘But, M--, he’s one of these hard guys, or pretends to be. Regularly getting poor grades in French, but the “king” at aikido and down the “workshop”…’

(LPWC 11967-11969)

The speaker uses ma as a conjunction in (7.29) to indicate that despite having compromised the hearer it is not the speaker’s fault. In (7.30), G-- uses ma to point out that there is a distinction between M--’s anti-social behaviour and

28 Luxembourgish school term denoting a mark below 30 points out of 60 (<50%).
assaulting a stranger. In (7.31), the speaker identifies M-- poor performance in school while doing well in martial arts and in vocational activities.

7.6.2 Non-propositional uses

a) the DM *ma*

There are seven different uses of *ma* that can be found in LEWC and LPWC. All uses are found sentence-initially and are mostly signposting markers. Firstly, it is used expressively; the speaker becomes emotive and feels the need to express their opinion at all costs.

(7.32)

Nee, maach wats de wells, mee et muss ee sech net grat eremerkennen dran, also ech géing dat gäer virdru gesinn an autoriséieren, *ma* so mol.

*[No, make you want, but it must one itself not really again-recognise in-it, so I would that willingly before see and authorise, DM DM MP.]*

‘No, do what you want to do, but people shouldn’t really recognise themselves in it, so I’d really like to see it in advance and authorise it, honestly!’

(LEWC 1938-1941)

(7.33)


*[Be-ashamed?! I? DM you snotty-one there! The hedges stink MP still, where your rags on-it hung, I have your father already known, there were you still in-the cabbage!]*

‘Ashamed? Me? Oh, you little snot! The hedges still stink where your nappies were hung up. I already knew your father when you were still in the cabbage patch!’

(LPWC 7859-7861)
(7.34) 

So, elo hänk awer a Schecks\textsuperscript{29}. Ech kommen aus dem Bing. Ech freeë mech wei e Kichelchen fir dech erem ze gesin an da kreien ech hei en deckt Ouer gemaach. \textbf{Ma} Himmelnonditschä!

\textit{[DM, now hang MP in shiksa. I come from the jail. I rejoice myself like a biscuit for you again to see and then get I here a thick ear made. DM heaven-name-of-God!]} \hspace{1cm}

‘Now, just calm down, woman. I’m just outa jail. There’s me looking forward like a child at Christmas to seeing you again and you’re giving me an earful. Fucking hell!’

(LPWC 28730-28733)

When used expressively, the DM \textit{ma} is used in sentences where the speaker is giving a negative or unpleasant opinion. In (7.32), the speaker indicates that, although the hearer can do what they want, the speaker strongly insists on checking it and giving consent to it. In (7.33), the speaker reproaches the hearer, and indicates that the hearer is a very young person by referring the hearer’s snot and the stink of the drying nappies they not-so-long-ago used to wear. In (7.34), the speaker, who has just been released from prison, swears at their partner for having issued a reprimand instead of a welcome.

A second use of \textit{ma} is topic expansion, where the speaker indicates that they would like to add further information to a topic.

(7.35)

\begin{tabular}{p{3cm}p{12cm}}
D--: & (zum I--) Sot him, hie kéint d’Gaardenhaische nees bei sech oprichten! Wann en sou drun hängt. \\
A--: & Ech sin ee vun den Artisten, déi \\
D--: & \textbf{Ma} da kënnt Der jo eppes mam Gaardenhaischen ufänken! (zum I--) Sot dem Baggersmann, e soll d’Haischen nêt an e Koup rennen. Hei as een, dee kann d’Holz nach verwäerten... \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{29}Schécks originally comes from Yiddish \textit{shikse} ‘gentile girl’, but is now a colloquial Luxembourgish term for a young woman.
(7.36) Two characters are talking about a third character, M--, who is Portuguese:


Joffer K--: Aha!

A--: Hie sot: „Soss dréit dat de Muttergotteshimmel um Enn nach zu zwee, an dat duerf ech op kee Fall zouloossen, a scho guer net, wann dat Framënsch M-- de Lourdsch heescht.“

Joffer K--: Zu zwee! Ma dann ass dat jo…

A--: „Ech hunn och esou geduecht“, sot d’Mumm Séiss.

[During:] There runs one. The mister has only so insinuations made, but he said: “When that is-correct, what I think, then helps tha woman-person on no case by the Corpus-Christi-procession the Mother-of-God-sky carry.

Miss K--: Aha!

A--: He said: “Else carries that-one the Mother-of-God-heaven in-the end already to two, and that may I on no case allow, and already at-all not, when that woman-person M-- the Lourdsch is-called.”

Miss K--: To two! DM then is that MP…

A--: “I have also so thought”, said the Mumm Séiss.]
‘A--: There’s something going on. The priest only hinted at something, but he said, “If that’s true what I think, then this woman cannot under any circumstances help to carry the canopy of the Virgin Mary during the Corpus Christi procession”.

Miss K--: I see…

A--: He said, “Otherwise, when all’s said and done, there’ll be two of them carrying the Virgin’s canopy, and I can’t permit that under any circumstances, and absolutely not, if that woman’s name is M-- de Lourdsch.”

Miss K--: Two of them? So you mean…

A--: “Just what I was I thinking”, said Mumm Séiss.’

(LPWC 21989-22002)

(7.37)

| g--: | ët huet mer souguer ganz gutt gefall. awer ët as eng prinzipsfro: ech sin éierlech a gin der méng fra, awer du schummels a gëss mer déng sekretärin! |
| a--: | lo bääß dech nèt doranner fest! |
| g--: | ma nawell grad! du huess gefuddelt! awer ech hu gewonn! ech hu mech nämlech verléift! |
| a--: | a méng sekretärin?! |
| g--: | ech gin souguer méi wäit a behaapten, hatt huet sech och a mech verléift! |

[g--: it has me even very good pleased, but it is a question-of-principle: I am honest and give you my woman, but you cheat and give me your secretary!

a--: now bite yourself not in-it firm!

g--: DM MP exact! you have cheated! but I have won! I have myself namely fallen-in-love!

a--: and/in my secretary?

g--: I go even more far and claim, she has herself also in me fallen-in-love!]

‘G--: I really liked it actually. But I’m making a point here: I’m being honest and I give you my wife, but you cheat and give me your secretary!

A--: Now don’t get wound up!

G--: Well, quite! You cheated! But I won! I’ve fallen in love, I tell you.

A--: With my secretary?!

G--: I would go even further and claim that she’s fallen for me too!’

(LPWC 23953-23961)

30 ‘de Lourdsch’ is a Luxembourgish spelling reflecting the Portuguese surname <(de) Lourdes> with a final voiceless palato-alveolar fricative.

31 ‘Mumm Séiss’ (Aunt Suzy) is a character in the eponymous Luxembourgish operetta by Edmond de la Fontaine.
In (7.35), speaker D-- uses *ma* to expand on the topic that A-- could make use of the wood from the garden shed. In (7.36), the speaker K-- starts her sentence with *ma* to indicate that she has reached the conclusion that the character M-- de Lourdsch appears to be pregnant. In (7.37), G-- uses *ma* to tell A-- about how G-- and A--‘s secretary fell in love.

The third use of *ma* is found in expressive questions:

(7.38) A couple discussing J--‘s scarf:

J--: *Hat ech en déi leschté Kéier dann net och di ganzen Zäit un?*

P--: *Wat weess ech?*

J--: *Ma kucks du dann net?*

P--: *Wat?*

J--: Kucks du mech net? Du kucks mech net! Du weess net, ob ech de Schal un hat oder net!

[J--: *Had I it the last time then not also the whole time on?*

P--: *What know I?*

J--: *DM look you then not?*

P--: *What?*

J--: *Look you me not? You look me not! You know not, whether I that scarf on had or not!*]

‗J--: Wasn’t I wearing it all the time on the last occasion?

P--: What do I know?

J--: Well, don’t you look at me?

P--: What?

J--: Don’t you look at me? You don’t look at me! You don’t know whether I was wearing that scarf or not!‘

(LPWC 9663-9670)

(7.39) The characters’ son comes home and goes immediately upstairs.

MAMM: *Ma* wat huet en haut? Dat ass dach soss net seng Manéier.

PAPP: Also, Manéiere sinn dat net.

MAMM: Vläicht huet en Ierger an der Schoul.

[Mother: *DM what has he today? That is MP else not his manner.*

Father: *DM, manners are that not.*

Mother: *Perhaps has he trouble in the school.*]

‗Mother: What’s the matter with him today? That’s not his usual behaviour.

Father: Well, you can’t call that “behaviour”.

Mother: Perhaps he’s got some trouble at school.‘

(LPWC 11521-11523)
In (7.38), speaker J-- is annoyed that speaker P-- does not pay attention as to whether a certain scarf was worn or not. In (7.39), the character of the mother uses ma to add more emotion to her inquiry after her son. In (7.40), the speaker loses patience with the hearers for standing around and looking gloomy because the speaker is helping his friend.

A fourth use of ma is to introduce answers or replies to questions. The questions under review are either explicit, such as those found in LPWC, or implicit due to the asynchronous nature of emails in LEWC.

(7.41) J-- and P-- are getting ready to go out to a dinner party:

J--: Nom éischte Maufel dees d’n en aus! Watfiree Paltong dees d’iwwregens un?
P--: Ma deen.

[J--: *After-the first mouthful do you it out! What-for-one jacket do you by-the-way on?*
P--: *DM that-one.*]

‘J--: After the first mouthful, you’ll be taking it off! Which jacket are you putting on by the way?
P--: Well, that one.’

(LPWC 9750-9753)
(7.42) T-- A-- is talking to somebody on the mobile phone.


[E--, yes. **No,** it is the A--. T-- A--, yes. No, it goes now bad, we are en-route in-the car. **DM,** the F--, K-- J--... the whole team. Fishing! On-the border fishing.]

‘E--, yes. No, it’s A--. T-- A--, yes. No, this is a bad time, we’re on our way in the car. Oh, with F--, K-- J--..., the whole gang. Fishing! Fishing on the border.’
(LPWC 28568-28571)

(7.43)

**Irgendwei as schon rem Sonnden. Irgendwei geht et mega schnell.**
**Ma** dach, ech denken dach nach un dech :-(.
Hei get et eigentlech net vill ze soen.

