Pragmatic particles in Madurese: A corpus study of *jâ'* in oral narratives and conversations

Master Thesis

September 2015

Supervised by

Dr. Ad Foolen

Irham s4440676

I.Irham@student.ru.nl

Linguistics Department

Faculty of Arts

Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates the pragmatic function of the particle *jâ'* in Madurese oral narratives and conversations. The particle is often semantically empty, but serves an important pragmatic function within human communication. To uncover this pragmatic function, the present study uses both a qualitative and quantitative approach. It uses the conversation analysis framework to deal with conversation data, while the sentence form and function perspective is used to interpret oral narratives. These approaches often support one another when it comes to pragmatic issues. The findings show that the particle *jâ'* can function as emphatic particle, explanatory particle, negative imperative particle, and complementizer and can also be used to indicate disappointment. The present study also corroborates the results of previous studies by showing that text type or genre can influence the pragmatic function both quantitatively and qualitatively. It is suggested that *jâ* was originally an emphatic particle, but there is evidence that it was also used as a negative particle from the very beginning. It could thus be regarded as a case of homonymy. Further study by means of diachronic corpus research might unravel the precise semantic development as well as the pragmatic function of the particle.

Keywords: Pragmatic particles, Madurese, Oral narrative, Conversation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank Allah SWT for His uncountable love and blessing in my life. My deepest thanks and appreciation go to Dr. Ad Foolen who has very patiently supervised me. This thesis would never have been possible without his kind help: correcting my academic writing and giving some worthwhile insights in dealing with pragmatic particles in particular.

I also would like to thank Prof. Pieter Muysken who has devoted his time to read my thesis as the second reader, and Kobin Kendrick for his corrective feedback, especially in the realm of conversation analysis, glossing, and transcription. The completion of this thesis is also indebted to Prof. William Davies (IOWA University) who has allowed me to use the collections of Madurese oral narratives and commented on some parts of my thesis.

I would like to thank the Indonesian Endowment Fund for Education (*LPDP*) Ministry of Finance, which gave me a priceless opportunity to study at Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands, and for financing my study and stay during my master program.

I also thank my big family, especially my parents Mustar and Wama, my brothers Khoirul Anam, Ainul Arifin, Imam Faisol, Nur Hasanah, and my newly-born nephew, Muhammad Gibran Mubarok, who have endlessly prayed for my success.

Additionally, I am also lucky to have new family in Nijmegen. My thanks go to my great Indonesian linguistic colleagues, Zainur Rofiq, Condra Antoni, Irene, Maria, and Tessa, to the ex-tenants of Hatert 70, to the Muslim Community in Nijmegen (Kemuni), my friends at the Badminton Club in Nijmegen and the fellow Tadarus Qur'an Nijmegen community. I also thank the Indonesian Student Association (PPI) Nijmegen, who gave me the opportunity to connect with this great community.

Last but not least, I thank the people who have supported me, but whom I cannot mention here.

Irham

Nijmegen, September 2015

Table of Contents

TRANSCRIPT SYMBOLS

1 **Data are represented in three-line transcripts**. The first line is a literal transcription of the Madurese utterance. The second line provides a word-by-word gloss of the utterance. The third line is an English translation.

2 Temporal and sequential relationships

[Left bracket indicates the starting point of overlapping speech.

] Left bracket indicates the ending point of overlapping speech.

(0.0) Number in parentheses indicates silence represented in seconds.

(.) A dot in parentheses indicates a micropause.

3 Aspects of speech delivery

:: Colons indicate the prolongation or stretching of the preceding word.

hhThe letter "h" or a series of "h" indicates audible outbreath. The number of "h" corresponds to the length of outbreath.

.hh The letter "h" preceded by a period indicates audible in breath. The number of "h" corresponds to the length of the in breath.

4 Aspects of intonation and prosody: punctuation marks are not used grammatically, but indicate intonation

. A period indicates a falling, or final, intonation contour.

? A question mark indicates rising intonation.

, A comma indicates a slightly rising intonation.

?, The combination of question mark and comma indicates a rise stronger than a comma, but weaker than a question mark.

5 Others

( ) Empty parentheses indicate inaudible word(s).

(word) Words in parentheses in the first line of the transcript represent likely possibilities of what was said. Words in parentheses in the third line of transcript indicate that the word was not used in Madurese, but was added to the translation to make it grammatical.

((words)) Double parentheses are used to supply contextually relevant information

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
AGI	*-agi* morpheme
AV	active voice
DEF	definitive
E	-e (locative) morpheme
FP	focus particle
HRT	hortative
IRR	irrealis
KA	*-ka* morpheme
NOM	nominalization
P	particle (as in Wouk 1988, for kan and ya)
PRT	particle (denoting ja' particle and its variants)
PM	past marker
PFV	perfective
REL	relative marker
RE	Dreduplication
OV	object voice

Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1. Introduction : Pragmatic Particles

The essence of communication is to achieve mutual understanding and avoid misunderstanding, but speakers do not always make their communicative goals explicit. However, there are always subtle cues that help the hearer interpret their utterance. Such communicative signals may occur in non-verbal form, intonation, and special words or phrases, which can be regarded as *pragmatic markers* (cf. Meyerhoff, 1994; Fraser, 1996; Norrick, 2001; Foolen 2011).

There are many different terms for *pragmatic markers*; *discourse markers* (Schiffrin, 2001; Fraser, 1996, 2006, 2009; Maschler, 2009), *pragmatic particles* (Foolen, 1996; Cook, 1999; Wouk, 1999), and *discourse particles* (Werner, 1991; Aijmer, 2002; Fischer and Drescher, 1996, Fischer, 2006). Additionally, several other, lesser used terms, such as *phatic connective* were proposed by Bazzanella (as cited in Foolen, 2011). This thesis will use the term "pragmatic particles" without any specific propensity to a particular theoretical foundation.

The term pragmatic particle is chosen on the basis of the results from the present study. The data include many small words, mostly monosyllabic, that often have no lexical meaning, but have a pragmatic functions in conversation. Due to their small size, the term *particle* is considered to be more appropriate than *marker*. The pragmatic particles in this study can be exemplified by words such as *jâ', keng* and *la*.

Additionally, I use the term "marker" to indicate the function that the particle has in the conversation. The same marker can comprise the same particles. Conversely, the same particles can have different functions or "markers" in the conversation. In addition, Levinson (1983: 87-88) suggests that a pragmatic marker "indicates relationship between utterance and prior discourse". More noticeably, pragmatic markers often have a pivotal pragmatic meaning that helps both speaker and hearer to achieve their communicative goal (Brinton, 1996).

Pragmatic particles are rather neutral with respect to "speech division like adverb, conjunction or interjection" and to "syntactic restriction" (Foolen, 2011: 216), which means that they are not restricted in terms of position. They can appear in the left periphery like in English or in the right periphery like in East Asian languages (Lee, 2007). Furthermore, Dutch, German, and some Scandinavian languages have pragmatic particles which preempt the middle field of

the utterance. This latter case is widely known as the modal particle (cf. Diewald, 2011; van der Wouden, 2002).

Pragmatic particles often have multifunctional meanings in conversation, which may be context-bound, but do not have to be. Wouk (1999) studies the use of the particle *ya* in Indonesian conversation. Its primary function is to indicate agreement. However, it is also used to maintain solidarity between the interlocutors. Indeed, Pragmatic particles serve the communicative goal of the speaker, which is also put forward by Fraser (1996, 2006). They serves as a clue as to the communicative intentions of the speakers and makes the discourse more coherent. More importantly, it mitigates the cognitive effort of participants in interpreting the utterances of a speaker (Han, 2011).

To summarize, a pragmatic particle is a communicative signal that helps the hearer to interpret an utterance (cf. Gumperz, 2001, Foolen, 2011) and reach the communicative goal. In a broader sense, it serves as a link between the preceding and following discourse (Fraser, 1990, 1996, 2006).

Fraser (1990) argues that a sentence has essentially two meaning: one semantic and one pragmatic meaning. This latter meaning can be derived from the use of markers. He defines three different categories: "basic pragmatic markers such as *please*, commentary pragmatic markers such as *well*, and parallel pragmatic marker such as *damn* in *Take your damn shoes off the table"* (Fraser, 1990: 386-387). Fraser (cf. Fraser, 1996, 2005, 2009), in subsequent work, also includes discourse markers in the categorization and further subdivides them into elaborative markers, contrastive markers, temporal markers, assessment markers, deference markers, emphasis markers, conversational management markers, and other markers.

However, the functions defined by Fraser do not have to be absolute. Non-linguistic factors such as age, gender, language contact, and language variation, can influence the pragmatic function of Pragmatic particles. This is demonstrated in several studies, for instance on the use of *You Know* in adult and adolescent speech (Erman, 2001) and EFL (House, 2009). Erman shows that adults use *You Know* as "a cohesive device to bracket utterances, conversely, as metalinguistic monitor in adolescents" (p. 1356). Later studies show that EFL do attribute an interpersonal function *You know*, but use it "to make salient coherence relation and focus on, or robust connection in discourse production and planning difficulties" (House, 2001: 190). More strikingly, Lee (2004) points out that *You Know* is used more frequently by males than females,

which goes against earlier findings (cf. Lakoff, 1973; Holmes, 1986; Brinton, 1996) that females use more *You Know* in their speech.

Wouk's (1999) investigation on *ya* (yes) and *kan* (right) in Indonesia is also a worthwhile example. *Ya* is primarily used as an "affirmative" marker or "continuer," but is also used as a solidarity marker (Wouk, 1999: 205). Wouk argues that it is the Indonesian *Gotong royong* collectivism culture which evokes solidarity behavior. This culture value is reflected in the Indonesian communication style.

The function of Pragmatic particles can vary across languages, cultural, and contextual discourses in which Pragmatic particles are used. The particle *ya*, often translated as *Yes* in English, can have different functions in different contexts (see Wouk, 1999). The Dutch particle *ja* '*yes*', is not merely an agreement marker, but is also often used to express surprise, as a continuer, or for topic shift (Hoek, 2013). This flexibility and uniqueness of Pragmatic particles in different languages keeps it an interesting topic for research.

The present study aims at investigating the Madurese pragmatic particles in conversation as well as in oral narratives and will focus specifically on the particle *ja'*, because it is unique and used for different purposes. The discussion will include an analysis of the syntactic position, pragmatic meaning, and the semantic paths along which the different meanings of the particle *ja'* are derived from the (postulated) primary meaning.

1.2. **The Madurese Language and Pragmatic Particles**

The Madurese language belongs to the western Austronesian language family and in specific the western Malayo-Polynesian branch (Adelaar, 2005 as cited in Davies, 2010). It is the fifth most-spoken language in Indonesia (Ethnologue, 2015). It is spoken by around 3.5 million people, based on *Badan Statistik Indonesia* (Statistics Indonesia), throughout the Madura Island, ranging from Bangkalan in the west to Sumenep in the East. The Madurese language is not only spoken in Madura Island, but also in some parts of East Java such as Probolinggo, Lumajang, Jember, Sitobondo, Bondowoso, and northern part of Banyuwangi (Davies, 2010).

Like Javanese, Madurese employs a hierarchy of speech levels. It has three registers or speech levels; *enje'-iyeh* (the lower level), *engghi-enten* (the medium level), and *engghi-bunten*

(the higher level). The lower level, *enje'-iyeh*, is usually used by speakers who have an equal social status, like friends to friends. It can also be used by older people speaking to younger ones,

but not the other way around. *Engghi-enten* can be used to interact with a new friend. It is called *engghi-enten*, because the users often mix the lower and the higher level. The *engghi-bunten* level is used by speakers with a lower social status to talk to hearers that have a higher social status. It is also used in formal speech. The choice of speech level depens on the speaker-hearer relationship and the context in which the conversation occurs.

Stevens' (1965) discusses the use of the different speech levels. In Davies' (2010) book, he also dicusses the Madurese speech levels. He uses the term *kasar, tenggaan*, and *alos* for the mentioned terms above. Furthermore, Muakman (2007) specifically pointed to the Madurese's speech level system in relation to the preservation of the Madurese language.

Madurese has both open and closed class words (Davies 2010). However, this distinction is not rigid (Davies, 2010). Madurese speakers often use some pragmatic particles to index their intended message. It is quite easy to find Madurese words that cannot be literally translated into English, such as *jeh, joh, ja',* and *kek.* In order to understand the usages and functions of such particles, it is necessary for non-native speakers to make use of equivalent English translations, as in Ikranagara's (1975) approach to Indonesian pragmatic particles in which English translations were used for the particles that were used in folk play.

The Madurese basic word order is SVO like Javanese, Sunndanese, and other regional Indonesian languages. Madurese is "head-initial" (Davies, 2010: 150) which means that an adjectival modifiers follow the noun they modify and relative clauses follow their head, as in the examples below.

```
1  Bengko rajâ
   House  big
   Big house

2  Mored se datâng
   Student REL come
   The student who come
```

(adapted from Davies, 2010: 151)

The morphological processes in Madurese consist of affixation, reduplication, and compounding.

The present study attempts to explain the use of the pragmatic particle *jâ'* in the Madurese language. It will employ a socio-pragmatic perspective to investigate how the particle *jâ'* functions in conversations and monologues. This perspective seems to fit the current study, because it will not only look at the particle's literal meaning per se. Instead, it will focus on speaker-hearer relationships and the context in which the particle appears. I hypothesize that the

speech level system in the Madurese language affects the pragmatic meaning of the particle *jâ'*. Accordingly, the context-based equivalent English translation will be provided during the discussion and analysis in order to make it easy to understand for non-native speakers of Madurese.

The following chapters will include a literature study to make a clear distinction between previous research and the present study. Studies that will be included are by Ikranagara (1975) and Wouk (1999) on Indonesian pragmatic particles and Yuniar, Sujatna & Heriyanto (2013) on discourse markers in Sundanese oral narratives.

Chapter 2
Studies of Pragmatic Particles in Indonesia

In this section, I will first give an overview of pragmatic particles. Afterwards, I will discuss some works related to the present study. There have not been many studies on pragmatic particles in the Indonesian language, let alone on particles in the local languages of Indonesia. Ikranagara (1975) is the first to study the use of particles in *Betawi*, a dialect spoken in Jakarta. She based her research on a Betawian folk play. Subsequently, Wouk (1998, 1999, & 2001) published a series of papers pertaining to Indonesian pragmatic particles (*ya/iya* and *kan*). She believes that these particles are commonly used to create solidarity between the interlocutors. Yuniar, Sujatna and Heriyanto (2013) studied discourse markers in Sundanese oral narratives, which comprises a cross-linguistic study of pragmatic particles in Indonesian (local) languages. The present study focuses specifically on pragmatic particles in the Madurese language, one of the local languages spoken in East Java Indonesia.

2.1. Pragmatic Particles

The study of pragmatic particles is not new. English language studies on pragmatic particles have developed in the last decades (cf Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Schourup, 1985; Schiffrin, 1987). Not surprisingly, some researchers have started to study particles in different languages, like Japanese (Hayashi, 2010), Korean (Yoon, 2010), and Singapore-English (Gupta, 1992), but also in languages like German (Abraham, 1991; König, 1991) and Dutch (Foolen, 1995; van der Wouden & Foolen, 2015).

One problem in the field of pragmatic particles is how to define them. It is often hard for researchers to deal with words that have no equivalent translation in other languages and personally, I feel it is difficult to explain what *jâ* in Madurese means. This word has no lexical meaning, but does have (borrowing Sperber & Wilson's term on relevance theory, 1986 & 2001) a "procedural meaning," which means that the pragmatic meaning of *jâ* can be derived from the context in which it appears.

Pragmatic particles play an important role in achieving mutual understanding in conversations. They often "express speakers' attitude towards addressee" (Wierzbicka, 1991:

341) and give the hearer a communicative clue as to how to interpret utterance (Fraser, 1990; Han, 2011; Foolen, 2011). Andersen (2001), who uses the term pragmatic marker, defines Pragmatic particles as a "class of short, recurrent linguistic items that generally have little lexical import but serve significant pragmatic functions in conversations" (p. 39). Brinton (1996) defines several characteristics of pragmatic particles (she uses the term pragmatic markers):

a) They are a dominant feature of spoken discourse.
b) They are often short and phonologically reduced
c) The propositional meaning is often difficult to define
d) They are optional rather than obligatory, which means that their absence in conversation "does not render a sentence ungrammatical and/ or unintelligible" (Fraser, 1988: 22)
e) They are predominantly multifunctional

(Adapted from Brinton, 1996: 33-35)

The description above shows that a pragmatic particle can be understood as a word that does not have a lexical meaning, but does have pragmatic meaning. The pragmatic meaning is frequently, if not always, multifunctional.

The particle *jâ'* has no lexical meaning and the environment defines its pragmatic meaning. Interestingly, the particle *jâ'* is only optional when it appears in sentence-medial position and functions as a complementizer (I will explain this in section 4 & 5). In initial position, the particle *jâ'* is obligatory.

In the following subsections, I will review some related studies: pragmatic particles in Indonesian colloquial language, particles in *Betawi*, discourse markers in Sundanese oral narrative, and pragmatic particles in Madurese language.

2.2. Pragmatic Particles in Indonesian Colloquial language: Fay Wouk (1998, 1999, 2001)

Wouk (1999) was the first to study Indonesian colloquial language. Her first publication was on the pragmatic particle *kan* and its function as a solidarity building element in conversations. The particle *ya* also appears to have the same function (Wouk, 1999, 2001). These two pragmatic particles are the two most frequently used particles in Indonesian conversations. The pragmatic particle *kan* is "a shortened form of negative particle "*bukan*" (Wouk, 1998: 379), which is often used as an agreement marker.

