

Mysteries of response particles in Norwegian and German Toward a comparative study

John Ole Askedal
University of Oslo

1. Introduction

1.1. Preliminary remarks

The present paper deals with a certain kind of lexemes which have a very prominent part to play in discourse. These are the so-called answering words, or 'response particles' as I shall call them, in Norwegian and German, i. e. the Norwegian and German functional equivalents of French *oui, non, si*, English *yes, no*. This choice of subject matter reflects my wish to pay a tribute to Werner as a friend and a colleague by discussing phenomena which are within the scope of his wide-ranging research interests in the field of German and comparative Germanic linguistics. In recognition of Werner's active interest in my own mother tongue, it is from my point of view not totally inappropriate that the non-German Germanic part of it involves Norwegian. The study of response particles also concerns the pragmatics-syntax interface, a domain to which Werner has made a great number of important contributions. Furthermore, particles in Germanic languages have probably over the years been one of Werner's favourite themes. Taking account of Werner's general interest in language typology, it seems natural in this context to deal with particles that cater to truly universal pragmatic and communicative needs, as the response particles certainly do. The particles in question also exhibit functional variations which are reminiscent of the complex issues of grammaticalization and lexicalization, and diachronic change, which are also among Werner's favoured fields of study. (Cf. e.g. Abraham 1991.)

1.2. The material

As far as the empirical foundations of the present paper are concerned, I have decided to base my investigation on a literary work of art. For the present purpose, I have chosen as my source of material the first seven chapters of the novel *Mysterier* [*Mysteries*], published in 1892, which is one of the early masterpieces of the Norwegian Nobel laureate Knut Hamsun (1859–1952). This late 19th century Norwegian novel in fact reads like any good modern colloquial Norwegian text, and the structural peculiarities found therein are also typical of modern colloquial speech.¹ Thus this novel provides a diachronic perspective of structural constancy in colloquial Norwegian for a considerable stretch of time. It has been translated into German twice under the title *Mysterien*, and there are hence corresponding German texts available for interlingual comparison. I have opted for the most recent translation (Hamsun 1996).

1.3. Response particles

Both Norwegian and German belong to the group of European languages which, like French, but unlike English, possess three response particles:

(1)	French	German	Norwegian
	<i>oui</i>	<i>ja</i>	<i>ja</i> [ja(:)]
	<i>si</i>	<i>doch</i>	<i>jo</i> [ju(:)]
	<i>non</i>	<i>nein</i>	<i>nei</i>

With regard to the particles meaning 'yes' and 'no', there are clear phonological similarities between German and Norwegian, these being cognate languages. It should be noted that, in Norwegian, in contrast to the other two languages, the consonantal onset of *ja* and *jo* is the

¹For a survey of colloquialisms in Hamsun's prose cf. in particular Øyslebø (1964: 261–282).

same and the vowels [a(:)] and [u(:)] are maximally opposed with regard to height. This might be taken as an indication of lexical motivation in the shape of phonological iconicity.

The basic meaning or function of 'oui/ja' may be considered that of affirming a proposition (2a). 'Non/nein/nei' is either used to reject a non-negated proposition (2b) or to affirm a negated one (2c), whereas 'si/doch/jo' is used to contradict a negated proposition (2d). In each case, the proposition in question may be formulated either as an assertion with a presupposed truth value or as a question without a presupposed truth-value:

- (2a) Er hat das Buch gekauft./Hat er das Buch gekauft?– Ja (, er hat das Buch gekauft).
'He has bought the book./Has he bought the book? – Yes (, he has bought the book).'
- (2b) Er hat das Buch gekauft./Hat er das Buch gekauft?– Nein (, er hat das Buch nicht gekauft).
'He has bought the book./Has he bought the book? – No (, he has not bought the book).'
- (2c) Er hat das Buch nicht gekauft./Hat er das Buch nicht gekauft?– Nein (, er hat das Buch nicht gekauft).
'He has not bought the book./Hasn't he bought the book? – No (, he has not bought the book).'
- (2d) Er hat das Buch nicht gekauft./Hat er das Buch nicht gekauft?– Doch (, er hat das Buch gekauft).
'He has not bought the book./Hasn't he bought the book? – Oh yes, he has (bought the book).'

From standard examples like these it seems to follow that response particles have a semantic, referential as well as a pragmatic, interactional aspect; pragmatically, they are used to affirm or reject or contradict a proposition, but they can only do so by simultaneously referring to that proposition.

Presumably due to their pragmatic function, response particles have traditionally often been classified as a subgroup of interjections (as they still are in the most recent standard grammars of Norwegian and Swedish; cf. Faarlund et al. 1997: 968–971, Teleman et al. 1998: 751–758; cf. also the classification of German *ja* in Abraham 1991: 332). Modern German grammars treat them together with interjections but still see response particles and interjections as different types.² In the Duden grammar (Eisenberg et al. 1998: 381–383), the two types appear under the common heading "Gesprächspartikeln [conversational particles]" but are differentiated functionally as "Antworten auf Entscheidungsfragen, Grüße, Gebote u.dgl. [answers to yes/no questions, greetings, commands etc.]" and "Ausrufe [exclamations] (Interjektionen)" respectively. Weinrich (1993) deals with both types in the chapter "Syntax des Dialogs [syntax of dialogue]" (pp. 819 ff.) but interjections are classified as means of "Dialogkontakt" (pp. 819 ff., 857–861) whereas the response particles (pp. 861–866) appear under the general heading "Affirmation und Negation" (pp. 861 ff.). In Zifonun et al. (1997), a common chapter is devoted to "Interjektionen und Responsive [response particles]" (pp. 362 ff.) on account of their shared pragmatic function as "interaktive Einheiten [interactional entities]" (p. 362).³

The recent discussions mentioned here appear to be typical in that pragmatic and discourse structuring functions are in the foreground of discussion whereas the referential function alluded to above is not explicitly mentioned (or perhaps not even assumed). However, the literature about response particles is not totally silent about their referentiality. A notable case in point is Brinkmann (1979: 370) who uses the expression "anaphorischer

²In the authoritative monograph by Ehlich (1986), the response particles are not even mentioned. This book contains a comprehensive survey of the research history of interjections.

³The internal structure of this chapter is, however, somewhat confusing. *Ja* and *nein* here appear together between the interjection *hm* and about 15 further interjections of basically the same type as *hm*. Somewhat surprisingly, the response particle *doch* is not mentioned in this context but only later on in connection with the use of *doch* as a conjunction (p. 2415). The use of *doch* as a 'modal particle' is dealt with on a far broader basis (pp. 56 f., 614 ff., 903 ff., 1213 ff., 1223 ff., 1541 ff.).

Wert [anaphoric value]" of *ja*. One important modern voice is Abraham (1991: 369), who is very explicit about the anaphoric value of German *ja*: "*Ja* as an adverbial in initial sentential position always has an anaphoric, or deictic, function, in that it takes up a whole proposition (or at least part of it, e.g. just the rheme of this proposition) referring to it by way of a modal appreciation" (cf. also Abraham 1991: 370).

In what follows I shall try to elucidate both the referential and the interactional aspects of response particles by analysing their syntagmatic textual distribution. Each particle is investigated with regard to the following distributional possibilities:

- (3) 1. Syntagmatic independence
2. Phrase initial position (as some sort of pre-modifier below the clause level)
3. Sentence initial position (meaning the position in front of a sentence or clause)
4. Sentence internal position
5. Sentence (or phrase) final position (after a syntagmatically complete sentence, clause or phrase)

Concerning pragmatic functions, I cannot go into the whole array of relevant discourse-structuring properties of response particles but rather concentrate on the aspect of turn-taking (cf. e.g. Levinson 1983: 296–303, Brown and Yule 1983: 104 f., 230 f., with references, Zifonun et al. 1997: 468 ff.).

Following Brinkmann (1979) and Abraham (1991), I presuppose that response particles are referential entities insofar as they refer to some propositional content in about the same fashion as pronouns referring to sentences or clauses. Concomitantly, I assume that response particles can refer anaphorically as well as cataphorically and that anaphorically referring response particles have antecedents in a true textual sense.

For purposes of interlingual comparison, it is shown how the Norwegian particles in question are rendered in the German translation. English translations of the Norwegian and German examples are given throughout.⁴

2. Norwegian *ja*

2.1. The distribution of *ja*

2.1.1 Syntagmatic independence

The syntagmatically independent occurrences of *ja* invariably stand in a dialogic context and refer to an antecedent. The antecedent is in the majority of cases a full interrogative sentence:

- (4) Er det din kat?
Ja. (183)
Ist das deine Katze.
Ja. (61)
'Is that your cat? – Yes.'

The antecedent may also be a communicatively equivalent sentence fragment:

- (5) Av mig?
Ja. (177)
Mit mir?
Ja. (52 f.)
'By/with me? – Yes.'

Although interrogative sentences or expressions derivable therefrom clearly predominate, there is also one example where the antecedent is an declarative sentence:

- (6) Det er matklokken, sier Minutten.

