# EVALUATING THE PRAGMATIC PARTICLE *JÂ'* IN A MADURESE SPOKEN CORPUS

Irham
*Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia*
irhamaladist@gmail.com

First received: 14 August 2017 Final proof received: 31 January 2017

**Abstract**

In verbal interaction and communication, speakers often employ communicative signals; verbal or non-verbal, special words or phrases, which can be regarded as *pragmatic markers* (Fraser, 1996; Foolen 2011). This paper aims to investigate the Madurese pragmatic particle *jâ'*: its position in the sentence and in sequences of interaction, and how it functions in conversation. To achieve the objectives of the present study, conversation analysis was employed to describe the particle's position in interaction and to account for its pragmatic functions. The data of the present study were taken from recorded conversations among Madurese speakers. This study showed that the particle *jâ'* predominantly occurred in turn-initial positions. In addition, the particle *jâ'* also appeared in sentence-initial and sentence-middle positions but not in sentence-final positions. In terms of function, the particle *jâ'* could function as topic shifts, prohibitive markers, and emphatic markers.

Keywords: pragmatic particles; Madurese; conversation analysis; turn

Language is the most noticeable tool that makes verbal interaction and communication possible. Communication, furthermore, is designed to gain mutual understanding, although the speakers do not always make their message explicit. Nonetheless, there are often subtle cues to interpret speakers' utterances. Speakers often make use of communicative signals: verbal or non-verbal, particular words or phrases, which can be regarded as pragmatic markers (Fraser, 1996; Foolen 2011).

Until recently, there are many different terms referring to pragmatic markers; discourse markers (Schiffrin, 1987; Fraser, 1996, 2006), discourse particles (Aijmer, 2002), and pragmatic particles (Foolen, 2011; Wouk, 1999). Additionally, several terms, albeit less used, such as phatic connective were also proposed by Bazzanella (as cited in Foolen, 2011). Regardless of the confounding conditions, this paper will use the term "pragmatic particles" to refer to certain small words, monosyllabics such as ke', la and *jâ'* in Madurese, or sih, kug, and dong in bahasa Indonesia that often have no lexical meaning but rather a pragmatic or procedural meaning. Therefore, the term "particle" is more appropriate to use.

The study of pragmatic particles in conversation has been a poignant issue in the last decades. For instance, investigations of 'well' and 'now' (Fraser, 1990; Aijmer, 2002; Defour, 2007) have found that they carry pragmatic meanings as "interpersonal function" (Traugott, 1999: 180) or as "topic changer" (Aijmer, 2002: 57-58). Additionally, the study of the particle 'oh' and its position in the conversation has been exhaustively explained in several publications (Heritage, 1984, 1998, 2013; Schiffrin, 1987). Heritage (2013) observes that the particle 'oh' can occur in first (as opening), second (as a response), and a third position (as closing).

(1) (GJ:FN) ((Three people are walking together: someone passes them wearing a photograph tee-shirt))
1 N: -> Oh that tee-shirt reminded me [STORY]

(2)
1 Ann: How are you feeling Joyce.=
2 Joy: -> Oh fi:ne.
3 Ann: 'Cause- I think Doreen mentioned that you weren't so well?

(3) (HG:II:25)
1 N: .hhh Dz he 'av 'iz own apa:rt[mint?]
2 H: [.hhhh] Yea:h,=
3 N: -> =Oh:,
(Heritage, 2013: 1-2)

Not only can the particle 'oh' appear in three different positions in the sequence of interaction, but it also can occur in turn-initial and turn-medial (James, 1972, 1974, as cited in Heritage, 2013). The

 *doi*: 10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9814

flexibility of the particle's position in the conversation gives rise to its multifunctionality. The abovementioned studies show that pragmatic particles in spoken language are worth studying with regard to their positions, both sequence and turn, which leads to their pragmatic functions. The present study, therefore, aims to investigate the pragmatic particle *jâ'* in Madurese conversation, how it is used and functions.