In investigating the range functions of the particle *kan* in the corpus, Wouk (1998) makes use of both a quantitative and a qualitative approach. The former gives evidence that the case is representative and worth investigating, while the latter's objective is develop a robust understanding of the pragmatic functions of the particle *kan*. Wouk employs the event typology by Labov and Fanshel[1] (1977) to understand the relation between the speaker and the hearer in the conversation. The analysis also takes intonation and turn unit of the particle *kan* into account.

Wolff (1980)'s study focused on the particle *kan* and found that it has three main functions. It serves first of all as agreement marker and functions like tag questions in English. It is also an indication of conjoint knowledge, which is presumably on par with Holmes' (1986) *you know*. Lastly, it can also be used as a request for verification. Wouk (1998) reassesses these findings by studying Indonesian colloquial data. She found that the particle *kan* is mostly used as emphatic marker and to some extent as topic introduction.

Wouk's (1998) study also confronts Wolff's (1980) prediction that *kan* seems unlikely to appear in an A event. Wouk (1998) demonstrated that this particle can in fact occur in an A event and that this "indicates a conjoint knowledge" (p. 397), illustrated in (1) and (2) (adapted from Wouk 1998:397).

```
1 D   sebenarnya saya seneng sekali    lho,   me-apa
      really     I    like   very much EMPH   me-what
      I really like me-whatchamacallit very much

2     jurusan seni rupa dulu kan  mau dafter di ITB ya
      subject art       PAST  kan want enroll in ITB yes
      I wanted to enroll to the art department in ITB you know
```

Wouk mentions that this is a conversation between three women who meet each other for the first time. D's statement about the Art Department contains privileged information that is expressed by means of the pragmatic particle *kan* in line 2.

The particles *kan* and *ya/iya* can appear in sentence-final (the particle *kan* occurs in this position most frequently), sentence-initial (the particle *ya/iya* occurs in this position most frequently), and sentence-middle position (Wouk, 1998, 1999, 2001). Wouk (1998) provides a detailed picture of the distribution of *kan* in the data (illustrated in the table below). It can be used in final position in main clauses, dependent clauses, noun phrases and temporal expressions.

[1] Labov and Fanshel (1977) make use of event or knowledge typology. An event is an A event when the speaker has privileged knowledge, B event when the listener has privileged knowledge, and AB event when both speakers and listeners have privileged knowledge. O event is when knowledge is already there (culturally available) and D event is when both speaker and hearer have different views (Labov and Fanshel (1977).

Table 1

Position	Number
Internal	78
Subject predicate	44
Clause – PP	5
Linker – clause	18
Temp/Loc – Clause	6
Other	5
Final	135
Main clause	69
Dependent clause	27
NP	33
Temp/Loc	6
Initial	21
Intonation Unit	6
Total	240

Adapted from Wouk (1988: 387)

The different positions serve different functions. More importantly, the event typology in which the particles appear determines their pragmatic meaning.

Wouk's analysis of the pragmatic particles *kan* and *ya/iya* is relevant for the present study for two main reasons. The first has to do with its remarkable contribution to the field of cross-linguistic study on pragmatic particles. The use of semi-natural data (since Wouk chose the topic of the conversations in the recording) leads to an analysis that reflects the occurrences and functions of the particles in daily conversation. This thesis, on the other hand, will study the use of pragmatic particles in Madurese monologues (oral narratives) and dialogues or conversations. This will lead to a more convincing claim. The reason has to do with the syntagmatic position as

a way of understanding the particle *kan* and *ya/iya*. By closely looking at the position of the particles together with event typology proposed by Labov and Fanshel (1977) in conversations, Wouk (1998, 1999, & 2001) shed light on the range of functions of the particle *kan* and *ya/iya* in the corpus.

The present study will pay specific attention to the syntagmatic position of the particle *jâ'* to explain its meaning. Unlike Wouk's (1998, 1999, & 2001) approach, the event typology will not be considered, since it is much more appropriate to be used to figure out the epistemicity of the conversation. Epistemicity is not expected to be a relevant feature in explaining *jâ'*. Notwithstanding, the speaker-hearer relations will be taken into account to understand the pragmatic functions of *jâ'* when necessary.

2.3. Pragmatic Particles in *Betawi*: Ikranagara (1975)

Ikranaga's study (1975) is a pioneering study within the field of pragmatic particles in Indonesian local languages. She studies pragmatic particles in *Betawi*, a dialect spoken in Jakarta and uncovered the eight most frequently used pragmatic particles in the play. They are *ko', ke', ah, kan, ye (ya), sih, deh,* and *dong.* Ikranagara (1975) uses equivalent English translations for each use of a particle to facilitate understanding, which helps non-Indonesian readers to understand the meaning of the pragmatic particles.

The study focused specifically on the type of sentence and the action of sentences with a particle. The particle *ko',* for instance, expresses surprise when it is used in a statement. On the other hand, when *ko'* is used in a question it indicates an unbelievable state, urging the addressee to elaborate. The English translation for the latter case is "how come" (Ikranagara, 1975:96). The particle *deh* in imperative sentences signals an instruction or a command, which the hearer has to obey.

Example of *ko'* (adapted from Ikranagara, 1975: 96)

```
3 ko' lu tao
  PRT you know
  (why) you know (I am surprised)
```

Example of *deh* (adapted from Ikranagara, 1975: 96)

```
4 iya deh
  yes deh
  yes (I urge to believe)
```

Ikranagara (1975) also elaborates on how these particles deal with politeness and to some extent the conversational principles as proposed by Grice (1975). The presence of particles in a conversation affect politeness, albeit indirectly. She states that a "statement, command, or question with no particles in *Betawi* are neither rude nor polite" (Ikranagara, 1975: 103). However, these particles give a clear indication of the relationship between interlocutors. The use of the particle *deh* in imperative sentences is much more appropriate in top-down relationships than in bottom-up relationships. This indicates that the speaker has more "power" or authority over the hearer.

Some uses of particles violate the conversational principles, to which all utterances should adhere. Accordingly, it should be clear that what the speaker says is not known to the hearer (Lakoff, 1972). The particle *kan*, for instance, violates these principles in that it shares a conjoint knowledge and establishes agreement, which is illustrated in the example adapted from Ikaranagara (1975: 99) below.

```
5 Ma'    buyung kan kerje disana
  Mother buyung PRT work  there
  Buyung's mother work there (you know that)
```

The particle *kan* is used by the speaker to seek agreement, not to convey the message. It is known to both hearer and speaker that *Buyung's mother works there*. This function is similar to that of English tag-questions.

To recapitulate Ikarangara's findings, pragmatic particles in *Betawi* express "speakers' feeling about proposition" (p. 106). Although these particles do not directly determine the degree of (im)politeness in Sundanese, speaker-hearer relationship can be understood from the specific choice of particles in the conversation. Analyzing pragmatic particles and the politeness system of a language is intriguing work and may lead to different conclusions across languages and cultures.

2.4. Pragmatic Particles in Sundanese: Yuniar, Sujatna, Heriyanto (2013)

Yuniar, Sujatna, & Heriyanto (2013) study the *Dongeng Kang Ibing*. Their paper is short and their analysis is concise, but they pay specific attention to Sundanese, the second largest local language after Javanese and spoken by approximately 35 million people (Ethnologue, 2015). It may lead and encourage other researchers to look at pragmatic particles in other local languages in Indonesia.

Yuniar et al. (2013) focus on the particles *téh, mah, da*, and *wé*. Their function is to help the hearer to understand the speaker's intended goal in the conversation. Moreover, they demonstrate that the particles *téh, mah, da*, and *wé* frequently indicate shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer. Moreover, these particles are favored as a "response signal" in interaction (Yuniar et al., 2013: 170), which is why they believe that ementioned particles fulfill a similar function in narratives and daily conversations.

Yuniar et al. (2013) argue that particles function overall as emphatic marker. Additionally, the particle *téh* can appear in post-verbal position to give emphatic meaning to the preceding verb. The particle *mah* can occur after a noun, which emphasizes the preceding noun. The particle *wé* can be used to index a following sequence and can be used to "introduce the next sequential of the story" (Yuniar et al., 2013: 172). This function is comparable to the particle *now* in Aijmer (2002).

2.5. Pragmatic Particles in Madurese

The study of pragmatic particles in the Madurese language is relatively new. Studies on Madurese have mostly focused on grammatical aspect (Davies, 2010) or its morphological and phonological feature (Stevens, 1968). Madurese discourse markers are discussed in Davies' (2010) book only in a very limited way. He notes that the particle *la* functions to mark perfective aspect.

La can sometimes also simultaneously mark past events, but not necessarily. It indicates past tense whenever it is used together with a past temporal adverb like *baari'*. The example below illustrates the particle la marking both perfective aspect and past tense.

6 Baba la mangkat ka Sorbâjâ baari'
Father PRT go to Surabaya yesterday
Father went to Surabaya yesterday

Davies (2010) also discusses the particle *mareh*, which can also mark past events. *La* and *mareh* often co-occur in one sentence, which emphasizes that the action is completed. The examples below illustrate the use of the particle *la* and *mareh*.

7 Andi la tedhung
Andi PRT sleep
Andi has slept

8 Andi mareh tedhung

Andi PRT sleep
Andi has slept

9 Andi la mareh tedhung
Andi PRT PRT sleep
Andi has slept

In all three sentences, the particle *la* and *mareh* precede the verb "*tedhung*" and give it "perfective" meaning. To some extent, those meanings may pragmatically be somewhat different. The utterance in (1) suggests that at the time of speaking, the speaker intends to say that Andi has already slept. It means that *Andi has just slept, and is still sleeping in the time of speaking*. The utterance in (2) is used to convey that Andi's action, in this case *sleeping*, has been completed. Andi may awake at the time of speaking, because the action of sleeping has completed (Andi is not sleeping anymore). Finally, the use of both particles in example (3) emphasizes that Andy has already completed the action (Irham & Rofiq, 2015: 11). It is important to note that *la* and *mareh* do not only have perfective meaning when they occur in pre- verbal position. They also carry this meaning in pre-causative position, as in (4) or in pre- reduplication of adjectives in combination with the causative marker *ma-*.

10 Andi la ma-labu ale'en
Andi PRT CAUSS. fall brother. POSS
Andi has made his brother fell

11 Andi la go-ma-jago ke kaka'en
Andi PRT RED. CAUSS. arrogant to brother.POSS
Andi has been arrogant to his brother (meaning has made an impolite act)

There has as of yet not been a study that specifically discusses pragmatic particles in Madurese. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, I would like to use the results from my internship on pragmatic particles in Madurese oral narratives.

I investigated the use of pragmatic particles in ten Madurese oral narrative videos. The materials were downloaded from the IOWA Digital Library collection on Madurese Oral Narratives. In each video, the speaker tells a Madurese legend, which discusses the origin of names of particular Madurese popular places, like *Bangkalan* (name of the region) or *Buju' cendana* (the name of a grave). The story mostly contains moral and historical values that reminds today's young Madurese of their ancestors. The data source is classified as monologue instead of dialogue or conversation, because there is only speaker in each recording. Nonetheless, analyzing pragmatic particles in a non-dialogic corpus remains becuase the genre of

the text may affect the distribution of the pragmatic particle and pragmatic function as well. There have been several studies on pragmatic particles in monologues, for instance Han (2011) in public speeches, and Gonzales (2004) and Norrick (2001) in Oral Narratives.

I employed Fraser's (1996, 1999, 2006) classification of pragmatic markers: elaborative markers such as *firstly*, contrastive markers such as *but*, temporal markers such as *at that moment*, inferential markers like *as a result*, assessment markers such as *I think*, difference markers[2] for instance the word *sir*, emphatic markers such as *indeed*, conversational management markers such as *well*, and other markers such as *frankly*, *you know*, or *certainly*. However, these categories do not all appear in the corpus. Additionally, I found "solidarity building" markers, such as the word *cong* "son" or *na'-kana'* "children" which are derived from the Madurese kinship concept. This marker is used to invite the audiences to listen to the story as if they were a member of the family, treating the audiences as if they were his (the story teller's) son.

Based on Fraser's categorization, I finally came up with six clusters of discourse markers; emphatic markers (*jâ', jeh, la*), elaborative markers (*aherra*), inferential markers (*daddi*), contrastive markers (*tape, namong*), temporal markers (*pas, laju, saellana*), and markers of solidarity building ([ka]*cong, kana'*) In the following table, the distribution of the pragmatic particles is summarised.

Table 2 The distribution of pragmatic particles in the corpus.

Category	Member	English Equivalent translation
Emphatic marker	*jâ'*	
	Jeh	
	La	
Elaborative marker	*aherra*	Finally
Inferential marker	*daddi*	So
Contrastive marker	*tape*	But

[2] Fraser (1996) defines difference markers signalling "a message separate from the basis message" (p. 190). He exemplifies the use of **Sir** and **Honor** in this category. It could best be labelled as addressing marker, since it addresses other speakers in the utterance.

	namong	However
Temporal marker	*pas*	Then
	laju	Then
	saellana	After that
Solidarity building	[ka]*cong*	Son
	kana'	son

This finding can be a stepping stone for future researchers who intend to delve into Madurese pragmatic particles. Particles are commonly used in daily conversations as well. Accordingly, I will discuss the particle *jâ'* in chapter 4, 5, 6, and 7 consecutively. This particle is chosen because of its polyfunctionality, making it an interesting particle to research. Chapter 3 will elaborate on the corpus and methods I employ in the present study.

2.6. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed and reviewed some related studies. The study of pragmatic particles is an interesting topic, especially in languages with a collectivistic culture like Indonesian. Without paying too much attention to their confounding term, I refer to pragmatic particle in my study as a small word that frequently has no lexical meaning, or the lexical meaning is hard to define, but it does play a pivotal role in understanding the utterance in the conversation.

The studies by Ikaranagara (1975), Wouk (1998, 1999, & 2001), and Yuniar et al. (2013) all regard them as a small unit of word, often monosyllabic, (*ko', deh, & sih* in Ikranagara [1975], *kan, ya/ya* in Wouk [1998, 1999, & 2001], and *téh*, *mah*, *da*, and *wé* in Yuniar et al. [2013]), that has no lexical meaning but has a pragmatic function in conversations. The first two studies employ a socio-pragmatic approach to investigate and understand the pragmatic function of the particles. Thus, the speaker-hearer relation is important.

Chapter 3
Corpus and Methods

This section will discuss the corpus of the present study and the method used to investigate the pragmatic function of the particle *jâ'*. The data include both audio and video recordings of Madurese oral narratives (monologues) and naturally speech.

3.1. The Materials and the Participants

The present study incorporates two types of corpora. The first is a monologue corpus retrieved from the IOWA Digital Library. The second is a corpus of natural speech, obtained by recording conversations. The former corpus consists of ten video-taped monologues in which three people of about 45-60 years old are involved. There is only one person who speaks in Madurese in each recording, so that it can be considered a monologue. All speakers are native speakers of Madurese and come from different regions. One person is from Sumenep, the eastern part of Madurese in which a dialect from this region is considered as the standard Madurese. The other two speakers are from Bangkalan.

The speakers tell several Madurese old story, for instance. on the origin of a place name, the mountain *pekol* or a story between *ko'ol* "Snail" and *kancel* ". In total, there are 14856 words and 47 hits of the particle *jâ'* in the corpus, as illustrated in table 1.

Table 3

No	Title	English translation	Speaker	Words	Total hits of the particle *jâ'/ jâ'reng*
1	Rato Islam ongghu'	The Islamic King Nods	Moh. Hasan Sasra	1568	8
2	Perreng Sojjinna Ke Raba	Bamboo skewer	Moh. Hasan Sasra	1468	3
3	Bato Teteanna Buju' Napo	The stone of *Buju' Napo*	Moh. Hasan Sasra	1365	3

4	Ko'ol ban Kancel	Snail and *kancel*	Zawawi Imron	1007	12
5	Asal Molana Gunong Pekol	The origin of the mountain *Pekol*	Zawawi Imron	1198	4
6	Susan Cendono	*Susan cendono*	Abdurrahman	1498	8
7	Ke' Taji	*Ke' Taji* (the name of a person)	Abdurrahman	1195	7
8	Bhângsa Cara, Raghâ Padmi	*Bhângsa Cara, Raghâ Padmi* (the name of a social class in the kingdom)	Moh. Hasan Sasra	1252	0
9	Radhin Saghârâ	Beautiful lake	Moh. Hasan Sasra	2647	0
10	Pangpang se kamantan	The Column that was Paraded Around	Moh. Hasan Sasra	1658	2
	Total			14856	47

The second data source is obtained from audio recordings of natural conversations. The conversations are in Madurese and there are four participants (Rai, Muz, Ati, and Muh, *pseudo names*) involved in the recordings. The participants are between 10-24 years old. All of the participants are native speakers of Madurese and reside in Madura Island. Some speakers of East Java Island also speak Madurese, even though they are not living in Madurese Island. The participants were not informed of the recordings, except Rai, who was asked to do the recordings. Thus, the other participants were not aware that their talks were recorded.

The topics of their conversations varied from education and daily life in boarding school to personal experiences that they shared voluntarily. There were no instructions and Rai was aware that data on Madurese would be collected for the purpose of this theis. The recordings were made between January and February 2015. The recordings are exhaustive, as the participants did not all live in the place, which made recording on an everyday basis difficult.They were only able to record their speech when they met each other in their spare time. Unfortunately, it was not possible for me to record data myself, which forces me to rely on the

quality of the recorded materials when studying the distribution and meaning of the particle *jâ'* and its variants.

Below is the data sample from the audio-recorded conversations.