[**Somehow is already again Sunday. Somehow goes it mega quick.**
**DM** yes, I think MP still to you.
**Here is it actual not lot to say.**]

‘Somehow it’s Sunday again. Somehow things go really quickly. Well of course I still do think about you. There is not much to tell here, actually.’
(LEWC 5249-5251)

(7.44) M-- and R-- talking about a posh meal they had.

m--: a mär woussten nêt, wat eng kaper wär.
r--: **ma** sécher wousste mer, wat eng kaper wär.
m--: du duechst, ët wären déck fëscheeër.
r--: ech hu jhüst de geck gemeet.

[M--: And we knew not, what a caper would-be.]
[R--: **DM** sure knew we, what a caper would-be.]
[M--: You thought, it would-be thick fish-eggs.]
[R--: **I have just the fool made.**]

‘M--: And we didn’t know what capers were.
R--: Of course we knew what capers were.
M--: You thought they were big fish eggs.
R--: I was only joking.’
(LPWC 15714-15717)

In (7.41), responsive **ma** is used in an answer to a previous question asked by another dramatic character. In (7.42), the character also uses **ma** to give an answer
on the mobile phone to the implicit question about where they are heading for. In (7.43), the speaker uses *ma* in an answer to the question or comment asked by the hearer in a previous email expressing the idea to the speaker that the speaker never thinks about the hearer. In (7.44), the speaker uses *ma* to reply to the previous comment that both characters really did not know what capers were. As is apparent from the examples above, *ma* can be used either as a response or as a comment to a previous utterance by another speaker.

A fifth use of the DM *ma* is to allow speakers to introduce a new topic of conversation. This use of *ma* is found consistently in LEWC at the beginning of emails. This use could have derived from the function mentioned above of replying to topics and answering questions.

(7.45)

Hallo,
*ma* schei wann ech dech un d’Laache kreien, da schreien ech dir dach direkt nach emol, well ech hun emmer vill op Lager fir d’Leit laachen ze din.

[Hello, *DM* pretty when I you on the laughing get, then write I you *MP* direct still once, because I have always lot on stock for the people laughing to do.]

‘Hello, Well that’s nice if I get you to laugh, then, I’ll write back to you straight away, because I’ve always got a lot of things in stock to make people laugh.’
(LEWC 867-870)

(7.46)

Hallochen c--!
*Ma* also dan debugge mer mool :) ech huelen un datt et en […] ass? Den éischte schratt ass datt der di neitsten firmwares vun hierie homepage download an déi installéiert am router […].

[Little-hello C--! *DM* so then debug we *MP* I take on that it en […] is? The first step is that you the newest firmwares from their homepage download and those install in-the router […].]
‘Heyho, C--!
Right, let’s debug, shall we? I assume that it’s a […]? The first step is for you to download the latest firmwares from their website and to install them in the router […]’
(LEWC 6220-6225)

(7.47)
halloechen,
hun dech net um MSN gesin dofir eng eischter mei ‘traditionell’ e-mail :-) 
Ma daat E-- huet mer geschriwen. Witzeg, hat mengt du wiers e Meedchen :-)

[little-hello,
Have you not on-the MSN seen that’s-why a rather more ‘traditional’ email - DM that E-- has me written. Funny, she thinks you would-be a girl]

‘Heyho,
Didn’t see you on MSN, hence this more “traditional” email instead. Right, that E-- wrote to me. Funny, she thinks you’re a girl.’
(LEWC 5561-5564)

The three examples (7.45), (7.46), and (7.47) are the opening paragraphs of emails as shown with the greetings Hallo and Hallöchen. Both (7.45) and (7.46) start straight away with the content of the email as indicated by the introductory ma. In (7.47), the speaker first comments on the circumstances of writing the email. Only after that, when they introduce the actual content of their email, do they use ma.

A sixth use of ma by speakers is to emphasise their directives. Although still used sentence-initially, the use as a signposting marker is lost.

(7.48) The speaker is talking to somebody on the mobile phone.

Neen, dat geet net! Mir komme soss ze spéit! Ma da looss et kräischen. A so him, et wär schnoll e groust Meedchen!

[No, that goes not! We come else too late! DM then let it cry. And say her, it would-be already e big girl!]

No, that’s not on! We’ll get there too late otherwise! Just let her cry, then. And tell her she’s a big girl already!
(LPWC 9365-9369)
(7.49)

Ma da géi direkt an ’dJuddegaass bei deem L-- seng Al, an da seecs de direkt, se sollen e Samschdeg op de Kaffi kommen!

[DM then go direct in the Jews’-alley by that L-- his old-one, and then say you direct, they should on Saturday on the coffee come!]

‘Right, go quickly into Jews’ Alley to L--’s old mum and tell her quickly they should come over for supper on Saturday!’

(LPWC 21568-21569)

(7.50)

F--: Dir waart en Dënschdeg de mëtten am Stater Park. Dir gouft gesinn. An Dir hut eppes gesinn.
S--: Jo, d’Tulpe virwëtze schon, déi kleng Luusserten.
F--: Ma stell dech net sou saudomm, du Fatzbeidel! Du waars do wéi d’Kläpperei lass goung…

[F--: You were a Tuesday the afternoon in-the City’s park. You were seen. And you have something seen.
S--: Yes, the tulips pry already, those little rogues.
F--: DM stand yourself not so sow-dumb, you rags-pouch! You were there how the fight loose went…]

‘F--: You were in the city park on Tuesday afternoon. People saw you. And you saw something.
S--: Yes, tulips poking their noses out already, those little rogues.
F--: Oh, don’t you play the idiot with me, you rag-bag! You were there when the fight started…’

(LPWC 11803-11807)

The first two directives contain the cluster ma da, both contributing to the force of the command. In (7.48), the speaker instructs the hearer to let a girl carry on crying and in (7.49) the speaker tells the hearer to invite somebody’s mother to a meal. The speaker in (7.50) on the other hand, where the DM ma is not followed by dann issues a command to the hearer to stop telling lies.

The seventh final use of ma seems to derive from the previous, directive use. Whereas the directive use can occur throughout a conversation, the final use of ma, the conclusive ma occurs towards the end of conversations. In the examples, which appear below, speakers use ma to indicate that they are wrapping up what they are saying. Similar to the introductory ma, the conclusive use of ma is predominantly found more in LEWC than in LPWC.
(7.51)

Ma mell dech wanns de hei bass, ausser du bass schonn ausgebucht :o)!
Bis dann,

*[DM get-in-touch yourself when you here are, apart you are already out-booked!]*
*Until then,*

‘Well, get in touch if you’re here, unless you’re already booked up!
See you,’
(LEWC 4138-4140)

(7.52)

Ma da gesi mer eis mar,
bis dann,

*[DM then see we us tomorrow,]*
*until then.*

‘Right, we’ll meet tomorrow, then.
See you!’
(LEWC 621-622)

(7.53)

Ma dann
Tschü

*[DM then]*
*Bye*

‘Alright then
Bye bye’
(LEWC 5347-5348)

(7.54)

De Mann huet awer sou em di *** Joer a geschter sot de K-- mer, jo ech soll oppassen, well deen hått e Faible fir Meedercher tescht 18 an ***. Ma gudd dann.

*[The man has but so around the *** year and yesterday said the K-- me, quot. I should pay-attention, because that-one would-have a weakness for girls between 18 and ***. DM good then.]*
‘That man is ***-ish, though, and K-- said to me, like, I should be careful because they say he’s got a weakness for girls between 18 and ***. Oh well, bring it on, then.’
(LEWC 395-397)

The reason why the directive *ma* might have evolved into the conclusive *ma* is shown in (7.51), where the speaker uses a directive geared to the hearer, asking them to get back in touch. The farewell phrase *bis dann* ‘see you’ then indicates that the speaker has finished wrapping up the email. In the next sentence, (7.52), the speaker does not use *ma* with a directive; instead, the speaker uses a first person plural construction followed by *bis dann*. In (7.53), the speaker uses the DM *ma* in the minimal phrase *ma dann* ‘alright then’, followed by a farewell. In (7.54), the speaker uses *ma* and *dann* to indicate that they are bringing to an end a previous utterance by the speaker about the man who has a weakness for young women. The actual email is not, however, brought to end, as it continues for another more than 20 lines.

To sum up the seven DM uses of *ma*: firstly, there is a group that uses *ma* for expressiveness, and this is already mentioned in 3.3.1 by Schanen (1980). Subsection 3.3.2 mentioned that the WLM (1906: 278) refers to *ma* as an interjection, possibly because of its sentence-external position. This use is seen when speakers use the DM to express their opinion, to expand a topic of conversation, and to ask a question while under the stress of emotion. Furthermore, *ma* is also used to reply to questions or to add a comment. As for the questions, they can be explicit or implicit, and previously asked synchronously (such as in LPWC) or asynchronously (such as in LEWC). From this use in replying, application to the opening of emails and introduction of a new topic of conversation has developed as a further shade of use. Moreover, *ma* is found in directives, especially imperatives, from which the last shade of use of *ma* comes, where speakers use the DM to conclude or bring their emails to a close. It is difficult to show the actual development of uses of *ma*; without any further investigation, no pragmaticalisation path will be attempted to be drawn in this thesis. Most of latter uses have not been documented in the dictionaries mentioned in 3.3.2. A summary of the seven uses of the DM *ma* is given in figure 7.1 below.
7: Qualitative Analysis of DMs

7.7 Mä bon

7.7.1 Non-propositional uses

a) the DM mä bon

The DM mä bon corresponds to the French DM mais bon, literally meaning ‘but good’. Found solely in LEWC, it is used by speakers to express acceptance of something mentioned in the previous utterance, where it is felt as inevitable. Mä bon is thus a signposting marker and is found sentence-externally.

(7.55)

Ech stung do wéi en Iesel a wosst iwwerhaapt net méi wat ech sollt soen. Mee bon, iergendwéi si mer do rem aus däer Saach erauskomm.

[I stood there like a donkey and knew at-all not anymore what I should say. DM, somehow are me there again out that thing out-come.]

‘I was standing there like an ass and didn’t know at all what to say any more. But anyway, somehow we manage to get out of it.’