⁴Whenever possible, I have for expository purposes tried to provide an English equivalent of the Norwegian response particle. The result may not in all cases be idiomatic.

Ja, svarer Nagel. (162)
 Es läutet zum Essen, sagt Minute.
 Ja, antwortet Nagel. (32)
 'It is the bell summoning us to the meal. – Yes, Nagel answers.'

In all these cases, *ja* refers anaphorically and introduces a new turn in the dialogue.

2.1.2. Phrase initial position

In the syntagmatic type I have chosen to call 'phrase initial', *ja* is adjoined to a non-verbal constituent of some sort. This type is intermediate between syntagmatically independent and sentence initial *ja* and may in principle be explained by ellipsis.

In many cases *ja* stands in a dialogic context and there is an antecedent interrogative sentence to which the phrase including *ja* refers by being construable as an element of the preceding sentence. In these cases, *ja* also indicates that a new turn is being taken:

- (7) Har de nogensinde drukket champagne? [...]
 Ja for mange år siden, i mine forældres sølvbryllup, [...]. (157)
 Haben Sie jemals Champagner getrunken? [...]
 Ja, vor vielen Jahren, auf der Silberhochzeit meiner Eltern, [...]. (24)
 'Have you ever drunk champagne? [...] – Yes, many years ago at my parents' silver wedding, [...].'

In the following case, the antecedent is also elliptical and derives from an interrogative sentence:

- (8) Fra Helsingfors, syntes jeg min mand sa?
 Ja fra Helsingfors. (188)
 Aus Helsingfors, glaube ich, sagte mein Mann?
 Ja, aus Helsingfors. (68)
 'From Helsinki, as I believe my husband said? – Yes, from Helsinki.'

The phrase with *ja* may, however, also refer to a declarative sentence:

- (9) Jeg håper det bedste, sa han.
 Ja jeg også, sa doktoren. (181)
 Ich hoffe das Beste, sagte er.
 Ja, ich auch, sagte der Doktor. (58)
 'I hope for the best, he said. – So do I, the doctor said.'

In the following case, the antecedent is elliptical and derives from a declarative sentence:

- (10) Jo kanske også talt med hende. [...]
 Ja men ikke ordentlig, [...]. (160)
 Doch, vielleicht auch mit ihr gesprochen. [...]
 Ja, aber nicht richtig. [...] (29)
 'And perhaps also spoken to her. [...] – Yes, but not properly, [...].'

The following example is special in that the elliptical phrase is not the replica of a specific element in the preceding sentence, but rather a textual addition corresponding to an element in the preceding sentence:

- (11) Men det var dog hovedstaden allikevel. Det var jo møtestedet for alt hvad som fandtes i landet av storheter og berømmelser og kunst og teater og alt mulig.
 Ja, og foruten dette alle de fremmede som strømmet til, [...]. (194)

Es sei doch der Treffpunkt für alles, was es im Lande gebe an Größen und Berühmtheiten und Kunst und Theater un allem Möglichen.
 Ja, und außerdem alle die Fremden, die dort hinströmen! [...]. (77)
 'But it was after all the capital. It was the meeting place for every celebrity in the country and art and theater and all. – Yes, and in addition to that all the strangers who thronged there, [...].'

In a number of instances, however, a description of *ja* as being used anaphorically seems less natural. For instance, *ja* is commonly used in connection with politeness formulae, where anaphoric reference to a preceding proposition may in principle be inferable, but affirmation of the politeness act in question appears to be a more likely interpretation of the function of *ja*:

- (12) Ja værsgod, jeg bor ovenpå. (156)
 Ja, bitte, ich wohne oben. (24)
 'Yes, please, I live upstairs.'
- (13) Dermed vil hun uten videre gå.
 Ja tusen tak, sier jeg, [...]. (167)
 Damit will sie so ohne weiteres gehen.
 Ja, vielen Dank, sage ich, [...]. (38)
 'Then she gets ready to leave at once. – Yes, thanks a lot, I say [...].'

In a number of other cases, *ja* does not initiate a new dialogic turn but rather functions to confirm or emphasize the communicative import of the following element. In most of these cases, there is no anaphoric reference to a propositional antecedent:

- (14) Pause.
 Nei det er kanskje helst med med – ja med andre ting De har syslet. (147)
 Pause.
 Nein, Sie haben sich vielleicht mit – ja, mit anderen Dingen befaßt. (10)
 'Silence. – No you have been busy doing other – yes doing other things.'
- (15) [...], men allikevel istand til å lokke ut av en den siste skilling, ja utsuge en til nødlidenhet, [...]. (170)
 [...], aber trotzdem imstande, einem den letzten Schilling abzuschmeicheln, ja, einen bis zur Armut auszusaugen, [...]. (42)
 '[...], but still capable of wheedling out one's very last shilling, yes squeeze one into destitution, [...].'
- (16) Ja de kvinder, de kvinder! (170)
 Ja, die Frauen, die Frauen! (42)
 'Yes, those women, those women!'

Whereas *ja* in (7)–(11) has anaphoric reference, such reference cannot be assumed in (12)–(16). In the latter cases it is to a varying extent possible to construe some sort of cataphoric reference by way of pragmatic inferencing, but this seems hardly natural. Thus, in (12)–(16) *ja* occurs with weakened referential value and its pragmatic function as a marker of affirmation predominates. In (16), *ja* is even more pragmatically loaded and carries with it a note of irony or sarcasm. *Ja* introduces a new turn in (12)–(13), (16) but not in (14)–(15).

2.1.3. Sentence initial position

In the prototypical case, sentence initial *ja* introduces a new turn and refers anaphorically to an interrogative sentence, the main content of which is repeated as a declarative sentence after *ja*:

- (17) Var kniven sløv?
 Ja den var sløv. (149)
 War das Messer stumpf?
 Ja, es war stumpf. (13)
 'Was the knife blunt? – Yes, it was blunt.'
- (18) Var den unge mand da så forgapet i hende?
 Ja han var vel det. (149)
 War denn der junge Mann so in sie vergafft?
 Ja, das war er wohl. (14)
 'Was the young man so crazy about her? – Yes, he probably was.'
- (19) Var det godt?
 Ja jeg husker at det smakte godt. (157)
 War das gut?
 Ja, ich erinnere mich, daß es gut geschmeckt hat. (24)
 'Was it good? – Yes, I remember that it tasted good.'

In other cases, the sentence introduced by *ja* stands in a looser relationship to the preceding interrogative, cf. (20) where *ja* introduces a rhetorical comment:

- (20) Si mig engang: er De høiremand?
 Nagel spærret øinene forbauset op; så brast han i latter og svarte:
 Ja, hvad tror De? (201)
 Sagen Sie mal: Sind Sie ein Anhänger *der Rechten*?
 Nagel sperrte erstaunt die Augen auf; dann brach er in Lachen aus und antwortete:
 Ja, was glauben Sie? (87)
 'Tell me, are you a conservative? – Nagel opened his eyes wide up, then he began to laugh and answered: – Yes, what do you think?'

Sentences introduced by *ja* also occur after a declarative sentence. *Ja* then behaves in the same fashion as after an interrogative, introducing a new turn in the dialogue and preceding a declarative sentence which repeats the propositional content of the preceding interrogative:

- (21) Apropos: dengang De kom til konsul Andresen for å takke ham som de fortæller ...
 Ja jeg vilde takke ham for hans hjælp. (161)
 Apropos: als Sie damals, wie Sie erzählen, zu Konsul Andresen kamen, um sich zu bedanken ...
 Ja, ich wollte ihm für seine Hilfe danken. (30)
 'By the way, when you then came to consul Andresen to thank him, as you now tell me – Yes, I wanted to thank him for his assistance.'

In other cases, there is a looser relationship between the preceding sentence and the sentence introduced by *ja*. Cf. (22), where *ja* introduces an explanation, and (23), where the sentence introduced by *ja* is a corrective rejoinder in the guise of an interrogative:

- (22) Men De har jo gjort det før. (152)
 Ja, men da var jeg fuld, [...]. (152)
 Aber Sie haben das doch schon einmal gemacht. (18)
 Ja, aber da war ich betrunken, [...]. (18)
 'But you have done so before. – Yes, but then I was drunk [...].'

- (23) I det hele tat var det skrekkelig med vankundigheten ute hos almuen.
 Ja, men manden blev jo frisk? (209)
 Insgesamt gäbe es draußen im gemeinen Volk eine schreckliche Unaufgeklärtheit.
 Ja, aber der Mann wurde doch gesund? (98)
 'The general ignorance of the common people was terrible. – Yes, but after all the man was cured, wasn't he?'

In (24) the antecedent is an indirect rendering of an imperative, and the sentence introduced by *ja* is straightforward direct speech:

- (24) Han bad mig om å bringe et brev for ham. — Ja, sa jeg, det skal jeg gjøre; [...]. (163)
 Er bat mich, für ihn einen Brief zu überbringen. — Ja, sagte ich, das werde ich erledigen; [...]. (32)
 'He asked me to carry a letter for him. – Yes, I said, I'll do that; [...].'