Table 4

No	Recording code	Duration
1	Rec 1	00:03:52
2	Rec 2	00:04:10
3	Rec 3	00:09:47
4	Rec 4	00:08:50
5	Rec 5	00:04:31
6	Rec 6	00:10:53
7	Rec 7	00:01:31
8	Rec 8	00:02:09
9	Rec 9	00:04:38
10	Rec 10	00:07:48
11	Rec 11	00:05:57
12	Rec 12	00:00:35

Because of time restrictions, the data from audio-recorded conversations were not all transcribed and glossed. The transcription is only given in cases in which the particle *jâ'* appears. There are 17 instances of the particle *jâ'* in one hour and 61 seconds of conversations in total. Thus, the coding and the analysis are based on these instances.

3.2. Coding and Analysis

Since there are not in the English language, the data were excerpted by using the annotation software ELAN (Wittenburg et al., 2006), glossed by means of the Leipzig Glossing Rules, and translated into English, as is illustrated in the given example. The transcription, in conversation analytic style (Jefferson, 2004), is also used for data description and helps the reader to understand the flow of the data display.

```
1 Muz       Jâ'? engkok lo' parlo deiye-na      mbak
            PRT  I      not need  like this-DEF sister (Rai)
            I don't need this sister (Rai)

2           Terro tao perjuangan-na (al Fikri) jiah kayak apa ((laugh))
            Want  know effort-DEF    al Fikri  that like  what
            I want to know how al Fikri struggles (laugh)
```

The analysis will comprise a qualitative description of the recordings and earlier mentioned data sources, focusing specific on the occurrence of the particle *jâ'*. The recordings were first converted into mp3 format and were then entered into ELAN, so that the data could be transcribed and glossed. Next, all instances of *jâ'* were retrieved from the corpus. They were annotated for syntactic position (sentence-initial, medial or final) and occurrence on the sequence. This was followed by an observation of the environment in which the particles appeared. The final step included a survey which tested some variants of *jâ'* to see how they function and are used by Madurese speakers. This can give insight into how the particle is being used and understood by native speakers.

In the following chapter, I will discuss the syntactic position of the particle *jâ'* in the corpus, which will be the starting point of the remainder of this thesis. It covers the position in the sequence and the turn in the interaction, the collocation with other word classes, and the type of sentences the particle *jâ'* appears in.

Chapter 4
The distribution of the particle *jâ's* position in the corpus

The present chapter will discuss the distribution of the particle *jâ'* and its other variants. It covers the environment of the particle in the sentence, its position in the sequence and the turn, and also the sentence types it appears in. It will also briefly discuss the collocations in which the particle occurs.

The position of a particle within the utterance is a clear indication of its function. It is also a helpful tool to understand the organization of the particle in the corpus and the underlying communicative meaning it carries out. This is in line with Conversation Analysis theory, which stipulates that the sequence of interaction and, to some extent, the turn, can elucidate how a particular pragmatic particle is used and understood in the conversation (cf. Heritage, 1984, 2002, 2013; Kendrick & Torreira, 2014; Escandell-Vidal, 2012; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Needless to say, the kinds of actions that are embedded in the particle's function can also be interpreted differently depending on the context in which they appear. For instance, the particle "oh" in closing position (sequence) can be understood as acknowledgement (Heritage, 2013), while it functions as agreement marker in the second position of the interaction.

Contextual position, either of the sequential position of the social action or the turn system, or syntactic position of a pragmatic particle is deemed to be one of fundamental cue to understand its potential meaning (cf. Wouk, 1998, 1999, & 2001; Ikranagara, 1975; Aijmer, 2013). Wouk (1999) for instance, solicits that the particle *ya* can appear in sentence-initial, sentence-medial, and sentence-final position. Thus, she observes how the particle is used in all positions by Indonesian speakers. This sheds light on the general pattern and function of the particle in the interaction. *Well* is used similarly (Innes, 2010; Schourup, 2001). It mostly appears in initial position and can serve different purposes, for example, for agreeing, repairing, or for hedging (Aijmer, 2013; Fischer, 2006).

This chapter aims at discussing the distribution of the particle *jâ'* in the following contexts: its position in the sequence of the interaction, its position in turns, and its distribution across sentence type. The co-occurrence with other particles will also be discussed, in order to give insight into its use in Madurese conversations.

4.1. The Sequence of *jâ'* in the Interactions

The observation of *jâ'* in relation to its position in the sequence of the interaction is based on the dialogue data. The monologue corpus does not fit this framework, because the conversational analysis framework focuses specifically on data from conversations.

A sequence consists has three positions: first position (initiating the sequence), second position (response to the sequence), and third position (closing the sequence) (Schegloff, 2007; Heritage, 2013; Levinson, 1983; Sidnell, 2010). In the analysis of the particle "oh", Schegloff (2007) and Heritage (2013) show that this particle appears in all three positions and that each position has a range of functions, which supports the claim that position is important in the interpretation of the particle.

The particle *jâ'* behaves differently from the the particle "oh" (in Schegloff, 2007; Heritage, 2002, 2013) or to the particle *ya* (in Wouk, 1999 & 2001). The latter two particles can appear in all positions. In contrast, the particle *jâ'* only appears in the first and the second position. In the first position, the particle *jâ'* is used to open the sequence, initiate the talk, or begin the story. In the following excerpt (excerpt 1), Muz initiates her conversation by telling a story about her roommate. She uses the particle *jâ'* (Iine 1) in the first position as a first pair part that invites a second pair part (line 4-5) from the hearer.

Excerpt 1

```
1  Muz      Jâ' tang kamar saintek mbak.
            PRT my   room  saintek sister
            My roommate sister (Ati)

2           aduh cek ngellonah    ro deiyeh
            HRT  FP  complain-DEF FP that
            Complain (indeed about the price)

3           "adu mbak   gimana aku gimana mbak()"
             HRT sister how    I   how sister
             How I am sister

4  Ati      Engkok ngejjid   pertamanah mak cek benyakeng.
            I      surprised first-DEF  FP  FP  many-DEF
            I also surprised at first why so expensive

5           kan engkok andik datanah  Kabbih joh?
            P   I      have  data-DEF all   FP
            I have all the data
```

Prior to this conversation, Muz and Ati talked about their tuition fees. The tuition fee differs across departments and the student's academic background. Muz, who studies in the department of education, feels pity for her roommate studying in the department of science and technology because of the high amount of money that should be paid. Muz produces an utterance to open the sequence. The presence of the particle *jâ'* in the first position of the interaction (line 1) can be understood as the speaker's initiative to tell the story about her roommate (line 2-3).

This adjacency pair[3] might be represented as *inform-acknowledge*. The first pair part includes information. Muz informs the hearer (Ati) that Muz' roommate complained about the high tuition fee. This invites the next speaker to produce an adjacency pair of acknowledgement of the given information. Ati responds to the previous information in the form of an assertion (line 4). This assertion is clear from the given evaluation of the tuition and the use of the adjective *"ngejjid"* – surprised (Kendrick, 2015- *personal communication*). As such, Ati's response complied to a conversationally communicative obligation, which allows the interaction to continue (Schegloff, 2007; Garcia, 2013; Kendrick, 2013).

The particle *jâ'* in the first position of the interaction can also be regarded as a *question-answer* pair. The particle *jâ'* is used before a question particle, like *arapah*-why, which invites the hearer to respond with an answer. In the following example, the question with *jâ'* occurs in (line 7) after a short pause (0.2 ms, in line 6).

Excerpt 2

```
1  Muz      Engkok deremmah se  nitibeh (.) spp
            I      how      REL entrust     tuition fee
            How should I entrust (.) tuition fee,

2           Ce' lo' parcaja-na (hh) ((laugh)) ka nak~kanak
            FP  not believe-DEF               to RED-child
            I don't believe in (hh) ((laugh)) students

3           (0.1)

4  Ati      Engkok gitak majer, [majer bileh] gitak taoh
            I      yet   pay     pay   when   yet   know
            I (have) not paid, I don't know when to pay

5  Muz                          [Iyeh mbak] padeh mbak
```

[3] Several scholars have defined adjacency pairs as an exchange of two turns that are produced by two different speakers and are functionally related. The first turn, known as first pair parts, initiates second pair parts as a response (Levinson, 1983; Schegloff, 2007; Garcia, 2013) or, for instance, an offer, as the first pair parts invite an acceptance/refusal from the recipient in the second pair parts.

```
                                Yes sister same  sister
                                Yes me too sister (Ati)
6           (0.2)

7  Muz      Jâ' saintek       jeh arapah ye mbak   ye=
            PRT sci. and tech FP  why    P sister  P
            What does happen to science and technology department student?

8  Ati      =Mateh saintek        dujutah   pa'ratos
             Die   sci. and tech. two mill. four hundreds
            Science and technology is two million and four

9           tello [polo]
            three  ten
            hundreds thirty

10 Muz            [Aduuuh pa'ratos]
                   HRT    four hundreds
                   Four hundreds

11  Ati     .hh ((laugh)) engkok engkok pa ngejjit (.)
                          I      I      TM surprised
            .hh ((laugh)I I am then surprised

12          duh mak cek benya'(hh)eng ye ((laugh))
            HRT FP  FP  many-DEF      P
            why it is too much ((laugh))

13          cak-en  engkok hhh ((laugh))
            say-DEF I
            I say hhh (laugh)
```

After a short silence, Muz continues, because no one else does. She initiates another first adjacency pair and produces a question (line 7). This is the first pair part and invites a second pair part from the hearer. *Jâ'* occurs first position in the sense that it is produced after a short gap and it occurs in an interrogative sentence that calls for a response. The second pair part is necessary, because Muz expects an answer, which is reflected in the use of *jâ'* with the question particle *arapah*-why.

The two examples above clearly illustrate that *jâ'* can appear in the first position of a sequence and function as *inform-acknowledge* or *question-answer*. In the *inform-acknowledge* adjacency pair, *jâ'* is used by the speaker to give the information that invites the hearer to acknowledge and assess it. The use of *jâ'* before a question particle focuses attention on the question itself in the *question-answer* adjacency type.

The particle *jâ'* can also appear as a response in the second position. *Jâ'* seems to provide detailed information in this case, unlike the particle *ya,* which marks agreement when it appears in second position (Wouk, 1999). In the example below, Rai asks the hearers whether the department of science and technology has a subsidy policy. As such, the question produced by Rai invites the next speaker to produce a second pair part in the form of an answer (a *question-answer pair*) (Levinson, 1983). Thus, Muz responds (line 2) to Rai's question (line 1) to comply to the social obligation in the interaction, so that the conversation flows smoothly.

Excerpt 3

```
1  Rai      ade'    UKT se  pa'ratos      ruah?
            Nothing UKT REL four hundreds FP
            Is there no UKT[4] that is four hundreds?

2  Muz      Jâ'reng b[enya' praktegeh      mbak] PRT
                    many    practice-DEF   sister
            Many (laboratory) practices sister (Rai)

3 Ati                [se  pa'ratos jeh  olleh diddi'  sapah yeh pole
                      REL four hundreds FP get little who  P   again
                     (that who get four hundreds) only little

4           keng lakar  lok lok apa () ongghu mbak
            FP   really not not what   really sister
            Really sister (.) (Rai)
```

The example above clearly shows that Muz is answering Rai and uses *jâ'* deliberately.

There are a number of studies on particles in second position. For instance, the particle *ya* is used as agreement marker or as continuer (Wouk, 1999). The particle "oh" functions similarly to *ya* in *bahasa Indonesia* and indicates acknowledgement (Schegloff, 2007; Heritage, 1984, 1998, 2002, & 2013). The particle "well" is frequently used by the speaker to signal a dispreferred response (Levinson, 1983; Lam, 2006; Heritage 2002). The particle *jâ'* in the present corpus does not perform any of the mentioned functions. The particle is prefaces-information giving when it is used in a response. Not the particle *jâ'* or its variant *jâ'reng* can stand alone as a response (the particle *ya* or *oh* can stand alone to function as an answer, see Wouk (1999) and Heritage [1984, 2013] for more detail). The particle *jâ'* is a prefaces-particle, like "well", but does not introduce a dispreferred response.

[4] *Uang Kuliah Tunggal*, the tuition fee policy where students get subsidy from the university, so that they only pay four hundreds rupiah instead of 2 million something rupiahs.

4.2. The Sentential Position of *jâ'* in the Corpus

Sentential positin is not restricted to the grammatical category or syntactic position of *jâ'*. This notion is expanded to the position of the particle in the turn taking system, which is more appropriate for the data used in this study. The term sentential position is used to make observation of the position of the particle in the corpus easier. It is also a helpful term for researchers who work with written data. The terms sentential position and turn position are interchangeably without any specific propensity to a particular theoretical basis.

The pragmatic function of particles is often, if not always, determined by their position within an utterance. The particle *kan* has different functions in different positions (Wouk, 1998). The particle *kan* in turn-final position is regarded as an invitation for agreement, while, the use of *kan* in turn-initial position frequently evokes the speaker's opinion. *You know* in turn-initial position is used similarly, in that it denotes speakers uncertainty (Holmes, 1986). On the other hand, *you know* in turn-final position can function as a "floor-yielding-device" (Östman, 1981, as cited in Holmes, 1986: 6).

Jâ' in the present study can be used in sentence-initial position and sentence-middle position, but not in sentence-final position. The evidence from the monologue data shows that 66% (29 hits) of the occurrences is sentence-initial, while 34% (15 hits) is sentence-middle position. Surprisingly, all occurrences in the dialogue data set are in sentence-initial position. The difference might be caused by differences in genre. However, *jâ'* and its variants (*jâ'reng/ jâ'rengan*) do not occur in sentence-final position in the corpora.

Out of 29 sentence-initial occurrences, 6 are in post-initial position. The particle *jâ'* can be used after second person "*ba'na*" to specify the recipient in an imperative sentence. Accordingly, contrastive markers, like "*tape* or *keng*," are sometimes used preceding the particle *jâ'* in negative-imperative constructions. To illustrate, the examples of *jâ'* in already mentioned positions are given below.

Excerpt 4

```
1     Aaa, ba'na ja' takabbur kancel ba'na ja' ojup
      HRT  you   PRT arrogant kancel you   PRT arrogant
      Don't be arrogant kancel, don't be arrogant!
```

The excerpt above is part of a story teller's utterance who is retelling a conversation between a snail and *kancel*. The snail is talking to *kancel* and reminding him not to be arrogant, by using the negative imperative particle *jâ'* preceded by the second person pronoun "*ba'na*". The second

person pronoun is optional in imperative sentences, but the data show that speakers often include it in their utterances. The use of the second person pronoun increases the number of possible positions of *jâ'*.

Contrastive markers also appear frequently before *jâ'*. The Madurese contrastive particle *tape*-but can appear before the particle *jâ'* and signals contradiction. Excert 5 illustrates the use of *jâ'* in post-initial position. The excerpt is a retold dialogue between a king and a prince. The king cannot accept the fact that his prince converted to the new religion, which the prince intents to spread through society. The prince asks the king permission to do so and after a long debate, the king allows the prince to tell the society about the new religion.

Excerpt 5

```
1     Bageno, tang anak  Pratanu  marah engkok la  sroju'
      Bageno, my   child Pratanu  HRT   I      PFV agree
      Bageno and my child Pratanu I already agree

2     engkok la  sroju'mun tang rakyat  reya
      I      PFV agree if  my   society this
      I already agree if my society

3     maso'   agama    anyar, tape ja' paksa
      convert religion new    CM   PRT force
      convert to the new religion but don't force (them)
```

The particle *jâ'* in line 3 is in an imperative sentence that is preceded by the contrastive particle *tape*, creating a condition. Thus, the sentences above suggests that the king agrees with the prince's proposition, but under one condition: that he does not force the religion unto the people.

There is one use of *jâ'* in the dialogue materials that is not found in the monologue corpus. The speaker uses the particle *jâ'* after the perfective marker "*la*" (line 5).

Excerpt 6

```
1  Rai      rapien Muhammmad enjek rapien
            Neat   Muhammad  not   neat
            Muhammad likes neat

2  Rai      Anu (.) cak-en  cak-en  mama=
            FIL   Say-DEF say-DEF mother
            Mother (.) says says

3  Muz      =ja' engko' la pasra   ruah
            PRT I      PM give up FP
            I already give up

4           La ce' pasranah    ruah polana  e-kabennyain
```

```
            PM FP  give up-DEF FP   because OV-CAUSS-together
            Very give up because it is done together

5           Laguna    Muna se  anuh la  ja'iyah rapa
            Sometimes Muna REL FIL  PFV PRT     why
            Sometimes Muna does it so I ignore it

6           Cak-en  engkok ((laugh))
            Say-DEF I
            I say (laugh)
```

In this excerpt, Rai and Muz talk about their younger brother and sister and the chores they have to do. Rai says that her younger brother likes to be neat and tidy (line 1-2). Muz gives asserts this in line 3-6. She does not always do her chores, because her younger sister Muna has already done them (line 5). She uses the particle *jâ'* (*iyah*) preceded by the perfective marker *la* to indicate this.

The sentence "*la ja'iyah rapa cak-en engkok"* is considered a subclause of the main clause "*laguna muna se anuh*". "*Laguna muna se anuh*" has canonical sentence construction, because it contains the subject *muna* and the non-verbal predicate *se anuh*, so *jâ'* (*iyah*) can be argued to occur in post-initial position.