(LEWC 888-890)

(7.56) The speaker is considering leaving country and partner.

Egal et as net dei einfachsten Decisioun, och weinst dem B-- (mee bon, ech soen mer alt emmer en ass virdrun och ouni mech eens gin), mee meng Elteren brauchen mech och (meng Mamm scheint den Dout vun hierer Schwester net sou gutt ze verkraaften), also mengen ech och dass et lo Zait get Heem ze kommen.

[Whatever it is not the easiest decision, also because-of the B-- (DM, I say myself MP always he is before also without me one give), but my parents need me also (my mother seems the death of her sister not so good to cope), so think I also that it now time is home to come.]
‘Never mind, it’s not the easiest decision, also because of B-- (oh well, I always tell myself that he used to cope without me before), but my parents need me as well (my mum doesn’t seem to cope very well with her sister’s death), so I think it’s now time to go back home.’

(LEWC 4803-4808)

(7.57)

Ma ech wees jo net genee wat meng Schwester dir do verziet huet, **mee bon** verspriech dir net zevill vu menger kleger arbecht. Et war nämlech eng einfach kleng Arbecht am Kader hun engem Proseminar.

[**DM I know MP not precise what my sister you there told has,** **DM promise yourself not too-much of my little work. It was namely a simple little work in-the framework of a proseminar.**]

‘Right, well I don’t know exactly what my sister told you, but yeah, don’t expect too much of my short paper. It was just simply a little piece as part of an introductory seminar course.’

(LEWC 5891-5894)

(7.58) The speaker is discussing the prospective choice between modules and dissertation.

Mee well ech d’Naechst Joer fir dei eischten Keier mol eng Keier e richtegen Choix hunn fir maer datt eraus ze sichen watt ech well, hunn ech decideiert dei 4 coursen an keng Dissertatioun ze maachen. Et ass wirklech schued, **mee bon.** Hoffen dann awer och meng Coursen ze kreien!

[**But because I the next year for the first time once one time a right choice have for me that out to search what I want, have I decided those 4 courses a no dissertation to make. It is truly a-pity, DM. Hope then but also my courses to get!**]

‘But because for the first time I get a proper choice to pick out what I want, I have decided to do those 4 courses and no dissertation. It’s really a shame, but hey! Hope to get my choice of courses, though!’

(LEWC 6030-6038)

In (7.55), the speaker explains having felt like a fool, but **mä bon** mitigates this utterance and the speaker moves on metaphorically and the narrative ends on a different note. In (7.56), the speaker expresses some worries about another person, but acknowledges the inevitable that B-- got along before knowing the speaker and will do so after the speaker has left. In (7.57), the speaker acknowledges that the hearer has spoken to the speaker’s sister, but whatever was said had no
bearing on the quality of the speaker’s short paper. Finally, in (7.58), the speaker finds it a pity not being able to write a dissertation, but accepts the situation nevertheless.

To summarise mà bon, the DM is used by speakers to express the idea that although they might speak negatively about something, they mitigate the situation insofar as they accept it as unavoidable. This use is not documented in the dictionaries mentioned in 3.3.2.

7.8 Okay
7.8.1 Propositional meanings
a) the adjective okay
When used as an adjective, okay is synonymous with ‘good’, ‘correct’, or ‘acceptable’.

(7.59)

dann get et och nach een b&b fun *** pond deen net um interent ass. den k-- waar schon do, ass ok an zentral. ech kinnt eech do eng kummer reserveieren wanns du wells.

[Then exists it also still a B&B of *** pounds that not on-the internet is. The K-- was already there, is okay and central. I could you there a room reserve when you want.]

‘Then there’s also a B&B for £*** which is not on the internet. K-- has been there before, it’s okay and central. I could book you a room if you want.’
(LEWC 8787-8791)

(7.60)
dat mat dem breiw as ok kanns du roueg machen.

[That with that letter is okay can you MP make.]

‘That thing with the letter, that’s okay; feel free to do it.’
(LEWC 6351)

(7.61) Somebody else mentions H--’s heart condition.

d--: maja, h--, ech hun nach nét gefrot, wéi ët mat déngem hiärz as ...
h--: alles ok! ech muss just lues maachen! keng onnéideg opreegung!
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[D--: ]  DM, H--, I have still not asked, how it with your heart is...
H--:  All okay! I must only slow make! No unnecessary excitement!

‘D--: Oh yeah, H--, I still haven’t asked you how your heart it…
H--: Everything’s okay! I just have to take it easy. No unnecessary excitement!’
(LPWC 26496-26499)

As seen in the examples above, okay is used as a positive connotation. It is worth noting that in the three translations provided, English also uses okay.

7.8.2 Non-propositional uses

a) the DM okay

As a first use of the DM, okay expresses agreement by speakers with or confirm what has been previously uttered. A Luxembourgish synonym for this usage is an der Rei ‘in the row’, cognate to German in Ordnung. English has ‘alright’, ‘very well’, or ‘okay’. It is a sentence-external signposting marker.

(7.62) The hearer made a request to the speaker.

Ok kee Problem, ech soen him daat schon, keen spam. Ech well sou Saachen och net, ech wees daat nervt total.

[DM no problem, I say him/her that already, no spam. I want so things also not, I know that annoys total.]

‘OK, no problem, I’ll make sure to tell her; no spam. I don’t want those things either; I know it’s totally annoying.’
(LPWC 5164-5165)

(7.63) The speaker is on the mobile phone.

en dokter… eng ambulanz, wannechgelift… en infarkt, mengen ech… jo, maache mer… direkt… ok…

[a doctor… an ambulance, please… an infarct, think I… yes, make we… direct… DM…]

‘a doctor… an ambulance, please… a heart attack, I think… yes, we’ll do… immediately… ok…’
(LPWC 27058-27059)
In its second usage, *okay* is used by speakers to indicate the end of a previous conversation topic and the beginning of a new one. Similarly, *okay* is sometimes also used to signpost a new strand in the present conversation.

(7.62) The speaker is rounding off their email.

Ausserdem kennt hei kee mei aus dem Haus well alles hoffnungslos ageschneit ass. Oi. **Ok** ma vill Gleck da mam R-- an ech melle mech soubal ech eppes méi Spannendes ze zielen hun…

*[Furthermore comes here nobody more out the house because all hopeless in-snowed is. Oy. DM DM lot luck then with-the R-- and I get-in-touch myself as-soon-as I something more exciting to tell have…]*

‘What’s more nobody can get out of their house because everything is hopelessly snowed up. Oh dear. Alright then, well good luck with R-- and I’ll get back in touch as soon as I have something more exciting to relate…’

(LEWC 681-684)

(7.63)

**Salut,**

eppes noschecken misst kee Problem sin, wann et net mei sou grouss ass. **Ok,** vill Spass dann nach

*[Hello, Something after-send would-must no problem be, when it not anymore so big is. DM, lots fun then still]*

‘Hello, Sending another thing shouldn’t be any problem, so long as it’s not as big any more. Alright, have some good fun then.’

(LEWC 5174-5177)

(7.64)


*[You are no on the head fallen, you know very precise, who the G-- dead-struck has. DM - you are fair, you stand yourself in-front your band. You want nobody in devil’s kitchen bring. But you see not, that you yourself there-with self in devil’s kitchen bring.]*
‘You were not born yesterday; you know very well who beat G-- to death. Alright, you’re a fair person; you put yourself in front of others. You don’t want anybody to get into hot water. But you don’t see that it’s you who’s getting into hot water that way.’
(LPWC 11680-11684)

In (7.62), the speaker uses the DM *okay* to indicate a break from talking about the snow and start wrapping up the email. Similarly, the speaker in (7.63) uses *okay* to indicate that they should stop talking about something that needs sending and wrap up the email. In (7.64), the dramatic character uses the DM to start a new strand in the conversation. In the previous sentence, the speaker tells the hearer that the hearer knows G--’s murderer, whereas in the utterance after *okay*, the speaker uses a different approach and starts discussing the dire consequences that might follow for the hearer.

To conclude, the DM *okay* is used to flag up a change of conversation topic or to introduce a new idea or strand into the conversation. Similar to *mă bon*, the DM *okay* is also undocumented in the dictionaries mentioned in 3.3.2.

7.9 *So(t)*

7.9.1 Propositional meanings

a) the verb *soen*

The verb *soen* means ‘say, tell’ or ‘sagen’ in English and German respectively. *So* is the 2nd person singular form imperative (7.65-7.66), whereas *sot* is either the 2nd person plural form imperative (7.67) or the 1st/3rd person singular or the 2nd person plural forms preterite (7.68).

(7.65)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hoffentlech ass dest brauchbar :)</th>
<th>So mir just wann d’qualiteit net gutt genuch ass, dann scannen ech nach emol.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*[hopefully is this useable. Say me only when the quality not good enough is, then scan I it more once.]*

‘Hope this is of some use. Just let me know if the quality is not good enough, and I’ll scan it again.’
(LPWC 5278-5279)
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(7.66)

Da so mer mol – wéi ass däi Numm?

[Then say me MP - how is your name?]

‘Tell me, what’s your name?’
(LPWC 12398)

(7.67)

Sot mir just nach – wann an Äerem Haus ee verstoppt gewiescht wir, hätt dat kénne geschéien, ouni datt Dir eppes dovu wousst?

[Say me only still - when in your house one hidden been would-be, would-have that could happen, without that you something there-from knew?]

‘Just tell me one more thing - if somebody had been hiding in your house, would that have happened without you knowing anything about it?’
(LPWC 25536-25538)

(7.68)

Ech hun och ugefaang meng Workshop’en ze halen an dem 5. Schouljoer. Dat eischt wat ech gesot krut war: “Joffer, d’S-- sot dir hätt eng Krakelschreft”.

[I have also started my workshops to take in that 5th school-year. The first what I said got was: “Miss, the S-- said you would-have a scribbly-handwriting”.]