In the cases dealt with so far, *ja* behaves in a normal fashion in the sense that it has anaphoric referential function and introduces a new dialogic turn. In a fair number of cases, one or both of these characteristics are lacking.

First, there are examples where *ja* introduces a new turn but has no clearly identifiable anaphoric reference. In this connection, imperatives are of special interest as they have appropriateness conditions but no truth value. Hence a *ja* preceding an imperative cannot be understood referentially as confirmation of truth value. It can also not be construed as an expression of acceptance of the act to be performed on the part of the speaker (as in (24)), but only as a kind of phatic confirmation of the act of ordering. Cf. the following examples:

- (25) Ja fortæl Deres historie fra keiserbesøket, fuldmægtig. (204)
 Ja, erzählen Sie Ihre Geschichte vom Kaiser-Besuch, Assessor. (91)
 'Well, tell us your story about the imperial visit, Mr. Assistant Judge.'
- (26) Ja lat os nu finde på noget (201)
 Ja, laßt uns jetzt etwas ausdenken ... (87)
 'Well, let us think about something'

The following example (27) with the modal verb *få* is not an imperative in the morphological sense, but it is functionally similar and, presumably, *ja* may be ascribed the same speech-act affirming function as in (25)–(26):

- (27) Ja men dere får ikke bryte op. (201)
 Ja, aber Sie dürfen nicht aufbrechen. (87)
 'Yes, but you may not leave.'

In the following case (28), *ja* precedes an interrogative sentence and introduces a new turn, but it can here hardly be taken to affirm the following propositional content:

- (28) Godaften, frøken! Jeg er en fremmed, tilgiv meg, jeg går en tur og vet ikke hvor jeg er kommet hen. [...]
 Ja hvor skal de hen, sier hun [...]. (167)
 Guten Abend, Fräulein! Ich bin ein Fremdling, vergeben Sie mir, ich gehe spazieren und weiß nicht, wo ich hingelangt bin. [...]
 Ja, wo wollen Sie hin, sagt sie [...]. (38)
 'Good evening, Miss! I am a stranger, forgive me, I am just walking around and I do not know where I am. [...] – Yes but where are you going, she says [...].'

In other examples, initial *ja* precedes an interrogative but does not introduce a new turn. It may then be taken as an anticipation of a forthcoming affirmative answer, in particular when the question is a rhetorical one with main clause order as in (29)–(30):

- (29) Har de nogensinde drukket champagne? Ja det har de naturligvis? (157)
 Haben Sie jemals Champagner getrunken? Ja, das haben Sie natürlich? (24)
 'Have you ever drunk champagne? Yes of course you have?'
- (30) [...] jeg vet ikke om De kan se en liten mørk dame med med silkekant på kåpen? Ja det er fru. (177)
 [...] ich weiß nicht, ob Sie eine kleine dunkle Dame mit Seidensaum am Mantel sehen können? Ja, das ist seine Frau. (53)
 '[...] I don't know whether you can see a small dark lady with silver lining on her coat? Yes, it is his wife.'

In (31)–(34), initial *ja* seems to be further weakened to some sort of phatic marker:

- (31) Ja kunde De ikke det? (157)
 Könnten Sie nicht doch? (25)
 'Well, couldn't you?'
- (32) Ja hvad synes nu De? (195)
 Ja, was meinen Sie denn? (79)
 'Well, what do you think?'
- (33) Ja De er ikke på forretninger her i byen da? (147)
 Also dann sind sie nicht geschäftlich hier bei uns? (10)
 'So the reason for your visit in this town is not business, is it?'
- (34) Ja er det ikke en kar! fortsatte doktoren [...]. (197)
 Ja, ist das nicht ein toller Bursche! fuhr der Doktor fort [...]. (81)
 'Atta boy! the doctor continued [...].'

Essentially the same sort of pragmatic weakening is found in numerous instances with *ja* preceding a declarative where no new turn is being introduced:

- (35) Ja han hadde jo gjort manden en gjentjeneste [...]. (206)
 Ja, er habe diesem Mann immerhin einen Gegendienst geleistet [...]. (94)
 'Well he had done the man a favour in return [...].'
- (36) Ja dette jeg nu har fortalt Dem er en hemmelighet og jeg ber dem om at (149)
 Ja, was ich Ihnen jetzt erzählt habe, ist ein Geheimnis, und ich bitte Sie ... (14)
 'Well what I have told you know is a secret and I ask you'
- (37) Litt efter sa Nagel:
 Ja nu er altså frøken Kielland forlovet. (163)
 Kurz danach sagte Nagel:
 Ja, jetzt ist also Fräulein Kielland verlobt. (33)
 'A moment later Nagel said: – Well now Miss Kielland is engaged.'

In such cases it is at least possible to consider the initial *ja* as conveying cataphoric affirmation of the following prepositional content and hence as being in principle referential. The referential weakening goes even further when *ja* is combined with an interjection which presumably testifies to its predominantly pragmatic, not referential value in these cases. Cf. (38)–(39):

- (38) Å ja, i Guds navn, vi får finde os i det. (176)
 Ach ja, in Gottes Namen, wir müssen uns damit abfinden. (52)
 'Oh well, for Heaven's sake, we have to put up with that.'
- (39) Ja Gud hvor det måtte være deilig! (189)
 Ja, Gott, wie schön das gewesen sein muß! (70)
 'Oh, by God, that must have been nice!'

2.1.4. Sentence internal position

In contrast to German (cf. Abraham 1991: 345, 367–369), Norwegian has no sentence internal use of *ja*.

2.1.5. Sentence final position

It is a well-known characteristic of colloquial Norwegian that certain light sentence adverbials may be placed in sentence final position. The response particle *ja* may also conform to this distributional pattern:

- (40) Å leve er krig med trolde, ja. (172)
 Zu leben ist Krieg gegen die Trolle, ja. (45)
 'Living is waging war with trolls.'
- (41) [...] men det er lidt mistænkelig ja; [...]. (148)
 [...]; aber es ist doch etwas verdächtig; ... (12)
 '[...] but it is after all somewhat suspicious; [...].'

Although common in neighbouring Swedish, this distribution of *ja* is in all probability a rarity as far as European languages are concerned. However, given an understanding of response particles as referential entities, it is not at all unnatural. It may then simply be considered another instance of anaphoric affirmation of propositional content on a par with the anaphoric affirmative function we have assumed with regard to, e.g., (35)–(37). Sentence final *ja* is definitely gaining ground in modern colloquial Norwegian.

2.2. Comparison with the German translation

A comparison of the original Norwegian occurrences of *ja* with their German renderings has to take into consideration, first, whether the Norwegian particle has been translated at all, second, what kind of German lexical expression is used, and, third, whether the German equivalent is positionally on a par with the Norwegian original or not.

The vast majority of occurrences of Norwegian *ja* are translated into German. *Ja* is only omitted in a few instances: once as part of a conventional thanks-saying formula in sentence initial position (42), twice in front of an imperative, cf. e.g. (43), and once in front of a question (44):

- (42) De må gi mig regning når De vil. Det er jo mig det samme når jeg betaler.
 Ja tak, svarte værten, det haster ikke. (147)
 Hören Sie, mir ist eingefallen: Sie können mir die Rechnung ausstellen, wann Sie wollen. Mir ist es ja egal, wann ich bezahle.
 Danke, danke, antwortete der Wirt, das eilt nicht. (10)
 'You may give me the bill anytime you want. It's the same to me when I pay. – Yes, thanks, the proprietor answered, there is no hurry.'
- (43) Ja ta det der væk, sier jeg, [...]. (209)
 Nehmen Sie da das weg, rufe ich, [...]. (98)
 'Take that away, I say, [...].'

- (44) Ja kunde de ikke det? (157)
 Könnten Sie nicht doch? (25)
 'Well, couldn't you after all?'

Besides, the response particle is left out in the following case with Norwegian lexically reinforced *å ja*, leaving only the interjection *oh* in German:

- (45) Å ja jeg takker dem som jeg aldrig har takket i mit liv! (192)
 Oh, ich danke Ihnen, so wie ich noch nie im Leben gedankt habe! (74 f.)
 'Oh I thank you as I have never in my whole life thanked anyone before!'

Remarkably, Norwegian sentence final *ja* is retained in three of the four examples and only left out in the following (46):

- (46) [...]; men det er lidt mistænkelig ja, [...]. (148)
 [...]; aber es ist doch etwas verdächtig; [...]. (12)
 '[...]; but it is after all somewhat suspicious, [...].'

In a very few instances, *ja* is transferred to a different position in the German translation. In two cases, *ja* is moved from initial position in Norwegian into sentence internal particle position in German (where, *mutatis mutandis*, *ja* would not be possible in Norwegian). Cf. e.g. (47):

- (47) Ja det er godt. (159)
 Es ist ja gut. (27)
 'It's good then.'

In one additional instance such transfer is found in connection with the rendering of Norwegian *ja* as German *doch*:

- (48) Ja men ingen anden fik bryte op endnu, slet ikke, [...]. (201)
 Aber sonst dürfe doch niemand aufbrechen, durchaus nicht, [...]. (87)
 'But no one else was allowed to leave, none at all, [...].'