Unlike *jâ'* in post temporal adverb position, the perfective marker "*la*" does not complete the act. It does not indicate that the speaker has indeed completely done the chores. Instead, it emphasises the speaker's hesitation to help the family with their chores. The translation of *la jâ'* (*iyah*) is "(Then) I don't care". Line 5 can thus be understood as *(Then) I don't care (about the chores) because sometimes Muna helps the family to do the chores.*

This leads to the suggestion that *jâ'* can also appear after temporal adverbs that denote the relation of a particular illocutionary act. Thus, the particle has a pragmatic implication that is bound to the time of speaking and the context. For example, in the case of imperative warnings, a temporal adverb like *lagghuk*-tomorrow in "*lagghuk ja' entar ka sakolah*" – "don't go to school tomorrow"- can be used before *jâ'* to indicate that the speaker does not want the hearer to do something tomorrow. This is quite common in other languages, such as in Indonesian, Javanese, and English (Hopper, 1999; Ewing, 2005; Davies, 2005 & 2010).

The following section will discuss the particle *jâ'* in relation to the type of sentences. Each sentence carries out a particular illocutionary act or pragmatic function (Akmajian, 1984). For instance, interrogative sentences indicate questions. I will examine how the particle *jâ'*

behaves in declarative, interrogative, and imperative sentences and the pragmatic functions it has.

4.3 Particle *jâ'* and Sentence Types

Jâ' can appear in various sentence types, such declarative, interrogative, or imperative sentences. The dialogue data show that in fourteen out of seventeen hits, the particle *jâ'* occurs in a declarative sentence. It occurs two times in interrogative sentences, and only once negative imperative sentence. On the other hand, there are no instances of *jâ'* in interrogative sentences in the monologue corpus. There are 26 (59%) examples of the particle appear in declarative sentences and 18 (41%) in imperative sentences (41%).

For the sake of understanding only the dialogue data will be discussed, but examples from the monologue corpus will be presented as well. Excerpt 7 is an example of the use of *jâ'* used in a declarative sentence (line 14).

Excerpt 7

1	Muz	Mba::k Sister (Muz is calling)sister (Rai)
2		(o.3)
3	Ati	Mbak mun filem laen-na bedeh. Sister if film other-DEF exist Do you have another film
4	Muz	Enje' engko' terro nenguk-a lima menara No I want watch-IRR five towers No, I want to watch Lima Menara film
5		(0.9)
6	Ati	Cak-en embak filem jadul ((laugh)) Say-DEF sister film old Sister (Rai) says it is an old film(laugh)
7	Muz	=Engkok (kang-lakang) e kamar dhibik ((laugh)) I stay at room alone I stay at room alone (laugh)
8	Ati	Lima menara engkok lo' lebur Five towers I not like I don't like Lima Menara(name of film)
9		(0.2)

```
10  Muz     To-fo[to]
            Pictures
            pictures ((Muz talks to herself while)

11  Rai          [Ejeb] filem la   lambe' [ro jiah]
                  Long  film  PM   old     FP that
                  That has been an old film

12 Muz                                    [apah novella ro]
                                           What novel   FP
                                           The novel
13          (0.2)

14 Muz      Jâ'? engkok lo' parlo deiye-na      mbak
            PRT  I      not need  like this-DEF sister (Rai)
            I don't need this sister (Rai)

15          Terro tao perjuangan-na (al Fikri) jiah kayak apa ((laugh))
            Want  know effort-DEF    al Fikri  that like  what
            I want to know how al Fikri struggles (laugh)
```

In line 14, Muz says that she does not want to watch a movie simply for its title, even though it is an old movie. She also says that she really wants to know about the struggle of Al Fikri in the movie. The declarative sentence with *jâ'* argues why Muz wants to watch a movie. The preceding lines (4, 6, 8, and 11) illustrate that both Rai and Ati argue that *Lima Menara* is an old movie and even Ati herself does not like this movie (line 8). Muz then tells them she still intends to watch the movie, because she likes Al Fikri's struggle.

The declarative sentence is the most common type of sentence in most languages. It has the illocutionary act of giving a fact or argument such, as is exemplified in excerpt 7, line 14. Madurese speakers tend to use *jâ'* in declarative sentences as a starting point for an assertion or evaluation, as in excerpt 8.

Excerpt 8

```
1  Rai      Bik baba  eanuh (.)  e-kocak,
            By father OV-FIL     OV-say
            Father (.) says

2           "Jâ' engkok ghik  mampu  keng anuh,
             PRT I      still able   FP   anu
             I am still capable (of funding your study)

3           lok ngargein engkok se  alako[h
```

not respect I REL work
(but) you do not respect me

4 Muz [tang perjuangan]
My effort
My effort

5 Rai iyeh ((laugh))
Yes
Yes(laugh)

6 (0.4)

7 Muz Jâ' keng neser mbak () Jâ' neser mbak
PRT FP pity sister PRT pity sister
(I) Fell pity sister (Rai), feel pity sister

(0.7)

8 Rai Gik bennyak beasiswa de'
still many scholarship sister
There are still many scholarships

In this excerpt, Rai tells Muz about her experience of applying for a scholarship within the *economically disadvantaged family* category. Her father knows this and is angry at her, because Rai's decision to apply for the scholarship without her father's permission is regarded as impolite. Muz has had the same experience with applying for the scholarship, but Muz did not tell her father. Muz says that she applied for the scholarship, because she feels pity for her family (line 7), using the particle *jâ'* in sentence-initial position. *Jâ'* functions as a prefacing evaluation, which enables the speaker to emphasize her statement (reference). The example above can thus be understood as (the reason I applied for the scholarship is because) *indeed I feel pity for my family, sister).*

This use appear very frequently in the monologue corpus. The storytellers frequently use the particle to evaluate or emphasize the statement. The narrator in the excerpt below (excerpt 9) tells the story of a king who wants a *kerres* (*gaman*)-a traditional weapon. *Ke Taji*, the person who is responsible for making the weapon, has finished making it and gives it to the king. However, the *kerres* (*gaman*) is below the king's expectations and not fit for a king. This is emphasized and evaluated by the narrator in line 4 with the use of *jâ'*.

Excerpt 9

1 Dhateng jeh ke'Taji dha'kassa
Come FP Ke'Taji to there

Ke'Taji come to the King's place

2 Nyemba dha'rato pas nyongkem
Salute to king TM salute
Then he salutes the king

3 Pas ngator-agi gaman gelle' dha' rato
TM give-AGI gaman that to King
Then he gives the *gaman* to the king

4 Ja' rato e-berri'gaman ba'-jhubek
PRT king OV-give gaman RED-bad
The king indeed was given such a bad *gaman*

5 Sala gaman-na jiya ne'-enne EM
gaman-DEF that RED-small
Moreover, the *gaman* is very small

J*â'* in line 4 is used by the storyteller to convey to the audience that the *gaman* that Ke'Taji made is not fit for a king. According to the narrator, the king should have been given a better *gaman*, one that is bigger and more powerful.

Jâ' is predominantly used in imperative form in the monologue corpus. Imperative sentences are often associated with an order, request, command, warning, advice, or prohibition (Austin, 1962; Levinson, 1983) depending on the context. These illocutionary acts are also performed by particles. Thus, sentence-initial *jâ'* is often understood as a warning, advice, suggestion, or prohibition.

The monologue data is based on old Madurese stories which cover legends and the origin of place names. The narrators try to convey moral values and to some extent advice to the listeners. Imperative sentences are an effective tool to do so. The storyteller emphasises advice or prohibition by using the particle *jâ'* at the start of an imperative sentence. Below is an example of an imperative sentence with *jâ'*.

Excerpt 10

1 ya tanto-na areya careta reya maksodda
Yes certain-DEF this story this mean-DEF
Yes of course this stosy means

2 daddi pang-ajar-an dha'aba'na
TM NOM-teach to 2.SG
Become a lesson for you

3 mon ghi'nak-kana' ja' duli a-kabin ye
If FP RED-child PRT soon AV-marry P
Don't (soon) get married if you are still young

The excerpt above was said after the narrator told a story about a young man who got married at an early age. In The young man wanted to marry the princess, but failed to do so, because the princess does not like him and he gets frustrated. This is why the storyteller reminds the listeners not to marry at an early age (line 3), by using an imperiative sentence with *jâ'* in initial position.

The particle *jâ'* in the example above tells the listeners not to do something and so provokes a prohibitive meaning (van der Auwera, 2010) or advice. The English translation of *jâ'* in this sense is "do not," because it indicates prohibition.

This use is also found in the dialogue material. It reflects the idea that the particle is commonly used in interactions with a comparable pragmatic meaning as in monologues. The excerpt below is from a conversation between Ati, Muz, and Rai, who talk about a young lecturer in their university. Ati says that the lecturer gives lower grades more easily. Muz responds (line 9) to Ati's assertion (line 3-5) by saying that the he should not be hestitant to give good grades, because he will be teased if he is.

Excerpt 11

1	Atik	Ghik ngudeh dosena lok andik binih ((laugh))
		FP young lecturer-DEF not have wife
		The lecturer is still young and doesn't have wife (laugh)
2	Rai	Lok a-daftar-a yeh? ((laugh)) .hhh
		Not AV-register-a P
		you want to register (as wife) Don't you (laugh) .hhh
3	Atik	.hh((laugh)) (.) mun dosen
		FP lecturer
		.hh (laugh) (.) If the lecturer
4		Lok andik binih deiyeh lakarra mbak
		Non have wife FP really-DEF sister (Rai)
		Don't have wife indeed sister (Rai)
5		Cerre' nilai cak-en nak~kanak .hh ((laugh))
		Stingy grade say-DEF RED-Child
		My friends said the lecturer is stingy in giving grade (laugh)
6		(0.1)
7	Rai	hem
		Hem
		Heem (yes)
8		(0.3)
9	Muz	ja' re'~cerre' terro e-rayu kuah

```
PRT RED-stingy want  OV-tease FP
(say to the him) Don't be stingy otherwise he will be teased
```

In line 9, *jâ'* is used in an imperative sentence in a similar way as in the monologue data (excerpt 10, line 3). This means that this pragmatic function is not restricted to monologues, but is also used in interactions.

4.4. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the distribution of the particle *jâ'* in both corpora. Its position in interactions and turns, as well as the sentence type are important cues for unconvering the pragmatic meaning. The findings from the present study show that the particle *jâ'* has different functions in different positions.

The particle "oh" can appear in all three position in a sentence (Schegloff, 2007; Heritage, 1984, 2013), but *jâ'* can only occur in first and second position. In the former position, it is used a) to begin a story and b) to preface an interrogative sentence that, in the present corpus, often occurs together with question particles. In the latter position, it functions as a response.

J*â'* can appear in sentence-initial and sentence-middle position, but not in sentence-final position. The data from the present study demonstrate that *jâ'* is predominantly used in sentence-initial position. There is not enough data to explain why this particle cannot appear in sentence-final position. In contrast, the similar monosyllabic Indonesian particle *ya/kan* can be used all positions. The particle *kan* is derived from the Indonesian negative marker *bukan* (Wouk, 1998; Englebretson, 2003). It is also suggested that the particle *jâ'* developed similarly from the Madurese disclaimer/negative marker *enja'* (Pawitra, 2009). The incapability of *jâ'* to appear in sentence-final position is a unique and interesting feature. Therefore, it cannot be compared to particles like *ya/kan*.

The particle *jâ'* can be used in declarative, imperative, or interrogative sentences. It is used for different illocutionary acts. For instance, *jâ'* in imperative sentences indicates warning, prohibition. advice, and so on. The function can be derived from the context and the speaker- hearer relationship.

Chapter 5
The Particle *jâ'* in Oral Narrative Corpus

5.1. Negative imperative particles

Jâ' is used predominantly in negative imperative construction (15 out of 47 occurrences). This might be influenced by the genre of the text (oral narrative), as it tends to include suggestion, advice, or warning. The narrator is an old person and has the didactic responsibility to convey moral values to Madurese listeners. This is reflected in the themes of the stories: Madurese legend, the origin of the place in Madurese, the kingdom, etc.

Before discussing the negative imperative discussion, it is necessary to give an overview of how it is used. Its formal grammatical form is derived from the root of the verb or the bare verb, such as *tedhung* (sleep), *kala'* (take), *or maso'* (enter). Takahashi (2012) has argued that the meaning of an imperative is rather ambiguous and is not associated with one particular illocutionary act per se. An imperative sentence as "Don't come!" can be interpreted as a prohibition, a command, an order, an advice, or a request, depending on the context of the occurrence. This is also the case in Madurese, as the example below illustrates.

a) Tedhung!
   Sleep!
   Sleep! (imperative)

This might be understood as an order when a parent says this to his children. It can also be interpreted as advice if the speaker thinks that "sleeping" can prevent unexpected things.

There have not been many studies that discuss the Madurese negative imperative. However, the existing studies seem adequate to answer the question. In English, the negator *not* is used to negate a statement (before the adjective, adverb, noun or verb). This also happens in Madurese, where the negators *ta'* and *lo'* are used to negate an adjective or verb and *banne* to negate a noun. *Lo'* is most appropriate used to appear with the verb *tedhung*-sleep to create the proposition "*not sleep*". However, this sentence is not understood as a prohibition, or ay other meaning that an imperative usually has. Therefore, the negative imperative is not constructed by attaching the negative marker to the verb, adjective, or noun.

Languages like Madurese, as well as English, Javanese, and *bahasa Indonesia*, require a particular particle, and to some extent an auxiliary like *don't*, to construct an imperative. B*ahasa*

Indonesia uses the negative imperative particle *jangan*, Javanese uses *ojo'* and Madurese emplys the particle *jâ'* (and its variants) in sentence-initial position to create an imperative

Given that in Madurese a negative imperative is formed by placing the particle *jâ'* at the beginning of the sentence, the (imperative) example above can be constructed as follows: *jâ' tedhung!*, but we need the context to understand the pragmatic meaning. This is how I would like to elaborate procedural meaning (Sperber & Wilson, 2001) of the negative imperative particle *jâ'* throughout the study.

The present data demonstrate that most of the negative imperatives are used with a null pronoun. Only two out of fifteen have an overt second person pronoun, "*ba'na*"-, which precedes the negative particle *jâ'.*

Excerpt 12

```
1  A    raja-na ba'na gun para' padha-na tang soko
        big-DEF you   FP  like  same-DEF my   foot
        you  are only as big as my foot

2       mala-a    kene-an   ban  tang soko pas  a-jhalan
        more-DEF  small-DEF than my   foot when AV-walk
        even smaller than my foot when you are walking

3       du  bileh se  depa-a     ba'na?
        EXCL when  REL arrive-IRR you
        When will you arrive?

4  B    ba'na ja' takabur, Kancel. Ba'na ja'  ojup.    ja' sombong Kancel
        you   PRT arrogant kancel. you   PRT  arrogant PRT arrogant Kancel
        Don't be arrogant kancel, don't be arrogant, don't be arrogant!
```

The excerpt above is from a conversation between the *snail* and *Ko'ol*. The snail is mocking *ko'ol* for his small body. The snail said that *Ko'ol* is just as small as his foot, so that *Ko'ol* has to walk very slowly. Ko'ol's abilities are underestimated and so he responds that the snail should not insult him. In line 4, *Ko'ol* repeatedly uses an imperative sentence. Thus, the use of the negative imperative particle *jâ'* can be interpreted as an advice or suggestion, because there is no difference in social status. A difference in authority might have led to a command. The overt pronoun "you" also appears twice, which seems to emphasise that *Ko'ol* does not want the snail to be arrogant.

As has been noted earlier, most of the negative imperative forms are formed with a null pronoun. This finding is in line with Davies' (2010) observation that Madurese imperatives frequently occur without an overt subject. *Jâ'* following is very important in construction the

illocutionary act of a negative imperative sentence. Combined with the following word, it helps to establish pragmatic meaning. Thus, in the above example, the *jâ'* serves an advising purpose. On the other hand, it is the word "arrogant"-*takabbur, ojub, sombong*- that leads to the interpretation that what is being advised to the snail is not to be an arrogant person.

There does not necessarily have to be an overt subject to evoke the same meaning. The following excerpt is from a conversation in which the king order his governor to not force society.

Excerpt 13

```
1  A   Mun se  ta' gellem maso' agama    anyar jiah
       If  REL not want   enter religion new   this
       If they don't want to convert to this new religion

2      lo' olle  paksa jâ' paksa.
       not allow force PRT force.
       not allowed to force, don't force!
```

In line 2, the prohibition can be understood as an order, because the speaker, the king in this case, has more authority than the listener. There is a strong degree of commitment to prohibit and to command the governor not to exercise force on society.

This excerpt illustrates two types of negative imperative sentences. The first form is by employing a negative marker *lo'* to the root verb "allow". The second is formed by using the particle *jâ'.* Both forms are acceptable in Madurese. However, there is a slightly difference in interpretation. The former is best understood as a "soft" prohibition, because the speaker tries not to threaten the listener. The latter, on the other hand, indicates a "hard" prohibition, a direct order that should immediately be obeyed by the listener. Madurese speakers often use the former type to show respect.

The imperative is used to urge immediate action. The speaker expects the hearer to respond promptly. The audience is not expected to refuse a prohibition. Therefore, use of *jâ'* in line 2 can be interpreted to rule out negotiation or rejection. *Lo' olle* is weak in terms of "force" and is susceptible to negotiation.

In addition, a negative imperative sentence can also be interpreted as advice when it is used by a socially more powerful interlocutor. In the following example, the narrator attempts to teach the hearers a lesson. The narrator in this case has more authority.

Excerpt 14

```
1  A   melana    jâ' sampe' dhan-badhan dha' oreng  bhaba-an
       therefore PRT until  RED-bad     to   person down-NOM
       Therefore, don't underestimate a  little person!
```

The narrator is about to finish the story. He tells the listener that he should not insult, underestimate, or disrespect a person that seems weak. Prior to this, the narrator tells the story of *ke' taji*, a villager who finally became famous, because he pleased the king by making a good weapon and as a result saw his life considerably changed. For this reason, the narrator advises the listeners not to behave badly to other people. The negative imperative particle *jâ'* evokes a prohibition that functions pracmatically as an advice.