‘I’ve also started my workshops with Year Five. The first thing I was told was: “Miss, S-- said you had a scribbly handwriting”.’
(LEWC 824-826)

7.9.2 Non-propositional uses
a) the DM so(t)

The DM in this subsection comes in two forms, so, when addressing somebody in the 2nd person singular, and sot when addressing somebody with the 2nd person plural or more than one person. Although it originates from the imperative forms of soen ‘say’, the DM is used by speakers to indicate that they are speaking to their hearer and that they are introducing a new topic of discussion. The nearest translations for this DM are German sag(t) mal, French dis, dites, and English tell me, listen. Whereas the DMs above were either attention-calling markers or
signposting markers, this sentence-initial marker shows properties of both types of markers.

(7.67)

D’serial number fiir d’zinstalléiren dass di heiten: ***
Hoffen dat daat klappt :)
So, ech kommen aus dem schaffe net mi raus… di leën hei en aafenzt op!
Hudd der eng kéier di next sondeger sou zait?

[The serial number for to install it-is the here-one: ***
Hope that that works
DM. I come from the working not anymore out... they lay here an monkey-tooth on! Have you a time the next Sundays so time?]

‘The serial number to install it is this one here: ***
Hope that’ll be okay
Listen, I’ve got a ton of work here… They do things at breakneck speed here! Have you got time on one of the next Sundays or so?’
(LEWC 6254-6256)

(7.68)

So, elo hänk awer a Schecks. Ech kommen aus dem Bing. Ech freeë mech wei e Kichelchen fir dech erem ze gesin an da kreien ech hei en deckt Ouer gemaach. Ma Himmelnonditschi!

[DM, now hang MP in shiksa. I come from the jail. I rejoice myself like a biscuit for you again to see and then get I here a thick ear made. DM heaven-name-of-God!]

‘Now, just calm down, woman. I’m just outa jail. There’s me looking forward like a child at Christmas to seeing you again and you’re giving me an earful. Fucking hell!’
(LPWC 28730-28733)

(7.69)

Sot,
frot der mol eng Kéier d’M-- ob et meng Emaile kritt huet. Bis elo hunn ech nach êmmer näischt vun him héieren.

[DM, ask you MP one time the M-- whether it my emails received has. Until now have I still always nothing of her heard.]
'Tell me, could you ask M-- whether she got my emails? Until now I haven’t heard anything from her.'
(LEWC 7536-7539)

(7.70)
Dir hänkt mir eng op! Et weess ee geschwënn net méi, wat ee gleewe soll, an ob dat alles wouer ass, wat een de Leit sou weiderverziele geet. (Bleift iwverem Ofgoen nach eng Kéier stoen.) Sot, Här V--, kann ech dat do wielkch alles weiderverzielen?

[You hang me one up! It knows one soon not anymore, what one believe should, and whether that all true is, what one the people so further-tell goes. (Remains over-the down-going still one time stand.) Tell me, Mr V--, can I that there real all further-tell?]

‘You’re having me on! People soon won’t know any more what to believe and whether it’s all true what’s being passed on to the. (Stops one more time while going downstairs.) Tell me, Mr V--, can I really pass all that on to them?’
(LPWC 22123-22127)

The speaker in (7.67) uses the DM sot to change the subject from the installation serial numbers to the speaker’s working patterns. In (7.68) and (7.69), the speakers use the DM to address their hearers. (7.70) uses the DM to address their hearer. The change of subject is even more noticeable because sot appears after a stage direction.

To summarise the DM so(t), it is used by speakers to indicate that they are addressing their hearers and they are introducing a new topic of conversation. As already mentioned in 3.3.2, this usage of so(t) is given as an example in the LWB (1995b: 225). However, the usage is not described.

7.10 (E)sou
7.10.1 Propositional meanings
a) the adverb (e)sou

The adverb (e)sou is used to describe the manner or condition of something. It corresponds to English and German so. The adverb varies between esou and sou, because of the process of aphaeresis by which the unstressed initial vowel /a/ is
lost. This similarly happens with Luxembourgish *(e)lo ‘now’, *(e)riwwer ‘over’, and *(er)réischt ‘first’.

(7.71)
Mee du hues mech virun 2 Minutten kennengeleiert, daat as dain eischte Sproch an dann direkt sou e Komentar [...].

*[But you have me before 2 minutes met, that is your first saying and then direct so a comment [...]]*

‘But you just met me 2 minutes ago, that’s the first thing you say, and then straight out with a comment like that [...]’
(LEWC 5379-5381)

(7.72)
E bessere Sand geet een néirens sichen. Sou reng. Sou grimmleg!

*[A better sand goes one nowhere search. So fine. So crumbly!]*

‘There’s no better sand to be found anywhere. So loose and fine-grained!’
(LPWC 2356-2358)

7.10.2 Non-propositional uses
a) the DM sou
The DM *sou* is cognate with the German DM *so*, French *bon*, English *right*, as used by speakers to indicate that they are starting a new conversation topic. However, as opposed to *bon, sou* is more resolute. It is thus a sentence-initial signposting marker.

(7.73)
‘t ass schéin an ech si frou fir dech. 
*Sou*, lo kënnt leider dee net sou guddent Deel, M-—

*[It is pretty and I am happy for you. 
*DM, now comes unfortunately that not so good part, M-—...]*

‘It’s nice and I’m happy for you. 
Right, now comes unfortunately the-not-so-good part, M—…’
(LEWC 8146-8147)
Heya,

sou lo sinn ech graad mool opgestaanen.

[Heya,
DM now am I just-now once got-up.]

‘Heya,
Right, I’ve just got up.’

(LEWC 6125-6126)

The characters are annoyed at being stuck in their car.

A: Waat? Waat hun ech dann elo erëm gesoot?
B: Sou mier geht et elo duer! Ech hun do fier Luut am Besch gesin. Ech gin elo Hëllef sichen.

[A: What? What have I MP now again said?
B: DM me goes it now through! I have there before light in-the woods seen. I go now help search.]

‘A: What? What did I say now?
B: Right, I’m fed with all this now! I’ve seen some light over there in the woods. I’m going to get help.’

(LPWC 27947-27949)

The characters are talking about Bibbi, a teddy bear.

B: Just um Bauch ass de Stoff e bëssi dënn. (Zum P--) Du hues êmmer esou mam Daum dru geriwen. (Mécht et um Bibbi no) Sou! Da kënne mer jo lo fueren! Ech mengen, ech stéieren!
P--: Wéinst menger kanns de bleiwen.
J--: (hëlt eng Décisioun) Sou! Ech ginn lo mat dir of an ech maachen de Stillche fest.

[B: Only on-the belly is the fabric a bit thin. (To-the P--) Du have always so with-the thumb on-it rubbed. (Makes it on-the bibbi after) DM! Then can we MP now drive! I think, I disrupt!
P--: Because-of mine can you remain.
J--: (takes a decision) DM! I go now with you downwards and I make the little-chair firm.]

‘B--: It’s only on the stomach where the fabric is a bit thin. (To P--) You always used to rub it with your finger. (Imitates this on Bibbi)
Right, we can be off now! I think I’m in your way!
P--: Don’t leave on my account.
J--: (takes a decision) Alright then, I’ll go down with you and I’ll fasten the high chair.’

(LPWC 10022-10032)
In (7.73), the speaker uses the DM *sou* as a transition between the part where they are happy for the hearer and the part where they introduce some negative comments. In (7.74), the speaker uses *sou* to create a strong distinction between the greeting and the information that they have just got up. In (7.75), both characters B-- and J-- use the DM to initiate their turn of conversation. Also, apart from moving away from what has been said previously, the *sou*, which is used by both speakers, indicates that they are resolute in the decision that they have come to.

To conclude, the discourse marker *sou* is used by speakers either to initiate a new conversation topic or enter the conversation in a major way. The marker can also indicate that the speaker has made a decision. Similar to *so(t)*, the DM usage of *sou* is exemplified in the LWB (1995b: 230), but function is not covered.

### 7.11 Summary of Chapter

This chapter has systematically described each discourse marker while providing examples for their propositional meanings and non-propositional uses. While some discourse markers have appeared in examples given in previous literature, no explanations or descriptions are provided for them. This chapter has shown that whereas discourse markers of Germanic origin have propositional counterparts, the discourse markers of French origin have none. Overall, their uses varied. Some discourse markers are used to introduce a topic of conversation, such as *okay* and *sou*, others, such as *bon*, indicate the end of a topic. Some discourse markers introduce an answer or a reply, such as *ben* or *ma*, while others introduce a question, such as *ma*. Previous utterances can be reinforced by discourse markers, such as by *enfin*, or mitigated, such as by *mà bon*. Another set of markers, such as *lauschter(t)* and *so(t)*, draws the hearer’s attention to the speakers. Most of the markers explored in this chapter display one use only, with the exception of *ma*, for which seven were found. Summarising information of uses of DMs and occurrence is found in the following discussion chapter 8.
8: Discussion and Conclusion

8.0 Introduction
Chapter 8 aims to provide the reader with a discussion of the research findings and will indicate the advances resulting from this study. Section 8.1 revisits the research questions raised previously. Section 8.2 returns to the existing literature to explain the atypical uses of *ma* and *dann*, and section 8.3 offers guidance as to how the knowledge gained from this study might be applied. Finally, section 8.4 concludes the present thesis.

8.1 Revisiting the Research Questions
The research questions raised in subsection 4.1.2 were:

1. What is the frequency per 1,000 words of MPs and DMs in Luxembourgish? This is particularly relevant in view of and in comparison with frequencies found for German MPs in Möllering (2001, 2004).
2. What is the percentage of propositional meanings and non-propositional uses of MPs and DMs in Luxembourgish? This is particularly relevant in view of and in comparison with frequencies found for French DMs in Chanet (2003).
3. Which MPs in Luxembourgish are found in which sentence moods? This is particularly relevant in view of German MPs occurring in Altman’s (1987) seven basic sentence moods.
4. What are the uses of MPs and DMs in Luxembourgish?
5. Do the uses of MPs and DMs in Luxembourgish differ from the uses of their cognates in German and French?

8.1.1 Frequencies per 1,000 words
The research questions put forward above in subsection 4.1.2 were of both quantitative and qualitative nature. Whereas the qualitative research questions were mainly about describing for the first time in detail the uses of MP and DMs in Luxembourgish, the quantitative research questions were inspired by the
research carried out by both Möllering (2001, 2004) for German and Chanet (2003) for French.