Besides, in one example *ja* is translated as *oder* 'or' and the following declarative sentence is transformed into an exclamatory sentence with question verb order for the purpose of emphasis:

- (49) Ja De kan bare prøve, de kan bare prøve! (197)
 Oder wollen Sie etwa leugnen! (82)
 'You just try!'

Thus, in the vast majority of cases the translator renders Norwegian *ja* as German *ja* and leaves it in situ. Minor translation variations are only found in the not too numerous instances when *ja* is lexically reinforced by an interjection. Thus *ak ja* is translated as *ach ja* (50), which is also used to render *åja* (51), and *å ja* is rendered as *o ja* (52):

- (50) Ak ja, men så giftet hun sig allikevel med en telegrafist og flyttet til Kabelvåg! (168)
 Ach ja, und dann heiratete sie einen Telegraphisten und zog nach Kabelvåg! (40)
 'And then she married a telegraphist and moved to Kabelvåg!'
- (51) Åja det er ikke så godt å vite hvad man skal si om det; [...]. (148)
 Ach ja, man weiß nicht recht, was man dazu sagen soll; [...]. (12)
 'Well, it's not so easy to know what to say; ...'

- (52) Å ja det kunde være sandt nok, indrømmet Nagel også; [...]. (194)
 O ja, das sei wohl richtig, räumte auch Nagel ein; [...]. (77)
 'Well, that would probably be right, Nagel admitted; [...].'

In general, then, the German translator appears intent on achieving the closest possible similarity with the Norwegian original on the syntactic as well as the lexical level.

3. Norwegian *nei*

3.1. The distribution of *nei*

3.1.1. Syntagmatic independence

Syntagmatically independent *nein* commonly refers to a propositional antecedent and also usually serves the purpose of turn-taking. The antecedent is most often a full interrogative sentence, which may be either non-negated (53) or negated (54):

- (53) Er hun enke?
 Nei. (179)
 Ist sie Witwe?
 Nein. (54 f.)
 'Is she a widow? – No.'
- (54) Hænger det ikke en klokke på væggen, et gammelt skilderi eller sligt noget?
 Nei. (179)
 Hängt keine Uhr an der Wand, ein altes Gemälde oder etwas in der Art?
 Nein. (55)
 'There is a clock hanging on the wall, isn't there?'

In (55), the antecedent is an elliptically reduced interrogative sentence and *nei* is lexically reinforced by an interjection:

- (55) Ikke det? sa frøkenen.
 Å nei! (189)
 Nicht? sagte das Fräulein.
 O nein. (70)

3.1.2. Phrase initial position

Phrase initial *nei* usually occurs in a dialogic context and there is an antecedent interrogative sentence to which the phrase including *nei* has some sort of functional correspondence. The phrase in front of which *nei* is placed typically comprises the negation adverb *ikke* 'not'. As in the case of phrase initial *ja*, this use of *nei* may in all the cases in question be explained by assuming ellipsis. Cf. e.g. (56):

- (56) Forbydde han Dem da å si det?
 Nei ikke han. (163)
 Hat er Ihnen denn verboten, es zu erzählen?
 Nein, nicht er. (33)
 'Did he forbid you to tell it? – No, not he.'

Occasionally, the antecedent is an elliptic substitute for a full interrogative sentence:

- (57) Ikke engang tid?
 Nei ikke nu. (151)
 Nicht einmal Zeit?
 Nein, nicht jetzt. (17)
 'Not even time? – No, not now.'

In one example, the sentential antecedent is an imperative:

- (58) Drik ut! skriker fuldmægtigen og må vende sig bort for ikke å briste i latter.
Nei ikke helt ut, ikke helt ut. (151)
Trinken Sie aus! ruft der Assessor und muß sich abwenden, um nicht loszulachen.
Nein, nicht alles, nicht alles. (16)
'Empty your glass! the assistant judge shouts and turns away to conceal his laughter. – No, not all of it'

From these examples it is evident that *nei* occurs with negated as well as non-negated antecedents. In these examples *nei* is connected with turntaking and has anaphoric reference. This is not always the case.

In (59) with *nei* preceding a conventionalized politeness formula, *nei* is connected with turntaking but there is hardly a referential connection with the preceding sentence:

- (59) Ja det er altså en slags hallucination som
Nei om forlatelse, svarte han. (187)
Ja, das ist also eine Art Halluzination, die ...
Nein, Verzeihung, antwortete er. (66)
'Yes, it is some kind of hallucination which – No, excuse me, he answered.'

Likewise, in (60) the phrase *nei men* introduces a turn but *nei* has no obvious antecedent. It seems primarily to function as an interjection-like marker of emphatic denial:

- (60) Det blev med ett aldeles stille. Minutten så skrækslagen fra den ene til den andre og sa:
Men Nei men? (154)
Es wurde schlagartig völlig still. Minute schaute entgeistert von einem zum anderen und sagte: Aber ... Nein, aber ... ? (20)
'Suddenly it became very quiet. [The person called] 'The Minute' looked terrified from one to the other and said. – But No but?'

In other instances, *nei* clearly does not serve the purpose of turntaking, but is simply used for contrast within the clause. Cf. e.g. (61):

- (61) [...] og da de nådde toget og indtok sine plasser hadde ikke en sjæl observeret dem, nei ikke en sjæl foruten mig. (171 f.)
[...] und als sie den Zug erreichten und ihre Plätze einnahmen, hatte keine Seele sie beobachtet, nein, keine Seele außer mir. (45)
'[...] and when they reentered the train and sat down on their seats not a soul had observed them, no not a single soul except for me.'

3.1.3. Sentence initial position

Sentences with initial *nei* often have an interrogative sentence as textual antecedent, which may either be without (62) or contain a negation (63):

- (62) Fryser du, Jetta?
Nei jeg fryser ikke, lat oss sitte, svarte fruen. (191)
Frierst du, Jetta?
Nein, ich friere nicht, laßt uns sitzen bleiben, antwortete die Frau. (73)
'Are you cold, Jetta? – No, I am not cold, let us sit down, the woman said.'
- (63) [...] lå da ikke kniven ved siden av ham?
Nei den lå flere skrift borte. (148)
[...] lag denn das Messer nicht neben ihm?

Nein, es lag einige Schritte weit entfernt. (12)
'[...] didn't the knife lie beside him? – No, it lay several feet away.'

A sentence fragment may function as an interrogative antecedent:

- (64) Vel? Ikke nu?
Nei det hører ikke hit, sa Reinert også. (188)
Nicht wahr? Nicht jetzt?
Nein, das gehört nicht hierher, sagte auch Reinert. (69)
'Well? Not now? – No, it does not belong here, Reinert said too.'

A sentence introduced by *nei* may also be the answer to an imperative:

- (65) Godt, gjør mig dernæst den villighet å skjære litt tænder.
Nei det gjør jeg ikke. (152)
Gut, tun Sie mir weiterhin den Gefallen und knirschen Sie ein bißchen mit den
Zähnen.
Nein, das tu' ich nicht. (17)
'Well, do me the favour of grinding your teeth. – No, I won't do that.'

The antecedent may also be a declarative sentence. Most commonly, the sentence introduced by *nei* then serves to contradict a proposition maintained by the other speaker, as in (66):

- (66) Men Herregud, sier fuldmæktigen, jeg vilde bare by dem et glas øl jo. Og så kommer
de her og skjælder mig ut for å tale for høit.
Nei De misforstår mig og jeg ber om undskyldning. (150)
Herrgott noch mal, sagt der Assessor, ich wollte Sie doch nur zu einem Glas Bier
einladen. Und dann kommen Sie und schimpfen mich hier aus, zu laut zu sein.
Nein, Sie mißverstehen mich, und ich bitte um Entschuldigung. (15)
'But for Heaven's sake, I just wanted to offer you a glass of beer, the assistant judge
said. And then you come here and accuse of speaking too loud. – No, you
misunderstand me and I apologize.'

A sentence introduced by *nei* may, however, also be used to confirm the content of a preceding negated sentence, as in (67):

- (67) [...] jeg tror ikke hun var tyve år.
Nei hun var ikke atten engang efter hvad indskriften viser. (177)
[...] ich glaube nicht, daß sie zwanzig wurde.
Nein, der Inschrift nach war sie nicht einmal achtzehn. (52)
'[...] I do not think that she was twenty. – No, according to the inscription she was not
even twenty.'

A number of sentences with imperative meaning are similar in kind in that *nei* is connected with turn-taking but is not anaphorically linked to the preceding sentence or context. In (68)–(69), the sentence following *nei* is an imperative and in (70) a declarative sentence with imperative meaning:

- (68) Nei gå ikke, ikke med en gang! (167)
Nein, gehen Sie nicht, nicht sofort! (38)
'No, don't go, not at once!'
- (69) De gik kanske en halv time på denne måte, så ropte fru Stenersen ned til dem:
Nei kom nu tilbake engang! (192)

Auf diese Weise gingen Sie vielleicht eine halbe Stunde, dann rief Frau Stenersen zu ihnen hinunter:

Nein, jetzt kommt endlich mal zurück! (74)

'They walked along for perhaps half an hour, and then Mrs. Stenersen shouted down to them: – Come back now, please!'