The negative imperative particle is normally followed by the verb (extract 13), but a reduplicated form of an adjective also frequently follows the particle (extract 14) and adjective. The present corpus included the following examples: *paksa* (verb), *nepo* (verb), *takabbur* (adj), *ojup* (adj), *sombong* (adj), *bong-sombong* (Reduplicated form), *dhan-badhan* ((Reduplicated form).

To sum up, *jâ'* in negative imperative sentences can be understood as a prohibition in which the illocutionary acts are determined by the context. It can be followed by a verb, an adjective, or a reduplicated form of an adjective.

5.2. Explanatory particles

The particle *jâ'* and its variants *jâ'reng/jâ'rengan* can appear in sentence initial position to introduce an explanation.This is the second most predominant characteristic of the particle in the monologue corpus. The speaker often uses this particle to make something clear and at the same emphasize what is being stated.

In the following excerpt, the storyteller tells about *Buju' Napo* who has extraordinary powers. In the story, *Buju' nap*o wants to travel to Java, but there is no ship available. Instead, he uses a stone to cross the sea.

Excerpt 15

```
1  Buju' Napo  jâ'reng oreng  sakte coma keng nompa' bato Buju
   napo   PRT     person magic FP   FP   ride   stone Because
   Buju napo has a magical power, he only ride the stone
```

The particle *jâ'reng* is in post-initial position, after the subject *Buju' napo*. What follows after the particle is an explanation what *Buju' Napo* looks like in terms of his power. Thus, the particle *jâ'reng* elicits the preceding noun (phrase).

As mentioned earlier, the particle is not only used as explanatory particle. It also emphasizes the fact that *Buju' napo* has magical powers, which allow him to ride the stone. The narrator uses *jâ'reng* to state and at the same time emphasise *Buju' Napo's* extraordinary powers in excerpt 15.

A similar example is introduced in excerpt 16, in which the speaker says that he does not have a house to live in.

Excerpt 16

```
1  A   Be'eng me' pas ju'-toju' neng sadiyah
       you    QP  PM  RED-sit   at   there
       Why do sit at that place?

2      apa  se  e-kalakoh?
       What REL OV-do
       what do you do?

3  B   ja'reng dhalem lo' gedhuen compo'
       PRT I not have house
       because I don't have a house
```

Speaker A frequently finds speaker B sitting under a tree, so he asks why B does that. B responds that he sits under the tree because he does not have a house to stay in. *Jâ'reng* explicates the proposition marking the reason for his sitting there.

In the above example, the particle *jâ'reng* can be deemed as an introduction of the proposition that follows in explanatory way. At the same time, it could also be interpreted as emphasis. The speaker intends to express, to emphasize in particular, that he sits under a tree because he does not own a house and not because of something else. Accordingly, *jâ'reng* in B's response indicates that he thinks this is important. This function is similar to that of the particle *wong* in Javanese (see Widhyasmaramurti, 2008).

When the particle is left out, the reason for sitting under a tree would be *dhalem lo' gedhuen compo'*- I don't have a house. This answer is grammatically and pragmatically sufficient to answer the question. However, the presence of the particle adds emphasis. *Jâ'reng*

signals to the hearer that the following is important thus minimizes the hearer's effort understand the utterance (Han, 2011; Sperber & Wilson, 2011).

The use of *jâ', jâ'reng,* and *jâ'rengan* is a helpful tool for the speaker to elaborate his assertion and to make something clear. It is also used to add emphasis to a proposition holistically or to the proposition that follows as an explanation. It helps the hearer to project the coming argument.

5.3. Complementizer

Davies (2010) notes that *jâ'* in sentence medial position is often regarded as compelementizer. In some of the glossed corpora of Madurese oral narratives collected by the IOWA digital library *jâ* is annotated as complementizer, even in cases where it is not. The particle seems to function as a complementizer when it occupies the middle position after a particular verbal predicate, which leads to a specific pragmatic function.

Excerpt 17

```
1  Lo' benya' oreng neng Madure reya tao ja' neng Madura
   Not many  person at  Madura this know PRT at Madura
   There are not many Madurese know that in Madura

2  banya' makam kona
   many   cemetery old
   There are many old cemeteries
```

In the example above, *jâ'* is preceded by the verb *tao*-know. Thus, the clause that follows verb indicates what is (not) known by Madurese. By using *jâ'* after the verbal predicate *tao*, the narrator aims at specifying what is allegedly not known to Madurese people, regardless of the fact that they are Madurese. The particle "bahwa" in *bahasa Indonesia* has a similar function, see Englebretson (2003). Englebretson also states that *bahwa* introduces a projection of information that frequently appears after "a framing verb, abstract noun, and sometimes with no framing materials" (Englebretson, 2003: 123).

Jâ' also appears after the passive verbal predicate "heard"-*e-kapereng*. In the excerpt below, the narrator tells that the weapon which *Ke taji* has made is accepted by the King.

Excerpt 18

```
1  Aher-ra e-kapereng moso empu-empu se laen
   TM      OV-hear    by   person-RED REL other
   An then it is heard by other people
```

```
2  ja' bai-ghebeiyeh ke' taji e-tarema moso rato
   PRT RED-made      ke' Taji OV-accept by king
   That what is made by ke taji is accepted by the King
```

It is evident from the example in excerpt 18 line 2 that the presence of *ja'* is to give further information of what is being heard by the people of Madurese. This example is on par with "I heard that you pass the test", for instance, in which the complementizer "that" evokes additional information of what is heard by the speaker.

In most cases, the complementizer is not a core argument. Like in excerpt 17, the particle *jâ'* and "that" in "I heard that you pass the test" can be omitted. Thus, the particles can be left out without becoming ungrammatical or changing the pragmatic function. In contrast, omitting *jâ'* in excerpt 18 would make the sentence ambiguous. It loses the notion of what is heard by people, because the particle marks the proposition preceding it and what follows, and deleting the particle makes the sentences unrelated.

Englebretson (2003) provided a comprehensive list of the verbs preceding the particle "bahwa" in *bahasa Indonesia*. Some of these verbs also appear in the present data such as *tao* (know-"tahu"), *e-kapereng* (hear-"dengar"), and *kabele* (say-"bilang").

Table 5

Verb	Gloss
Tao	Know
a-careta	tell (the story)
(k)abele	say (or tell)
pa-nemo	find
e-kapereng	hear

The present data do not lead a similar list of verbs, due to the total number of the corpora employed in the study.

In most cases, the particle appears after the verbal predicate *tao*, which is optional. However, when it follows the verb *abele*- say, the particle cannot be left out. Omitting the particle leads to vague meaning.

Excerpt 19

1 Mpu bageno abele jâ' bedeh agama anyar
Mpu bageno say PRT exist religion new
Mpu bageno tell (the king) that there is a new religion.

In this excerpt, Mpu Bageno who just has come back from Kudus reports to the king that there is a new religion. Mpu Bageno himself has converted to this new religion. A*bele* can either be transitive or intransitive, but is intransitive in the example above. In English, for instance "that" as a complementizer, can still be omitted, like in the sentence "I tell you (that) it is dangerous". The presence of the absence of "that" does not change the meaning of the sentence.

The verbal predicate *abele* is different. It sometimes requires an object. Interestingly, when it occurs with *jâ'* an object is obligatory, which is illustrated in the following excerpts.

a. Embuk a-bele jâ' bapa' sake'
Mother A-tell PRT father sick
Mother says that father is sick.

When particle *jâ'* is omitted, the sentence will make no sense.

b. Embuk a-bele bapa' sake'
Mother A-tell father sick
Mother tells father (is) sick

The sentence with "Embuk abele" is grammatically acceptable. However, it leads to the question *what mother tells*. Hence, the complement clause initiated by *jâ*' makes the abstract notion (what the mother wants to tell) clear. Therefore, the following proposition serves as additional information and *jâ'* connects it as a logical explanation of the sentence. Leaving out the particle can lead to a vague sentence.

In addition, Madurese speakers use another construction when they are reluctant to use the particle. They will indicate indirect speech by attaching the definitive marker *–en* to the word "*(ko)cak*" *say*.

c. Cak-en embuk bapak sake'
Say-DEF mother father sick
Mother says (that) father is sick

Jâ' as a complementizer is optional and sometimes obligatory, depending on its context. It would be worth investigating is to see whether the occurrence of *jâ'* can be predicted based on Englebretson's list of verbs. It also warrants a more in-depth observation to answer the question whether *jâ'* carries a "functional load" on its own or whether it is a part of a "larger collocational expression" (Englebretson, 2003: 110).

5.4. Showing disappointment

Finally, *jâ'* can also be used to indicate disappointment when a speaker's expectations have not been met. Within this function, the particle appears in sentence-initial position as a response to a particular fact. Other variants of *jâ'* can also be used for this function.

Excerpt 20

```
1   jâ'reng engko' rato e-gabai-agi gaman kantah jiah
    PRT I king OV-made-AGI like this
    I am the king why I am given such a weapon (disappointed)
```

The excerpt above tells the story of a King who has just been given a weapon by his governor, but the is not as good as the king expected. The king demands only the best weapons and he feels disappointed that his governer has provided him with a weapon of poor quality, which is indicated by the particle *jâ'reng*.

The same function is also enacted by the particle *jâ'.* In the example below, the narrator restates the king's disappointment.

Excerpt 21

```
1  jâ' rato e berri' gagaman ba'-jhuba'
   PRT king OV-give  weapon  RED-bad
   The king is given a bad weapon (saying disappointedly)
```

The narrator attempts to share the feeling of dissatisfaction experienced by the king. In other words, he wants his listeners to notice that the king should not be given a bad weapon or any other disrespectful object, as the king will be disappointed otherwise.

These two examples lead to the question whether *jâ'* only indicates disappointment in indirect speech and whether *jâ'rengan* is used to indicate disappoint of the experience. The data is the corpus suggests that *jâ'* and *jâ'reng* can be used in both contexts. The example below is an expression uttered by the speaker in the story. Because the speaker is alone, it takes a long time before the job to finish.

Excerpt 22

```
1   Ya  on-laon-an jâ' aba' bi'-dhibi-an ade'    reng   nolong-e
    Yes RED-slow   PRT I    alone-NOM    nothing person help-E
    It goes slowly because I am alone nobody helps
```

Jâ' is best translated as "explanatory" in this sentence, but it also has a sense of disappointment. In other words, the speaker tries to explain why it (the job) goes slowly. At the

same time, the context suggests that the absence of person helping him influences his slow work. If there had been someone to help him, he would have finished it much faster.

It is also possible to use the particle *jâ'rengan* instead of *jâ'* or *jâ'reng* in daily speech. For instance, when the mother prohibited the children not to play after 18.00, but the children disobey her and something bad happens to them, the particle can be used to show the mother's disappointment.

```
1  jâ'rengan la mareh   e-pakenga' ro  jâ' a-main, ghi' pagghun a-main.
   PRT       PM already OV-told    to  PRT AV-play FP still AV-play
   I have told you not to play but you still keep playing
```

This function is often preceded by the prohibition that is disobeyed. Afterwards, bad things happen to the listeners, because they ignore the prohibition. The speaker feels disappointed, because the speaker has prohibited the hearer not to do something, to keep the hearer away from the bad thing that may happen to him.

The materials from Madurese oral narratives have provided some key elements pertaining to the function of the particle. In this type of text, *jâ'* predominantly functions as a negative imperative particle that can be immediately followed by the verb, am adjective, or a reduplicated adjective form. Additionally, it can also be used to introduce an explanation that has the same function as the particle "wong" in Javanese. Besides, the particle *jâ'* as a complementizer can sometimes be left out, like "bahwa" in *bahasa Indonesia*, while in other cases the particle is obligatory. The last function the particle *jâ'/jâ'reng/jâ'rengan* is to show a disappointment.

Chapter 6
The Particle *Jâ'* in Dialogic Corpus

In this chapter I will discuss the miscellaneous functions of the particle *jâ'* based on the observed conversations between four Madurese speakers. All of the participants are native speakers of Madurese language and reside in Madura island. The total length of the conversations is one hour and 61 seconds.

There are 17 instances of *jâ'* in this corpus that are used for different functions. *Jâ'* is semantically empty, but it does "encode a set of hints" that help both speakers and hearers to construct a relevant interpretation in the conversation (Jucker & Smith, 1998: 185). Accordingly, an observation of *jâ''s* illocutionary forces is called for.

6.1. Emphatic Particle

Jâ' is most dominantly used to add emphasis the basic intended message (Fraser, 1996). Pragmatic particles do not have a clear semantic meaning, but do have a pragmatic meaning (Foolen, 2011; Aijmer, 2002; Fraser, 1990; Jucker & Smith, 1998). *Jâ'* in this sense adds emphasis to a proposition. In other words, the particle highlights the importance of the acts, events, or the propositions themselves, so that both speakers and hearers can achieve a communicative purpose. The speakers often deem a statement to be crucial when they add emphasis. Han (2011) notes some usages of emphatic markers in public speeches. Their function is to fill a communicative feature and arourse the hearer's attention. She elaborates that the use of emphatic markers, such as *definitely, indeed,* and *really,* in public speeches play a significant role in achieving a speaker's communicative goal (Han, 2011).

The particle *jâ'* in initial position adds emphasis. It mostly appears in declarative sentences and is secondly used in interactions functioning as a response. In the following example, Rai starts the conversation with a question and Muz continues by responding. Muz uses *jâ'* at the start of the response. The presence of *jâ'* adds emphasis to Muz' statement.

Excerpt 23

```
1  Rai      ade'    UKT se  pa'ratos      ruah?
            Nothing UKT REL four hundreds FP
            is there no UKT that is four hundreds?

2  Muz      Jâ'reng b[enya' praktegeh      mbak]
            PRT     many    practice-DEF   sister
            Many (laboratory) practices sister (Rai)

3 Ati                [se  pa'ratos jeh] olleh diddi' sapah yeh pole
                      REL four hundreds FP get little who  P   again
                     (that who het four hundreds) only little

4           keng lakar  lok lok apa () ongghu mbak
            FP   really not not what   really sister
            Really sister (.) (Rai)

5  Muz      berarti dherih [Irian]
            TM      from    Irian
            Then from Irian

6 Ati                    [se ] jurusan    engkok nang settong oreng.
                          REL  department I      only  one    person
                          From my department only one person

7           olle pa'ratos      se  jurusan    biologi due' tello' ye
            get  four hundreds REL department biology two  three  P
            who get four hundreds, in biology dept. two (or) three

8           pokoeng diddi' mbak
            FP      little sister
            Only little

9           kabbhi ratah [mbak]  ade'    se  du  jutah   mbak
            All    same   sister nothing REL two million sister (rai)
            All is same, there is nobody who gets two million
```

In line 2, Muz gives a response that emphasizes the fact that there are many laboratory practices in the science and technology department, which is why there are not many students in the department who have a subsidy and only pay four hundred rupiahs for the tuition fee. This knowledge is strengthened by Ati's response in line 3-4 and line 6-9. Hence, the particle *jâ'* in Muz' turn is equivalent to "*indeed, the fact that*".

What is being emphasized by Muz (line 2) is presumably a fact unknown to Rai. This is logical, because the tone in the sentence is rising and so her statement can be considered a

question [Davies, 2010], which shows her ignorance of the fact that in the department of science and technology there are so many laboratory practices. Having the social obligation to respond, Muz attempts to provide sufficient information. Thus, in the above excerpt, *jâ'* emphasizes the unknown fact.

The interlocutors frequently use the particle to introduce an unknown fact to the others. As a result, the hearers commonly accept what is being emphasized and stated by the speaker. In the following excerpt, Muz, Ati, and Rai talk about movies. Muz wants to watch *Lima Menara*, Ati does not like the movie and thinks it is just too old (line 6 & 8). Rai confirms that the movie that Muz wants to watch is an old one (line 11). Afterwards, Muz emphasizes that her intention to watch the movie is not based on the age of the movie per se (line 14-15).

Excerpt 24

```
1  Muz      Mba::k
            Sister
            (Muz is calling)sister (Rai)

2           (o.3)

3  Ati      Mbak   mun filem laen-na   bedeh.
            Sister if  film  other-DEF exist
            Do you have another film

4  Muz      Enje' engko' terro nenguk-a  lima menara
            No    I      want  watch-IRR five towers
            No, I want to watch Lima Menara film

5           (0.9)

6  Ati      Cak-en  embak  filem jadul ((laugh))
            Say-DEF sister film  old
            Sister (Rai) says it is an old film(laugh)

7  Muz      =Engkok (kang-lakang) e  kamar dhibik ((laugh))
             I       stay         at room  alone
             I stay at room alone (laugh)

8  Ati      Lima menara engkok lo' lebur
            Five towers I      not like
            I don't like Lima Menara(name of film)

9           (0.2)

10 Muz      To-fo[to]
            Pictures
```

pictures ((Muz talks to herself while)

11 Rai [Ejeb] filem la lambe' [ro jiah]
Long film PM old FP that
That has been an old film

12 Muz [apah novella ro]
What novel FP
The novel

13 (0.2)

14 Muz Jâ'? engkok lo' parlo deiye-na mbak
PRT I not need like this-DEF sister (Rai)
I don't need this sister (Rai)

15 Terro tao perjuangan-na (al Fikri) jiah kayak apa ((laugh))
Want know effort-DEF al Fikri that like what
I want to know how al Fikri struggles (laugh)

Both the particle *jâ'rengan* (excerpt 22) and *jâ'* (excerpt 23) have the same function and occur in the same position.