The particle *jâ'* of Madurese was chosen in this study for the following reasons. First, Madurese is an understudied regional language of Indonesia and enriching studies on local languages can shed light on Indonesian linguistics research diversity because Indonesia is the country with the second highest number of languages in the world. Second, the particle *jâ'* displays an interesting feature of pragmatic particles, namely, multifunctionality/ polyfunctionality which this current research is mostly concerned with. Third, it is to further argue that the particle *jâ'* not only functions as a demonstrative pronoun or equal in meaning to English "Don't" as stated by Davies (2010). Fourth, having known that there are no extant studies on Madurese pragmatic particles, it is a good way to start with the particle that potentially has a multifunctionality feature as what current pragmatic and conversation analysts have done in the recent years. The earlier particles mentioned here and in Davies (2010) such as la and ke' were only marking tenses and contrasts. Thus, they are less interesting and perhaps require a more robust corpus from either diachronic or synchronic data to examine their functions. Finally, studies on Indonesian pragmatic particles remain largely unexplored and local languages are far from being researched. Therefore, the present study enriches cross-linguistic research and enhances the study of Indonesian local languages in particular.

**Studies of pragmatic particles in Indonesia**

Indonesia has about 743 languages spread out from Sabang, in Western Indonesia, to Merauke in the East. However, there are not many studies investigating pragmatic particles or discourse markers in Indonesian vernacular languages. The possibilities of this ignorance can be explained as follows; Indonesian languages are too many to study, Indonesian linguists have a low interest to study them, or the Indonesian government has low support to do research on local languages. As a result, there have only been two main publications, and unfortunately they were written by non-Indonesian linguists, that have a major contribution to the present study of pragmatic particles or discourse markers in Indonesia. The first work was written by Ikranagara in 1975, while another publication was written by Wouk from 1998 to 2001.

Ikranagara's (1975) study is the first work on Indonesian pragmatic particles. She based her research on a folk play in Betawi, a dialect spoken in Jakarta. In her investigation, she found eight most frequent uses of pragmatic particles in the play. They are *kok, kek, ah, kan, ye (ya), sih, deh,* and *dong*. In understanding the functions of those particles, Ikranagara (1975) used equivalent English translations for each use of particles. By so doing, it helps non-Indonesian readers understand the meanings of the pragmatic particles.

Additionally, the meanings of those pragmatic particles are intimately associated with the type of sentences they are embodied. The particle *kok*, for instance, expresses a speaker's feeling of surprise when it is used in a declarative sentence. Conversely, *kok* in interrogative sentences indicates a speaker's query, unbelievable state, so that the speaker requires further explanation. The English translation for the latter case is on par with "how come" (Ikranagara, 1975:96). In her description of the particles, she makes use of three types of sentences in which the mentioned pragmatic particles mostly occur. The declarative, imperative, and interrogative are the most common type of sentences that eight Indonesian pragmatic particles appear. However, it is only kek and ya that can be used in those three categories. The rest merely appear in either declarative or interrogative sentence such as *kok* and *kan*, in declarative or imperative sentence such as *ah*, *deh,* and *dong*, and the particle sih which naturally occurs in interrogative sentence. The present study has benefited from Ikranagara's (1975) elaboration for understanding meaning in a way that type of sentence determines the pragmatic meaning. Therefore, this paper also addresses which types of sentence particle *jâ'* can be used and what pragmatic meaning it carries in each sentence.

The following works that are also important to note are Wouk's (1998, 1999, 2001) investigations of Indonesian pragmatic particles, especially *kan* and *ya*. Unlike Ikranagara who based the study on a folk play, Wouk used data from informal dialogues among Indonesian speakers. She additionally describes the position of *kan* and *ya* and extends their meaning by stating that these particles build solidarity among the speakers (Wouk, 1999). This function is closely related to the fact that Indonesian speakers highly regard their culture and politeness system. On the other hand, the purpose of *kan* in final position, for instance, is to make a tag question that enacts conjoint knowledge between the speakers (Wouk, 1999) and to some extent marks solidarity building.

The latest study that is in line with the present paper is Yuniar, Sujatna, and Heriyanto (2013) on discourse markers in Sundanese oral narratives. They state that the particles *téh*, *mah*, *da*, and *wé* used in an oral narrative are also very commonly used in everyday oral conversation. From their

analysis, those pragmatic particles indicate an emphatic marker to the sentences they embody. The limitation of this study, however, is in their methodological approach and presentation of the data, which is not glossed or translated.