(70) Den gir efter, den holder ikke det spor, se her, nei, vil De se her! (151)

Er gibt nach, er hält nicht das geringste aus, hier sehen Sie, nein, wollen Sie wohl hersehen!

'It gives in, it doesn't hold at all, look here, no, will you look here!'

In such cases the emphatic value of *nei* is predominant but it is also possible to construe *nei* as the explicit rejection of a possible or implied alternative form of action.

In the instances discussed so far, the use of *nei* is connected with turntaking. In a fairly large number of instances, *nei* does not introduce a new turn but does retain some sort of referential value. Consider for instance (71)–(72), where *nei* on the one hand summarizes the content of the preceding negated sentence, but may on the other hand also be taken to conform to the following negated sentence. In these cases there thus appears to be a referential anaphoric-cataphoric ambivalence:

(71) Jeg vil ikke reise herfra mere, nei det vil jeg virkelig ikke. (188)

Ich will nicht mehr von hier fort, nein, wirklich nicht. (68)

'I will not leave this place, no I really won't.'

(72) Det hjelper ikke. Nei jeg kan ikke gjøre det, [...]. (157)

Das hilft nichts. Nein, ich kann das nicht tun, [...]. (25)

'It doesn't help. No, I cannot do it.'

Sentences like (73), where the sentence preceding *nei* contains an adjective with the negating prefix *u-* 'un-', are similar in kind, but still *nei* seems more cataphoric than anaphoric:

(73) Det var ubegripelig, fabelaktig; nei han forstod det ikke. (207)

Es sei unbegreiflich, phänomenal; nein, er verstehe das nicht: ... (96)

'It was inconceivable, fabulous; no, he couldn't understand it.'

In a fairly large number of instances *nei* cannot be interpreted anaphorically at all. A cataphoric interpretation is in particular possible when a sentence introduced by *nei* contains a negation. Consider first the following declaratives (74)–(75):

(74) Nei han har nok ikke snublet desværre! (148)

Nein, er ist wohl leider nicht gestolpert! (12)

'No, unfortunately he had not stumbled.'

(75) Nei jeg har aldrig hørt på maken! (193)

Nein, so was! (76)

'No, I've never heard anything like it!'

However, in the majority of cases the sentence introduced by *nei* does not contain a negation and hence the propositional content of the sentence does not on semantic grounds invite prefixation by *nei*. Consider (76)–(81):⁵

⁵This use of *nei* is barely hinted at in Faarlund et al. (1997: 969).

- (76) Pause.
 Nei det er kanskje helst med med – ja med andre ting De har syslet. (147)
 Pause.
 Nein, Sie haben sich vielleicht mit – ja, mit anderen Dingen befaßt. (10)
 ‘Silence. – No you have been busy doing other – yes doing other things.’
- (77) ... Nei jeg har set et ægteskap i mine dager, så å si overværet det til og med. (171)
 ... nein, von einer Ehe habe ich genug gesehen, ihr sogar beigewohnt, ... (44)
 ‘No, I have seen a marriage in my days, so to speak attended it.’
- (78) Nei det var småt det hele. (185)
 Nein, das Ganze war kleinlich. (63)
 ‘No it was all very petty.’
- (79) Han der, sier salig mama, nei kommer han hit så går jeg min vei, sier hun [...]. (166)
 Der da, sagt Mama selig, wenn der hierherkommt, zieh ich meines Weges, sagt sie [...]. (36)
 ‘That one, my deceased mother says, no, if he comes, then I’ll leave, she says [...].’
- (80) Nei for å komme tilbake til det vi talte om så er faktum det at [...]. (198)
 Nein, um auf das zurückzukommen, wovon wir sprachen, [...]. (83)
 ‘No, to come back to what we talked about, it is a fact that [...].’
- (81) Nei for et nydelig barn han hadde! (166)
 Nein, was für ein nettes Kind er hatte? (37)
 ‘What a nice child he had!’

The examples in (76)–(80) are declaratives, (81) is a typical exclamation. To these example the following interrogative (82) may be added:

- (82) Det skete av vanvare. Nei sa jeg det virkelig? (163)
 Das geschah aus Versehen. Nein, habe ich das wirklich gesagt? (33)
 ‘I happened by mistake. No, did I really say so?’

At least in some of these cases it is in principle possible to construe *nei* as an expression of rejection of some implicit alternative to the sentence or clause following *nei*. In any case, a drastic weakening of the referential value of *nei* is readily observable and *nei* accordingly seems to primarily function as a pragmatic particle.

3.1.4. Sentence internal position

The response particle *nei* is not used as a sentence internal adverb in Norwegian.

3.1.5. Sentence final position

In modern colloquial Norwegian, sentence final *nei* is often found after negated sentences, yielding a semantic correspondence relation between sentence internal negation adverb *ikke* and sentence final *nei*. Cf. e.g. (80):

- (83) Han var ikke beskjeden, nei.
 *Er war nicht bescheiden, nein.
 ‘He wasn’t modest, no, he wasn’t.’

This usage is, however, not attested in the present material.

3.2. Comparison with the German translation

Nei is omitted in the German translation only in the following single instance where in Norwegian it stands sentence-initially without marking turn-taking and rather functions as a marker of emphasis:

- (84) Han der, sier salig mama, nei kommer han hit så går jeg min vei. (166)
 Der da, sagt Mama selig, wenn er der hierherkommt, zieh ich meines Weges, sagt sie
 (36)
 'That one, my deceased mother says, no, if he comes, then I'll leave.'

In general, the Norwegian translator renders *nei* as German *nein* and leaves it in situ. Minor translation variations are only found in the few cases where *nei* is lexically reinforced by an interjection. *Å nei* is then rendered as *o nein* (85) or as *ach nein* (86):

- (85) Å nei! Jo det er naturligvis en overdrivelse, men (189)
 O nein! Doch das ist natürlich eine Übertreibung, aber ... (70)
 'Oh no! That is of course an exaggeration but ...'
- (86) Ånei jeg har holdt op med det. (147)
 Ach nein, das habe ich aufgegeben. (10)
 'Oh no, that I have given up.'

4. Norwegian *jo*

4.1. The distribution of *jo*

4.1.1. Syntagmatic independence

Syntagmatically independent *jo* occurs in two examples only. In both cases the antecedent is a negated interrogative sentence and *jo* is connected with turntaking. This may be considered the prototypical – but not necessarily the most frequent – environment for the use of *jo* as a response particle:

- (87) – De skulde ikke vite hvor de er kommet fra?
 Jo, svarer Minutten. (178)
 – Sie wüßten nicht, woher die gekommen sind?
 Doch, antwortet Minute. (53)
 'You wouldn't happen to know where they come from? – Yes, in fact I do, [the person called] 'The Minute' answers.'
- (88) Det synes De ikke å mene?
 Jo. (195)
 Das meinen Sie doch wohl nicht ernst?
 Doch. (78)
 'You don't actually mean that? – I do.'

4.1.2. Phrase initial position

As in the case of *ja* and *nei*, the phrase preceded by or including *jo* is in general structurally explainable by ellipsis.

In the majority of examples, phrase initial *jo* has a negated interrogative antecedent:

- (89) [...] – var det ikke til Malta?
 Jo, til Malta, svarte Dagny. (202)
 [...] – war es nicht Malta?
 Ja, nach Malta, antwortete Dagny. (88)
 '[...] – wasn't it Malta? – Yes, to Malta, Dagny answered.'
- (90) Men De har kanskje ikke talt med hende endda? [...]
 Jo kanskje også talt med hende. (160)

Aber Sie haben vielleicht noch nicht mit ihr gesprochen? [...]
 Doch, vielleicht auch mit ihr gesprochen. (29)
 'But perhaps you haven't spoken with her yet? [...] – Well, I might have spoken with her.'

As in (89)–(90), the use of *jo* is normally connected with turntaking. There are two examples where this is not the case. In (91), the antecedent is a formulaic locution preceded by *nei*:

- (91) Doktoren kom ham tilhjælp og sa:
 Det er altså en slags hallucination som
 Nei om forlatelse, svarte han. Jo gjerne det forresten; [...]. (187)
 Der Doktor kam ihm zu Hilfe und sagte:
 Ja, das ist also eine Art Halluzination, die ...
 Nein Verzeihung, antwortete er. Doch, meinetwegen; warum nicht? [...] (66)
 'The doctor came to his assistance and said: – It's a kind of hallucination then which ... – No, excuse me, he answered. Well, as far as I am concerned, why not [...].'

In the second example without turntaking (92), the phrase introduced by *doch* is preceded by a non-negated affirmative sentence which is functionally on a par with an imperative:

- (92) Nu må de fortsætte, jo, endelig! (205)
 Jetzt müssen Sie weitermachen, doch, unbedingt. (93)
 'Now you must go on, yes, definitely!'