The first research question concerned the frequency per 1,000 words of each MP and DM. As table 8.1 (repeating table 5.2 in subsection 5.2.3) illustrates below, it was found that most of the Luxembourgish MP frequencies were lower than their German equivalents. One must, however, bear in mind that the German frequencies were based on averages (not the ranges) of four large corpora, including spoken and written data, whereas the Luxembourg corpora have a lower word count and do not include naturally occurring spoken data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
<th>Möllering (2004)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alt</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>halt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awer</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>aber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dach</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>doch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dann</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>denn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eben</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>eben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)mol</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>mal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jo</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roueg</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>ruhig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zwar</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1 Frequency per 1,000 words of MPs

If one examines only the German MPs whose equivalents have been analysed in Luxembourgish, table 8.2 indicates that similarities of ranking exist between these and Luxembourgish MPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Möllering</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ja</td>
<td>jo</td>
<td>jo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>aber</td>
<td>awer</td>
<td>dach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>mal</td>
<td>(e)mol</td>
<td>(e)mol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>doch</td>
<td>alt</td>
<td>dann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>denn</td>
<td>eben</td>
<td>eben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>eben</td>
<td>dann</td>
<td>alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>halt</td>
<td>zwar</td>
<td>awer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>ruhig</td>
<td>dach</td>
<td>roueg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>roueg</td>
<td>zwar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2 Ranking in German and Luxembourgish MPs

In top ranking is the German MP ja found in Möllering (2004), and Luxembourgish jo in both LEWC and LPWC. The second most frequent is
German *aber* and Luxembourgish *awer* found in LEWC. German *mal* and Luxembourgish *(e)mol* in both corpora are the third most frequent MP. *Ruhig* is the lowest-ranking MP in Möllering’s analysis, which is also mirrored in LEWC with *roueg*. As for frequencies, two German MPs with very low frequencies match the Luxembourgish ones: German *halt* (0.32) is numerically close to Luxembourgish *alt* (0.64 and 0.23), while German *ruhig* (0.10) is close to Luxembourgish *roueg* (0.11 and 0.21).

In respect of the DMs, table 8.3 (repeating table 5.7 in subsection 5.4.2) shows that none of the Luxembourgish frequencies matches Chanet’s for French *bon* (4.05) and *enfin* (2.46), as all frequencies are less than 0.90 per 1,000 words. The most frequent DM in both corpora is *ma* with a frequency of 0.82 in LEWC and 0.83 in LPWC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
<th>Chanet (2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ben</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bon</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>héier(t)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lauschter(t)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā bon</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ok(ay)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so(t)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)sou</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3 Frequency per 1,000 words of DMs

Generally, table 8.3 shows that DMs in Luxembourgish are more frequently found in LEWC than in LPWC. Apart from *ma*, which has a very close frequency in both corpora, the second-highest frequency in LPWC is *so(t)* with 0.25. In LEWC, by comparison, the second-highest frequency is *ok(ay)* with 0.74 and the frequency then decreases gradually to *lauschter(t)* with 0.02. By contrast, MPs generally have similar frequencies, irrespective of whether they occur in LEWC or in LPWC. One can thus tentatively conclude that LEWC reflects a Luxembourgish variety or register that makes much more use of DMs than LPWC.
8.1.2 Percentages of non-propositional uses

As table 5.1 in subsection 5.3.1 shows, five out of nine MPs in LEWC and four out of nine MPs in LPWC occur more frequently with their non-propositional use than with their counterpart with Luxembourgish propositional meaning. *Eben*, for instance, is used in 96.97% of all cases as an MP, whereas it is found in only 3.03% of all instances as an answer particle. The already documented highly frequent MP *jo* is found in over 70% of all cases.

From these percentages a paradox emerges: whereas the propositional meanings of the MPs’ counterparts are likely to be explained in dictionaries and learning materials (e.g. *roueg* as an adjective meaning ‘quiet’), these propositional meanings are sometimes found less frequently in the word-corpora than their non-propositional counterparts. The more frequent occurrence of non-propositional uses (e.g. *eben* used 96.97% of the time in LEWC) remains unexplained, although an explanation may be that the fewer propositional meanings a word has, the more frequently this same word has non-propositional uses.

Similar to the MPs, seven out of nine DMs are found in their non-propositional reading in LEWC, with a higher proportion than their propositional counterparts. In LPWC, only 4 DMs have a higher non-propositional frequency. DMs of French origin that occur in LEWC rank 100% as DMs only. These are then followed by *ok(ay)*, originally English, used in over 70% of cases. Germanic DMs have a tendency to occur less frequently than their counterparts with propositional meaning.

Similarly, it is in the proportions of DMs that the difference between the two corpora becomes visible, with LEWC using proportionally more DMs, while LPWC uses proportionally more counterparts with propositional meanings. We could summarise that the dichotomy of propositional meanings and non-propositional uses is not to be neglected and is an issue for future research.

Tables 8.4 and 8.5 reveal the ranking of the DMs in both corpora. In table 8.4, it is worth noting that the most frequent DMs in LEWC have discourse structuring and signalling uses, and the less frequent ones are found in attention-grabbing roles.
8. Discussion and Conclusion

Table 8.4 Ranking of DMs in LEWC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ok(ay)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)sou</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bon</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mä bon</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so(t)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ben</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>héier(t)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lauschter(t)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.5 Ranking of DMs in LPWC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>LPWC</th>
<th>LEWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so(t)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bon</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)sou</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ok(ay)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lauschter(t)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ben</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>héier(t)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mä bon</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In LPWC, this trend is very slightly reversed, as can be seen in table 8.5. The most frequent DMs still have structuring and signalling uses, but also include the attention-grabbing marker so(t). The (French) discourse structuring forms mä bon and enfin are absent.

One reason for these trends might be that both emails and emulated discourse in plays and film scripts need structure-signalling markers, whereas attention-grabbing markers, only find a frequent application in plays and films scripts.

8.1.3 Basic sentence moods

Table 8.6 below shows which analysed MP is found in which Grundtyp referred to in Altmann (1987: 47-48).
Table 8.6 Distribution of MPs in Altmann’s *Grundtypen* (1987)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alt</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dann</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eben</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mol</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roueg</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zwar</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers in table 8.6 refer to the sentence mood types mentioned already in subsection 2.1.5:

1) *Aussagesatz*: Die Bayern spielen (doch/eben/einfach/halt/ja/schlecht) – D’Jeunesse spillé (MP) schlecht;
2) *V-1-Fragesatz*: Spielen die Bayern (auch/denn/eigentlich/etwa/mal/wohl) schlecht? – Spillt d’Jeunesse (MP) schlecht?;
3) *w-V-2-Fragesatz*: Wie spielen die Bayern (bloß/denn/eigentlich/mal/nur/schon/wohl)? – Wéi spillé d’Jeunesse (MP)?;
4) *V-1/-V-2-Imperativsatz*: Spielt (bloß/doch/eben/einfach/halt/ja/mal/nur/ruhig/schon) schlecht, ihr Bayern! – Spillt (MP) schlecht, d’Jeunesse!;
5) *V-1 Wunschsatz*: Ach würden die Bayern (bloß/doch/nur) schlecht spielen! – Oh géif d’Jeunesse (MP) schlecht spille!;
6) *V-1/-V-2-Exclamativsatz*: Spielen die Bayern (aber/vielleicht/aber auch) schlecht! – Spillt d’Jeunesse (MP) schlecht!;
7) *w-V-2/-V-L-Exclamativsatz*: Wie schlecht spielen (aber auch/doch) die Bayern! – Wéi schlecht spillé (MP) d’Jeunesse!

A tick indicates that the MP is found in that sentence mood, whereas a shaded cell indicates its absence. As seen in the table, every MP apart from *dann* and *mol* is found in type 1 statements. The data shows no MP found in sentence types 5, 6, and 7. The majority of MPs are found in two sentence moods, as with *alt*, *awer*, *dach*, *mol*, and *roueg*. *Dann* is found in three sentence moods; however, whereas *dann* is found in the middle-field in type 2 and type 3 questions, *dann* found in
type 4 imperatives occurs sentence-initially. A discussion of *dann* and *ma* follows below in section 8.3.

As to why mainly statements and imperatives contain MPs, it is worth raising the question whether spoken data might confirm their occurrence in the sentence types 5-7, for instance. Alternatively, because MPs only cluster with each other if both can occur in the same sentence type (see subsection 2.1.5), one MP is less likely to be produced in sentence 5-7, for instance, if other MPs cannot be used there. This requires some further investigation.

The question as to whether DMs occur in specific sentence moods is redundant, since DMs are sentence-external, thus any sentence type can follow or precede the DM. However, tables 8.8 and 8.9 below provide a breakdown of each DM and its position and function.

### 8.1.4 Non-propositional uses

Chapter 6 showed that MPs in Luxembourgish were mainly used to reinforce or mitigate utterances, or within these utterances the feelings and emotions expressed by the speakers. Some MPs, such as *dach*, reinforced the speaker’s obviousness regarding the information presented in the utterance, whereas *alt* reinforced the speaker’s casual attitude towards the utterance. A summarising table listing MP, sentence type (statement, question, directive, exclamatory or declarative) and use is found below in table 8.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP</th>
<th>Sentence Mood</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alt</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>alternative, casualness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awer</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td>contrast, reinforces emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>obviousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>reinforces directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dann</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>reinforces question (middle field)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>reinforces directive (sentence initial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eben</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>obviousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emol</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
<td>mitigates directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>shared knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roueg</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>mitigates directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zwar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>reinforces exclamative statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.7 Summary of MP uses**
In chapter 7, the analysis of the selected discourse markers in Luxembourgish reveals that the DMs are used to introduce, continue, or wrap up conversation topics, comments, questions, replies, or directives. Others draw attention to the speaker. Table 8.8 below summarises all the functions according to DMs. Whereas table 8.7 sentence types were also included, this was considered unnecessary for 8.8 as DMs occur sentence-external.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ben</td>
<td>introduces a reply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finishes a topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bon</td>
<td>summarises a topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>introduces a new topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>finishes a topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mitigates a previous utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>héier(t)</td>
<td>reinforces a previous utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lauschter(t)</td>
<td>draws attention to speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>expressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expands a topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reinforces a directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finishes a topic or conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mä bon</td>
<td>mitigates a previous utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ok(ay)</td>
<td>changes the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>introduces a new topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so(t)</td>
<td>draws attention to speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>introduces a new topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)sou</td>
<td>introduces a new topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>floor-taking device</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.8 Summary of DM uses**

Chapter 7 provided information for each DM about its external position and function, which is summaried in table 8.8 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>external position</th>
<th>function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>initial</td>
<td>final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ben</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>héier(t)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lauschter(t)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mä bon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ok(ay)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so(t)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)sou</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.9 Distribution of DMs according to position and function**
As seen in table 8.9 above, apart from héier(t), all DMs occur before clauses. The majority of DM have signposting functions, apart from héier(t), lauscher(t), and so(t). These three attention-calling signals also have in common that they have pragmatised from imperatives. Ma is marked by a superscript plus-sign because one of its functions suggests directive usage, akin to modal particle usage, even though ma is always found clause-externally.