Jâ' or *jâ'rengan* can also be used to indicate disagreement or distrust with what is stated by the previous speaker. In the excerpt below, Rai and Muz talk about their older brother. Rai (line 1) states that her brother will send them (Rai and Muz) a hand phone. Muz responds to the statement with disagreement or distrust, perhaps because she is not convinced that her brother will send her a hand phone. This might be because of previous experience with her borther's promises, but this is not mentioned in the conversation. On the other hand, Rai has had another experience with her brother's promises. She asked her brother to send his wife a monthly allowance, which he did (line 7, 8, & 9).

Excerpt 25

1 Rai bik kakak e-keremennah riah kocak-eng
By brother OV-send-DEF FP say-DEF
Brother says that he will send

2 Muz sapah
Who
Who

3 Rai Engkok kan=
I P
I

4 Muz =Jâ' la juah mbak
PRT P FP sister
(that he is) sister (expressing distrust)

5 Jâ' la juah lok ning kaparca[jein]
PRT PFV FP not able believe
He cannot be trusted

6 Ati [padeh deng tang a[bang
Same with my brother
Same as my brother

7 Rai [apa Jâ']rengan
What PRT
What

8 Jâ'rengan engkok minta anuh, ngabele embak soro kerem,
PRT I ask FIL AV-tell sister ask-CAUSS send
I ask (our brother) to send sister in law (money)

9 e-kereme
OV-send-DEF
(and he did) send her (money)

10 (0.2)

11 Muz embak satiyah de' entar de' hongkong
Sister now to go to Hongkong
Sister (in law)now goes to Hogkong

12 Rai iye, smsan riah ben engkok
Yes text FP with me
Yes she texts me

In line 4 and 5, the particle *jâ'* in Muz' statement shows her disagreement or distrust. Rai uses the particle *jâ'rengan* to indicate disagreement (line 7 and 8). Both of the particles are present in the sequence of responses in the conversation.

In addition, *jâ'(rengan)* is followed by either an active (24/14, 25/8) or passive sentence (25/5). Omitting the particle from the sentences does not affect the meaning of the sentence. However, it does have a different implication. For instance, when the particle *jâ'* is deleted from sentence (24/14), the sentence becomes "*engkok lo' parlo deiye-na mbak*". It is no longer

showing emphasis, but is a flat statement. The speaker does not emphasize what is stated and the hearer may not regard the utterance as something pivotal to concern.

The same would happen to 54/4 or 24/8. When we omit the particle *jâ'(rengan)*, the sentences are hard to be understood as emphasizing disagreement, which suggests that the particle *jâ'(rengan)* in these cases also functions as explanatory particle. It introduces an explanation for the proposition it follows. A particle which functions in a similar way is the particle "*wong*" in Javanese (Widhyasmaramurti, 2008). Below is an example of *wong* (p. 25)

```
1  Becike   lunga saiki wae, wong awake dhewe
   Good-DEF go    now   just, PAR we
   It would be best just to go now; after all we

2  isih  kudu    mampir  neng endi-endi
   still have.to Drop.by at   where-RED
   still have to drop by at some places.
```

Widhyasmaramurti uses "after all" in her translation, which can also be substituted by "because".

In order to test the hypothesis that "wong" in Javanese is equivalent particle to Madurese *jâ'(rengan)*, I did a questionnaire and asked the respondents to translate the following three sentences into either Javanese or *bahasa Indonesian*.

a) **Ja'reng** rakyat Plakaran ampon manjing (masok) agama anyar
   PRT society Plakaran already convert religion new
   Plakaran society have converted to a new religion

b) **ja'reng** engko' rato
   PRT I king
   I am the king

c) **Ja'** rato e-berri' gagaman (kerres) ba'-juba'
   PRT king OV-give weapon RED-bad
   The king is given a bad weapon

The results from the questionnaire demonstrate the following; the particle is translated as *wong* (Javanese), *orang* (*bahasa Indonesia*), and *kan* (*bahasa Indonesia*) in sentence A. In sentence B, it is translated into *orang* and *kan*. The particle is translated as *wong*, *kok*, and *orang* in sentence C.

The literal meaning of "wong" in Indonesian is *orang*, which partly confirms the hypothesis. What is interesting and surprising is that *kok* is given as equivalent translation of the particle *jâ'*. Ikranagara (1975) and Wouk (199, 2001) have argued that *kok* is used to express

surprise. It opens up opportunity to further investigate whether the particle *jâ',* or it variants *jâ'reng(an),* has the same function as the surprise particle in other and different contexts.

Returning to excerpt 25, *jâ'* in line 5 can also argued to introduce an explanation. For instance the sentence following *jâ'* in *"Jâ' la juah lok ning kaparcajein*" is an explanation of what Muz wants to tell Rai about her disagreement. Muz uses a passive construction, omitting the subject. It is clear from the utterance, however, that it is "her brother" who, according to Muz, cannot be trusted. Rai's uses *jâ'(rengan)* similarly in line 8. She tries to explain her rejection of Muz's statement. Thus, "*engkok minta anuh, ngabele embak soro kerem e-kereme*" is the main point that Rai wants to convey. The presence of *jâ'(rengan* makes the reasoning much clearer and stronger.

This typical function appears in the second position in the sequence of the interaction. The speakers respond most commonly to the preceding proposition and then give (emphasize) an explanation. Below is another example of *jâ'* in a response functioning as a explanatory particle.

Excerpt 26

```
1  Muz      beasiswa    derih apa  jiah mbak,
            Scholarship from  what that sister
            Where does the scholarship come from sister?

2           (0.1)

3 Rai       kan se pa'ratos        juah dari anuh pajak juah
            P   REL four hundreds  that from FIL  tax   that
            The four hundreds is from tax

4           ghik bileh ro, se nyetoragi   kalian ro
            FP   when FP   REL submit-AGI you    FP
            (that once) you collect

5  Ati      tang pajak berempah mbak, [saebuh    meter ((laugh))
            My   tax   how      sister thousands meters
            How much my tax sister (Rai) one thousands meters ((laugh))

6           se    e-potret ,  lebbih ghin nanganah
            REL   OV-captured more
            more than one thousands meters that are captured

7  Muz                              [ow  derih pajak]
                                     ow  From tax
                                     ow from tax

8  Rai      Jâ' e-okor     kabbih
            PRT OV-measure all
```

```
            All is measured

9  Ati      Iyeh bik mak       ebunah ((laugh))
            Yes  by  mother    leader
            Yes by village leader (laughg)

10  Muz     Iye mbak engkok lambek deeemah
            Yes sister I    past   how
            Yes sister (Rai), How was me

11  Rai     E  roma  juah benyak tananah se   [e-okor
            At house that many   land-DEF REL  OV-measure
            At house many lands are measured

12 Muz                                        [aduh iyot?] =
                                               HRT  yes
                                                    Yes

13  Ati     =E roma banyak kiah
             At home many  too
             At my home also many

14  Muz     Padahal e romah benyak oreng, e-kambuliin
            whereas at home many   people OV-together
            Whereas in my home there are many people live together

15  Rai     Gilok e-pesa
            Not   OV-separated
            Not yet separated

16  Muz     heem gilok e pesa
            Not  OV-separated
            Not yet separated
```

In the excerpt above, the speakers discuss where the scholarship (subsidy for the tuition fee) comes from. Rai answers that the scholarship is based on the tax of the land that the students collected when they enrolled for the first time. The more land they have, the more money they have to pay for the tuition fee. Ati then responds that she has many lands, capturing about one thousand meters. Rai responds that *indeed the fact that all lands are measured/captured* (line 8) no matter whether they truly belong to them or not. Line 11-16 reveal why Rai responds in this way. Some of the lands that are captured do not belong to Muz and Rai' family (Rai and Muz are siblings). Some of them have not yet been certified separately. They stay on such a big land with their big family and several houses are built on it. When their land is captured, all lands on which

several family houses are built are captured and labelled as theirs. For that reason, Rai says "*Jâ' e-okor kabbih*" to explain that indeed all lands are captured.

This excerpt has a close relation to the preceding conversations. Hence, it has the implication that because all lands are measured, they are assumed to be a well-off family. As a consequence, their higher tuition fee is much higher. The particle *jâ'* in these cases can be understood as an explanatory particle that can be substituted by English explanatory particles, like "*because*". The Madurese word that means *because* is the conjunction "*polanah*". The particle *jâ'(reng)* in excerpt 23 and 26 paradigmatically occupies "*polanah,*" so that it is understood as a particle that introduces a reason for, explanation of, or an elaboration of previous proposition(s) (Strenström, 1998; Schiffrin, 1987).

J*â'(reng)* in "*Jâ'reng benya' praktegeh mbak*" is a clear example of the particle being used to give an explanation of a previous speaker's proposition. The particle *jâ'(reng)* can be substituted by a set of explanatory particles like "because". As a result, the sentence can be equivalently translated as "look (sister), indeed, because there are many laboratory practices in the science deparment, they do not receive subsidy for their tuition fee".

6.2. Negative Imperative Particle

Unlike a filler that is used in a pause in a conversation to buy the speaker time to prepare his next utterance, *jâ'* is a core element in the sentence. When it is used in an imperative sentence, *jâ'* becomes a semantic element that gives negative meaning. Thus, the sentence can be understood as either a warning or prohibition. Chondrogianni (2011) investigates the prohibitive marker in Modern Greek and sheds light on the particle *μη(ν*) and its environment in the syntactic structure. The particle *μη(ν)* introduces a prohibitive marker when it is not preceded by the subjunctive particle *vά.* Consequently, this prohibition can be understood as "preventive and negative warnings." the former uses a perfective verb while, the latter uses an imperfective verb (Chondrogianni, 2011:138).

The particle *jâ'* in Madurese language complies a similar function as prohibition or warning when it appears in a negative imperative sentence. It expresses an act of warning, or to some extent, a prohibition to the hearer not to do something.

Excerpt 27

1	Atik	Ghik ngudeh dosena lok andik binih ((laugh))
		FP young lecturer-DEF not have wife
		The lecturer is still young and doesn't have a wife (laugh)
2	Rai	Lok a-daftar-a yeh? ((laugh)) .hhh
		Not AV-register-a P
		you want to register (as wife) Don't you (laugh) .hhh
3	Atik	.hh((laugh)) (.) mun dosen
		FP lecturer
		.hh (laugh) (.) If the lecturer
4		Lok andik binih deiyeh lakarra mbak
		Non have wife FP really-DEF sister (Rai)
		Don't have wife indeed sister (Rai)
5		Cerre' nilai cak-en nak~kanak .hh ((laugh))
		Stingy grade say-DEF RED-Child
		(they are) stingy in giving grade (laugh)
6		(0.1)
7	Rai	hem
		Hem
		Heem (yes)
8		(o.3)
9	Muz	jâ' re'~cerre' terro e-rayu kuah
		PRT RED-stingy want OV-tease FP
		(say to him/the lecturer) Don't be stingy otherwise he will be teased

The second response of Muz is a (negative) imperative sentence prefaced by the particle *jâ'* (line 9). It orders the hearer not to do something, which means that Muz has a commitment to warn the hearer not to do something. This type of sentence belongs to the commissives in Austin's classification (Austin, 1962). Nonetheless, this meaning is not necessarily restricted warnings. It can also be understood as an order, request, or perhaps advice. However, looking at the social status of speaker and addressee, a request or advice is unlikely, since the speaker is the student and the addressee is the lecturer. In Indonesian culture, the student has a lower social status, which means it is impolite to order or command. Furthermore, the person that they are talking about is not present. This suggests that Muz tries jokingly warns Ati and says "*hey Ati, please tell him (the lecturer) not to be stingy when giving grades, as he will be teased otherwise.*" More uses and functions of the particle as negative imperative particle are discussed in chapter 5.

Jâ' can only be used in negative imperative sentence, since it carries negative meaning. This might be because *jâ'* is the grammaticalized form of *enjâ',* which means "not" (Pawitra, 2009; Davies, 2010). *Jâ'* preserves its old meaning whenever it is used in a command or imperative sentence. For this reason, the sentence in line 9 will lose its semantic as well as pragmatic meaning when *jâ'* is omitted. It would be ungrammatical to say "*re'~cerre' terro e-rayu kuah*".

Davies (2010) elaborates that negation can be expressed in at least the following ways in Madurese: 1) using the particles *ta'* or *lo'* to negate either the adjective or the verb,

a) Engkok ta' ngakan
   1.sg PRT eat
   I don't eat

b) Engkok lo' penter
   1.sg PRT smart
   I am not smart

2) using the particle (n) *jâ'* in (negative) imperative sentence,

c) Ja' ngakan
   PRT eat
   Don't eat!

and 3) using the particle *banne* to negate nouns or prepositional phrases (p. 73).

d) Engkok ngakan nase'banne bujhâ
   1.sg eat rice PRT salt
   I eat rice not salt

The negative particle always precedes the word it negates. The word *re'~cerre',* for instance, can be derived from the adjective *cerre',* meaning 'stingy". Plural meaning is often achieved by reduplication. However, the word "*re'~cerre*"' is an exception, because it is not a plural (many stingy), but modifies the adjective "*cerre*" as submodifier. Thus, line 9 in the excerpt above can be understood as "Don't be too stingy!". Based on Davies' (2010), either the particle *ta'* or *lo'* negates a verb. Thus, we can construct a sentence such as the following.

e) (ta' or lo') re'~cerre' terro e-rayu kuah
   PRT stingy want OV-tease FP
   Not stingy otherwise be teased (say)

However, neither the particle *ta'* nor *lo'* can substitute *jâ'* in such a negative imperative construction. Even though *ta'* and *lo'* can both precede the verb, they do not carry the pragmatic meaning of warning of request. Hence, the particle *jâ'* as negative imperative particle can be

immediately followed by a reduplicated form of the adjective. To highlight, *ta'* or *lo'* cannot be used as a negative imperative particle.

Table 6

Root	Reduplicated form	meaning
Penter	ter(ma)penter	smart
Cerre'	re'-cerre'	Stingy
Laon	on-laon	Slow
Abid	bid-abid	Slow (longtime)

The above words are examples of reduplicated forms. It is common to make a reduplication in Madurese (See Davies, 2010 for detailed description of reduplication in Madurese).

6.3. Topic-control particle

Aijmer (2002) proposes frame functions of discourse particles. In her investigation of *now*, Aijmer (2002) calls *now* a "topic-changer" (p. 57). She distinguishes "S-use" and "D-use". The former means that *now* has a temporal function, whereas the latter *now* serves a discourse function (Aijmer, 2002: 58-59). Corcu (2006) investigates the particles *zaten* and *ya* in Turkish dialogues. The particle *ya* in final position functions as internal topic shift, external topic shift, and to some extent as introducing a new topic" (Corcu, 2006:4-5).

Similarly, jâ'seems to function as topic-control particle by either shifting the topic of the conversation (excerpt 28/7) or introducing a new one (excerpt 29/1). Unlike *ya* in Turkish,*jâ'* appears in initial position before a question to change the topic of the conversation. In excerpt 17, Muz and Ati discusst their tuition fees. In the beginning of the conversation, Muz expresses her worries about paying the tuition fee. Ati confirms that she has not paid the tuition fee either. After a short pause, Muz introduces a new topic (line 7).

Excerpt 28

```
1  Muz      Engkok deremmah se  nitibeh (.) spp
            I      how     REL entrust    tuition fee
            How should I entrust (.) tuition fee,
```

2 Ce’ lo’ parcaja-na (hh) ((laugh)) ka nak~kanak
FP not believe-DEF to RED-child
I don’t believe in (hh) ((laugh)) students

3 (0.1)

4 Ati Engkok gitak majer, [majer bileh] gitak taoh
I yet pay pay when yet know
I (have) not pay, I don’t know when to pay

5 Muz [Iyeh mbak] padeh mbak
Yes sister same sister
Yes me too sister (Ati)

6 (0.2)

7 Muz Jâ’ saintek jeh arapah ye mbak ye=
PRT sci. and tech FP why P sister P
What goes wrong with science and technology department.

8 Ati =Mateh saintek dujutah pa’ratos
Die sci. and tech. two mill. four hundreds
Science and technology is two million and four

9 tello [polo]
three ten
hundreds thirty

10 Muz [Aduuuh pa’ratos]
HRT four hundreds
Four hundreds

11 Ati .hh ((laugh)) engkok engkok pa ngejjit (.)
I I TM surprised
.hh ((laugh)I I am then surprised

12 duh mak cek benya’(hh)eng ye ((laugh))
HRT FP FP many-DEF P
why it is too much ((laugh))

13 cak-en engkok hhh ((laugh))
say-DEF I
I say hhh (laugh)

14 Rai Iyeh anuh[5] kategori berempah beeng
P FIL category what you
What category[6] are you

[5] This is a filler. It has no meaning. FIL: FIller

[6] Category here refers to the student’s financial category when they first enroll in university. They are divided into three main categories; category one is for financially disadvantaged students, category two is for those who cannot pay above average, and category three is for students who can pay above the average

15 Ati Kabbi mbak ratah mbak
All sister same sister
All the same sister (Rai)

16 Muz Enjek mbak adek kategorinah [mun saintek]
Not sister nothing category-DEF if sci. and tech. department
No sister (Rai) sci. and techn. dept. student has no category

17 Ati [ratah mbak]
Same sister
The same sister (Rai)

Muz aggrees with Ati's statement that they have both not paid the tuition fee (line 4-5). After Muz' turn in line 4, no one takes the floor. Instead, there is a short pause of around 0.2 milliseconds. Muz, as the last speaker, has the right to continue her turn (Sacks et. al, 1974). Muz starts again by addressing a question about how the tuition fee for science and technology students is determined. She uses *jâ'* in initial position, before the question (line 7). She said "*Jâ' saintek jeh arapah ye mbak ye*" which means that she is wondering what happens to science and technology students and the tuition fee.