The above studies investigate pragmatic particles in other Indonesian local languages. Linguists such as Ikranagara and Yuniar et al. use the term "discourse marker" in a way that they focus on investigating the functions of the particle in the discourse context. In addition, they employ the Schiffrin paradigm on discourse (markers). The present study, however, employs pragmatic particles in a way it will focus much on the pragmatic functions and incorporates conversation analysis within the investigation of the particle in conversation. Pragmatic particles in Madurese have never been explored except in a very short discussion in Davies (2010: 91-92, 185, & 240). This study can extend the discussion of pragmatic particles on local language, as what has been done by Ikranagara and Yuniar et al., and on spoken data like Wouk works.

**Madurese language and pragmatic particles**

The Madurese language belongs to the Austronesian language family, specifically Western Malayo-Polynesian (Adelaar, 2005 as cited in Davies, 2010). It is the fifth most-spoken language in Indonesia (Ethnologue, 2015). The population, according to *Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia* (Statistics Indonesia), is about 3.5 million spread throughout Madura Island, ranging from Bangkalan in the west to Sumenep in the East. Madurese is not only spoken in Madura Island but also in some parts of East Java such as Probolinggo, Lumajang, Jember, Sitobondo, Bondowosao, and northern part of Banyuwangi (Davies, 2010).

The lexical categories of Madurese language comprise open class and closed class words (Davies 2010). Nonetheless, several lexical items do not have a rigid word level. He further exemplified the so-called particles, namely *jâ', ba', keng*, and *coma* that are extensively used as' complementizer, question marker, and degree of modifier' (Davies, 2010: 240, 396, & 465). However, it is evident that from the present findings, the word *jâ'* is not always used in such a way.

Besides its polyfunctionality as it is going to be discussed in the discussion part, the particle *jâ'* is interesting because it is said to be grammatically derived from the word *enjâ'* which literally means "not" (Parwitra, 2009) and is often used to make a disclaimer or sense of denial. The following example below may give you an illustration how it is used. AX is asking BK whether or not BK has eaten. BK responds that he has not eaten yet by using *enjâ'*.

Example 1

```
1  AX   kakeh mareh ngakan
        You   PM    eat
        Have you eaten?

2  BK   enjâ'
        PRT
        No, I have not
```

Here, *enjâ'*, as the former form of *jâ'*, takes place as a complete turn. In such an exchange, AX's initiating sequence leads BK to respond in the second turn. BK's response is answering the preceding illocutionary act of questioning. *Enjâ'*, therefore, functions as the second pair part of the talk, and as a complete turn. Nonetheless, not all meanings of *jâ'* in the talks are "not". Some other meanings and functions of the particle are described in the findings and discussion sections.

## METHOD

The data were utterances consisting pragmatic particles as already mentioned in the previous parts. The data source of the present study was tape-recorded conversations. The conversations were in Madurese in which four participants were involved. All of the participants were native speakers of Madurese (speakers whose first language was Madurese) aged between 18 to 25 years old. The recording was made via an application on the phone and was started as soon as the speakers spoke Madurese. There was no setting given and the informants were speaking as naturally as they were in the natural use of the particle in Madurese conversation. As a result, the duration of recording varied. The collections of those recorded conversations were then considered as a spoken corpus.

There were 12 recordings in total (see Table 1). The data were then transcribed using ELAN. First of all, the recordings were excerpted to software in order to segment the utterances and gloss them. The glossed data were then created as well as its standard translation to make the readers easy to understand the sequence of the dialogues. I specifically focused on the occurrences of the particle *jâ'* in the conversations. The sequences and positions in the turn where particle *jâ'* took place were also considered for the purpose of the analysis. The obtained data were then analysed by employing Conversation Analysis.

The presentation of the data were written by following Leipzig glossing rules and Conversation Analysis rules; the original data and glossed data

were written in courier new with size 9, left-aligned vertically word by word, the English equivalent translation were written in TNR 12. In addition, the Conversation Analysis approach was incorporated to achieve the intended goal, namely to figure out pragmatic meanings of the particle *jâ'*. Thus, I closely examined the positions and the sequences of the interactions and turns of the conversation (cf. Heritage, 1998, 2013). Additionally, Fraser's (1990, 1996) framework was also employed to give a sufficient picture on the functions of the particle. It was initiated by describing the form (position in the interaction) of the particle and followed by giving sufficient elaboration of the pragmatic functions.

Table 1. Description of the recording

| No | Recording code | Duration |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Rec 1 | 00:03:52 |
| 2 | Rec 2 | 00:04:10 |
| 3 | Rec 3 | 00:30:11 |
| 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 |

## FINDINGS

From the observed data, the particle *jâ'* did not appear in all recordings. I offer ten excerpts of data where the participants made use of *jâ'* in their conversations. The meaning of *jâ'* in the conversations may, at least, depend on the position in the turn and the sequence in the conversations and type of sentence where *jâ'* appeared.