4.1.3. Sentence initial position

Sentences with initial *jo* often have a negated interrogative (93)–(94) or declarative (95) sentence as textual antecedent. This is combined with turntaking:

- (93) Men det skulde ikke være i anledning av fødselsdagen at flaget var heist?
 Jo det var det vel. (161)
 Aber hätte es nicht anlässlich des Geburtstages sein können, daß die Flagge gehißt war?
 Doch, das war es wohl. (30)
 'But wouldn't it be so that the flag was running because of the birthday? – Well, that would have been so.'
- (94) Slog De dem ikke i hodet?
 Å jo jeg slog mig litt i hodet. (159)
 Haben Sie sich nicht den Kopf geschlagen?
 O ja, ich habe mir ein bißchen den Kopf geschlagen. (28)
 'Didn't you hurt your head? – Well, yes, I did hurt my head a bit.'
- (95) [...] kanskje kommer jeg slet ikke. [...]
 Jo De må naturligvis komme. (193)
 [...] Ja, vielleicht komme ich überhaupt nicht. [...]
 Doch, natürlich müssen Sie kommen. (76)
 '[...] perhaps I won't come at all. [...] – But of course you must come.'

A non-negated question is also possible as an antecedent. Cf. (96):

- (96) Kan De også huske hvad De svarte da jeg fandt det vakkert? At De bare én gang før hadde hørt noget skjønnere, og det var i drømme.
 Jo, han husket det, han nikket. (204)
 Aber können Sie sich auch erinnern, was Sie antworteten, als ich es schön fand? Daß Sie nur einmal zuvor etwas Schöneres gehört hätten, und das im Traum.

Doch er erinnerte sich, er nickte. (91)

'Can you also remember what you answered when I found it beautiful? That you had only once before heard something more beautiful, and that was in your dreams. – Yes, he remembered that, he nodded.'

In (96), *jo* may be understood as refuting an implicit possible alternative, *in casu*, that the person answering the question did not remember.

The example (97) is similar to (93)–(96), but the antecedent is a non-negated phrase explainable by ellipsis:

- (97) Lat os høre. Et mord for eksempel?
Jo da. Jeg kunde myrde en eskimo [...]. (205)
Lassen Sie uns hören! Einen Mord zum Beispiel?
Ja doch, ich könnte einen Eskimo totschiagen, [...]. (92)
'Let's hear! A murder for instance? – Oh yes, I could murder an eskimo [...].'

In a number of cases, there is an antecedent, but no turntaking. In (98) the antecedent is a non-negated interrogative, in (99) a negated declarative, in (100) a non-negated interrogative functioning as an imperative, in (101) a subordinate clause functioning communicatively as an emphatic declarative and in (102) an ordinary non-negated declarative:

- (98) – Vet Dere hvad vi har fundet på mens dere var borte? Jo vi har bestemt os til å ha stort selskap hos os imorgen aften. (192)
– Wißt ihr, was uns eingefallen ist, während ihr weg wart? Ja, wir haben beschlossen, morgen aber ist bei uns große Gesellschaft. (74)
'Do you know what we have concocted while you were away? Well, we have decided to have a big party at our house tomorrow night.'
- (99) Det var jeg vist ikke. Jo kanskje jeg var fuld, det vet jeg ikke. (198)
Das war ich bestimmt noch. Doch, vielleicht war ich betrunken, ich weiß es nicht. (82)
'I probably wasn't. Well, perhaps I was drunk, I don't know.'
- (100) Vil De så fortelle os den drøm også! Jo gjør det. (204)
Wollen Sie uns denn nicht auch diesen Traum erzählen! Doch, tun Sie es. (91)
'Will you then tell us that dream also! Please do so.'
- (101) [...] hvor De har rakkert Gladstone ganske ordentlig til! Jo De er en net en! (197)
[...] wo Sie Gladstone ganz ordentlich heruntergemacht haben. Sie sind mir vielleicht einer! (82)
'[...] how you have disparaged Gladstone! You are really a bad one!'
- (102) Han hørte dig, jo han gjorde, han vendte sig. (203)
Er hat dich gehört, ja doch, er hat sich umgedreht. (91)
'He heard you, yes, he did, he turned around.'

The following example (103) is perhaps amenable to the same sort of interpretation as (102), but the textual link is admittedly a fairly tenuous one:

- (103) Deres uniform var også så pen og de bar den med elegance. Jo, sjøofficerene hadde alltid bedåret ham. (202)
Ihre Uniform sei auch so schön, und sie trügen sie mit Grandezza. Doch, die Seeoffiziere hätten ihn immer bezaubert. (88)
'Their uniform was also very beautiful and they wore it with elegance. In fact, naval officers had always enchanted him.'

Examples like (104) are similar to (98)–(102), but the antecedent is a non-negated phrase explainable by ellipsis:

- (104) Hvad så? Jo så får hun sig fat i en kjæde, [...]. (208)
 Was jetzt? Ja, jetzt besorgt sie sich eine Kette, [...]. (97)
 ‘What then? Well then she had got hold of a chain, [...].’

In a number of cases there are, however, no strong textual reasons for assuming a propositional antecedent. One is thus led to assume that *jo* in these cases (if at all referential) refers cataphorically to the following sentence. We are here by definition dealing with occurrences of *jo* which cannot be accounted for by a negational element in the preceding context. Consider the following examples of declarative (105)–(108) and interrogative (109) sentences:

- (105) Jo, det slog mig med ett da jeg kom ind i gangen; [...]. (144)
 Doch, mir war gleich so, als ich in den Flur kam; [...]. (6)
 ‘Well, I noticed it as soon as I entered the corridor; [...].’
- (106) Jo det er da virkelig et morsomt syn! (199)
 Doch, das ist wirklich ein erquicklicher Anblick! (84)
 ‘But that was really a funny sight!’
- (107) Jo det var pokker til forskjel. (89)
 Und doch, das sei Teufel noch eins ein Unterschied. (89)
 ‘Well, that made a hell of a difference.’
- (108) Fruen så på klokken, jo det var doktoren, hun kjendte hunden. (206)
 Die Frau des Hauses sah auf die Uhr, doch, das war der Doktor, sie kannte den Hund. (95)
 ‘The woman looked at her watch, certainly it was the doctor, she recognized the dog.’
- (109) Jo hvorfor er ikke jeg som andre mennesker? (192)
 Ja, warum bin ich nicht wie andere Menschen? (75)
 ‘Why am I not like other people?’

One may surmise that the use of *jo* is in some way caused by a negative presupposition in the speaker’s mind, but this hardly suffices to explain all of the cases in question nor the frequency with which *jo* turns up in environments without any kind of overt negation.

4.1.4. Sentence internal position

In contrast to *ja* and *nei*, *jo* is often used used sentence-internally as a sentence adverb (pragmatic or ‘modal’ particle). The similarity between the uses of *jo* considered so far and its sentence-internal use as a modal particle does not consist in shared conditions of occurrence pertaining to the presence of a negation in the preceding context, but is rather of a more abstract nature insofar as *jo* in all its environments denotes some sort of contrast.⁶ Cf. the following examples:

⁶It should be noted that Norwegian Riksmål/Bokmål (“Dano-Norwegian”) sides with Danish (and German, cf. *doch*) in not making a lexical difference between the responsive ‘jo’ and the sentence-internal modal particle ‘jo’. However, such a difference is made in the other variety of written Norwegian (Nynorsk/‘New Norwegian’; cf. Hovdenak et al. 1986: 324 f.), cf. (i), (ii), and in Swedish (Malmström et al. 1991: 242 f.), cf. (iii)–(iv):

- (i) Er han ikkje rik?
Jau, han er sers rik.
 ‘Isn’t he rich. – Yes, he is very rich.’
- (ii) Han er *jo* sers rik.
 ‘He is after all very rich.’

- (110) Jeg vilde jo bare gi Dem et varsku [...]. (203)
 Ich wollte Ihnen doch nur einen Wink geben [...]. (90)
 'I just wanted to give you a warning hint [...].'
- (111) Men De har jo gjort det før. (152)
 Aber Sie haben das doch schon einmal gemacht. (18)
 'But you have done that before.'
- (112) Så. Ja det er jo smukt av ham. (160)
 So. Ja, das war doch reizend von ihm. (28)
 'Well, that was very kind of him.'
- (113) De spiller jo violin? (186)
 Sie spielen doch Geige? (66)
 'But you do play violin, don't you?'

4.1.5. Sentence final position

Like a number of other Norwegian sentence adverbs, *jo* is also used sentence-finally. The corpus contains only two examples, each of which represents a different distributional type common to colloquial Norwegian. In (114), *jo* is used sentence-finally without corresponding to a sentence initial or sentence internal *jo*:

- (114) Men Herregud, sier fuldmæktigen, jeg vilde bare by dem et glas øl jo. (150)
 Herrgott noch mal, ich wollte Sie doch nur zu einem Glas Bier einladen. (15)
 'But for Heaven's sake, I just wanted to invite you to a glass of beer.'