This topic is a different topic than in the preceding lines (line 1-6). The use of *jâ'* is then to shift the topic from discussing how to pay the tuition to how science and technology students deal with the tuition fee. From a speaker-hearer relationship point of view, the use of *jâ'* also evokes the pragmatic meaning of information seeking, in the sense that Muz does not have the knowledge for the case she addresses.

Ati, a student of the Science and Technology department, directly answers that it is terrible for science and technology students, because they have to pay about two million and four hundred thirty something rupiahs (line 8-9). Her response immediately follows Muz' question. This suggests that Ati has more knowledge about this case.

Jâ' in initial position can also be used to project the upcoming new information, rather than express the intent to seek information. It usually appears when the speakers want to begin to tell about their personal experience. In the following example, Muz opens the sequence by telling about her roommate. She tells Ati how her roommate's feels towards having to pay more than other students.

Excerpt 29

1	Muz	Jâ' tang kamar saintek mbak.	
		PRT my room sci. and tech. sister	
		My roommate sister (Ati)	
2		aduh cek ngellonah ro deiyeh	
		HRT FP complain-DEF FP that	
		Complain (indeed about the price)	
3		"adu mbak gimana aku gimana mbak()"	
		HRT sister how I how sister	
		How, how I am sister	
4	Ati	Engkok ngejjid pertamanah mak cek benyakeng.	
		I surprised first-DEF FP FP many-DEF	
		I also surprised at first why so expensive	
5		kan engkok andik datanah Kabbih joh?	
		P I have data-DEF all FP	
		I have all the data	
6		(0.2)	
7	Rai	Dujutah pa'ratos berempah?	
		Two million how	
		How much did say, two million?	
8	Ati	tello poloan ghik bede cek~recekenah (hh) [e budinah]	
		Thirty teen FP exist RED-small at back-DEF	
		Thirties, there is small number (hh)added	
9	Muz	[iyot pasti]	
		Yes sure	
10		iyot ((laugh)) .hhh	
		yes	
		Yes sure ((laugh)) .hhh	

In the excerpt above, *jâ'* prefaces a statement in which the speaker begins to tell about her roommate's feeling. It also occurs in initial position, as in the previous excerpt. However, in this case, the use of *jâ'* is not to ask for an explanation, as it appears in a *wh*-question. It introduces new information that the speaker wants to share with other participants. This new information is in line with the topic they discussed earlier: the different tuition fees for science and technology students.

The new information leads to a different topic. More importantly, it is a new information for other participants. It can be traced from Ati's response in line 4-5. Although she is a student in the department of science and technology, she is still surprised by the amount of money she has to pay. Thus, this response subtly agrees and accepts the new information given by Muz.

It is not necesarily the particle that leads to the given interpretation in sentences 28/7 and 29/1. The action types also play a role. In excerpt 28, the particle appears after a short gap that is less than 0.2 milliseconds. As mentioned in the turn taking principle, one may (continue to) take the floor if nobody holds it (Sacks et. al, 1974). Since nobody voluntarily takes the turn, Muz continues her turn (28/7) by constructing an in situ wh- interrogative sentence (*arapah*-why). The particles in 28/7 and 29/1 occur in the first position of the sentence. However, they are distinct in the form of pairs. Excerpt 28/7 is a *question-answer* pair, while 29/1 is an *information-acknowledgment* pair.

The why-question is used to provoke an explanation. Thus, the particle *jâ'* signals the upcoming of question that seeks for a reason. If the particle is left out, for instance, the sentence remains understood as an interrogative sentence: *arapah*-why "*saintek jeh arapah ye mbak ye*" (sometimes regarded as question particle by Davies, 2010). Nonetheless, the absence of *jâ'* may undermine the value of "emphatic" that can direct the addressee to pay more attention to the question. Therefore, the particle *jâ'* that is used together with the wh-question "why" is signaling the upcoming question, so that the addressee can notice it and since "why" is used for information seeking, the particle *jâ'* emphasizes the urgency of the speaker's intention to get an explanation.

6.4. Question Particle

The example excerpt 17 illustrates that topic shift can be realized by using a wh-question with *jâ'*. This section will give a more elaborate overview of questions in Madurese and specifically question particle *jâ'*.

Davies (2010) has extensively discussed questions in Madurese. He shows that Madurese has different question types: yes/no question, alternative question, tag question, constituent question, long-distance question, and question particle *bâ'*. I will focus on constituent questions, yes/no questions and the question particle *bâ'*. The first two types are taken into account, because *jâ'* only appears in yes/no questions combined with a constituent question. The question particle *bâ'* seems to be comparable to *jâ* and will give an idea of the pragmatic functions of the particle.

Constituent questions in Madurese are formed by "a set of interrogative pronouns" (Davies, 2010: 444), like *apa*-what, *sapa*-who, *dhimma*-where, *arapa*-why and *barampa*-how

much/many. In excerpt 28/7, *jâ'* occurs together with *arapah*-why in sentence initial position. If we regard *arapah-why* (Davies, 2010) as a question particle, it is evident that co-occurrence of question particles is possible. Nonetheless, the absence of *jâ'* in initial position does not make any changes to the status of the sentence. Instead, its presence emphasizes the question.

To illustrate how *jâ'* is used in interrogative sentences, I provide a manipulated example that commonly occurs in Madurese informal conversations. Speaker A is offering an option or a solution to the hearer (speaker B) of staying together after the fasting month (*Ramadhan*).

```
1 Jâ'  apolong-ah     mareh pasaan  deremmah ye?
  PRT  together.IMPF  PM    fasting how      yes
  (I offer you, how if) you stay together (married) after fasting month
```

In this example, *jâ'* emphasizes and highlights the importance of getting married soon after the fasting month (speaker's A perspective). The final particle *ye* strengthens this emphasis in a way that it calls for agreement (Wouk, 1998). The sentence, however, will be still understood as a question, because it has the interrogative pronoun "*deremmah*"-how, regardless of the presence or absence of *jâ'*.

In addition, *jâ'* in initial position indicate an indirect request when it is used in a declarative sentence. It is frequently used as a "satire" among teenagers.

```
1 Jâ'  e-ater-ah       ngara nyamanan
  PRT  OV-escort. IMPF guess good.NOM
  probably you had better take her home (I ask you)
```

The three speakers are in a restaurant. Speaker A says to speaker B "*Jâ' e-ater-ah ngara nyamanan*". The person they are talking about is speaker C. Hence, speaker A indirectly asks speaker B to take speaker C home because speaker C might not have a ride home. It can be understood as "satire" when speaker A knows that speaker B has no intention to take speaker C home. However, speaker A insists regardless of what is known. Therefore, in this case, speaker uses *jâ'* as satire.

There have been several studies on question particles (cf. McCawley, 1994; Kuong, 2008; Bruening, 2007). In terms of yes/no-questions, Davies (2010: 441) argues that they can be formed by one of the following strategies:

a) Intonation
b) With question particle *apa*-what in sentence-initial position
c) With question particle *apa*-what immediately following the subject

d) With question particle *apa*-what followed by adverb (*biyasana*-usually)
e) With subject-auxiliary inversion
f) With question particle *apa*-what in sentence-initial position combined with subject-auxiliary inversion

Jâ' in excerpt 17/7 occurs with intonation. In the following example, *jâ'* is realized as a question particle in a yes/no question. It precedes the modal verb *bias-a* projecting (prop)ability and the suffix *–a* marking irrealis mood.

Excerpt 30

```
1  Muh   Areh salju mbak
         This snow  sister Rai
         Is this a snow sister Rai?

2  Rai   Benni
         No
         No, it is not

3  Muh   Apah?
         What?
         What?

4  Rai   gelle'   ruah se  salju
         Just now FP   REL snow
         The previous picture you saw was the snow

5  Muh   apah se  tade'   dheun-ah cak-eng kakeh gelle'   roh
         What REL nothing leaf-DEF say-DEF 2.SG  just now FP
         What was the seasons that trees fall you said

6  Rai   gugur musim gugur
         Autumn Autumn
         It is autumn autumn

7  Muh   areh neng dinna-en ye mbak   neng laiyeh ye
         This at   here-DEF P  sister at   there  P
         This is at here (pointing) yes sister

8         macem Australia (0.15) deirih laiyeh
         like Australia (0.15)  from   there
         it is like Australia (0.15)from there

9         entar ka Sangkah[7] jâ' bisa-a ye.
         Go    to Sangkah PRT can-IRR P
```

[7] *Sangkah* is the name of a place near their house that has a small harbor.

```
          Can go to Sangkah right?

10  Rai   ((laugh))
          ((laugh))
          ((laugh))

11  Muh   ye?
          Right
          Right

12  Rai   entar ka sangkah ((laugh))
          Go    to sangkah ((laugh))
          Go to sangkah

13  Muh   Heem yeh mbak
          Heem yes sister
          Yes mbak

14  Rai   akapalan? ((laugh))
          By boat?
          Go to sangkah by boat?

15  Muh   heem
          Heem
          Heem (yes)

16  Rai   Adooo depak   bileh
          HRT   arrrive when
          When will he (his brother) arrive (if by boat)
```

The excerpt above is taken from a conversation between Rai and her younger brother, a 10-year old boy. Muh is looking at his older brother's picture in Rai's hand phone. Her brother is currently studying in Europe and Muh wonders what snow looks like and whether or not her brother can go home by boat via *Sangkah* (line 7-9). The particle functions as question particle preceding the modal verb *bisa-a*. Thus, it projects the (prop)ability of the action/event. The suffix *–a*, on one hand, marks irrealis mood showing that the action is imperfect and not still ongoing. The speaker expresses his mental state of wonder by using this sentence.

This typical occurrence,when *jâ'* is immediately followed by the irrealis word *bisa(a),* is also observed by Davies (2010). However, it is not the question particle *jâ'* that he mentions, but the particle *bâ'.* This latter particle does not appear in my data. It might be a case of dialectical variation. Nevertheless, both particles seem to perform a similar function and display a similar syntactic order. To illustrate, I discuss some examples from Davies (2010: 465-466).

a) Amir **ba' bisa**-a maca-agi sorat ka ba'na?
Amir PRT can-IRR AV.read-AGI letter to you?
Can Amir read the letter for you?

b) **ba' bisa-a** Amir maca-agi sorat ka ba'na?
PRT can-IRR Amir AV.read-AGI letter to you?
Can Amir read the letter for you?

In my data, the construction appears as follows.

c) entar ka Sangkah **jâ' bisa-a** ye.
Go to Sangkah PRT can-IRR P
Can go to Sangkah right?

The question that arises is whether these two particles are interchangeable (or dialectical). To answer this question, I presented the following sentences to Madurese speakers and asked to indicate whether they thought the sentence was notionally correct. There is no prior knowledge required to answer the questions. It is expected that their answers are based on their intuitions. I also expect a significant dfference in terms of meaning and function of the particle *jâ'* and *bâ'* when they are used in interrogative sentences.

Table 7

No	**The sentences**	Response "Yes"	Response "No"
1	*Entar ka Bangkalan **jâ'** bisa-a ye?*	25%	75%
2	***Jâ'** bisa-a ye Entar ka Bangkalan?*	62.5%	37.5%
3	*Bisa-a **jâ'** Entar ka Bangkalan?*	12.5%	87.5%
4	*Bisa-a Entar ka Bangkalan **jâ'** ?*	25%	75%

None of the sentences received a score of 100%. Sentence 1 is considered an uncommon construction and rarely appears in Madurese conversations. This type os sentence is found in the present data (see 30/9). On the other hand, the same construction as Davies' (2010) data on the particle *ba'* is only receives a positive response in 62.5% of the cases. This suggests that the particles can be used interchangeably. Moreover, when I asked the participants whether *jâ'* in sentence 1 and 2 could be replaced by *ba'* with no difference in meaning, 87.5 % said that it could. However, more thorough research is necessary to draw conclusions, but the results from

the questionnaire suggests that *jâ'* and *bâ'* are interchangeable and that the fact that *bâ'* does not appear in the present sample is a result of dialectical variation only.

The question particle *jâ'* can also be substituted by *apa*-what- when it appears in yes/no questions (Davies, 2010). Thus, in example C (and 30/9), *jâ'* can be replaced by *apa*-what.

d) entar ka Sangkah **apa bisa-a** ye.
Go to Sangkah PRT can-IRR P
Can go to Sangkah right?

6.5. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed the range of functions of *jâ'* based on the data from the conversations. J*â'* is often used as emphatic particle, topic-control particle, negative imperative particle, and as a question particle. It often functions as a projection of the upcoming information, a highlight to pay attention to the statement made by the speakers, and emphasis or disagreement.

The results of the present study demonstrate that *jâ'*(reng) in declarative sentences carries emphatic meaning and serves to signal an explanation of a previous proposition. It will appear in second position in these cases. In first position, the particle functions as topic-control particle. The present data suggests that *jâ'* functions as topic-shift in the form of a question (see excerpt 28). In declarative sentences such as excerpt 18, it functions as giving or introducing new information.

Interestingly, *jâ'* preserves its old meaning in imperative sentences. This meaning might be obtained from the fact that it was viewed as a negative particle (*en) jâ'* in some publications (cf. Pawitra, 2009; Davies, 2010), meaning "not". Thus, it functions as a negative imperative particle that may evoke prohibition, suggestion, or request, or, in the present study, as a warning to a third person shared between the interlocutors as a joke (see excerpt 27).

Finally, it can be used as a question particle and is on par with Davies' (2010) question particle *bâ'*. The particle is often followed by the irrealis word *bisa-a* and can be substituted by the interrogative pronoun *apa*-what.

Chapter 7

Restricted *jâ'* and Its Unique Meaning

This chapter is devoted to overview the use of the particle *jâ'* in two different genres of (texts). Additionally, the restricted construction and usage of the particle *jâ'*, as well as its variants *jâ'reng*, and *jâ'rengan* are also elaborated on. I distributed questionnaires among Madurese to how they use and interpret the particle in their daily conversations. Afterwards, I would like to discuss the meaning of the particle itself: where it comes from and whether the meaning in one usage, like as negative imperative particle, is (not) related to other functions.

7.1. Genre, Pragmatic Functions, and the Particle *jâ'*

Pragmatic or discourse particles are not limited to a particular genre or text type. Genre is understood as a type of text that is categorized based on external criteria (Biber, 1988, as cited in Paltridge, 1996). Thus, it covers formal and informal, or monologue and dialogue. The oral narrative and conversation corpora in the present study can be regarded as two different genres, in which *jâ'* is used for different purposes. The number of occurrences in the different corpora also varies.

This notion corroborates earlier findings in relation to pragmatic particles and text type. Foolen (1996) showed that the same pragmatic particles in different genres can evoke different functions. Lam (2009) exemplified the use of the particle *so* in monologic and dialogic data. She found a different rate of occurrence in both corpora.

In the present study, the particle *jâ'* and its variants *jâ'rengan* and *jâ'reng* are examined based on oral narratives (monologue) and conversations (dialogue). It is the particles occur at different rates in monologues and dialogues. Chapter 3 already demonstrated that *jâ'* and its variants occur more frequently in monologues than in dialogues. More specifically, the negative imperative particle *jâ'* is predominantly used in oral narratives, which is most likely because the monologues discuss several themes adduced to Madurese local wisdom. For instance, the narrator picks up the old story of Bangkalan, the original name of Bangkalan, and some legends that are aimed at demonstrating moral and social values. In contrast, the topics of the conversations mostly evolve around daily life and personal experiences.

A complementizer that appears as the second most frequent function in oral narratives is not found in the conversation corpus, which could be for the same reason as above. However, the two genres do not only share differences. but also similarities. The emphatic and explanatory particle realized by *jâ'(rengan)* occur at the same rate. These two functions seem to be very commonly used by Madurese speakers in stories and conversation.

The propositions above lead to two main concerns. First of all, the same pragmatic particle can be realized differently in different genres. The realization may vary in terms of frequency and pragmatic function. Secondly, it is also possible to figure out the same pragmatic particles being used in different genres with pragmatically no differences in their functions and meanings. This is why some scholars claim that pragmatic particles are, to some extent, polyfunctional and sometimes monofunctional. As Foolen (2003) also notes, the function and occurrence of pragmatic particles can be affected by text type or speech event. This claim has been exhaustively examined by many scholars (cf. Lakoff, 1973; Holmes, 1986; Brinton, 1996 and Lee, 2004 on *you know*).

7.2. Restriction and variation in Negative Imperative Particle

The previous chapters have shown that *jâ'* functions as a negative imperative particle when it is followed by a verb, adjective, or a reduplicated form of adjective. Davies (2010) has argued that the use of *jâ'* is meant to indicate prohibition in negative imperative sentence. Nonetheless, it is also evident that the particle has other variants that appear in the same position but in a different sentence construction. In declarative sentences and interrogative sentences, for instance, *jâ'reng* or *jâ'rengan* can occupy the sentence-initial position.

Given that *jâ'* has other variants, it is salient to test whether they are interchangeable. In other words, whether *jâ'* in negative imperative sentences can also be realized by the particles *jâ'reng* or *jâ'rengan*. To answer this question, I offered the following sentences to Madurese speakers (14 respondents). I tested whether the particle appeared with *ella* "already" (Davies, 2010), as this particle is often used in negative imperatives to emphasize the meaning. Therefore, *ella* can be translated as "don't". To illustrate, see the following extract.

