



The Meanings and Functions of Discourse Particles in Papuan Malay: *mo* and *se*

Izak Morin

English Education Master Program
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Cenderawasih University, Papua, Indonesia
Email: izakmorin@gmail.com

Jeremina Kio

English Education Master Program
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Cenderawasih University, Papua, Indonesia
Email: jeremyq23zine@gmail.com

Abstract

The goal of this paper is to explore the meanings and the functions of two kinds of discourse particles in Papuan Malay (PM), *mo* and *se*, which play a role in natural human-to-human conversations and/or written exchanges among the interlocutors in Tanah Papua. These particles become visible in various utterances or sentences that were chosen from the thirty-three short stories and/or jokes in PM written by various authors and mobilized by the internet for Papuan and non-Papuan audience throughout Tanah Papua and beyond. The content analysis, semantic, and pragmatic methods are used to examine the meanings and functions of both particles in utterances or sentences in which they appear. The results show that the article *mo* and *se* are not inflected grammatically. They are not clitic particles so their forms do not change regardless of where they emerge in an utterance or a sentence. They are a final-ending type. Semantically, each particle carries more than one meaning. It can have one meaning in one context but entirely different meaning in another context. Pragmatically, each particle carries more than one function, but, it cannot serve as one-word answer to a question. Both particles are functionally categorized as information-status particle, illocutionary function particle, modal particle, evidential particle, and focus particle.

Keywords: Papuan Malay, Tanah Papua, discourse particles, meaning, function, information-status particle, illocutionary function particle, modal particle, evidential particle, and focus particle.

1. Introduction

Papuan Malay (PM) is a mixture of Malay and languages in Tanah Papua¹. PM is currently used as the main language of communication by ‘the people who have about 275 languages’ (Eberhard et al., 2020). It is used side by side with Indonesian language (IL) because IL is the national language of Indonesia where Tanah Papua becomes part of. Geographically, Tanah Papua shares the border land with the Independence State of Papua New Guinea (PNG) in the east side of the same island.

Historically, PM gradually formed as a language of communication through contact with different people coming to Tanah Papua in five different periods. *First*, the casual traders from the nearby islands under the Ternate/Tidore Sultanate came for trading purposes that began about the 8th century (Antoh, 2007). They used the Spoken Malay as a language of commercial and other activities for centuries (800-1854). These frequent contacts were the meeting points where Spoken Malay and local vernaculars mixed. *Second*, the Protestant missionaries arrived in the northern part of Tanah Papua in 1855 with the Bible written in the formal Malay.

¹ Tanah Papua [lit. land papua] is internationally known as West Papua. In this paper Tanah Papua is used to include the newly established six provinces in the most eastern part of Indonesia.

Then, between 1855 and 1962 the missionaries used Malay, Dutch, PM and local vernaculars in religious activities (Kamma, 1981). *Third*, the Dutch government began its educational and governmental activities in 1875. The formal Malay was compulsorily used in these activities. PM only served as a bridging language between these two languages (Morin, 2018). *Fourth*, the Catholic missionaries came to the southwestern part of Tanah Papua and began their missions from 1895 to 1962 where the Bible was written in formal Malay while Dutch, PM and local vernaculars were the languages of religious activities. *Fifth*, Indonesia occupied Tanah Papua in 1963 where IL was introduced through education and government institutions as a national language. Thus, PM was formed as a result of a long colonization and/or occupation process and frequent use of mixed languages. Up to now PM is still an oral form of language because it has not met some written language requirements.

Although PM is an oral form it is now visible in some written forms everywhere in Tanah Papua as seen on notice boards, in leaflets, in advertisements, on banners, on street boards, and only a few words in the local newspapers (Morin, 2018). Currently, PM written form is used by the local government health institutions and private sector institutions to pass the message on how to prevent the spread of Covid-19. In addition, we can also discover the massive use of written PM in some conversational-based short stories and/or jokes composed by different writers in the internet (websites, bloggers, facebook, instagram, etc).

The latest study on Discourse Particles of PM (Morin, 2020)^{II} shows that there are fourteen discourse particles in PM and they are divided into three groups as seen in Table 1 of Section 2. Linguistically, discourse particles are considered as components in a language that have meanings and functions in utterances or sentences of which they are a part. In particular, Goddard (2011:165) points out that formally discourse particles are “morphologically invariable and from a functional point of view, they tend to express a speaker’s immediate ‘here-and-now’ attitudes, thoughts, and desires.” This idea is, then, specifically clarified by Vyatkina et al.(2008) that “discourse particles are a word class that encompasses uninflected words that are not adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, or interjections.” They are “fully integrated into the syntax of utterances and cannot constitute utterances by themselves.” (Ameka, 1992a:108). Some examples in English are *well, just, oh, now, sort of* and *you know* (Aijmer 2000) and in Indonesian Language (IL) includes *pun* and *lah* (Sneddon, 2010) and in PM are *e, o, ka* and *to* (Morin, 2020).

This paper only focuses on two out of the fourteen discourse particles of PM: *mo* and *se*. We argue that both particles have their own meanings and functions based on the context where utterances or sentences they become part of are used.