Additionally, before analysing its pragmatic functions, the particle *jâ'* is clustered based on its position in the interaction how the particle *jâ'* appears in sequence and turn, and sentence type; whether it occurs in declarative, interrogative, or imperative sentence.

The data showed that the particle *jâ'* only occurred in either initial or middle position of the turn. It did not appear in sentence final position. It is noticeably different from the syllabic particle ya/kan that can appear in all positions (Wouk, 1999, 2001) where both *jâ'* and *ya/kan* belong to the same language family, which is an Austronesian language. It can be expected that they may have similar characteristics in terms of turns in conversation.

From the corpora, there are ten occurrences of *jâ'*, most of them are in turn-initial positions. Nine of them appear as second pair part as a response. The particle *jâ'* also occurs in the first and second position. It seems to be equivalent to oh as to open and response the sequence interaction (Heritage, 2013). Both *jâ'* and *oh* are comparable in a way that there are monosyllabic and thus we may expect them to share the similar characteristics. In terms of sentence type, the particle *jâ'* is abundantly used in declarative sentences. Some speakers in the data, likewise, use the particle in interrogative and imperative sentences. The meanings are varied across sentences.

### The particle *jâ'* in turn- initial position

As previously mentioned, the present data showed that the particle *jâ'* occurred in turn-initial position in most occurrences. However, this does not necessarily mean that it cannot occur in middle position. In section 1, *jâ'* possible occurrence has been exhaustively elaborated. Based on the data, some examples of *jâ'* in initial positions are presented Excerpt 1 and Excerpt 2.

Excerpt 1

```
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)
```

Excerpt 2

```
1  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?
```

In the spoken corpus, the particle *jâ'* appears turn-initial. The present data have not revealed any occurrence of the particle in turn-final nor in turn middle position. This finding may add to the particle's uniqueness or speciality.

Excerpt 3

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

### The particle *jâ'* and the sequence in conversations

The present data show that the particle *jâ'* can occur in the first (opening) and second position (response).

```
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
6              (0.2)
```

Excerpt 4

```
1  Rai         ade'    UKT[i] se  pa'ratos      ruah
               Nothing UKT REL four hundreds FP
               There is 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)
```

For the sequence of the interaction, the particle *jâ'* can appear in the first and second position. The function then varies from opening the talk to giving a response.

**The particle *jâ'* and sentence types**

The particle *jâ'* can appear in various types of sentences such as in declarative sentences (excerpt 5), interrogative (excerpt 6), or imperative sentences (excerpt 7). The data show that eight out of ten hits, the particle *jâ'* occurred in declarative sentence.

The findings show that the particle *jâ'* can occur in turn-initial position that is often used to initiate the floor in conversation. Unlike *enjâ'* or the particle *ya* in bahasa Indonesia, the particle *jâ'* cannot be used as a complete turn. Besides, it appears in the sequence of conversation in the first and second position only. None of the data shows that the particle is possible to take the third position. I regard with sentence types, the particle can all be used in declarative, interrogative, and imperative sentences. Extended elaboration on how it functions will be given in the following section.

Excerpt 5

```
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)
```

Excerpt 6

```
1  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
```

Excerpt 7

```
1  Muz         ja' 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
```

**DISCUSSION**

In this section, the multiple functions of the particle *jâ'* are elaborated. Its old meaning (not-derived from *enjâ'*) and its canonical translation in Davies' (2010) works are maybe only a few functions of the particle in natural language use. The particle *jâ'* not only can explain the previous proposition (like that as noun clause in English) but also can function as a topic shift, a prohibitive marker, and an emphatic marker. In addition, the present corpus shows that the particle *jâ'* never occurs in a single turn as a complete turn nor as a single response for a question. It has received a new meaning that can be traced from the context where the particle appears in the conversation.

***Jâ'* as a topic shift**

Aijmer (2002) proposes frame functions of discourse

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

Similarly, the present particle in this paper seems to share similar pragmatic functions of topic shift. Unlike *ya* in Turkish that occurs in final position, the particle *jâ'* in initial position that prefaces question is used to shift the topic of the conversation. In the following example, excerpt 8, Muz and Ati discuss about the tuition fee in their university. In the beginning of the talk, Muz expresses her worries about paying the tuition fee. Ati confirms that she has not paid the tuition fee either. After a short gap, Muz initiates a new topic to discuss (line 7).