8.1.5 Uses in Luxembourgish, German, and French

Chapter 6 reveals that the propositional uses of the MPs found in Luxembourgish diverge from their MP cognates found in German. Provided the MP in question existed both in German and Luxembourgish, its usage in both languages was essentially the same. The only exception documented in this study is zwar in section 6.10. Not only does Luxembourgish have an additional propositional usage, zwar dach ‘yes, it is’ and zwar net ‘no, it isn’t’, neither of which exists in German, but the non-propositional use of zwar is lacking in German as well, i.e. zwar is not an MP in present-day German. It is worth pointing out that, at times, there are fewer differences between the non-propositional uses of a Luxembourgish word and its German equivalent than between the propositional meanings of a Luxembourgish word and its German equivalent. Section 6.6, for instance, reveals that eben is an MP in both German and Luxembourgish, as is its use as a retort in the English sense of ‘exactly’. However, the German propositional meaning of ‘level’ does not exist in Luxembourgish, i.e. eben is not an adjective in Luxembourgish.

Similarly, bon exists as a DM in both French and Luxembourgish, but the propositional meaning of ‘good’ only exists in French, i.e. bon is not used as an adjective (with associated suffixes) in Luxembourgish. The lack of propositional meanings for bon, ben, enfin suggests that there is a difference between French DMs used in Luxembourgish and Germanic ones. Whereas the French DMs have no propositional counterparts in Luxembourgish, Germanic MPs and DMs do. Ok(ay) seems to function like a Germanic DM because it has an adjectival propositional use.
As for the Germanic DMs, Luxembourgish prefers *lauschter(t)* before an utterance and *héier* after an utterance, which is similar to Netherlandic Dutch (Roel Vismans, personal communication), where *luister* ‘listen’ is found before an utterance and *hoor* occurs after an utterance (Kirsner and van Heuven 1996). Furthermore, section 7.5 on *héier(t)* and section 7.6 on *lauschter(t)* reveal that the second-person plural forms are less frequently used than the second-person singular forms, which are zero-marked. Peter Gilles from the University of Luxembourg and Fernande Krier of the University of Rennes attribute this to a further process of pragmatisation of these two discourse markers (personal communication). As for the DM *ma*, there are similarities with the French DM *mais* and Italian *ma* (see section subsection 7.6.1), but Luxembourgish *ma* presents more uses than the forms found in in those languages.

### 8.2 Revisiting the Literature

Whereas both MP and DM literature mentions MPs and DMs as having pragmatised from their propositional counterparts in other word classes, this is not always the case for MPs and DMs in Luxembourgish. In their Luxembourgish usage, MPs and DMs can exist in their non-propositional usage without any or with fewer propositional meanings. This is the case, for instance, with *alt*, which has no propositional meaning at all, or with *eben*, which does not have the German meaning of ‘level’. As for DMs, those that are originally French have no propositional counterpart either. *Enfin*, for instance, is used, as in French, as a DM in Luxembourgish, but the propositional meaning exists only in French.

Instead of thus saying that MPs and DMs must have pragmatised in their respective language, one must add that if there is no propositional counterpart, then the MP or DM will have pragmatised in the language from which it was borrowed. It is worth raising the question why only French DMs have been borrowed into Luxembourgish and German MPs have not. The likeliest explanation is the genetic proximity of German and Luxembourgish. It is therefore more difficult to define and identify borrowing from German into Luxembourgish. Luxembourgish *zwar*, however, has developed pragmatically only in Luxembourgish.
A second inconsistent point is the case of sentence-initial *dann* and *ma* found in directives. Whereas the former was discussed in qualitative results of MPs, the latter one was discussed in the DM results chapter. Unsatisfactorily, however, neither of them seems to be restricted to their respective categories. Sentence-initial *dann* is interpreted as a modal particle, changing the illocutive force of the utterance in which it is used. It emphasises the directive force used in the imperative or cohortative sentences. This would be very similar to the uses of *dach* in directives, except that sentence-initial *dann* does not appear in the middle-field, which is a prerequisite characteristic of MPs.

As for *ma* found in directives, this is not fully understood as a DM, since it provides no qualitative link between the speaker’s attitude and the utterances that have occurred before or will follow. Similarly to *dann* above, *ma* in directives focuses mainly on the attitude conveyed in the current sentence.

In this light, it is worth considering modal particles and discourse markers as categories that have no ‘clear boundaries’, or are defined by common properties (Lakoff 1987: 16). The two categories of MPs and DMs thus sharply contrast with what Lakoff explains as ‘the classical theory of categories [,] an unquestionable, definitional truth’ (ibid.: 6). Instead, discourse markers and modal particles are categories that could draw on *family resemblances* (Wittgenstein 1953, cited in Lakoff 1987), whereby the categories’ members, ‘like family members, are similar to one another in a wide variety of ways’ (Lakoff 1987: 16). Möllering provides a bullet-pointed list of modal particle features, but adds that the ‘not all features are present in all instances of modal particle function’ (Möllering 2004: 21). Lakoff writes that ‘members of a category may be related to one another without all members having any properties in common that define the category’ (Lakoff 1987: 12). One would likewise expect pragmatic markers to be related to each other, without all of them having every property in common that defines pragmatic markers as a category.

To link the concept of family resemblances back to the results of this study: even though one of the possible sentence-positions of *dann* or the use of *ma* in directives does not match the features of other modal particles and discourse...
markers, *ma* and *dann* can still be categorised as discourse marker or modal particle respectively. This is not dissimilar to *prototype theory* as developed by Rosch (e.g. 1977, cited in Hansen 1998: 82). Hansen explains that:

[c]ategories which are structured in terms of prototypes are not based on necessary and sufficient criteria for membership: rather, they have central and peripheral members, such that the central members possess a cluster of salient and prototypical properties, some but not all of which are shared by the more peripheral members. (Hansen 1998: 82)

Both family resemblances and prototype theory postulate the absence of clear boundaries that can include and exclude members, but prototype theory introduces the notion that some category members are central members because they are better examples and come quickly to mind. In family resemblances, the fundamental idea is the shared properties between the members of a strategy, yet some members can be better examples of their category than others.

One can then provide two explanations in order to account for *ma* and *dann*. The first explanation assumes that there are central, prototypical members and non-central, peripheral members of the categories modal particles and discourse markers. As figure 8.1 illustrates, whereas *dach* and *héier* are prototypical MP and DM members respectively, *dann* and *ma* are peripheral, less prototypical members of their categories, because they have uses and/or formal characteristics not found in prototypical members: the MP *dann* can occur sentence-initially and the DM *ma* can introduce directives.

![Figure 8.1 Ma and dann as less prototypical members](image-url)
The alternative explanation assumes that prototype theory is not applied to the categories of MPs and DMs, but to the pragmatic markers themselves. Smith (2002), for instance, refers to the ‘prototypical use of [German es] as a pronominal anaphor’ (ibid.: 68) and his ‘central’ functions (ibid.: 98) contrast with ‘peripheral uses’ (ibid.) or ‘less prototypical senses’ (ibid.: 72). Akin to Smith’s es category (Smith 2002), ma and dann are seen as categories, and their different uses as members of their respective categories. As figure 8.2 illustrates, whereas the directive use of ma and the sentence-initial use of dann are peripheral uses of their respective pragmatic marker categories, non-directive uses of ma and the middle field-position of dann are prototypical/central uses of their categories.

The reason why it is interesting to categorise MPs and DMs, especially dann and ma, is that once pragmatic markers get tagged for corpus linguistic annotation, for instance, they lose their entire label as ‘modal particle’ or ‘discourse marker’. The German Stuttgart-Tübingen Tagset (Schiller 1999), for instance, has no part-of-speech tag covering modal particles. Instead, modal particles are tagged as their propositional counterparts, such as ‘ADJD’ (adverbial or predicative adjective) or the large category ‘ADV’ (adverb). The attraction of being able to distinguish from pragmatic markers and their propositional counterparts, to have these categories, would facilitate future corpus-based research into modal particles or discourse markers.
8.3 Future Research

8.3.1 Ma
Based on the high frequency and the various uses of *ma*, future work on spontaneous spoken language might shed further light on the points raised on the basis of the data in this thesis. In the social networking website Facebook group *You know you're from Luxembourg when...* a user called Baas wrote on 28 February 2008, ‘[You know you’re from Luxembourg] When you start your sentences or especially your answers with “Ma” or “Mää” ’ (Facebook 2009). This comment not only suggests that that there is an awareness of how *ma* works as a DM, but also how it is marked as stereotypical for the speech of people with Luxembourgish origins.

8.3.2 Dann and (e)sou
As already mentioned in subsection 6.4.2, it is unsurprising to find deictic *dann* having a modal (particle) use when occurring sentence-externally. This can also be said for deictic *(e)sou* having DM uses as described in 5.3.10. Further research into Luxembourgish deictics would be needed to clarify modal uses. Although LEWC and LPWC, do not show any modal usage of this word, spontaneous language data, however, might illustrate DM uses as mentioned in the LWB (1995b: 260).