In (115) there is such correspondence between, first, a sentence initial, second, a sentence internal, and, third, a sentence final *jo*:

- (115) Lat mig se forresten, jo den er jo kav mælt rotten jo, se her! (151)
 Lassen Sie mich mal sehen, doch, der ist doch vollständig verrottet, was, sehen Sie!
 (17)
 'Just let me have a look, it is really completely rotten, just look here!'

The last example exhibits a combination of two common copying constructions where either a sentence initial or a sentence internal adverb is repeated in sentence final position (cf. Askedal 1989: 693–696). Consider the possibilities of variation shown in (116):

- (116) *Jo*, den er rådden, *jo*.
 Den er *jo* rotten, *jo*.
Jo, den er *jo* rådden, *jo*.

4.2. Comparison with the German translation

Jo is the least frequent of the three response particles, but it is the one that is least uniformly treated in the German translation.

Sentence internal *jo* is omitted twice. Cf. e.g. (117):

- (117) Jeg synes jo at Kristiania er god nok for mig. (195)
 Ich will meinen, daß Kristiania gut genug für mich ist. (78)

-
- (iii) Är han inte rik?
Jo, han er mycket rik.
 'Isn't he rich? – Yes, he is very rich.'
- (iv) Han är *ju* mycket rik.
 'He is after all very rich.'
- Cf. section 5 for further discussion.

'I find Kristiania quite good enough for me.'

In one instance, sentence final *jo* is rendered as *doch* and moved into sentence internal particle position:

- (118) Men Herregud, sier fuldmæktigen, jeg vilde bare by dem et glas øl jo. (150)
Herrgott noch mal, ich wollte Sie doch nur zu einem Glas Bier einladen. (15)
'But for Heaven's sake, the law clerk says, I just wanted to invite you to a glass of beer.'

Similarly, sentence initial *jo* is once translated as *vielleicht*, which is placed in sentence internal particle position:

- (119) Jo De er en net en! (197)
Sie sind mir vielleicht einer! (82)
'Well, you are really some fellow!'

In the other instances, Norwegian *jo* is translated and left *in situ* as compared with the Norwegian original, but there is rather great lexical variation. The translationally equivalent to be expected is of course *doch*, but in addition, a number of other particle words also occur.

In (120), sentence initial *jo* is replaced by German *nun*:

- (120) Jo jeg så altså en åpen myr, [...]. (189)
Nun, ich sah also ein offnes Moor, [...]. (70)
'Well, I saw an open moor, [...].'

Phrase initial *jo* is in one instance rendered as *ja* (121):

- (121) Jo, til Malta, svarte Dagny. (202)
Ja, nach Malta, antwortete Dagny. (88)
'Yes, to Malta, Dagny answered.'

Ja is also used in six examples to translate sentence initial *jo*, cf. e.g. (122)–(123), and in two further instances to render sentence internal *jo*, cf. e.g. (124)

- (122) Jo jeg kjender dem alle. (177)
Ja, ich kenne sie alle. (53)
'Yes, I know them all.'
- (123) Jo hvorfor er ikke jeg som andre mennesker? (192)
Ja, warum bin ich nicht wie andere Menschen? (75)
'Why am I not like other people?'
- (124) Så kunde jo også doktorerne pakke sammen. (207)
Dann könnten ja auch die Ärzte zusammenpacken. (95)
'Then the doctors might as well pack their bags too.'

In a number of cases, lexically reinforced *ja* is used. *O ja* is used once for phrase initial *jo* (125) and once for sentence initial *å jo* (126)

- (125) Var det ikke en sørgelig tildragelse?
Jo en ytterst sørgelig tildragelse. (162)
War das nicht ein trauriges Ereignis?
O ja, ein äußerst trauriges Ereignis. (32)
'That was a very sad matter, wasn't it. – Oh yes, very sad.'

- (126) Slog De dem ikke i hodet?
 Å jo jeg slog mig litt i hodet. (159)
 Haben Sie sich nicht den Kopf geschlagen?
 O ja, ich habe mir ein bißchen den Kopf geschlagen. (28)
 'Didn't you hurt your head? – Well, yes, I did hurt my head a bit.'

Similarly, sentence initial *jo* with the additional particle *da* is translated as *ja doch*:

- (127) Jo da, disse kroker og denne zinkplate hadde bedret henne! (208)
 Ja doch, diese Haken und diese Zinkplatte haben ihr geholfen! (97 f.)
 'After all, these hooks and this slab of zinc had after all helped her!'

Sentence initial *jo* also appears once as *jawohl* (128) and once as *tja* (129):

- (128) Jo nu kunde hun ikke tåle å være ren længer! (208)
 Jawohl, jetzt könne sie es nicht länger aushalten, sauber zu sein! (97)
 'Very well, she was no longer able to endure being clean!'
- (129) Jo det hadde da hjulpet henne litt, virkelig hjulpet henne, [...]. (208)
 Tja, das habe ihr etwas geholfen, ihr wirklich geholfen, [...]. (97)
 'Well, it had helped her a bit, really helped her [...].'

In fact, in the majority of examples with sentence initial *jo*, the German text does not have *doch*, but some other expression.

In three renderings of sentence internal *jo*, German particle words occur which are not used in the other environments. These are *sowieso* (130), *mal* (131) and *leider* (132):

- (130) Det var jo dog klart for alle at han måtte ha brukt en kniv. (148)
 Er wäre sowieso allen klar, daß ein Messer benutzt haben mußte. (13)
- (131) Lat mig se forresten, jo den er jo kav mælt rotten jo, se her! (151)
 Lassen Sie mich mal sehen, doch, der ist doch vollständig verrottet, was, sehen Sie!
 (17)
- (132) Ja han fik jo aldri kald desværre; [...]. (163)
 Ja, er kam nun leider nie in ein Amt; [...]. (33)

In the above-mentioned copying construction with three occurrences of *jo*, the first two are given as *doch* and the last as *was*:

- (133) Lat mig se forresten, jo den er jo kav mælt rotten jo, se her! (151)
 Lassen Sie mich mal sehen, doch, der ist doch vollständig verrottet, was, sehen Sie!
 (17)
 'Just let me have a look, it is really completely rotten, just look here!'

It seems likely that the greater variation in the German renderings of *jo* as compared with *ja* and *nei* reflects its more marked status.

5. Summary

The Table in (134) summarizes the distribution of the three response particles:

(134)	<i>ja</i>	<i>nei</i>	<i>jo</i>
1. Syntagmatically independent	11 (7%)	11 (12%)	2 (3,5%)
2. Phrase initial	28 (20%)	11 (12%)	5 (9%)

3. Sentence initial	100 (70%)	69 (76%)	32 (56%)
4. Sentence internal	–	–	16 (28%)
5. Sentence final	4 (3%)	–	2 (3,5%)
Total	143 (100%)	91 (100%)	57 (100%)

Not surprisingly, the three particles occur in an order of frequency that corresponds to natural assumptions concerning markedness relations. One may safely assume that affirmative *ja* 'yes' is less marked than negative *nei* 'no', which is again less marked than *jo* 'doch' which affirms the alternative to a negated proposition. The special status of *jo* is of course also reflected by the fact that it is universally less common than the particles meaning 'yes' and 'no'. In this context it is interesting to note that there is in Norwegian a distributional asymmetry between *ja* and *nei* on the one hand, and *jo* on the other, since only *jo* may be used as a sentence adverb, and, furthermore, that a substantial part of the occurrences of *jo* in the text investigated do in fact occupy the sentence internal position in question. (But cf. n. 6.)

Obviously, the three first distributional possibilities dealt with represent the same basic response particle function. Together, they form a referential continuum ranging from anaphoricity to cataphoricity, with ambivalence in between, and presumably even to neutralization of referentiality and transition to a pure pragmatic marker: Syntagmatically independent response particles can in principle only refer anaphorically to a preceding propositional antecedent. Phrase initial and, in particular, sentence initial response particles are in principle, as a type, referentially ambivalent between anaphoric and cataphoric reference, but in certain circumstances the ambivalence of referential direction is set aside. Referential ambivalence clearly makes itself felt when the sentence introduced by the response particle copies the content of the sentential antecedent, but is less clear when the sentence following the response particle constitutes some kind of more loosely attached comment. In this latter case, the anaphoric interpretation still predominates. On the other hand, the response particle moves towards cataphoricity when there is no turntaking involved, and even more so when there is no identifiable propositional antecedent.⁷ The extreme case of referential depletion and pragmatization is reached when the response particle *nei* is used to introduce non-negated affirmative sentences or imperatives. Still, it has to be emphasized that all three particles are retained in all responsive functions.

For the general drift of the semantic and pragmatic development of Norwegian response particles I suggest the formula in (135):⁸

(135) Type 1: ←RP ⇒ Type 2/3: ←RP→ ⇒ Type 2/3: RP→ ⇒ PrP

Concerning the formula in (135), one has to make the general proviso that we are here presumably dealing with a cline not a sequence of discrete stages. It has to be added that both the stages "Type 2/3: ←RP→" and "Type 2/3: RP→" allow for pragmatic subtypes with or without turntaking.