Extract 31

1	Rai	kan	bik	mama	anuh	**"ja'. ella**	rapah	gutak	la	anuh
		P	by	mother	FIL	PRT PRT	please	P	PM	FIL

Mother says " please don't (go working) the fact that

2 Gutak la tokang soper-ra ka kenneng-nga
P PRF smart driver-DEF to place-DEF
The fact that the driver has known the place

3 **Ja'ender** alakoh"
PRT work
Don't work first for this time

Table 8

No	Sentence	Response Yes	Response No
1	Ella ***jâ'*** kala'!	100%	0%
2	Ella kala' ***jâ'***!	0%	100%
3	***Jâ'*** ella kala'!	0%	100%
4	***Jâ'reng*** ella kala'!	12.5%	87.5%
5	Ella ***jâ'reng*** kala'!	0%	100%
6	Ella ***jârengan*** kala'	37.5%	62.5%

All respondents judged sentence 3 to be ungrammatical. This is unexpected, because this construction does appear in the corpus. It is possible that the result for sentence 2 is influenced by the fact that the sentence is written instead of spoken. If we look more closely, we notice that there is a moment of silence before *ella* immediately follows the particle *jâ'.* This silence is not there in writing, which might have led to misunderstanding.

The data support the notion that *jâ'* and its variants cannot occupy the sentence final position. The questionnaire also suggests that in imperative sentences it is possible to replace *jâ'* with *jâ'rengan*, but not with *jâ'reng*, but it is unclear why. It is possible that the nominalization (-an) of the word *reng* has something to do with it, but this needs further investigation in the form of a diarchonic corpus study.

Extract 31 also demonstrates a unique and surprising fact pertaining to the negative imperative particle. It is not only *jâ'* and *jâ'rengan* that can function as negative imperative particle, but also *jâ'ander*. This might be a collocation of the particles *jâ'*+ *ander* that creates new meaning. Both particles cannot be parsed in a way that they are semantically empty. J*â'ander* is only used in prohibitions that last a particular time. The speaker uses it to prohibit the hearer from doing something in a particular set of times. In other words, it can be interpreted as

for the time being, or for this time, I prohibit you to do (this-that). The sentence *jâ'ander tedhung!* is thus understood as *now, for the time being, don´t sleep!*

7.3. *Jâ'keng* as (Emphatic) Contrastive Particle

In addition to the explanatory particles discussed in chapter 5 and 6, another variant of the particle *jâ'* is *jâ'keng.* Both particles are often used together as a collocation. The particle *keng* itself is a focus particle meaning *only*, as is illustrated in the example below.

1) Engko´ keng ju´toju´
   I FP RED-sit
   I only sit (not something else)

Keng functions as a focus particle, emphasizing the fact the speaker is only sitting and not doing something else.

This particle is often used together with the particle *jâ'* in imperative sentences, leading to the meaning "don´t only". The earlier meaning of the particle *keng* is preserved and the particle *jâ'* used to indicate prohibition and emphasis. By using *jâ'keng*, the speaker expresses higher expectations of the speaker's abilities. In other words, the speaker wants the hearer to do more than he or she has done.

2) *jâ´*keng tedhung!
   PRT sleep
   Don´t only sleep

This type of sentence can be placed in the following context. The speaker in this case finds the hearer sleeping, but the speaker believes that the hearer can do better and more that he does now. However, the hearer is sleeping, because he thinks that he has finished his job. Thus, this difference of opinion lead to the use the particle *jâ'keng* to indicate that the hearer should do more.

The particle *keng* can also be used as contrastive particle meaning *but*. It appears in declarative sentences and takes a sub-clause instead of a main clause. The following example may occur in a occasion in which the speaker tells his friend that the class has begun but that he is late.

3) iyeh la maso´ **keng** engko' telat!
   Yes PM enter PRT I late
   Yes (the class has begun) but I am late

The particle *jâ'keng* is functionally similar to *jâ'ander* in a way that they are both predominantly used in imperative sentences. Unlike *jâ'* that emanates prohibition, the particle *jâ'keng* is much more appropriate to be understood as an advice. To some extent, it might be used as a "soft" prohibition, but as strong advice. Thus, when a speaker says *jâ´keng tedhung* – don't only sleep- this has two main implications. First, the speaker does not want the hearer to sleep, which can be considered the soft prohibition. And the second, the speaker strongly advices or suggests that the hearer should not only sleep but do something else.

An interesting characteristic of *jâ´keng* is that it can be syntactically separated, or more specifically, the position of the separate particles can be swapped, resulting in *keng.jâ*. This construction can only appear in negative imperatives, but with different meaning. In this case, it means "but don't" and is used to emphasize denial.

7.4. From Adverb to Particles

Recently, pragmatic particles have addressed from a grammaticalisation perspective in a diachronic approach. Research should not only focus on its behavior in data, but should focus on uncovering their meaning and to what extent their semantic and pragmatic properties are related. It would be interesting to see how the semantic and pragmatic meaning of *jâ'* develops in a diachronic perspective and to see whether *jâ'* as a negative imperative particle was derived from the same root as complementizer *jâ'*, but this requires diachronic corpora (cf. Hopper & Traugott, 2003; Aijmer, 2001; König, 1991; Östman, 1981).

The present study used synchronic data, which is not sufficient to answer the mentioned questions. However, a discussion with a colleague, a researcher in the Language Centre Surabaya, Indonesia and a native speaker of Madurese, had led to the following possible scenario for the origin of the particle *jâ'*.

There are two possible scenarios. The first scenario is based on already published articles and dictionaries stating that *jâ´* in imperatives originates from the negation marker *enjâ´* (Pawitra, 2009; Davies, 2010). In Pawitra, moreover, it is classified as an adverb functioning as a disclaimer. Thus, the particle can be used to disclaim or dispute the preceding proposition in the conversation. In addition, *jâ´* is described in Davies (2010), besides as negation marker, as a negative imperative particle meaning "don't", and as a complementizer which is translated as "that".

Consequently, the new pragmatic meaning in imperatives is derived from the negation marker *enjâ´* - not, from an adverb to a particle. This claim is similar to Diewald's (2011) analysis of the grammaticalization process. She shows that it is common for (monosyllabic) words to shift from its grammatical as well as pragmatic function, in this case adverb, to a new meaning. She uses some German particles, such as *aber*, *denn*, and *eben*, as examples, see Diewald (2011).

The negation in imperative sentences with *jâ´* is derived from *enjâ´*. In other words, the particle preserves its old meaning "not," but loses its initial morpheme "en". The previous chapters have already shown that the particle *jâ´* can only be used in negative imperatives that emanates a force of a prohibition. The present study has proven that the particle is never used in (positive) imperatives, like English "Take!" but always in negative one, like "Don't take".

The second scenario has nothing to do with the negation marker *enjâ´*. The particle *jâ´* being used as prohibition is derived from the particle *ajjhâ.* In conversation, this particle can function as a complete turn, like *ya* (Wouk, 2001). *Jâ* cannot stand alone as single turn and is always followed by a proposition. A*jjhâ* is often found in Eastern dialects of Madurese. For ease of pronunciation, *ajjhâ* is shortened to *jhâ* which means "don't".

The above two scenarios are only tentative and need further and in-depth investigation, but they can be used as stepping stone to explain other functions. Jâ' has probably developed into a complementizer after the other function had been established. In chapter 5 and 6, it is stated that the particle *jâ* can only occupy sentence-initial and sentence-middle position. It is not possible to occur in sentence-final position. A complementizer translated as "that" is rudimentary in initial clause. It functions to give additional information of the preceding noun (phrase). A complementizer usually answers the question "what". Hence, the complementizer function is obtained later compared to others (Englebretson, 2003; Ransom, 1986).

The emphatic and explanatory function are pragmatic properties that are not related to the negative imperative particle mentioned earlier. Within these two functions, either *jâ, jâreng,* or *jârengan* can be used interchangeably. This suggests that the emphatic function and explanatory are recruited later and that there homonymy with the negative imperative particle In other words, they gain their semantic and pragmatic meaning from two different sources, but have a similar form. This is supported by the narrative corpus, as the speakers often use *jâ'* to emphasise the message. In case of explanatory particle, the emphasis remains there together with the

specification that the speaker wants only "this" thing not something else. What is interesting then, is that there is also emphasis in negative imperatives when the particle *jâ* is used. It gives a hard prohibition or a strong advice compared to the use of *lo' olle* as prohibition, see excerpt 13 page 42.

7.5. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed the different rate of occurrence of the particle in both corpora. Text type is an important factor determining the use of pragmatic particles. The present study has shown that the same pragmatic function does not appear quantitatively and qualitatively in the same way in different corpora. One function may be predominantly used in a particular genre.

Other functions and forms of the particle *jâ* have also been discussed. The, negative imperative particle in Madurese can also be realized by *jâander* or *jâkeng.* The former is used as a prohibition with regard to a particular set of time. The latter, on the other hand, is used to express specificity, in which the speaker wants the hearer not only to do "X" but also "Y".

Pertaining to grammaticalization, *jâ* might originally be derived from two different sources in which they both have stable functions: as empahtic particle and negative imperative. The particle *jâ* as emphatic particle is the original meaning in the former. In conversation, this function is extended to explanatory particle in which the particles *jâ, jâreng* and *jârengan* can be used similarly. *Jâ'* later developed into a complementizer. This might have been the last step in the grammaticalisation process of the particle *jâ*. At the same time as the formation of the emphatic particle, *jâ'* was also predominantly used as prohibition marker. This function derives from the negation marker *enjâ*, or *ajjhâ* that is often found in Eastern Madurese. Thus, there is homonymy between the particle *jâ* as emphatic particle and negative imperative particle. However, there is no conclusive evidence as to the origin of the particle. Nonetheless, the development of pragmatic meaning of *jâ'* might be best described as follows: a) emphatic particle - explanatory particle – complementizer, and b) negative imperative. This, however, will need further research.

Bibliography

Abraham, W. (1991). Discourse Particles in German: How does their illocutive force come about? In Abraham, W (Ed.). *Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 203-252.

Aijmer, K. (2002). *English Discourse Particles: Evidence from a Corpus*. Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Aijmer, K. (2013). *Understanding Pragmatic Markers: A Variational Pragmatic Approach*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Akmajian, A. (1984). Sentence Types and the Form-function Fit. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 2(1), 1-23.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do Things with Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bruening, B. (2007). Wh-in-Situ Does Not Correlate with Wh-Indefinites or Question Particles. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 38(1), 139-166.

Chondrogianni, M. (2011). The Pragmatics of Prohibitive and Hortative in Modern Greek. In: Selected papers from the *19th International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics* (19th ISTAL, April 2009). Monochromia, Thessaloniki, 135-142.

Corcu, D. (2006). Analysis of Discourse Particle in Relations to the Information Structure of Text & Dialogues: Examples from Turkish. *Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (10-ICAL).*

Davies, W. D. (2010). *A Grammar of Madurese*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Davies, W. D. (1999). Madurese and Javanese as Strict Word-Order Languages. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 38, I.

Diewald, G. (March 01, 2011). Pragmaticalization (defined) as Grammaticalization of Discourse Functions. *Linguistics*, *49*(2), 365-390.

Englebretson, R. (2003). *Searching for Structure: The Problem of Complementation in Colloquial Indonesian Conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Escandell-V, V. (2012). Speech Acts. In Hualde, J. I., Olarrea, A., & O'Rourke, E. (2012). *The Handbook of Hispanic Linguistics*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 629-651. Ewing, M. C. (2005). *Grammar and Inference in Conversation. Identifying Clause Structure in Spoken Javanese*. Amsterdam: Benjamins

Fischer, K. (2006). *Approaches to discourse particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Foolen, A. (2011). Pragmatic Markers in Sociopragmatic perspective. Gisle Andersen & Karin Aijmer (eds.) *Pragmatics of Society*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 217-242.

Foolen, A. (1995) Dutch Modal Particles: The Relevance of grammaticalized Elements. In: Thomas F. Shannon & Johan P. Snapper (Ed.). *The Berkeley Conference on Dutch Linguistics 1993, 57-70.*

Fraser, B (1988). Types of English Discourse Markers. *Acta linguistica Hungaria,* 38, 383-395.

Fraser, B. (1990). An Approach to Discourse Markers. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 14(3), 383-398.

Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics,* 6(2), 167-190.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are Discourse Markers?. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 31(7), 931-952.

Fraser, B. (2006). Toward a Theory of Discourse Markers. In Fischer, K (Ed.). *Approaches to Discourse Markers*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Press, pp189-204.

Garcia, A. C. (2013). *An introduction to Interaction: Understanding Talk in Formal and Informal Settings*.

Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. In Cole, P., & Morgan, J. L. (Ed). *Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, 41-58.

González, M. (2004). *Pragmatic Markers in Oral Narrative: The Case of English and Catalan*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gupta, A. F. (1992). The Pragmatic Particles of Singapore Colloquial English. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 18(1), 31-57.

Han, D. (2011). Utterance Production and Interpretation: A Discourse-pragmatic Study on Pragmatic Markers in English Public Speeches. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 43(11), 2776-2794.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hayashi, M. (2010). An Overview of the Question-Response System in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 42(10), 2685-2702.

Heritage, J. (1984). A Change-of-State Token and Aspects of its Sequential Placement. In: Atkinson, J.M., Heritage, J. (Ed.). *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 299--345.

Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced Responses to Inquiry. *Language in Society,* 27, 291-334.

Heritage, J. (2002). Oh-prefaced Responses to Assessments: a Method of Modifying and Agreement/Disagreement. In: Ford, C., Fox, B., Thompson, S. (Ed.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 196-224.

Heritage, J. (2013). Turn-initial Position and Some of Its Occupants. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 57(3), 331-337.

Holmes, J. (1986). Functions of "You Know" in Women's and Men's Speech. *Language in Society,* 15(1), 1-21.

Hopper, P. J. (1999). A Short Course in Grammar. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Hopper, P. J., & Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Irham & Rofiq, Z. (2015). Tense and Aspect in Madurese: Projecting Davies' work on Grammar of Madurese. In proceeding of *International Conference on Interdisciplinary Social Science Studies*. London, (5-12),

Innes, B. (2010). Well, That's Why I Asked the Question Sir: Well as a Discourse Marker in Court. *Language in Society,* 39(1), 95-117.

Ikranagara, K. (1975). Lexical Particles in Betawi. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* 5, 93-108.

Jucker, A.H & Smith, S.W. (1998*). And People Just You Know Like* '*wow*': Discourse Markers as Negotiating Strategies. In A. H. Jucker and Y. Ziv (Ed.). *Discourse Markers: Description and Theory*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 171-202.

Kendrick, K. H. (2015). The Intersection of Turn-Taking and Repair: The Timing of Other-Initiations of Repair in Conversation. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*, 98.

Kendrick, K. H., & Torreira, F. (2014). The Timing and Construction of Preference: A Quantitative Study. *Discourse Processes,* 52(4), 255-289.

König, E. (1991). Identical Values in Conflicting Roles: The Use of *German Ausgerechnet, Eben, Genau,* and *Gerade* as Focus Particles. In Werner Abraham (Ed.). *Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 11-36.

Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.

Lam, P. (2006). Well but That's the Effect of It: The Use of Well as a Discourse Particle in Talk Shows. *Sprache und Datenverarbeitung,* 30(1), 99-108

Lam, P. (2009). The Effect of Text Type on the Use of *so* as a Discourse Particle. *Discourse Studies,* 11(3), 353-372.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCawley, J. D. (1994). Remarks on the Syntax of Mandarin Yes-No Questions. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics,* 3(2), 179-194.

Norrick, N. R. (2001). Discourse Markers in Oral Narrative. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 33(6), 849-878.

Östman, J.-O. (1981). *You Know: A discourse Functional Approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Pawitra, A. (2009). *Kamus Lengkap Bahasa Madura-Indonesia* (Complete Dictionary Madurese-Indonesian). Jakarta: Dian Rakyat.

Ransom, E. N. (1986). *Complementation: Its Meanings and Forms*. Amsterdam: Benjamins

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language,* 50(4), 696-735.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schourup, L. C. (1985). *Common Discourse Particles in English Conversation*. New York: Garland.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis: An introduction*. Chichester, U.K: Wiley-Blackwell.

Stevens, A. M. (1968). *Madurese Phonology and Morphology*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2001). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Stenström, A.-B. (1998). From Sentence to Discourse: Cos (because) in Teenage Talk. In A. H. Jucker and Y. Ziv (Ed.). *Discourse Markers: Description and Theory*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1-12.

Takahashi, H. (2012). *A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of the English Imperative: With Special Reference to Japanese Imperatives*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

van der Auwera, J. (2010). Prohibition: Construction and Markers. In Shu, D., Turner, K., & International Conference on Contrastive Semantics and Pragmatics. (Ed.). *Contrasting Meaning in Languages of the East and West*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 443-475.

van der Wouden. T., & Foolen, A. (2015). Dutch particles in the Right Periphery. In Hancil, S., Haselow, A., and Post, M. (Ed.), *Final Particles.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 221-247

Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics. The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Widhyasmaramurti, W. (2008). *Tak and Kok in Javanese Language*. Unpublished thesis. Utrecht University the Netherlands.

Wolff, J. U. (1980). *Beginning Indonesian: Part 1*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University, Southeast Asia Program.

Wouk, F. (1998). Solidarity in Indonesian Conversation: The Discourse Marker *kan*. *Multilingua*, 17(4), 379-406.

Wouk, F. (1999). Gender and the Use of Pragmatic Particles in Indonesian. *Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 3(2), 194-219.

Wouk, F. (2001). Solidarity in Indonesian Conversation: The Discourse Marker *ya*. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 33 (2), 171-191.

Yoon, K. E. (2010). Question-Response Sequences in Conversation across Ten Languages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10), 2782-2798.

Yuniar, D., Sujatna, E.T., Heriyanto. (2013). Discourse Markers in Sundanese Oral Narrative. *LiNGUA*, 8 (2), 170-173.