8.3.3 Quotative *jo*
Although much has been written about the German MP *ja*, there is a need to further clarify the quotative usage of *ja*. The light being shed on the Luxembourgish quotative *jo* and anecdotal observation suggests that a similar usage might also be found in German. Because it has been said earlier that this use of *jo* is stressed, again spoken language might illustrate this quotative better than written texts could. Whereas LEWC and LPWC shows this quotative only being used in conjunction with a negative attitude, it is worth raising the question whether this use of *jo* can also be used with any other speaker’s attitude.

8.3.4 Tagging pragmatic markers in corpora
Finding pragmatic markers in LEWC and LPWC was only possible through manual categorisation and through application of formal and functional tests. Had
this study been conducted on German pragmatic markers, an automatic search would not have been any quicker, as part-of-speech tagsets, such as the Stuttgart-Tübingen Tagset have no separate tag for MPs or DMs. Manual sorting was (humanly) possible in this thesis, due to the small size of the corpora and the small selection of search items. Future research should investigate how to attempt tagging MPs and DMs automatically in order to facilitate corpus-based research in pragmatic markers.

8.3.5 Further corpora
As already pointed out in subsection 4.1.1, there is a corpus available to researchers in Luxembourg, however, lod.korpus proves to be problematic, both in terms of query architecture and in terms of copyright issue. Professor Claudine Moulin at the University of Trier (personal communication) points out that researchers need to be granted a more suitable access to that corpus. Furthermore, one can never have too much data and further corpora (especially spontaneous spoken language) need to be compiled in order to able to carry out empirical research in Luxembourgish. Furthermore, LEWC and LPWC need to be more functional for corpus linguists. Both corpora lack any annotation and a first instance of development would be to add meta-data information permissible within the anonymity of the participants and authors, to tag the parts-of-speech, and to consider a polished spellchecked annotation of the raw data, from which the part-of-speech could be tagged more easily.

8.4 Conclusion
The present dissertation is the first study to provide a detailed analysis of modal particles and discourse markers in Luxembourgish. The originality of this study is two-fold. Firstly, by adopting a data-driven approach, two word-corpora specifically created for this thesis have been analysed: the Luxembourgish Email Word-Corpus and the Luxembourgish Plays Word-Corpus. Secondly, with a two-pronged strategy, this thesis has revealed quantitative and qualitative analyses of nine modal particles (alt, awer, dach, dann (and da), eben (and ebe), emol (and mol), jo, roueg, and zwar) and ten discourse markers (ben, bon, enfin, héier (and héiert), lauschter (and lauschttert), ma, mà bon, okay (and ok), so (and sot), and
sou), together with their propositional counterparts. This contribution fills a gap in our understanding of modal particles and discourse markers in Luxembourgish.
This bibliography follows the English naming conventions and alphabetic order.


References


References


References


References


References


References


## Author Index

This index contains only primary authors.

### A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>22, 31-32, 43, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aijmer</td>
<td>22, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altenberg</td>
<td>23, 56, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altman</td>
<td>108, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altmann</td>
<td>34, 140, 148, 156,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161, 164, 170, 177, 187,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>232-233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audehm</td>
<td>22, 30-31, 58, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auer</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bach</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaghel</td>
<td>43-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentner</td>
<td>91, 93-94, 100, 103-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand</td>
<td>23, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollendorf</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braber</td>
<td>19-20, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braun</td>
<td>74-75, 82-84, 91-93,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96, 100, 102-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braune</td>
<td>43-44, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinton</td>
<td>22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brons-Albert</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruch</td>
<td>71-72, 79, 84, 94, 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruxelles</td>
<td>23, 65, 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bublitz</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkhardt</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bybee</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chanet</td>
<td>20, 23, 57, 66, 108,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113-114, 129, 130-131,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>228-230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christophory</td>
<td>91-92, 100-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinson</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowie</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danet</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrmann-Loutsch</td>
<td>96-99, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dik</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dostie</td>
<td>23, 28, 39-42, 47-49,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66, 188, 197, 200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dudenredaktion</td>
<td>23-26, 28, 32, 37, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durrell</td>
<td>28, 134, 146, 152-153,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158-159, 163, 168, 173,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenberg</td>
<td>28, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erman</td>
<td>48, 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>70, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follmann</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foolen</td>
<td>53-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franck</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank-Job</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser</td>
<td>14-15, 27-28, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frehner</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ganguer</td>
<td>85, 87-88, 90, 96, 98-99, 100, 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilles</td>
<td>70-71, 76-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzáles</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Götte</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimm</td>
<td>90, 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gupta</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamlin</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>20, 28, 31, 33, 37-38,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52-53, 64, 66, 82, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Härder</td>
<td>60-62, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartmann</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heggelund</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heine</td>
<td>45-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellbig</td>
<td>22-23, 28, 32, 37, 50-51, 56, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hentschel</td>
<td>21, 24, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herring</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo Navarro</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hock</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockett</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffmann</td>
<td>77, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoogvliet</td>
<td>21, 35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Resource Pack</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### J

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaffe</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakobson</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### K

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kafka</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karagjosova</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller</td>
<td>68, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemme</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirnsre</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kloss</td>
<td>69-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowles</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koch</td>
<td>59-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>König</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosaka</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krivonosov</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krummes</td>
<td>1, 42, 46, 71, 91, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### L

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakoff</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larra</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenk</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenke</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenz</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letzburger Online Dictionnaire</td>
<td>(LOD), 13, 85-88, 96-100, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>39, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loi</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luchtenberg</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburger Wörterbuch (LWB)</td>
<td>13, 78, 85-90, 96, 98-100, 161, 177, 181, 187, 202, 224, 227, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>61, 63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Author Index

M
Malané, 71
Martin, 85
Molnár, 43, 58, 64-65, 108, 114
Mortelmans, 45
Müller, 85

N
Newton, 68, 70-71, 73, 105, 167
Nübling, 16, 68

O
Östman, 19, 59

P
Pfeiffer, 90
Pons Bordería, 27
Posner, 51

R
Rath, 23
Redeker, 37
Reiner, 19
Reiners, 18
Richter, 167
Rinnen, 96-99, 196
Rosch, 239
Rudolph, 25, 33-34, 58
S
Sanger, 64
Schanen, 16, 80-82, 84, 94-95, 215
Schiffrin, 23, 37
Schildt, 43
Schiller, 240
Schiltz, 91, 94, 100, 104, 105
Schmitt, 79-80, 84, 95-96, 170
Schügler, 19, 27
Schwegler, 45
Scott, 112
Smith, 240
Soares da Silva, 20
Sondag, 91-92, 100-102
T
Thurmail, 23, 33-36, 56
Torma, 62
Traugott, 33, 45, 47, 49
Travis, 38-39
V
Vahle, 94-95
Van Baar, 26

W
Walter, 44
Waltereit, 22-23, 28, 44-45, 52, 54
Watts, 59
Webb, 62
Weinert, 159, 170
Werner, 22
Weydt, 16, 18-22, 36, 53, 55-56, 58
Winters, 31
Wittgenstein, 54, 238
Wörterbuch der Luxemburgischen Mundart (WLM), 13, 85, 87-90, 96, 98-100, 161, 177, 187, 215
Wray, 170
Z
Zeevat, 38
Zevat, 42
Appendices

Appendix 1: Introductory Email for Email Data

In this introductory email, originally written in Luxembourgish, potential participants are asked whether their emails may be used in this thesis.

Moien,

Hei ass de Cédric Krummes an ech schreiwen iech als Doktorand vun der Universität vu Sheffield an England, wou ech énnert der Leedung vum Prof. Gerald Newton Lëtzebuergesch recherchéieren.


An deem Zesummenhang wéilt ech gären är E-Mails sammelen, dëi dir mer virdru geschéckt hutt. Är E-Mails hutt dir mer un eng vun dëse véier Adresse geschéckt:
C.Krummes@sheffield.ac.uk
[private email address]
[private email address]
[private email address]

Wann Dir averstane sidd, mir bei menger Aarbecht ze hëllefen, géif et mech freeën, wann ech Är E-Maile kéint benotzen. Ech géif dëi sammelen, dëi ech bis haut vun iech krutt hunn.

A fir Är an och meng Rechter ze beschützen, géifen all E-Mails anonym gemaacht ginn, d.h. all Numm, Uertschaft, an Nummer gëtt gekierzt/gelësch:\n
De Pol huet dem Kätt 300 Frang fir op Pariës ginn.

gétt:
De P huet dem K 3 Frang fir op Pa ginn.

Ausserdem ginn an der These némmen dëi Sätz kopéiert, dëi relevant sinn. D’Annexe wäert och némmen aus deenen eenzelne Sätz bestoen, dëi erausgewielt ginn.

Wann Dir d’accord sidd, kéint Dir mer w.e.g. op dës E-Mail zréckántwerten? Ech wäert Iech dann en Averständneesformulaire per E-Mail schécken, deen Dir per Computer ausfëlle kënnt. Dee schéckt Dir dann ausgefëllt zréck.

Bei weider Froen, zéckt net, Iech mat mir a Kontakt ze setzen, oder mengem Doktervater selwer, dem Prof. Gerald Newton (G.Newton@sheffield.ac.uk), eng E-Mail ze schécken.
Schéine Bonjour vu Sheffield,

Cédric Krummes
Appendix 2: Follow-up Email for Email Data

In this follow-up email, originally written in Luxembourgish, willing participants are given further information on how to give their consent.

Moien,

Fir d’éischt mol villmols Merci, dass dir d’accord sidd, mir mat menger Dokterthese ze hëllefen. Et freet mech, dass ech är E-Mail(e) sammele kann.


Äert Passwuert fir den Averständnesformulaire ass:
[alphanumeric password]

Ech géif mech freeën, wann dir de Formulaire gutt liest, en ausfëllt, an deen ännert ärem Numm u mech zréckschéckt. Dir kënnt natierlech och dëse Formulaire fir är eegen Zwecker erausdrécken – ‘t ass äert gutt Recht.

Wann der nach weider Froen hutt, kënnt dir mer selbstverständlech eng E-Mail schécken. Meng britesch Handysnummer ass [private mobile phone number].

Net vergiessen: de Formulaire MAM Passwuert dra riwwwerschéckten!

A wéi gesot, Merci fir är Coopération!

Mat engem schéine Bonjour,

Cédric Krummes
Appendix 3: Consent Form for Email Data

In this form, email participants give their consent for their emails to be used as data.