2. Materials and Methods

In connection with the core of this paper we present the table below to show the results of the previous research on Discourse Particles of Papuan Malay (Morin, 2020).

Table 1 Three groups of discourse particles of PM and their position in utterances or sentences

Group 1 2 particles				Group 2 5 particles				Group 3 7 particles			
Particles and Position			Primary meaning	Particles and Position			Primary meaning	Particles and Position			Primary meaning
initial	medial	final		initial	medial	final		initial	medial	final	
		e				ka				baru	new
		o				kapa			dulu	dulu	first time
						mo		jadi		jadi	become
						se				lagi	again
						to				saja	only
									sampe	sampe	until
								suda		suda	already

Source: <https://jlepnet.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/4.pdf>

^{II} <https://jlepnet.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/4.pdf>

From the table we chose the discourse particles *mo* and *se* in Group 2 as the focus of our discussion. The content analysis, semantic and pragmatic methods were selected to use in order to identify, classify, and analyze the use of the particles *mo* and *se* in utterances or sentences found in 33 short stories/jokes in PM. Reading strategy was used to identify, classify, and determine the primary and secondary meanings of the particles and also the functions of the particles in utterances or sentences in which they existed. The meanings were, then, translated into English and Indonesian Language (IL). The results of this analysis are presented in Section 3 in a detailed discussion and followed by a conclusion in Section 4.

3. Results and Discussions

Below are the results and discussions on the two discourse particles: '*mo*' and '*se*' whereas other particles will be discussed in a series of separate papers in the coming publications. Let us look at the meanings and the functions of these two discourse particles as presented below.

3.1. Meanings and functions of discourse particles '*mo*' and '*se*' in daily communicative practices.

We demonstrate that the discourse particles *mo* and *se* have differences and similarities in their meanings and functions in utterances or sentences in which they appear. Each particle carries certain meanings and functions depending on a context or a social practice in which interlocutors use it in their conversations and/or in their written communications.

The selected utterances and/or sentences as discussed below are presented in three languages: Papuan Malay (PM), Indonesian Language (IL) and English. IL is used to show the similarities and differences in word choices and meanings with PM because 'IL is the main lexifier for PM in the meantime' (Morin 2018).

3.2 The particle *mo*

We argue that in PM the word *mo* is not only a common verb but it is also a discourse particle. As a verb it indicates what the speaker feels or considers to be probable or likely and what his/her intention or plan is about to be. We show that as a verb it occupies a mid-position in an utterance or a sentence. Whereas, as a discourse particle we show that it frequently follows the last word in an utterance or a sentence to convey a number of meanings and functions in accordance with a context or a social practice in which a communication exchange between speaker and addressee takes place. It does not attach to any word which precedes it. Utterances 1 and 2 respectively show their differences in use. In utterance 1 the speaker uses *mo* 'want to' or 'intend to' as a verb to indicate the third party's intention or plan to leave the city for a week. Meanwhile, in utterance 2 the word *mo* appears twice. The first *mo* is a verb which has the similar meaning like *mo* in utterance 1. But, this one is to signal the speaker's intention to throw a stone at the mango. And, the second *mo* as a discourse particle it has the meaning 'only' that emphasizes

PM	IL
1) De mo berangkat dinas luar kota satu minggu. He wants to leave the city for a week.	Dia mau berangkat keluar kota satu minggu.
2) Ah, tapi sa mo lempar manga mo . Argh, but I only want to throw [this stone at] the mango .	Ah, tapi saya mau melempari mangga saja .

the noun *manga* 'mango' which means that the throw would be exactly aiming at the mango hanging on the tree but not at something else. In short, as a verb both *mo* and *mau* in PM and IL respectively can be translated into English future intention or plan as 'want to' and a discourse particle it is translated into English as 'only' and IL as *saja* functioning as an emphazier.

Indeed, the particle *mo* frequently occurs at the end of an utterance or a sentence with various meanings and functions. The subsequent utterances will show how the particle *mo* plays its role as empathic marker to a word and/or an utterance or a sentence that precedes it.

First, the particle *mo* in utterance 3 means 'so well' in English and *dengan baik* in IL. Here, the speaker (the father) uses the particle *mo* after the verb phrase *su tau* 'already know' to convince the addressee (the son) that the parents usually know everything. In this case, the time marker *su* 'already' suggests that an action (a verb) or a feeling (an adjective) or a state (an adjective) has already happened

PM**IL**

- 3) Bapa juga su tau **mo**. Saya juga sudah mengetahuinya **dengan baik**.
I already knew it **so well**, too.

and/or has been achieved and therefore the occurrence of particle *mo* strengthens that course. So, the function of the particle *mo* in utterance 3 is to stress a common knowledge that everybody including the speaker and the addressee usually know very well.

Second, the simultaneous appearance of *su* and *mo* in the same utterance or sentence is commonly used by the speakers of PM to indicate that something/situation has been completed and/or has been on the process of completion. In utterances 4, 5, 6 and 7 respectively show this condition. The meaning of the particle *mo* is 'actually' in English and *sebenarnya* in IL with different functions. The speaker in utterance 4 confirms that John has already eaten by adding the particle *mo* at the end of the utterance because he already knew this information. So, the function of the particle *mo* is to introduce unexpected information to the addressee who assumed otherwise. While, in utterance 5 the speaker ensures the addressee that the third party is actually already angry. Here, the particle *mo* is used to make the third person's feeling clearer to the addressee so they can decide whether or not they have to meet that person. In utterance 6 the speaker confirms that in reality the ticket fare is already stable. So, any plan to have a trip would be possibly conducted without doubt. Here, the particle *mo* is used to correct the addressee's misunderstanding that the ticket is still skyrocketing. Similarly, the speaker (the motorbike passenger) in utterance 7 also corrects the addressee (the motorbike driver) that in fact she has already held firmly on the bike before she is advised to do so.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>4) PM
John su makan mo
Actually, John has already eaten.</p> | <p>IL
John sebenarnya sudah makan</p> |
| <p>5) De su mara mo
Actually, he/she is angry</p> | <p>Dia sebenarnya sudah marah</p> |
| <p>6) Harga tiket su stabil mo
Actually, the ticket fare is already stable.</p> | <p>Harga tiket sebenarnya sudah stabil</p> |
| <p>7) Sa su tahan kuat-kuat mo.
Actually, I have already held on it strongly</p> | <p>Sebenarnya, saya sudah menahan sekuatnya</p> |

Third, in utterance 8 the particle *mo* has the meaning of 'of course' in English and *tentu* in IL because they mean something like 'as everybody does/knows' or 'as is obvious'. In this utterance the speaker (a male friend) uses the particle *mo* to stress a common habit that females usually perform in a female toilet. Thus, the speaker convinces the addressee (another male friend) by emphasizing the verb *duduk* 'sit down' with the particle *mo*. He said so because his friend strongly advised him for not entering a female toilet to have a pee. But, he rejects and confirms that he absolutely knows how to behave in the female toilet.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>8) PM
Nan sa kencing juga duduk mo.
Before I have a pee I will of course sit down too.</p> | <p>IL
Sebelum saya kencing saya tentu duduk juga.</p> |
|--|---|

Fourth, in utterance 9 the speaker boasts himself that he has the capability to remember everything that he observes. In this sense, when the particle *mo* precedes the verb *tau* 'remember' or 'know' it has the meaning of 'can' or 'could' in English and *bisa* in IL. Here, the speaker convinces the addressee that when he observes people pressing their ATM PIN he can remember the PIN numbers straight away without writing them down on a piece of paper. So, he uses this particle to secure a trust from the addressee about his capability to memorize numbers.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>PM</p> <p>9) Sa satu kali lia langsung tau mo.
Once I observe the numbers they press I can remember them right away.</p> | <p>IL</p> <p>Saya sekali melihat angka-angkanya ditekan saya bisa langsung mengingatnya</p> |
|--|---|

Fifth, utterance 10 below shows that the speaker uses the particle *mo* to talk about surprising extremes, that is, a sea ghost can do more than what people imagine. Therefore, this particle conveys the meaning of ‘even’ in English and *bahkan* in IL. The speaker (the mother) uses it to persuade the addressee (the son) that a sea ghost has the ability to destroy everything. But, she does not use the particle *mo* to emphasize the power of sea ghost. Instead, she uses it to emphasize a ship which is bigger than human being but it can be overturned by a sea ghost. Hyperbolically, she exaggerates her response to the question from the addressee (the son) about whether or not a sea ghost can bite people. So, the particle *mo* is used to explain an additional, unexpected situation or condition.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>10) PM
Kapal saja de kasi tabale mo.
Even a ship can be capsized</p> | <p>IL
Bahkan kapal pun ia membalikkannya.</p> |
|--|---|

Sixth, the particle *mo* stresses how something tastes, feels, sounds, looks, smells, becomes and gets. For tasting, utterance 11 shows that the speaker (a durian seller) convinces the addressee (a buyer) that durian fruit tastes delicious. The seller uses this particle to emphasize the word *enak* ‘delicious’ because he already tasted one of these fruits before bringing them to the market to sell. Thus, the particle *mo* in this context carries the meaning of ‘just’ which also means ‘simply’ or ‘there’s no other word for it’. It intensifies the adjective *enak* in this assessment utterance or sentence.

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| <p>11) PM
Enak mo.
It’s just delicious.</p> | <p>IL
Enak</p> |
|--|---------------------------|

Seventh, the particle *mo* emphasizes a negative response from the speaker as in utterances 12, 13, 14 and 15 below. The response in utterance 12 shows how the speaker uses the particle *mo* to stress that he does not have a western girlfriend (a foreign girlfriend). In this case, it has the meaning of ‘at all’ in English and *sama sekali* in IL because the speaker convinces the addressee that what has been said about

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>12) PM
Aiii, trada mo.
Hmm, not at all.</p> | <p>IL
Masa! Tidak sama sekali.</p> |
|---|--|

him is completely wrong. His girlfriend is actually from the western part of Tanah Papua not from a western country. In utterance 13 the speaker makes a cynical statement after causing the addressees (the group of young people) to walk away from him. In this case, the speaker uses the particle *mo* to stress this

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>13) PM
Ah, trada mo.
Take that.</p> | <p>IL
Itu baru kamu rasain (Tobat kamu!)</p> |
|--|---|

sarcastic statement. In contrast, utterances 14 and 15 indicate the use of the particle *mo* after negative word *bukan* ‘not’ to emphasize a disagreement from the speaker that what he expects to listen to or to know is not available. In utterance 14 the speaker calls the announcer of the radio talk show to request a song called *Tupu Tupu Malam* ‘Night Butterfly’ but he shortens it as TTM. So, the addressee (the announcer) assumes that TTM could stand for a very famous love song called *Temam Tapi Mesra* ‘Friends But Affectionate’. The speaker rejects and corrects that acronym by putting the particle *mo*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>14) PM
Aaah, bukan mo...Tupu Tupu Malam
Argh, that’s not what I mean.
(I actually mean) Tupu Tupu Malam</p> | <p>IL
Akh, bukan Tupu Tupu Malam yang saya maksudkan</p> |
|---|--|

which means ‘what I mean’. Similarly, the speaker uses the particle *mo* in utterance 15 to stress the negative phrase *bukan itu* ‘not that’. Still in the same conversation as in utterance 14, the speaker (the caller) warns the addressee (the announcer or the host) to stop giving wrong answers which are not

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>15) PM
Ah, suda stop. Bukan itu mo.
Stop it. That's not what the answer is</p> | <p>IL
Hentikan. Itu bukan jawabannya</p> |
|--|--|

appropriate to the song requested for. In all cases, the negative words *trada* 'not exist' and *bukan* 'not' are different in their use but they do not affect the functions of the particle *mo* as emphasizer and as carrier of implicit meanings which have been explicated in their English equivalence.

Eight, the particle *mo* is also used in a combination with other particles such as *suda* and *saja* for the role of either as an emphasizer or as a creator of a new meaning. Now, we look at a combination of the particle *mo* and the particle *suda* which contains some meanings and functions in their occurrence in utterances or sentences below. Utterance 16 is part of a conversation between husband and wife while they were fishing. The speaker (the husband) uses both particles to show how he is extremely annoyed with his wife's compliment on her ex-boyfriend. In this case, the particle *mo* puts more weight on particle *suda* to strongly emphasize the adjective *diam* 'quiet' which shows a very deep feeling of annoying from the speaker. So, this phrasal particle has the meaning of 'please just' to express such a feeling. But,

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>16) PM
Sueh, mancing diam suda mo
Oi, please just be quiet while fishing</p> | <p>IL
Hei, harap tenang sementara mancing.</p> |
|--|--|

if the particle *suda* stands alone it only carries the meaning of 'please' as a polite way of expressing the feeling. In utterance 17 the speaker uses the particle *mo* to stress the particle *suda* to show that the speaker emphasizes how soon the character in the story left the animal foods store after being aware that it was not one of the eating places. The appearance of the particle *mo* to follow the particle *suda* is, in fact,

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>17) PM
Pace malu pica dan hilang dari situ
suda mo.
He was so embarrassed and therefore
disappeared from that place immediately.</p> | <p>IL
Ia sangat malu sehingga ia menghilang
dari tempat itu secepatnya.</p> |
|--|---|

to strongly emphasizes the verbal phrase *hilang dari situ* 'disappear from there'. So, in this case, the phrasal particle *suda mo* conveys the meaning of 'immediately' to indicate how soon the person left the place. Furthermore, the combination of *suda mo* in utterance 18 emphasizes the noun phrase *de pu maitua* 'his wife'. This means that the focus is only on *de pu maitua* and therefore the focusing adverb 'only'

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>18) PM
Tra tunggu lama langsung pace ko telpon
de pu maitua suda mo.
Not waiting for long he right away
only telephoned his wife.</p> | <p>IL
Tidak menunggu lama ia langsung
menelepon istrinya saja.</p> |
|---|--|

is an appropriate meaning in English and *saja* in IL. For utterance 19 the speaker uses *suda mo* to strongly intensify the verbal phrase *kase masuk* 'put on' and at the same time to connect what was said on the subject (all available foods) of the utterance. Here, the particle *mo* puts more weight on particle *suda* to stress that verbal phrase. Implicitly, the particle *mo* has the meaning of 'no matter what' which is placed at the end of this utterance. The clause 'the foods taste like' is left implicit after the expression 'no matter what.' Accordingly, the meaning of *suda mo* is 'just' (with nothing in reserve) and 'no matter what'

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>19) PM
Pokoknya smua lauk yang ada dong kase
masuk suda mo.
Principally, all available foods are just
put them on [their plate] no matter what.</p> | <p>IL
Pokoknya semua lauk yang tersedia
dimasukkan saja apa adanya</p> |
|--|--|

(connecting what was said before) in English and for IL the focusing adverb *saja* 'just' and the conjunction *apa adanya* 'no matter what' should be appropriate in this context. But, if the particle *suda* stands alone it only has the meaning of 'please' as a polite way of requesting somebody to do something.

Ninth, we also look at another combination, that is, a combination of the particle *mo* and the particle *saja*. Like the first combination above, the occurrence of this phrasal particle in utterances below also bears some meanings and functions according to a context or a social practice in which a communication between speaker and addressee takes place. In utterance 20 the speaker rejects the result of the medical check-up for the new police cadet recruitment. He believes he does not have any issue with his health condition and therefore he chooses to use *saja mo* ‘only just’ to strongly emphasize the adjective *sehat* ‘healthy’. The presence of the particle *mo* is to strengthen the meaning of *saja* ‘just’ so the

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>PM</p> <p>20) Baa, sa ni sehat-sehat saja mo
Ah, I’m only just healthy [I don’t feel something wrong with my health]</p> | <p>IL</p> <p>Masa! Saya ini sehat-sehat saja</p> |
|--|--|

implicit meaning behind this phrasal particle is that the speaker does not feel something wrong with his health condition at all. Another implicit meaning of this combined particle is in utterance 21. Here, the speaker uses the particle *saja mo* to indicate that an answer for a question being raised by the addressee about what the word *generasi* ‘generation’ means is an easy answer. Thus, the occurrence of such a

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>PM</p> <p>21) Generasi itu saja mo
[The meaning of the word] ‘generasi’
is too easy (it is not a big deal)</p> | <p>IL</p> <p>[Makna dari kata] generasi sangat gampang.</p> |
|--|---|

combination stresses how easy the answer would be. Meanwhile, the speaker (the son) in utterance 22 uses the particle *saja mo* to express how small a piece of bread he expects to receive from the addressee (the father). In this case, the English translation is ‘only just’ and added with the implicit meaning ‘nothing more than that’. The existence of *mo* is to intensify the role of *saja* ‘only’ in this utterance. Similarly, in IL the use of *hanya* ‘only’ and *saja* ‘only’ in the same utterance shows the similar tone of *saja mo* in PM. So, structurally, the focusing adverb *saja* is always put at the end of the utterance

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>PM</p> <p>22) Baa..bapaaa, sedikit saja mooo.
Ah, dad, only just a bit. Nothing more than that</p> | <p>IL</p> <p>Ayo, bapak, hanya sedikit saja.</p> |
|---|---|

while *hanya* occupies the initial and/or mid-position. Finally, the use of *saja mo* in utterance 23 emphasizes the phrase *su tua* ‘already old’. Here, the speaker (the grandson) thinks that what would happen to the addressee (the grandpa) is a common issue to any older people. In this sense, the presence of *saja mo* has the meaning ‘it does not matter’ because this utterance is actually a cynical answer against the previous statement.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>PM</p> <p>23) Su tua saja mo
It does not matter [you] are already old.</p> | <p>IL</p> <p>Tidak apa-apa [anda] sudah tua</p> |
|--|---|

In sum, there are twenty three short stories and/or jokes from which the particle *mo* appears in the utterances or sentences as noticed above. Through the internet connection the story writers and bloggers have contributed to the production, reproduction and dissemination of these stories for Papuan and non-Papuan readers throughout Tanah Papua and beyond. These linguistic representations show that the particle *mo* consists of a single particle (utterances 2-15) and a combined particle (utterances 16-23). The single particle carries eleven meanings with eleven functions whereas the combined has seven meanings with seven functions (see Table 2). Functionally, the PM speakers use particle *mo* as a single particle for different language functions. First, they use it when emphasizing a particular thing which is a target of an action (utterance 2). Second, they use it when justifying the existing or common knowledge (utterance 3). Third, it is used when correcting a mistake or a misunderstanding (utterance 4). Fourth, it is used to make things clearer or more precise (utterances 5, 6, 7). Fifth, it is used to confirm certainty (utterance 8). Sixth, it is used to confirm intellectual and physical capabilities (utterances 9, 10). Seventh, it is used when intensifying things and conditions described (utterances 11). Eighth, it is used when emphasizing a negative idea or statement (utterance 12). Ninth, it is used when emphasizing disagreement (utterance 13, 14, 15). Meanwhile, the PM speakers combine the particles *suda* and *saja* with the particle *mo* for different language functions.

First, it is used to make a polite request (utterance 16). Second, it is used to indicate how soon an action is taken (utterance 17). Third, it is used to emphasize a particular situation/event described (utterance 18). Fourth, it is used when confirming an action described (utterance 19). Fifth, it is used when emphasizing a condition described (utterances 20). Sixth, it is used when indicating an intellectual capability (utterance 21). Seventh, it is used when contradicting factual evidence (utterances 22, 23). Based upon the functions of both single particle and combined particle it can be concluded that there are five categories of discourse particle *mo* such as information-status particle (utterance 11), illocutionary function particle (utterance 16), modal particle (utterances 3-10, 11-17), evidential particle (utterances 14, 15, 16, 19, 23) and focus particle (utterances 2, 18, 20, 21, 22). Table 2 below provides a detailed of meanings, functions and categories of the particle *mo* in its single and combined forms.

Table 2 Meaning, Function and Category of Particle *mo*

No	Meaning		Function	Category	Utterance or Sentence
	single particle	combined particle			
1	only		emphasizing a particular thing being a target of an action.	focus particle	2
2	so well		justifying the existing or common knowledge	focus particle	3
3	actually		correcting a mistake or a misunderstanding	evidential particle	4
			making things clearer or more precise	evidential particle	5, 6, 7
4	of course		confirming certainty	modal particle	8
5	can		confirming intellectual capability	Information status particle	9
6	even		Emphasizing physical capability	focus particle	10
7	just		intensifying things and conditions described	focus particle	11
8	at all		emphasizing negative idea or statement	modal particle	12
9	take that		emphasizing sarcastic idea or statement	modal particle	13
10	what I mean		emphasizing disagreement	evidential particle	14
11	what the answer is		emphasizing disagreements	evidential particle	15
12		please just	making a polite request	illocutionary function particle, evidential particle	16
13		immediately	indicating how soon an action taken	modal particle	17
14		only	emphasizing a particular situation/event described	focus particle	18
15		just...no matter what	confirming an action described	focus particle	19
16		only just	emphasizing adjectives	focus particle	20, 22
17		not a big deal	indicating an intellectual capability	evidential particle	21
18		it doesn't matter	contradicting factual evidence	modal particle	23

3.2 The particle *se*

The particle *se* does not have a meaning at all when it stands alone without becoming part of an utterance or a sentence or a word or a phrase. We argue that, pragmatically, the occurrence of particle *se* after a word or a phrase indicates an exclamatory mood. It has some implicit meanings and functions depending on a context or a social practice in which it is triggered to emerge.

In utterance 24 the speaker (grandfather) expresses his amazement to the addressee by placing the particle *se* just after the word *cucu* 'grandchild' to emphasize a compliment. The speaker chooses to use the particle *se* to acknowledge the addressee's intellectual capability because all the questions raised by the speaker were answered in a correct and amazing way. Therefore, the meaning behind this particle is 'smart' and at the same time the particle *se* also functions as a compliment marker. In this latter case, the particle *se* can be translated into English as 'how smart' or 'what smart.' and into IL as *bukan main*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>PM</p> <p>24) Memang, cucu se! Tete pegang ko.
Wow! How smart my grandchild!
Grandpa (I) hold on you</p> | <p>IL</p> <p>Bukan main pintarnya cucuku! Kakek mengagumimu.</p> |
|--|--|

pintarnya. Similarly, the use of this particle after the addressee's name as in utterance 25 refers back to the whole story of Julius in the church congregational context where the addressee is a regular church-goer. The story shows that Julius has an alcoholic addiction which is still difficult to quit and still a concern of the priest. Accordingly, one of the meanings behind the particle *se* can be explicated as 'stubborn' and it can also be translated into English as 'how stubborn' or 'what a stubborn' and into IL

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>PM</p> <p>25) Julius se! Miras tu ko pu musuh besar dalam ko pu hidup.
What a stubborn Julius! Alcoholic drink is the biggest enemy in your life.</p> | <p>IL</p> <p>Bukan main bandelnya! Minuman keras merupakan musuh terbesar dalam hidupmu, Julius.</p> |
|---|--|

as *bukan main bandelnya*. On the contrary, the use of the particle *se* after the name of the Indonesian airplane Garuda as in utterance 26 does not have a direct connection with the past issues of this airplane. Instead, the speaker's personal love affair is put forward. Her regret to refuse a pilot's love proposal in the past always comes into her mind every time an airplane flies over. So, if another domestic airplane called Batik Air flies above her she will spontaneously say Batik Air *se!* In this case, the emergence of the particle *se* is to show an exclamatory expression of regret. Therefore, it can be translated into English as 'what a stupid' and into IL as *bukan main bodohnya* and the hidden meaning behind Garuda can be explicated as 'stupid' *bodoh* in both English and IL translation respectively. In this similar vein, the use of

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>PM</p> <p>26) Garuda se! Kalo waktu itu sa balas kaka pilot pu salam ni mungkin sa ada ikut terbang di atas sana ee.
What a stupid! If at that time I responded to the pilot's loving letter I'm probably flying with him up there with Garuda.</p> | <p>IL</p> <p>Bukan main bodohnya! Kalau saat itu saya membalas surat cinta dari si pilot saya mungkin ada terbang bersamanya dengan Garuda di angkasa.</p> |
|---|--|

the particle *se* after the adverbial phrase *sungguh mati* 'truly indeed' in conditional utterance 27 suggests that the speaker expresses her regret and at the same time her imagination of how she would probably feel if she was beside the captain of the ship. Regarding this, the embedded meaning in the phrase *sungguh mati* can be revealed as *mesra* 'affectionate' and the English translation for the particle *se* can be

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>PM</p> <p>27) Boo, surat dari kapten kapal tu kalo sa balas ni, sungguh mati se!, sa pasti ada kancing deng kapten di kapal puti itu kappa.</p> | <p>IL</p> <p>Astaga, kalau saya membalas surat cinta dari si kapten kapal, alangkah mesranya!, saya mungkin sedang bersamanya di kapal itu.</p> |
|--|---|

Oh dear, if I answered the love letter
 from the ship captain, **what an affectionate
 feeling** I would have! I’m probably sitting
 with the captain right now in that passenger ship.

‘what an affectionate feeling.’ and *alangkah mesranya* in IL. Lastly, in utterance 28 the use of *se* after the annoyed expression *tra tau aturan* ‘out of the rule’ is to show that the speaker expressed his anger and disagreement to the addressee (the official of PLN – National Electricity Company) for uninformed electricity blackout. In this sense, the particle *se* can be translated into English as ‘ridiculous’ or ‘how could that be’ and into IL as *masa* and the implicit meaning in the common phrase *tra tau aturan* can be explained in English as ‘no public reminder is provided at all’ and in IL as *tidak ada pemberitahuan sama sekali*.

<p>PM</p> <p>28) PLN kam ni kurang ajar. Tra tau aturan se! PLN, you guys useless. Ridiculous! How could that be! No public reminder is provided at all.</p>	<p>IL</p> <p>PLN memang kurang ajar. Masa, tidak ada pemberitahuan sama sekali.</p>
--	---

In conclusion, the use of particle *se* in the above utterances or sentences appears in five short stories in PM. These linguistic representations show that the particle *se* has twofold functions such as making exclamatory statements (utterances 24-27) and confirming an annoyed statement (utterance 28). Based on these functions it is classified into two categories such as illocutionary function particle and information-status particle. Table 3 below shows its meanings, functions and categories.

Table 3 Meaning, Function and Category of Particle *se*

No	Meaning		Function	Category	Utterance or Sentence
	single particle	combined particle			
1	what a or how		making exclamatory statements	illocutionary function particle	24-27
2	ridiculous, how could that be		confirming annoyed statements	illocutionary function particle	28

3.3 Classification of discourse particles *mo* and *se*.

There are six categories of discourse particles such as connective particles, information-status particles, illocutionary function particles, modal particles, evidential particles and focus particles (Goddard, 2011:166). On the basis of the discussion above the particle *mo* meets four categories such as information status particles, modal particles, evidential particles, and focus particles. Meanwhile, the particle *se* only meets the category of illocutionary function particles. A brief description of each category and its relevant utterances that support are discussed below.

3.3.1 Particle *mo* as information status particle.

Information-status particles are often called ‘topic markers’ (Goddard, 2011) because they refer to what an utterance or a sentence is about in a context or a social practice where a communication takes place. The topic can be person, thing, location or anything that a speaker wants to talk about. In utterance 9 we notice that the speaker talks about the intellectual capability of remembering people’s PIN numbers by only watching them doing transaction in any Bank ATM. In this case, the particle *mo* is used by the speaker to confirm the intellectual capability to the addressee that this capability may not be owned by many people.

3.3.2 Particle *mo* as modal particle.

Modal particles occur in utterances or sentences to soften ‘what is being said (although they can also be used to make statement more forceful) and they can add extra emphasis’ (Weinert 2007). They express interpersonal pragmatic meaning: intention and attitude of the speaker as well as an expected effect on the listener (Vyatkina et al., 2007). In utterance 8 the particle *mo* means ‘of course’ which is used by the speaker to confirm that what the addressee expects the speaker to do is already well-known.

Meanwhile, in utterance 23 the particle *mo* has the meaning of ‘it does not matter.’ This is used by the speaker to make the statement sarcastically stronger to remind the addressee to obey the common rules regarding transportation fares. This particle reflects the mood or attitude of the speaker and highlights the focus of the utterance.

3.3.3 Particle *mo* as evidential particle.

Ifantidou (2001) points out that ‘an utterance has an evidential function if and only if it overtly communicates evidential information, whether this information is linguistically encoded or pragmatically inferred’. In this sense, evidential particles are deemed important in a communicative exchange between interlocutors because they certify the speaker’s source of knowledge through the use of ‘know’, ‘think’ and ‘say’ (Goddard 2011). Besides, they ‘encode not only what a speaker knows or how he knows it; but also what an addressee can be taken to know, or should know, or apparently (perhaps culpably) fails to know’ (Haviland, 2011). There are four utterances or sentences that show the use of particle *mo* as evidential particle. In utterance 4 the speaker uses this particle when correcting a wrong assumption or a misunderstanding made by the addressee. Meanwhile, in utterances 5, 6, and 7 the particle *mo* is used by the speaker to make things clearer or more precise to the addressee.

3.3.4 Particle *mo* as focus particle.

Focus particles indicate how something figures in relation to other potential or real alternatives, either excluding them (like *only*, *merely*) or adding to them (like *also*, *too*, *even*) (Goddard 2011). Under this category there are nine utterances or sentences in which the particle *mo* functions. First, it is used when emphasizing a particular thing which is a target of an action (utterance 2). Second, it is used when justifying the existing or common knowledge (utterance 3). Third, it is used to confirm physical capabilities (utterance 10). Fourth, it is used when intensifying things and conditions described (utterances 11). Fifth, it is used to make a polite request (utterance 16). Sixth, it is used to emphasize a particular situation/event described (utterance 18). Seventh, it is used when confirming an action described (utterance 19). Eighth, it is used when emphasizing a condition described (utterances 20). Ninth, it is used when contradicting factual evidence (utterances 22).

3.3.5 Particle *se* as illocutionary function particle.

In speech-act theory, illocutionary force refers to a speaker's intention in delivering an utterance and it is also known as an illocutionary function or illocutionary point (Nordquist, 2018). Concerning with the particle, Goddard (2011) proposes that illocutionary function particles are analogous to questioning and exclamatory particles heard or written in everyday communicative exchanges in a conversation or in a text message. Furthermore, Leech (1993) mentions that illocutionary acts functions consist of four types such as competitive (ordering, asking, demanding and begging), convivial (offering, inviting, greeting, thanking and congratulating), collaborative (asserting, reporting, announcing and instructing) and conflictive (threatening, accusing and reprimanding). These four types are demonstrated through the use of the particle *se* in the utterances or sentences above. In this case, the particle *se* is used to modify illocutionary function from one type to another type.

We can notice the use of particle *se* as an exclamatory particle in utterances 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28. The occurrence of this particle changes a collaborative function (i.e., asserting) into convivial function (i.e., complimenting) as in utterance 24, into conflictive function (i.e., reprimanding) as in utterance 25, into conflictive function (i.e., blaming) as utterance 26, into convivial function (i.e., adoring) as in utterance 27, into conflictive function (i.e., blaming) as in utterance 28. Such modifications indicate that the particle *se* bears the convivial and conflictive functions in the utterances or sentences.

4. Conclusion

From the discussion above, it can be concluded that the particles *mo* and *se* are not inflected. In addition, both are not clitic because they are not pronounced as part of another word. Every utterance or sentence in which they appear they remain in the same form. Structurally, they are a final-ending type because they always occur at the end of each utterance or sentence. Semantically, both particles can convey more than one meaning. Each particle can carry one meaning in one setting but entirely different meaning in another setting. Pragmatically, the particles *mo* and *se* can suggest more than one function, but, they cannot serve as one-word answer to a question.

In each utterance or sentence as presented above we can see some differences between PM and IL in terms of word choices and grammatical structure. This implies that, as a matter of fact, both particles have already taken shape as an undivided part of PM and therefore they function as in-group markers for the speakers of PM. Such a firm shape of discourse particles signals that the processes of appropriation and reevaluation had and have already happened because the speakers have been having the positive attitudes and/or perceptions on PM for centuries.

The author of stories in the websites, in the blog and also the internet providers are the “exemplary authoritative figures” (Goebel, 2015) who have already contributed to the production, reproduction, publication and dissemination of these discourse particles for Papuan and non-Papuan audience in Tanah Papua and beyond. In particular, the internet plays an important role to make “one-to-many participants framework”(Asif, 2007a) effective to promote the particles *mo* and *se* across space and time in the virtual world.

References

- Agha, Asif. (2007a). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Aijmer, Karin. (2002). *English Discourse Particles*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Ameka, Felix. (1992). Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*18:101-118.
- Antoh, Demmy. (2007). *Rekonstruksi dan Transformasi Nasionalisme Papua*. Sinar Harapan. Jakarta.
- Eberhard, David M., Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig (eds.). (2020). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. Twenty-third edition. SIL International. Dallas/Texas. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- Goddard, Cliff. (2011). *Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction*. 2nd edition. Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Goebel, Zane. (2015a). *Language and Superdiversity: Indonesians Knowledgeing at Home and Abroad*. Oxford University Press. New York.
- Haviland, W., (2011). *Anthropology: The Human Challenge*. 13th ed. Wadsworth. Canada.
- Ifantidou, Elly. (2014). *Pragmatic Competence and Relevance*. John Benjamins B.V. Athens.
- Kamma, F.C. (1981). *Ajaib di Mata Kita. Masalah komunikasi antara Timur dan Barat dilihat dari sudut pengalaman selama seabad pekabaran Injil di Irian Jaya*. BPK Gunung Mulia. Jakarta.
- Kawashima, Sue A. (1999). *A Dictionary of Japanese Particles*. Kodansha International. Tokyo.
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1993). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford University Press. New York.
- Morin, Izak. (2018). *Understanding the language ideologies of Papuan Malay*. Doctorate thesis, LaTrobe University. <http://arrow.latrobe.edu.au:8080/vital/access/manager/Repository/latrobe:42823>
- Morin, Izak. (2020). Discourse Particles of Papuan Malay: e and o. *Journal of Language & Education Policy* 1: 59-71. Available: <https://jlepnet.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/4.pdf>
- Nordquist, Richard. (2018). Illocutionary Force in Speech Theory: Glossary of Grammatical and Rhetorical Terms. *Thoughtco* Available: <https://www.thoughtco.com/illocutionary-force-speech-1691147>
- Sneddon, James Neil, Alexander Adelaar, Dwi Noverini Djenar, Michael C. Ewing.(2012). *Indonesian Reference Grammar*. 2nd edition. Allen & Unwin. Melbourne.
- Vyatkina, N., & Johnson, K.E. (2007) Teaching German Modal Particles: A Corpus-Based Approach. *CALPER Publications*. Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research. The Pennsylvania State University. Available: https://calper.la.psu.edu/publications/publication-items/teaching-german-modal-particles-a-corpus-based-approach/CALPER_GMP_D_H2.pdf
- Weinert, Regina. (2007). *Spoken Language Pragmatics. An Analysis of Form-Function Relations*. Continuum. New York.