The developments sketched here bear a resemblance to the process of grammaticalization insofar as the particles in question suffer a loss of referential, semantic content and are refunctionalized.⁹ But there are important differences. Desemanticization in this case does not result in the further enrichment or even establishment of some grammatical category. Accordingly, there is no basic change of distribution. The response particles remain in their structurally marginal positions, outside of the sentence construction proper, and the additional sentence internal position of *jo* equals that of other (non-grammaticalized) sentence

⁷The Norwegian linguistic pioneer Ivar Åsen notes that the "answering words [Svarsordene]" "ja, jau, nei" are used "as a kind of introductory words without any specific meaning [et Slags Indledningsord uden nogen bestemt Betydning]" (Aasen 1965: 293).

⁸ RP = response particle. "←" denotes anaphoric and "→" cataphoric reference. "⇒" is used to indicate the general direction of pragmatization.

⁹ On these general aspects of grammaticalization processes cf. for instance Abraham (1991: 337, 372 f.), Heine et al. (1991: 15, 17), Hopper and Traugott (1993: 103–120), Lehmann (1995: 127), Hagege (1993: 196).

adverbs. Thus, we are here dealing with functional proliferation within the lexical domain not with grammaticalization as “paradigm-forming on formal grounds” (Abraham 1991: 373).

Concerning the classification of response particles in relation to interjections, response particles should in my opinion not be conflated with the class of interjections due to their inherent referentiality; or, in Peircean terms, responsive particles are in principle ‘symbolic’, interjections ‘iconic’ (cf. Peirce 1960 ff.: 2.247-249, 2.277).¹⁰ On the other hand, there do exist clear formal indications of a close functional relationship.

First, response particles may be lexically reinforced by an interjection so as to form a composite interjectional-responsive phrase (cf. Aasen 1965: 293). Cf. the following examples:

- (136) Å ja det kunde være sandt nok, indrømmet Nagel også; .. (194)
 O ja, das sei wohl richtig, räumte auch Nagel ein; ... (77)
 ‘Well then, that might well be true, Nagel admitted.’
- (137) Ak ja, men så giftet hun sig allikevel med en telegrafist og flyttet til Kabelvåg! (168)
 Ach ja, und dann heiratete sie einen Telegraphisten und zog nach Kabelvåg! (40)
 ‘And then she married a telegraphist and moved to Kabelvåg!’
- (138) Nå ja, se indom senere engang da når De går forbi. (181)
 Na ja, schauen Sie dann später einmal herein. (59)
 ‘Well, come around some other time then!’
- (139) Ånei jeg har holdt op med det. (147)
 Ach nein, das habe ich aufgegeben. (10)
 ‘Oh no, that I have given up.’
- (140) Slog De dem ikke i hodet?
 Å jo jeg slog mig litt i hodet. (159)
 Haben Sie sich nicht den Kopf geschlagen?
 O ja, ich habe mir ein bißchen den Kopf geschlagen. (28)
 ‘Didn’t you hurt your head? – Well, yes, I did hurt my head a bit.’

In such phrases the interjection regularly precedes the response particle. The interjection seems to function as a sort of emotive premodifier of the responsive particle which is the head of the phrase (to a certain extent similar to the adverb + adverb structure in *meget vakkert* ‘very beautiful’ etc.).

Second, the response particles are occasionally reduplicated (cf. Aasen 1965: 293):

- (141) Ja ja, idag begraver vi da Karlsen! (176)
 Jaja, heute begraben wir also Karlsen! (52)
 ‘Well, today we are burying Karlsen!’
- (142) Neinei, så hvil Dem litt og ta fat igjen. (153)
 Neinnein, also ruhen Sie sich etwas aus, und fangen Sie dann wieder an. (19)
 ‘Well, take a break and then continue.’

Such reduplication is not uncommon with interjections (*haha, hehe, hmhm, nånå*, etc.; cf. in general Ehlich 1986: 64 et passim) but is hardly found elsewhere in the Norwegian lexicon.

Reduplicated *jojo* is not attested in the corpus but is certainly possible (*Jojo, selvfølgelig kan vi gjøre det!* ‘Well, of course we can do it!’). It should be noted that reduplication of *jo* as *jojo* is impossible in sentence internal position (*Han har jo/*jojo gjort det.* ‘He has after all done it.’) When also taking into consideration that *ja* and *nei* do not occur clause-internally (**Han har ja/nei gjort det.*), one might in fact conclude that sentence-

¹⁰ But cf. the remarks on phonological motivation (iconicity) in section 1.2.

internal *jo*₁ should as a sentence adverb be kept apart from *jo*₂ as a response particle as in Nynorsk and Swedish where phonologically distinct lexemes exist for the two functions (cf. n. 6).

Concerning the relationship between the Norwegian original and the German translation, it is very evident that the translator follows rather slavishly the tenets of traditional literary translation and strives to retain as much of Hamsun's Norwegian idiomaticity as possible. Therefore, the translation in question is hardly a reliable indicator of structural differences between Norwegian and German in the domain of response particles. However, occasionally deviations occur that are at least symptomatic of such differences. In a few cases a Norwegian sentence initial response particle is rendered in a way that means integration into the particle slot of the German middle field, thus testifying to the categorial importance of this position in German (cf. Abraham 1991: 333). In particular, it has to be noted that the sentence final position is a common position for sentence-modifying modal particles in colloquial Norwegian, but alien to German, despite the translator's structural connivances with regard to placing *ja* and *jo* sentence-finally in certain cases.¹¹ I have on earlier occasions argued that this particular difference reflects the general difference between Norwegian as a VO and German as basic OV language inasmuch as sentence final operators with broad semantic or pragmatic scope seem more natural in the former type of languages than in the latter (cf. Askedal 1989: 697–701). In short, OV languages may be expected to have pre-specifying modifiers on the sentence level, whereas VO language may be expected to develop new kinds of post-specifying sentence modifiers. In the case of Norwegian, the sentence final response particles corroborate these expectations.

References

- Abraham, Werner: The Grammaticization of the German Modal Particles. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. Vol. II: *Focus on Types of Grammatical Markers*. Eds. Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1991, pp. 331–380.
- Askedal, John Ole (1989): Sprachtypologische Aspekte norwegischer Partikelstrukturen. In: *Sprechen mit Partikeln*. Ed. Harald Weydt. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 691–702.
- Brinkmann, Hennig (1979): Die Antwort als sprachliche Erscheinung. In: *Wirkendes Wort* 29, pp. 365–374.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule (1983): *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.
- Ehlich, Konrad (1986): *Interjektionen*. (Linguistische Arbeiten 111.) Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Eisenberg, Peter, Hermann Gelhaus, Helmut Henne, Horst Sitta and Hans Wellmann (1998): *Duden Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. 6., neu bearbeitete Auflage. (Duden Band 4.) Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien and Zürich: Dudenverlag.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie and Kjell Ivar Vannebo (1997): *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Hagège, Claude (1993): *The Language Builder. An essay on the human signature in linguistic morphogenesis*. (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series IV: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 94.) Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hamsun, Knut (1954): *Samlede verker*. Bd. 1. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- Hamsun, Knut (1996): *Mysterien*. Roman. Aus dem Norwegischen von Siegfried Weibel. Mit einem Nachwort von Walter Baumgartner. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi and Frederike Hünemeyer (1991): *Grammaticalization. A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott (1993): *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

¹¹ Cf. Abraham (1991: 343): “[...] the final field is strictly excluded as a landing site for [modal particles], [...]”

- Hovdenak, Marit, Laurits Killingbergtrø, Arne Lauvhjell, Sigurd Nordlie, Magne Rommetveit and Dagfinn Worren (1986): *Nynorskordboka. Definisjons- og rettskrivningsordbok*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.
- Lehmann, Christian (1995): *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. (LINCOS Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 01.) München and Newcastle: LINCOS Europa.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1983): *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.
- Malmström, Sten, Iréne Györki and Peter A. Sjögren (1991): *Bonniers svenska ordbok*. 5th edn. Stockholm: Bonnier Fakta Bokförlag.
- Peirce, Charles S. (1960 ff.): *The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, Vols. I ff. Eds. Ch. Hartshorne and P. Weiss. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg and Erik Andersson (1999): *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*. 4 vols. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien; Norstedts Ordbok.
- Weinrich, Harald (1993): *Textgrammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Unter Mitarbeit von Maria Thurmair, Eva Breindl, Eva-Maria Willkop. Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien and Zürich: Dudenverlag.
- Zifonun, Gisela, Ludger Hoffmann, Bruno Streckenbach, Bruno et al. (1997): *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. 3 vols. (Schriften des Instituts für deutsche Sprache 7.1–7.3.) Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Øyslebø, Olaf (1964): *Hamsun gjennom stilen. En studie i kunstnerisk utvikling*. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Aasen, Ivar (1965): *Norsk Grammatik*. Etter fyrsteutgåva frå 1864. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.