Heimadder ginn ech, [participant’s full name], dem Cédric Krummes d’Autorisation fir:

☐ meng Email(en) fir seng Dokterarbecht ze benotzen;
☐ eenzel Sätz vun der/den Email(en) ze publizéieren;
☐ meng Email(e) fir weider Étuden ze benotzen.

Meng Emailsaddress ass: [email address].
Meng Telefons- oder Handysnummer ass [number].
Ech gi léiwer per [email / phone] kontakteiert.

[Locality], de(n) [date],[initials]
Passwuert: [alphanumeric password]

Ech verstinn dass, dass d’Email(en)
· ni ganz publizéiert gëtt/ginn, mee just eenzel Sätz.
· anonymiséiert gëtt/ginn, d.h. Nimm, Uertschaften, Zäiten, an Nummere gi geläscht.

Ech verstinn och,
· dass ech wéini och émmer meng Email(en) aus der Étude zeréckzéie kann. Mee soubal d’Étude fäerdeg ass fir ofzeginn, da kann ech mech net méi zeréckzéien.
· dass d’Étude als Examplaire an der Bibliothéik vun der Universitéit vu Sheffield an an der Nationalbibliothéik vu Lëtzebuerg stoe wäert. Je no deem kéint d’Étude och als Buch, Kapitel, oder Artikel veröffentlecht ginn.
· dass all meng perséinlech Informationen némmen an den Dossier kommen, an aus Ethiks- an Dateschutzgrënn net weidergi wäerten.

Bei Froen oder Problemer kann ech mech un de Cédric Krummes wenden. Seng Kontaktsinformatione sinn:

Centre for Luxembourg Studies
Dept. of Germanic Studies Handysnummer: [number]
University of Sheffield Emailsadress: [email address]
Sheffield
S10 2TN Doktervater: Prof. Gerald Newton
England E-Mailsadress: [email address]
Soubal de Formulaire ganz ausgefüllt ass, spächeren ech de Fichier önner
mengem Numm of a schécken en erën zerock.

☐ Ech si mat deem averstanen, wat ech ausgefüllt hunn, an hunn
d’Conditoune vum Benotze vun all mengen Date gelies. (*w.e.g. ukräizen*)

An nach eng Kéier: Villmols Merci, dass dir a menger Étude mathéleft!
Appendix 4: Introductory Letter for Plays Data

In this introductory letter, originally written in Luxembourgish, potential authors are asked whether their plays or film scripts may be used in this thesis.

Léiwen/Léif [title + author’s name],


Wann Dir averstane sidd, dem Här Cédric Krummes bei senger Aarbecht ze hëllefen, géif et eis freeën, wann Dir him e puer vun Äre Stécker an engem Computerformat (*.doc, *.txt, etc.) kéint schëcken. D’Stécker ginn nämlech duerno vun engem Konkordanzeprogramm analyséiert.

A fir Är an och eis Rechter ze beschützen, géifen all Stécker anonym gemaacht ginn, d.h. all Numm, Uertschaft, an Nummer gëtt gekierzt/gelëscht:

De Pol huet dem Kätt 300 Frang fir op Paräis ginn.

gëtt: De P huet dem K 3 Frang fir op Pa ginn.

Ausserdem ginn an der These nëmmen déi Sätz kopéiert, déi relevant sinn.

D’Annexe wäert och nëmmen aus deenen eenzelne Sätz bestoen, déi erausgewielt ginn.

Wann Dir d’accord sidd, kéint Dir dem Här Cédric Krummes w.e.g. eng E-Mail schëcken? Hie wäert Iech dann en Averständnesformulaire per E-Mail schëcken, deen dir per Computer ausfëlle kënnnt. Dee schëckt Dir dann ausgefëllt zrëck, zesumme mat Äre Stécker.

Bei weider Froen, zëckt net, Iech mat mir a Kontakt ze setzen, oder dem Här Cédric Krummes selwer eng E-Mail (C.Krummes@sheffield.ac.uk) ze schëcken.

Schëine Bonjour vu Sheffield.

Gerald Newton
D’Démarchen, fir mat Âre Stécker ze schaffen

1. E-Mail vum Cédric Krummes un den LSV.
2. Den LSV schéckt dem Cédric Krummes d’Adressen.
6. Dir schéckt den Averstándnesformulaire ausgëfellet zrèck, zesumme mat Âre Stécker.
7. Âr Stécker gi per Computerprogramm no Stëchwierder gesicht.
8. Déi relevant Sätz ginn anonym gemaacht a kommen an d’These als Beispiller an och an d’Annexe.
Appendix 5: Follow-up Email for Plays Data

In this follow-up email, originally written in Luxembourgish, willing authors are given further information on to give their consent.

Moien,

Fir d’éischt mol villmols Merci, dass dir d’accord sidd, mir mat menger Dokterthese ze hëllef. Et freet mech, dass dir als Schrëftsteller mer een oder zwee Stécker per Email schécke kënnt.

Éier dir är Stécker un är Email drunhängt, muss der mer den Averståndnesformulaire ausfählen. De Formulaire ass e Word-Dokument, wou drasteet, wéi d’Stécker (am Formulaire “Texter” genannt) anonym gemaacht ginn, wat är Rechter sinn iwwert är Texter, a wat aus der Dokterthese geschéie wäert.

Den Averståndnesformulaire ass protégéiert: dir kënnt nêmme ganz bestëmmte Felder ausfählen (Numm, E-Mail, a.s.w.) oder Casen ukräizen. ’t ass en Averståndnesformulaire, deen dir net braucht (physesch) z’ënnerschreiwen, dofir ginn ech iech elo e Passwuert, wat wéi eng elekronesch Énnerschrëft fonctionnéiert. Well d’Passwuert perséinlech ass, roden ech iech dofir och, dëse Formulaire net an der Ëffentlechkeet auszefellen.

Äert Passwuert fir den Averståndnesformulaire ass:
[alphanumeric password]


Wann der nach weider Froen hutt, kënnt dir mer selbstverständlech eng E-Mail schécken. Meng britesch Handysnummer ass [private mobile phone number].

Net vergiessen: de Formulaire MAM Passwuert dra riwwerschécken!

A wéi gesot, Merci fir är Coopératioun!

Mat engem schéine Bonjour,

Cédric Krummes
Appendix 6: Consent Form for Plays Data

In this form, authors give their consent for their plays or film scripts to be used as data.

Heimadder ginn ech, [full participant’s name], dem Cèdric Krummes d’Autorisatioun fir:

- mäin/meng Text(er) fir seng Dokteraarbecht ze benotzen;
- eenzel Sätz vum/vun (den) Text(er) ze publizéieren;
- mäin/meng Text(er) fir weider Étuden ze benotzen.

Den/D’ Titel(e) vum/vun (den) Text(er) ass/sinn: [titles of plays or films scripts].
Meng Emailsaddress ass: [email address].
Meng Telefons- oder Handysnummer ass [phone number].
Ech gi léiwer per [email / phone] kontaktéiert.

[Locality], de(n) [date],[initials]
Passwuert: [alphanumeric password]

Ech verstinn dass, dass den/d’ Text(er)
- ni ganz publizéiert gëtt/ginn, mee just eenzel Sätz.
- anonymiséiert gëtt/ginn, d.h. Nimm, Uertschaften, Zäiten, an Nummere gi geläscht.

Ech verstinn och,
- dass d’Étude als Examplaire an der Bibliothéik vun der Universitéit vu Sheffield an an der Nationalbibliothéik vu Lëtzebuerger stoë wäert. Je no deem kéint d’Étude och als Buch, Kapitel, oder Artikel veröfentlecht ginn.
- dass all meng perséinlech Informationen némmen an den Dossier kommen, an aus Ethiks- an Dateschutzgrënn net weidergi wäerten.

Bei Froen oder Problemer kann ech mech un de Cèdric Krummes wenden. Seng Kontaktsinformatione sinn:

Centre for Luxembourg Studies
Dept. of Germanic Studies Handysnummer: [mobile number]
University of Sheffield E-Mailsadress: [email address]
Sheffield
S10 2TN Doktervater: Prof. Gerald Newton
England E-Mailsadress: [email address]
Soubal de Formulaire ganz ausgefüllt ass, spächeren ech de Fichier ènnerm Numm of a schécken en erêm zeréck.

☐ Ech si mat deem averstanen, wat ech ausgefüllt hunn, an hunn d’Conditoune vum Benotze vun all mengen Date gelies. (w.e.g. ukräizen)

An nach eng Kéier: Villmols Merci, dass dir a mengen Étude mathélleft!
Below is a sample of an anonymised concordance for *roueg* found in the Luxembourgish Plays Word-Corpus. The superscript numbers indicate the line numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ze spéit heeën!</td>
<td>Roueg zum J.--, Ech soen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T--! Du Päi!</td>
<td>Roueg op de bèllëgen Plaazen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Komm mier gin an de Flyin'!</td>
<td>Roueg! Rico maach deng Zigarett aus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>grous opsto.) Dir kënnnt</td>
<td>roueg 4974 drauferen. (En hëlt den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wann s de dech elo émdréits a</td>
<td>roueg erausegees a 1710 Remittlech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prima.</td>
<td>roueg, well all Mensch êsst. 19610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>hire strait, sëtzzen a amont</td>
<td>roueg do z’ëssen 24807 g-- bal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>d’M--? t ass jo lo fort, dat duerfs de</td>
<td>roueg beschãissen 20792 J--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A--! Ech si jo net da!</td>
<td>Roueg! Lo kënnnt en, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>d’m--? t ass jo lo fort, dat duerfs de</td>
<td>roueg Beschäissen 20792 J--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A--! Ech si jo net da!</td>
<td>Roueg! Lo kënnnt en, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>hire strait, sëtzzen a amont</td>
<td>roueg do z’ëssen 24807 g-- bal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>méi schif</td>
<td>roueg nuckuck wëi sech dem G--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>net dohi goen.</td>
<td>roueg eis lek ën S--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Fou seng Pai hunn, duerf hie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Rumëscheil um Këns de, wie vun äis zwee am do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>sou e kleingt</td>
<td>Roueg! Kënnnt e, an dat ass lo méi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendices