



Discourse Particles of Papuan Malay: *e* and *o*

Izak Morin

English Teaching Program
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Cenderawasih University, Papua, Indonesia
E-mail: izakmorin@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the meanings and the functions of two kinds of discourse particles in Papuan Malay (PM), *e* and *o*, which contribute to natural human-to-human conversations and/or written exchanges in Tanah Papua. Both particles appear in various utterances or sentences that were selected from the thirty-three short stories and/or jokes in PM produced by various writers 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 explore the meanings and functions of the two particles in the utterances or sentences in which they occur. The results indicate that grammatically both particles are not inflected. They are not clitic particles and therefore they stay in the same form regardless of where they appear in an utterance or a sentence. They are a final-ending type. Semantically, one discourse particle can have more than one meaning. It can mean one thing in one context but something entirely different in another context. Pragmatically, both particles can have more than one function, but, they cannot function as one-word answer to a question. They are functionally categorized as illocutionary function particle and modal particle.

Key words: Papuan Malay, Tanah Papua, discourse particles, meaning, function, illocutionary function particle, modal particle.

1. Introduction

Papuan Malay (PM) is a hybrid language used by its speakers in conversations and/or written exchanges in *Tanah Papua* (internationally-known as West Papua but in this paper I use the local name *Tanah Papua* to cover both Province of Papua and Province of West Papua in the most eastern part of Indonesia). Tanah Papua shares the border land with the Independence State of Papua New Guinea. PM is used as the main language of communication by ‘the people who have about 275 languages’ (Eberhard et al., 2020). Apart from it, Indonesian language (IL) is also used because it is the national language of Indonesia.

Historically, PM started to form and to function as a language of communication through contact with outsiders coming to Tanah Papua in a gradual manner. *First*, some trading activities of casual traders from nearby islands under the Ternate/Tidore Sultanate commenced about the 8th century (Antoh, 2007). Spoken Malay was used all over Tanah Papua as the language of communication for trading and other activities and gradually it mixed up with the local vernaculars a result of frequent contacts over centuries (800-1854). *Second*, in 1855 Protestant missionaries introduced the formal written Malay through Bible in the northern part of Tanah Papua. During this religious mission (1855-1962) the languages such as Malay, Dutch, PM and local vernaculars were used in religious activities (Kamma, 1981). The Bible reading was in Malay but the sermon was a mixture of Malay, Dutch, PM and local vernaculars if the priest was a Papuan. Thus, PM kept on developing and enriching itself through the influence of Malay, Dutch and local vernaculars as lexifier and substrate during this colonization period. *Third*, the Dutch government introduced formal Malay in 1875 through education and government institutions. It was compulsorily used as a language of instruction and written materials through elementary schools while the Dutch language was taught as a subject at high schools. Even though both Malay and Dutch were used side by side in government, education and business affairs, PM served as a bridging language between these two languages. PM was only used as a lingua franca among Papuans in their daily communication during the Dutch time (1828-1962). *Fourth*, like Protestant missionaries, in 1895 Catholic missionaries also introduced the formal written Malay through Bible in the southwestern part of Tanah Papua. From 1895-1962 Malay, Dutch, PM and local vernaculars were the languages of religious activities.

Finally, the contact between Papuans and Indonesians occurred at the point of occupation in 1963. Indonesian language (Bahasa Indonesia), politically, was also introduced through education and government institutions as a formal language in Tanah Papua. This long colonization and/or occupation process and frequent use of mixed languages have regularly formed PM as a hybrid language form which can be signified as ‘a transcultural form’ (Ashcroft et al., 2000). PM is therefore the product of the colonization and/or occupation process. It is the language which has unified the 275 ethnic groups in Tanah Papua. Since it has already crystallized as an integral part of Papuan daily life it is acknowledged as part of their identity.

Until now, PM has not been codified in order to meet the requirements to be a written language (Morin, 2018). However, the speakers make their own written system to write on notice boards, in leaflets, in advertisements, on banners, on street boards, and only a few words in the local newspapers. In fact, the massive use of written PM in some conversational-based short stories and/or jokes composed by different writers is in the internet (websites, bloggers, facebook, instagram, etc). The issues or the questions for this study are: ‘Does PM have any discourse particles occurring in these stories?’ if it has ‘What are they?’ and ‘How many are there?’ I raised these issues or questions because there has not been any research on this particular aspect as explained in Section 2. Meanwhile, in Section 3, I explain the methodological steps I took to answer these questions.

The aim of the study was to investigate the discourse particles of PM. The first focus was on what discourse particles occur in utterances or sentences. The second focus was on how many discourse particles that PM has. The third focus was on what position each discourse particle resides in the utterances or sentences. From the results of this investigation I only chose two kinds of discourse particles in PM to explore their meanings and their functions in utterances or sentences where they are a part.

Discourse particles are elements in a language that carry meanings and functions in utterances or sentences of which they are a part. These “particles are a word class that encompasses uninflected words that are not adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, or interjections” (Vyatkina et al., 2008). They are “fully integrated into the syntax of utterances and cannot constitute utterances by themselves” (Ameke, 1992a:108). They follow “a word to show its relationship to other words in a sentence, and/or give that word a particular meaning or nuance” (Kawashima, 1999:i). And, “formally, they 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” (Goddard, 2011:165). Some examples in English are *well, just, oh, now, sort of* and *you know* (Aijmer 2000) and in Indonesian Language (IL) include *pun* and *lah* (Sneddon, 2010).

Some studies have been published so far on PM. For example, Walker 1982, Ajamiseba (1984), Samaun (1979), Suharno (1979, 1981), Van Velzen (1995), Burung (2004, 2008a, 2008b, 2009), Sawaki (2004, 2005, 2007), Warami (2005), Burung & Sawaki (2007), Kim *et al.* 2007, Donohue (2007a, 2011), Paauw (2008), Scott *et al* (2008), Saragih 2012, Kluge (2014), Morin (2016, 2018) discuss lexicon, morphology, syntax, phonology, semantics, sociolinguistics and grammar. However, none of these studies has paid attention to the discourse particles in PM. Thus, this is the focus of the study

2. Materials and Methods

Referring to the focus on understanding the ‘Discourse Particles of Papuan Malay’, a search for electronic documents was conducted between September 2019 and March 2020. In this respect, nine Papuan Malay-used websites¹ were selected as the primary sources of information in the search. Since this is a qualitative research I used the content analysis method together with semantic and pragmatic methods. First, reading techniques such as skimming and intensive reading were mostly used to identify the relevant documents during the search. This reveals that only 200 out of 500 Papuan jokes from these sites are relevant to the focus. Second, I used the similar techniques to classify particular utterances or sentences or clauses containing discourse particles from the selected jokes. These particles were, then, grouped on the basis of their types. Third, the particles were semantically studied to discover their primary and secondary meanings and also pragmatically their functions in utterances on the basis of what situational contexts they existed in. These meanings were, then, translated into English together with the utterances that hosted them.

¹<http://cerita-mob.blogspot.com.au>; <http://anakkerikiltablanusu.blogspot.com.au>; <http://papuamob.blogspot.com.au>; <http://papuaonthe.blogspot.com.au>; <http://humorpapua.blogspot.com.au>; <http://www.ketawa.com>; <http://thebestmob.blogspot.com.au>; <http://mop-papua.blogspot.com.au> and <http://gudangmob.wordpress.com.au>

Both kinds of literal and meaning-based translation were applied. The latter was mostly used to make the secondary meaning of each particle in utterances accurate, clear and natural in English. In addition, their functions were also described as part of this analysis. The results of this study are presented in Section 4 in a detailed discussion and followed by a conclusion in Section 5.

3. Results and Discussions

This study indicates that PM has fourteen discourse particles which can be divided into three groups as shown in Table 1 below.

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

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

The first group consists of two particles originating from two individual sounds and in the second group there are five particles in the form of words. Both groups do not have primary meanings at all. In contrast, the seven particles in the third group have the primary meanings in their own right. The occurrence of these particles in each utterance or sentence in every dialogue or conversation and written text depends totally on how interlocutors and/or writers selectively decide to use them in their communication with others.

The table above also indicates that all fourteen discourse particles of PM locate at the final part of the utterances or the sentences. Nevertheless, the particles *jadi* and *suda* occur in the initial position whereas *dulu* and *sampe* appear in the mid-position as well. This suggests that the discourse particles of PM are dominated by the final-ending type.

In this paper I only focus on the two discourse particles in the first group: ‘*e*’ and ‘*o*’ 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 ‘*e*’ and ‘*o*’ in daily communicative practices.

I argue that the discourse particles *e* and *o* carry differences and similarities in their meanings and functions in utterances or sentences in which they appear. The meanings and functions of each particle depend on a context or a social practice in which interlocutors use it in their conversations and/or in their written communication.

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).

3.1.1 The particle ‘*e*’

Linguistically, particle *e* is only a letter which is also a vowel under the phonetic alphabet category. It does not have any meaning at all when it stands alone. However, I argue that semantically and pragmatically it has various meanings and functions according to a context or a social practice in which an utterance or a sentence is produced and it becomes part of. In addition, I show that structurally, it always occupies a fixed final position in an utterance or a sentence without attaching to any word preceding it. Below are eleven points signaling its meanings and functions in each utterance and/or sentence.

First, the particle *e* has the imperative meaning, particularly in making an order or instruction a little more polite as noticed in utterances 1 and 2 and giving advice as seen in utterance 3.

Therefore, it can be translated into English as ‘please’ in utterances 1 and 2 and ‘must’ in utterance 3. IL translation can be *tolong*, *silakan* and *harus*. In utterance 1 the addressee (the grandma) was ordered to count the number of the coconuts which were about to drop from the coconut tree by the speaker (the grandpa).

- | PM | IL |
|--|---|
| 1) Nene, ko hitung e .
Grandma, please count. | Nenek, tolong hitung. |
| 2) Ko tunggu di prahu e .
Please wait on the canoe. | Silakan tunggu di perahu. |
| 3) Nene, nae di blakang tempo tapi tahan kuat-kuat e .
Grandma, get on at the back quickly and you must hold firmly [on the motorbike]. | Nenek, cepat naik di belakang dan harus menahan sekuatnya. |

Similarly, the speaker (the grandpa) in utterance 2 instructed the addressee (the grandson) to wait on the canoe while he dived into the deep sea water. And, the speaker (the motorbike taxi driver) in utterance 3 also asked the addressee (the passenger, old lady) to get on at the back seat of the motorbike while advising her to hold tightly because they were about to go. In this utterance, the particle *e* (must) is used to talk about obligation. So, the driver says what he thinks it is right for the passenger to do due to the unavailability of seat belt on motorbike. He is not asking the old lady to do things but he is telling or advising her to do things. As a whole, the appearance of this particle in each utterance above functions as a politeness marker (utterances 1 and 2) and as an obligatory marker (utterance 3). Like ‘please’ (Trosborg, 1995:212) and ‘must’ (Swan, 1996:517) in English, by adding this particle to an utterance the speaker shows deference to the addressee and pleads for cooperative behavior.

Second, the particle *e* may carry the meaning ‘could you’ for making a polite request more informal (utterance 4), ‘could I’ for offering a favor (utterances 5) and ‘do + infinitive’ for a polite apology (utterance 6). In utterance 4 the speaker (the wife) likely used this particle when asking the addressee (the husband) to do something for both the speaker and the addressee. Thus, utterance 4 shows the speaker requested politely that the addressee could call her *mami* ‘mom’ instead of her first name. In other words, she requested her

- | PM | IL |
|--|--|
| 4) Tete nan ko panggil sa deng sebutan MAMI e ?
Love, could you call me Mom? | Kamu nanti tolong memanggil saya dengan panggilan MAMI. |
| 5) Yo, mama ambil ko pu makan e
Yes, could I bring you some food? | Hm, ibu tolong ambikan makananmu, nak? |
| 6) Sa kira Makanan Terenak. Maaf e .
I thought the Nicest Food. Do forgive me . | Saya pikir Makanan Terenak. Mohon maaf. |

husband’s willingness to carry out her desired appeal. Meanwhile, the speaker (the mother) in utterance 5 assumed the addressee (the son) must be hungry because he just returned from his elementary school. She offered him a favor. This particle, then, has two readings for making offers such as ‘can I’ and ‘could I’. The latter is chosen as an English translation for the particle *e* because it makes an offer to sound less definite. In this case, the speaker was uncertain whether or not her offer was accepted by the addressee. Whereas, utterance 6 demonstrates that the speaker (the hungry young man) made a polite apology for entering the wrong place by accident. He used the particle *e* that has the meaning of (*do + infinitive*) as ‘an emphatic imperative’ (Swan, 1996:254). This is a direct apology from the speaker to show that he did not mean to enter the property.

Third, the particle *e* is used with negative imperative utterances. In this respect, it conveys the meanings of ‘I am telling you’ (utterance 7), ‘I am urging you’ (utterance 8), ‘I am begging you’ (utterances 9 and 10), and ‘I am warning you’ (utterances 11 and 12). It can be translated into IL as *tolong* ‘please’, *coba* ‘please’ dan *harap* ‘please’. Thus, respectively, in utterance 7 the particle *e* was used by the speaker (the father) to beg the addressee (the son) for not telling the real fact about his disease and in utterance 8 the speaker begged the addressee (the love one) for stopping from expressing the anger. The illocutionary

PM	IL
7) Ko jang bilang bapa sakit kanker hati e I’m begging you not to tell anybody that I’m suffering from a liver cancer.	Harap jangan memberitahukan siapapun bahwa saya menderita penyakit kanker hati.
8) Mace, ko jang mara-mara e Love, don’t be too angry I’m begging you .	Ibu, tolong jangan terlalu marah.
9) Iyo suda tete...tapi tete jang lama-lama e Alright, grandpa, but don’t be too long I’m telling you	Ya kakek, tapi tolong jangan terlalu lama.
10) Jadi, ko pikir ko pu kata-kata ulang e So, I’m urging you to reconsider what you’ve already said	Jadi, coba memikirkan kembali kata-katamu.
11) Kalo ko pi Jakarta, jang ko brani lewat Sorong e . If you want to go to Jakarta don’t ever go via Sorong I’m warning you	Apabila kamu pergi ke Jakarta tolong jangan lewat Sorong.
12) Stop tudu sembarang e I’m warning you to stop blaming me for no reason.	Harap jangan menuduh sembarangan

force embedded in particle *e* of utterances 7 and 8 is to get the addressee to do something for the benefit of the speaker. In contrast, for the benefit of the addressee, the speaker (the grandson) in utterance 9 used the particle *e* as an advice to the addressee (the grandpa) for not staying longer than expected in the deep sea water. In addition, in utterance 10 the speaker used this particle as a suggestion of urging to the addressee to reconsider his annoying words which have been uttered. Similarly, in both utterance 11 and utterance 12 the addressee was being warned by the speaker using the particle *e* at the end of these prohibitive utterances. In these cases (utterances 9, 10, 11 and 12), the speaker requested the addressee to cooperate for the benefit of the addressee.

Fourth, the particle *e* can be translated into English as ‘very’ or ‘so’ having a similar meaning to ‘to that extent’ or ‘that much’ and often used to talk about a high degree of some quality as in utterances 13 and 14. In IL it can be translated as *sangat* ‘very’ and *begitu* ‘so’. Utterance 13 shows the speaker talked to the addressee about someone who was very angry. Meanwhile, in utterance 14 the speaker (the young boy) saw a rose tattoo visibly printed on the addressee’s (the young girl’s) shoulder so he teased the young girl by complimenting the beauty of the tattoo flower. In both cases, the speaker used the particle *e* to add the idea of degree to gradable adjectives such as *emosi* ‘angry’ and *bagus* ‘beautiful’.

PM	IL
13) Pace de emosi e He is very angry/mad	Dia sangat marah.
14) Ade manis, tato mawarnya bagus e Sweet girl, your rose tattoo is so beautiful.	Adik manis, tato mawarnya begitu indah.

Fifth, the particle *e* can be translated into English as ‘indeed’ to strengthen the adverbs *skali* ‘very’ (utterance 15) and *mati* ‘very’ (utterance 16) and the reduplication of the adjective *kecil* ‘small’ (utterance 17) which carries the meanings of *sangat kecil* ‘very small’. Besides, it is also used to suggest confirmation or emphatic agreement (utterance 18).

PM

- 15) Tapi macam de rasa anggur ni knapa manis **skalie**
But after tasting the wine he questioned why it was **very** sweet **indeed**.

IL

- Tapi setelah ia mengecap anggur ini ia mempertanyakan mengapa anggurnya **sangat** manis **sekali**

- 16) Sa **mati** makan kelapa muda e
I like to eat young coconut **very** much **indeed**.

- Saya **sungguh sangat** ingin makan kelapa muda.

- 17) Baru de pu ikan kecil-kecil e
But, his fish are **very** small **indeed**

- Tapi, ikan-ikannya **sungguh sangat** kecil

- 18) De **paling** nakal di kelas e
He is **indeed** the naughtiest in the classroom

- Dia **sungguh amat sangat** nakal di kelas.

In IL it conveys the meaning *sungguh* ‘indeed’ and it is used after the adverb *sangat* ‘very’ and *sekali* ‘very’ and the superlative *paling* ‘the most’.

Sixth, the particle *e* carries the meaning ‘at all’ to emphasize a negative idea as in utterance 19. Here, the speaker used the particle *e* to stress that a small kid could not sing at all by intensifying the superlative *paling* ‘the most’.

PM

- 19) Ana kecil satu ni de **paling** tra bisa menyanyi e
This one small kid cannot sing **at all**

IL

- Ada seorang anak kecil yang tidak bisa menyanyi **sama sekali**.

Seventh, the particle *e* can play the role of ‘question tag’ in both writing and speech to ‘check whether something is true, or to ask for agreement’ (Swan, 2008:478). In writing, the exact meaning of the particle *e* as a question tag is normally clear from the context. But, in speech, the exact meaning of the particle *e* as a question tag can be shown by the intonation. A rising intonation (the voice goes up) is produced if the tag is a real question, that is, if we really want to know something and are not sure the answer (utterances 20 and 21). Meanwhile, a falling intonation (the voice goes down) is articulated if the tag is not a real question, that is, if we are already sure of the answer but we want to ask for agreement (utterances 22 and 23). In all cases IL uses *bukan* which corresponds to a sentence tag with ‘be’, ‘have’ or ‘do’ in English.

PM

- 20) Mungkin sa ada ikut terbang di atas sana e.
Probably I’m flying up there, **aren’t I?**

IL

- Mungkin saya ada ikut terbang di atas sana, **bukan?**

- 21) Ai, ade kalo ko melahirkan pasti sakit e.
Ah, when you give birth you must be painful, **mustn’t you?**

- Adik, kalau kamu melahirkan pasti sakit, **bukan?**

- 22) Pace ko mantap ko kuat e.
You are great and strong, **aren’t you?**

- Kamu mantap dan kuat, **bukan?**

- 23) O, jadi jalan trus baru belok kiri **e**.
O, so [I] walk straight and turn left,
don't I?
- O, jadi jalan terus kemudian belok kiri,
bukan?

Eighth, the particle *e* functions as a WH-question marker when it appears at the end of each WH utterance or sentence in PM. In contrast, IL has the particle *-kah* which is attached to each information question word as can be noticed in utterances 24, 25, 26 and 27.

PM

- 24) **Sapa** tadi yang mo suntik sa **e?**
Who just wanted to inject me?

IL

- Siapakah yang tadi hendak menyuntik saya?

- 25) Tapi, **kapan** kapal puti bisa sandar di Wamena?
But, **when** will the passenger ship be able to come to Wamena?

- Tapi, **kapankah** kapal putih bisa berlabuh di Wamena?

- 26) Nyong, HP yang ini **brapa e?**
Sir, **how** much is this handphone?

- Nyong, **berapakah** harga HP ini?

- 27) Nene, manusia dapa bikin dari **apa e?**
Grandma, **what** is human being made from?

- Nenek, manusia terbuat dari **apa?**
Dari **apakah** manusia dibuat?

Ninth, the particle *e* indicates that, according to the speaker, something is obvious and therefore this particle can be translated into English as 'definitely' (adverb of certainty) and into IL as *benar-benar*. It emphasizes a word or a phrase which comes before it. In utterance 28 the speaker confirmed that the ship is visibly made from iron and also the speaker in utterance 29 complimented the addressee for watering a healthy-looking plant. So, we use this particle to indicate how sure we are of something.

PM

- 28) Mama eee, [kapal] ini dong bikin dari besi **e**.
Wow, this ship is **definitely** made from iron.

IL

- Wah, kapal ini **benar-benar** terbuat dari besi.

- 29) Sah, subur **e**.
Wow, it's **definitely** growing well.

- Wah, **benar-benar** subur.

Tenth, the particle *e* plays the role of creating an exclamatory utterance as noticed in utterance 30. In this event, the speaker used the particle *e* to indicate an exclamatory statement because such a soup was his favorite. In this sense, it can be translated into English as 'what a' or 'how' and for IL the exclamation mark indicates this mood.

PM

- 30) Boo, ikan kuah kuning **e!**.
Wow, **what a** turmeric fish soup!

IL

- Wah, ikan kuah kuning!

Eleventh, apart from standing alone at the end of an utterance or a sentence, the particle *e* also combines with other particles such as *saja* (utterance 31), *suda* (utterance 32) and *dulu* (utterance 33) to emphasize and/or provide different meanings and functions. In utterance 31 the speaker used a combination of *saja e* to suggest that the addressees should go and have their lunch at the restaurant. Similarly, the speaker in utterance 32 also made a suggestion by combining the particles *suda* and *e* to show that the addressee was given chance to either agree or disagree with that suggestion. Both suggestions can be translated into English as 'why don't' and into IL as *sebaiknya* 'would be better' and *bagaimana kalau* 'why don't'. But, in utterance 33 the combination of *dulu* and *e* shows that the speaker asked permission from the addressee in order to visit his friend. In this respect, the English translation for the phrasal particle *dulu e* is 'may I' and the IL is *bolehkah saya* 'may I'.

PM

- 31) Kam dua pi makan di warung **saja e**
Why don't you two go and have
 your lunch at the restaurant?
- 32) Kitong kawin bulan Oktober **suda e**
Why don't we get married in
 October?
- 33) Bapa, sa pi ke Pius pu rumah **dulu e**
 Dad, **may I** go to Pius' house?

IL

- Kalian berdua **sebaiknya** pergi makan
 di warung saja.
- Bagaimana kalau** kita menikah bulan
 Oktober saja?
- Ayah, **bolehkah saya** pergi ke rumahnya
 Pius?

In sum, this particle always occurs at the end of these utterances or sentences which were selected from the thirty-three short stories in PM. They are produced by various writers and published by different bloggers and mobilized by the internet for Papuan and non-Papuan audience throughout Tanah Papua and beyond. Ideologically, these short stories are the sites of linguistic representations of PM, specifically, the use of particle *e*. The writers and the bloggers are 'the exemplary authoritative figures' (Goebel, 2015a) who produced, reproduced and disseminated this particle through the internet. In this sense, one-to-many participants framework (Agha, 2007a) is applicable for promoting PM. This particle consists of a single particle (utterances 1-30) and a combined particle (31-33). The utterances or sentences above show that PM speakers use particle *e* for different language functions. First, they use it when making a polite request (utterances 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12). Second, they use it when offering a favour (utterance 5). Third, it is used when offering an apology (utterance 6). Fourth, it is used to intensify an emotion or a compliment (utterances 13, 14). Fifth, it is used to intensify things and conditions described (utterances 15-17). Sixth, it is used to make an emphatic agreement (utterance 18). Seventh, it is used to emphasize a negative idea or statement (utterance 19). Eighth, it is used to mark a real question (utterances 20-21). Ninth, it is used to ask for agreement (utterances 22-23). Tenth, it is used to ask information questions (utterances 24-27). Eleventh, it is used to confirm objective facts (utterances 28-29). Twelfth, it is used to make an exclamatory statement (utterance 30). Thirteenth, it is used to make suggestions (utterances 31-32). Fourteenth, it is used to ask for permission (utterance 33). Based upon these functions the particle *e* is classified as illocutionary function particle (utterances 1-12, 18-33) and modal particle (13, 14-17). The former refers a speaker's choice to use four types of illocutionary acts functions such as competitive, convivial, collaborative and conflictive. The latter relates to a speaker's mood or attitude and to emphasize the focus of an utterance or a sentence. Table 2 below provides a detailed of meanings, functions and of categories of particle *e* as discussed above.

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

No	Meaning		Function	Category	Utterance or Sentence
	single particle	combined particle			
1	please		making polite requests	illocutionary function particle	1-3
2	would you		making a polite request	illocutionary function particle	4
3	could I		offering a favour	illocutionary function particle	5
4	do		offering an apology	illocutionary function particle	6
5	I am reminding you		making requests	illocutionary function particle	7,8
6	I am begging you		making requests	illocutionary function particle	9,10
7	I am warning you		making requests	illocutionary function particle	11,12
8	very		intensifying an emotion	modal particle	13
9	so		intensifying a compliment	modal particle	14

10	indeed		intensifying things and conditions described	modal particle	15-17
			making an emphatic agreement	illocutionary function particle	18
11	at all		emphasizing a negative idea or statement	illocutionary function particle	19
12	question tag (rising intonation)		making real questions	illocutionary function particle	20,21
13	question tag (falling intonation)		asking for agreement	illocutionary function particle	22, 23
14	wh-question marker		making information questions	illocutionary function particle	24-27
15	definitely		confirming objective facts	illocutionary function particle	28-29
16	what a <i>or</i> how		making exclamatory statements	illocutionary function particle	30
17		why don't	making suggestions	illocutionary function particle	31. 32
18		may I	asking for permission	illocutionary function particle	33

3.1.2 The particle “o”

Like the particle *e* above, particle *o* is also a letter which is a vowel under the phonetic alphabet category. I show that this particle always stands alone at the end of an utterance or a sentence without attaching to a word that comes before it. I argue that it always carries a variety of meanings and functions in utterances or sentences in which it becomes part of. First, it changes a simple utterance *sa senang* ‘I’m happy’ into an exclamatory utterance as seen in utterance 34 where the speaker expressed her happiness to the addressee after enjoying their being together as husband and wife. This particle then can be translated into English as ‘how’ and into IL as *alangkah*.

PM

34) Ini baru sa rasa ko pu ‘barang’ besar sampe. Sa senang **o!**
I just felt your ‘thing’ was very big
How happy I am!

IL

Saya baru kali ini merasakan ‘barangmu’ amat besar. **Alangkah** senangnya saya!

Second, the words *ternak* ‘animal’ and *terenak* ‘the most delicious’ were mistakenly read by the speaker in utterance 35 due to their slight difference in spelling. Accordingly, the speaker used the particle *o* with the meaning ‘just’ in English and *justru* in IL to indicate that after being inside the building he was objectively aware that this place was not an eating place but an animal store instead. In this case, the speaker uses *o* ‘just’ to persuasively get the addressee to accept this point of view.

PM

35) Jual Makanan Ternak **o**. Sa kira Makanan Terenak.
[What they] sell is **just** Animal Food. I thought the most delicious Food.

IL

[Yang mereka] jual **justru** Makanan Ternak. Saya pikir Makanan Terenak.

Third, the speaker (the wife) in utterance 36 asked the addressee (the husband) to go away because of hurting her feeling and therefore she used the particle *o* ‘please’ which is similar to *tolong* in IL to emphasize her negative imperative.

PM

36) Pergi, pergi! Jang ko bikin sake insan yang lema ini **o**

IL

Pergi, pergi! **Tolong** jangan kau menyakiti insan yang lemah ini.

Go away! **Please** don't hurt such a weak soul as me.

Fourth, in utterance 37 the speaker talked about an arrogant priest. He used the particle *o* to strengthen the adverb *skali* 'very' in his cynical assessment and therefore it can be translated into English as 'indeed' and into IL as *sungguh* or *memang*. And, lastly, utterance 38 shows that the speaker used the particle *o* which has the meaning *teruskan saja* 'keep on' to indicate an on-going activity, that is, the speaker (the owner of the banana tree) cynically asked the addressee (the thief) to keep on cutting down the banana tree.

PM

- 37) Ada Pendeta satu de **paling** gaya skali **o**.
There's a priest who is extremely **very** arrogant **indeed**.

IL

- (a) Ada seorang pendeta yang **sungguh paling** sombong
(b) Ada seorang pendeta yang **memang paling** sombong.

- 38) Iyo, mace ko tebang **o**
Alright, **keep on** cutting down [the banana tree].

- Baik bu, **teruskan saja** tebang [pohon pisangnya]

Overall, these utterances or sentences are part of the five short stories which become the sites of linguistic representations of PM, specifically, the use of particle *o*. This particle conveys five meanings and five functions (see Table 3) on the basis of social practices where it occurs. Like the particle *e*, this particle is also classified as illocutionary function particle (utterances 34, 36, 38) and modal particle (utterances 35, 37) based on its functions in each utterance or sentence. The bloggers and the internet have also contributed to the reproduction and distribution of this particle to the Papuan and non-Papuan audience inside and outside Tanah Papua.

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

No	Meaning		Function	Category	Utterance or Sentence
	single particle	combined particle			
1	how		making an exclamatory statement	illocutionary function particle	34
2	just		emphasizing words that follow	modal particle	35
3	please		making a request	illocutionary function particle	36
4	indeed		intensifying a cynical assessment	modal particle	37
5	keep on		giving a cynical order or command	illocutionary function particle	38

3.2. Classification of discourse particles *e* and *o*

Goddard (2011:166) proposes six categories of discourse particles such as connective particles, information-status particles, illocutionary function particles, modal particles, evidential particles and focus particles. The above discussion demonstrates that both particles *e* and *o* only meet two categories such as illocutionary function particles and modal particles. Below is a brief description of the two categories and relevant utterances that support.

3.2.1 Illocutionary function particles.

Illocutionary function particles are analogous to questioning and exclamatory particles (Goddard, 2011) in utterances or sentences produced by interlocutors in a communicative exchange. Leech (1993) points out that there are four types of illocutionary acts functions 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). From these functions the competitive and convivial are demonstrated through the use of the particles *e* and *o*. In this case, they are used to modify illocutionary force and/or change illocutionary types embedded in utterances or sentences.

Regarding the questioning particles, there are two kinds of questions (question tag, information question) in which the particle *e* occurs. In the question tag – the speakers in the utterances 20-23 use the particle *e* to modify the reporting utterances into the asking utterances.

While, in the information question the speakers in the utterances 24-27 use the particles *e* to change the reporting utterances into the asking utterances. Thus, these changes suggest that the particle *e* bears the competitive and convivial functions.

Meanwhile, the particle *o* is an exclamatory particle. The occurrence of this particle changes the stating/announcing utterance into the congratulating/complimenting utterance (utterance 34). Such a modification indicates that the particle *o* has the convivial function.

3.2.2 Modal particles.

Both particles *e* and *o* are modal particles that occur in utterances or sentences to show how the speaker thinks that the content of the utterances or sentences relates to the common knowledge of both the speaker and the addressee. They soften ‘what is being said (although they can also be used to make statement more forceful) and they can add extra emphasis’ (Weinert, 2007). In other words, they reflect the mood or attitude of the speaker and highlight the focus of the utterance. They express interpersonal pragmatic meaning: intention and attitude of the speaker as well as an expected effect on the listener (Vyatkina et al., 2008). These particles carry different meanings depending on utterances or sentences they become a part. Foreexample, the particle *e* convey the meanings ‘exactly’ or ‘precisely’ (utterances 28-29), ‘very’ and ‘so’ (utterances 13-14), the particle *o* carries the meaning ‘just’ (utterance 35) and both particles have the meaning ‘indeed’ (utterances 15-18, 37).

4. Conclusion

I have shown that linguistically, the particles *e* and *o* are not inflected. They are not clitic particles and therefore they stay in the same form regardless of where they appear in an utterance or a sentence. Structurally, the positional occurrence of these particles in utterances or sentences suggests that they are a final-ending type. Semantically, either the particle *e* or the particle *o* can have more than one meaning. It can mean one thing in one context but something entirely different in another context. Pragmatically, both particles can have more than one function, but, they cannot function as one-word answer to a question.

After showing some differences between PM and IL as noticed in the utterances and/or the sentences above it is implied that, in fact, these particles have already crystalized as an integral part of PM and therefore they serve as in-group markers for the speakers of PM. Such a crystallization of discourse particles suggests that the processes of appropriation and revaluation had and have already taken place because the speakers have been having the positive attitudes and/or perceptions on PM for multiple years.

The story writers, the bloggers and the internet providers are the exemplary authoritative figures 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 role of the internet makes one-to-many participants framework effective to promote these particles across space and time in the virtual world.

References

- Agha, Asif. (2007a). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge University Press
- Aijmer, Karin. (2002). *English Discourse Particles*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ajamiseba, Daniel C. (1984). *Kebinekaan bahasa di Irian Jaya*. In Koentjaraningrat (ed.), *Irian Jaya: Membangun masyarakat majemuk* (Seri Etnografi Indonesia 5) (hal.119-135). Penerbit Djambatan.
- Ameka, Felix. (1992). Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18(2-3), 101-118.
- Antoh, Demmy. (2007). *Rekonstruksi dan Transformasi Nasionalisme Papua*. Sinar Harapan.
- Aschroft, Bill. (2001). *Post-Colonial Transformation*. Routledge.
- Burung, Willem. (2004, October 6). *Comparisons in Melayu-Papua*(RCLT Workshop Presentation). Comparative Constructions, La Trobe University. Melbourne, Australia.
- Burung, Willem. (2008a, July 1-3). *Melayu Papua – A hidden treasure* (Conference Presentation) .

- Language Development, Language Revitalization and Multilingual Education in Ethnolinguistic Communities, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Burung, Willem. (2008b). *The prime 'FEEL' in Melayu Papua: Cognition, emotion and body*.
- Burung, Willem. (2009). *Melayu Papua: Where have all its speakers gone*. Universitas Cenderawasih.
- Burung, Willem and Yusuf W. Sawaki. (2007, August 6-8). *On syntactical paradigm of causative constructions in Melayu Papua* (Symposium Presentation). Malay/Indonesian Linguistics – ISMIL 11, Manokwari, Papua, Indonesia. [Online] Available: <https://indoling.com/ismil/11/abstracts/BurungSawaki.pdf> (October 24, 2020).
- Donohue, Mark. (2007a). Malay as a mirror of Austronesian: Voice development and voice variation. *Lingua* 118(10), 1470–1499. [Online] Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024384107001489> (Oct 24, 2020).
- Donohue, Mark. (2011). *Papuan Malay of New Guinea: Melanesian influence on verb and clause structure*. In Claire Lefebvre (ed.), *Creoles, their substrates, and language typology* (Typological Studies in Language 95) (413-435). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Eberhard, David M., Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig (eds.). (2020). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* (23rd ed.). SIL International. [Online] Available: <http://www.ethnologue.com> (October 24, 2020)
- Goddard, Cliff. (2011). *Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press
- Goebel, Z. (2015a). *Language and Superdiversity: Indonesians Knowledgeing at Home and Abroad*. Oxford University Press.
- Kamma, F.C. (1981). *Ajaib di Mata Kita: Masalah komunikasi antara Timur dan Barat dilihat dari sudut Pengalamanselama seabad pekabaran Injil di Irian Jaya*. BPK Gunung Mulia.
- Kawashima, Sue A. (1999). *A Dictionary of Japanese Particles*. Kodansha International
- Kim, Hyun, Christian G. Nussy, Benny E. W. Rumaropen, Eleonora L. Scott and Graham R. Scott. (2007, August 6-8). *A survey of Papuan Malay: An interim report*. (Symposium Presentation) Malay/Indonesian Linguistics – ISMIL 11, Manokwari, Papua, Indonesia 2007.
- Kluge, Angela. (2014). *A grammar of Papuan Malay*. LOT
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1993). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford University Press.
- Morin, Izak. (2018). *Understanding the language ideologies of Papuan Malay*. [Doctorate thesis, La Trobe University]. <http://arrow.latrobe.edu.au:8080/vital/access/manager/Repository/latrobe:42823>
- Paauw, Scott H. (2008). *The Malay contact varieties of eastern Indonesia: A typological comparison*. [Doctorate dissertation, State University of New York].
- Samaun. (1979). *The system of the contracted forms of the vernacular bahasa Indonesia in Jayapura, Irian Jaya*: Regional Language Centre. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Saragih, Chrisma F. (2012). *The practical use of person reference in Papuan Malay* [M.A. thesis, Radboud University Nijmegen]. [Online] Available: http://www.ru.nl/publish/pages/518697/thesis_the_practical_use_of_person_reference_in_papuan_malay.docx . (October 24, 2020)
- Sawaki, Yusuf W. (2004). *Some morpho-syntax notes on Melayu Papua*. Universitas Negeri Papua
- Sawaki, Yusuf W. (2005). *Melayu Papua: Tong pu bahasa*. Universitas Negeri Papua.
- Sawaki, Yusuf W. (2007, August 6-8). *Does passive exist in Melayu Papua?* (Symposium Presentation). Malay/Indonesian Linguistics – ISMIL 11. [Online] Available: <https://indoling.com/ismil/11/abstracts/Sawaki.pdf> (October 24, 2020)
- Scott, Graham R. Hyun Kim, Benny E. W. Rumaropen, Eleonora L. Scott, Christian G. Nussy, Anita C. M. Yumbi and Robert C. Cochran. (2008). *Tong pu bahasa: A preliminary report on some linguistic and sociolinguistic features of Papuan Malay*. SIL International Indonesia.
- Sneddon, James Neil, Alexander Adelaar, Dwi Noverini Djenar, Michael C. Ewing. (2012). *Indonesian Reference Grammar*. Routledge
- Suharno, Ignatius. (1979). *Some notes on the teaching of Standard Indonesian to speakers of Irianese Indonesian*. In Rudolf C. Tarumingkeng (ed.), *Irian, Bulletin of Irian Jaya Development* 8(1). (3-32). Universitas Cenderawasih, Institute for Anthropology.
- Suharno, Ignatius. (1981). *The reductive system of an Indonesian dialect – A study of Irian Jaya Case*. (Conference Presentation).

- Swan, Michael. (1996). *Practicle English Usage* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press
- Trosborg, Anna. (1995). *Intralinguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Van Velzen, Paul. (1995). Some notes on the variety of Malay used in Serui and vicinity. In Connie Baak, Mary Bakker and Dick van der Meij (eds.), *Tales from a concave world: Liber amicorum Bert Voorhoeve* [311-343 (265-296)]. Leiden University.
- Vyatkina, N., & Johnson, K.E. (2008) Teaching German Modal Particles: A Corpus-Based Approach. *CALPER Pedagogical Materials*: The Pennsylvania State University: Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research
- Walker, Roland W. (1982). *Language use at Namatota: A sociolinguistic profile*. In Amran Halim, Lois Carrington and Stephen A. Wurm (eds.), *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics* (Pacific Linguistics C-76) (79-94). The Australian National University, Research School of Pacific Studies.
- Warami, Hugo. (2005). Bentuk partikel bahasa Melayu Papua. *Linguistika* 6(1), 87–112
- Weinert, Regina. (2007). *Spoken Language Pragmatics. An Analysis of Form-Function Relations*. Continuum.
- Widyastuti, Ch. (2017, Agustus 1). *Mengapa tidak? Penggunaan Bahasa Melayu Papua sebagai Bahasa Pengantar Di dalam Kelas*. Sastra Papua.
<http://www.sastrapapua.com/2017/08/mengapa-tidak-penggunaan-bahasa-melayu.html>