Excerpt 8

```
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[ii] kategori berempah beeng
           P    FIL  category[iii] what     you
           What category are you

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)
```

```
18  Rai                                                  [be]
                                                          HRT
                                                          Ow (agree)
```

In the conversation, Muz agrees with Ati's statement that they have not paid the tuition fee (line 4-5). After Muz's turn in line 4, there is no one taking the floor. Instead, there is a short gap that is about 0.2 milliseconds. To this end, Muz, as the latest speaker who takes the turn, has her right to continue her turn and take the floor (Sacks et. al, 1974). Having this chance, Muz initiated her other first floor by addressing a question about how the condition science and technology student is concerning the tuition that they have to pay. She used *jâ'* in that prefaces question and it is in initial position (line 7). She said "*Jâ' saintek jeh arapah ye mbak ye*" that means what happens with science and technology students.

This topic that she addresses is a different topic in which she wants to discuss. The use of *jâ'* in the conversation above is then to shift the topic from discussing how to pay the tuition to a new one that is how science and technology students deal with the tuition fee. The question in which *jâ'* is embodied is not to ask for confirmation. However, as Muz is not a student of Science and Technology, she wants to seek information. The present of *jâ'* thus also generates a pragmatic meaning of information seeking in the sense that Muz does not have the knowledge for the case she addresses.

In responding to this case, Ati who is a student of Science and Technology directly answers that it is terrible for science and technology students because they have to pay about two million and four hundred thirty something (line 8-9). Her response directly occurs without a gap (line 8) after Muz' turn (line 7). It could be understood that Ati has more knowledge to tell Muz pertaining to this case.

Accordingly, *jâ'* that takes place in an initial position can also function as to addressing a new topic in which the speakers do not intend to seek information but to give new information. It usually appears when the speakers want to begin to tell their story of personal experience. In the following example, Muz opens the talk by telling the story of her roommate. She tells Ati how her roommate feels about having to pay much more compared to students of other departments.

Excerpt 9

```
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 it is 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
```

The excerpt above, *jâ'* prefaces a statement in which Muz begins to tell about her roommate's feeling. It also occurs in initial position as the previous excerpt. However, in this case, the use of *jâ'* is not to ask for an explanation as it appears in 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

discuss earlier where science and technology students have to pay the tuition fee in different amount of money.

Therefore, Muz' new information about how her roommate's feeling is slightly a different topic. More importantly, it is new information for other participants which can be traced from Ati' response in line 4-5. Although she is a student in science and technology department, she is still surprised facing the fact that she has to pay that cost. Thus, this response subtly shows that she agrees and accepts the new information given by Muz.

***Jâ'* as prohibitive marker**

Unlike a filler that merely fills in the blank a talk to, for instance, give the speakers time to project the following utterance, *jâ'* can function as the core element in the sentence. When it is used in the imperative sentence, *jâ'* becomes a semantic element that gives a negative meaning. Thus, the sentence can be understood as either a warning or a prohibition. Chondrogianni (2011) investigates the prohibitive marker in Modern Greek. Particularly, she sheds light the particle *μη(ν)* and its environment in syntactic structure. Particle *μη(ν)* introduces a prohibitive marker when it is not preceded by subjunctive particle *vá*. Consequently, such a prohibition can be understood as "preventive and negative warnings", the former uses a perfective verb while the later uses an imperfective verb (Chondrogianni, 2011:138)

The particle *jâ'* in Madurese in the imperative sentence complies with a similar function that is as a prohibitive marker. It expresses an act of warning, or to some extent, a prohibition to the hearer not to do something. To illustrate, following is an example from a Madurese oral narrative collected by IOWA digital library.

Example 10

```
1   Mon se  tak gellem maso'   agama    anyar jiya
     If  REL not want   convert religion new   this
     If they don't want to convert to the new religion

2   lo' olle  paksa, jâ'' paksa
    not allow force  PRT force
    don't force, don't force (them)
```

Here the speaker tells about the king that finds his guardian converting to a new religion. The guardian then asks permission to the King that he wants to tell the society of Arosbaya about his new belief. The king was angry at first because converting to a new religion without his permission is a breach of the kingdom's rules. However, the King lets the guardian exercise his new religion and even allows him to tell (invite) the society about his new religion.

The King warns the guardian not to force the society who does not want to convert to this new religion. The King says *"Mon se tak gellem maso' agama anyar jiya lo' olle paksa, jâ'' paksa"* which means "if they don't want to convert to the new religion you bring, don't force, don't force them". The *jâ"*-prefaced warning (line 2) eventually indicates a degree of action that should not be done by the hearer. Hence, regardless of King's disagreement to his guardian's new religion, he still allows the guardian to invite the society but with the condition of no force.

The particle *jâ"* attached to the word paksa "force" in line 2 gives a stronger negative meaning. The earlier literal meaning of "not" from the word lo' expresses speaker's state to warn. Thus, particle *jâ"* emphasizes the degree of warning. Here, the meaning of *jâ'* is equivalent to English "don't". To this case, I conclude that *jâ'* gives a negative meaning to the command it embodies. As a matter of fact, the negative meaning of *jâ'* remains there although the preceding proposition "lo' olle paksa" is omitted. The word lo' indeed gives a negative meaning to this proposition. However, it is not a precondition that entails a negative meaning of *jâ'* itself. To exemplify, the sentence can still be understood and accepted by Madurese speakers although it is presented in a way where "lo' olle paksa" is omitted such as in the following example:

```
1     Mon se  tak gellem maso'  agama    anyar jiya  jâ'' paksa
       If  REL not want  convert religion new   this  PRT force
       If they don't want to convert to the new religion, don't force(them)
```

This type of *jâ'* usage is also common in Madurese daily informal talk. From the audio-taped dialogues, Ati and Rai is talking about a young lecturer. According to Ati, a young lecturer tends to be stingy in giving a grade because the lecturer is not married yet. Rai agrees with Ati's statement. In closing the sequence, Muz makes a warning with *jâ'* in initial position.

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
                (they are) stingy in giving grade (laugh)

6               (0.1)

7  Rai          hem
                Hem
                Heem (yes)

8               (0.3)

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
```

Muz's response produces an imperative sentence prefaced by particle *jâ'*. It enacts a command or an order to the hearer not to do something. Thus, the speaker has a commitment to warn the hearer not to do something. Such a type of sentence belongs to commissives in Austin's category (Austin, 1962). Nonetheless, this *jâ'* meaning appearing in the imperative sentence is not necessarily restricted to a warning per se. It could also be understood as an order, a request, or perhaps advice. What is interesting from this function is that *jâ'* can only be used in a negative imperative sentence since it carries a negative meaning. The reason I could argue for this case is that *jâ'*" is a grammaticalized form of *enjâ'* which means "not". *Jâ'* preserves its old meaning whenever it is used in a command or an imperative sentence.

**_Jâ'_ as emphatic marker**

Besides the two mentioned functions, the particle *jâ'* also enacts an emphatic marker that is to emphasize a basic intended message (Fraser, 1996). Some English discourse markers within this category are *really*, *indeed*, and *definitely*. As the nature of pragmatic particles, they do not have a clear semantic meaning but does bring a pragmatic meaning (Foolen, 2011; Aijmer, 2002; Fraser, 1990). Particle *jâ'* in this sense also performs an illocutionary act of giving emphasis to sentence it is embodied. In so doing, the speakers deem a statement to be fervently crucial. Han (2011) notes some usages of emphatic markers in public speeches. Their function is that to fill a communicative feature and to arouse hearer's attention. She elaborates that the use of emphatic markers, such as *definitely*, *indeed*, and *really* in public speeches, plays a significant role to achieve speakers' communicative goal (Han, 2011).

Having discovered that fact, the particle *jâ'* that occurs in the initial position does emanate an emphatic marker. In most of the data, it appeared in declarative sentences and occurred in the second position as a response. In the following example, Rai initiates the conversation by addressing a question. Accordingly, Muz responds by answering the question. Muz uses the particle *jâ'* that prefaces a response. The presence of *jâ'* here gives an emphasis to Muz's statement.

Excerpt 12

```
1  Rai          ade'    UKT se  pa'ratos      ruah
                Nothing UKT REL four hundreds FP
                There is 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 no body 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. Therefore, there are not many students in this department who have a subsidy and merely pay four hundred rupiahs for the tuition fee. This knowledge is even strengthened by Ati's response in line 3-4 and line 6-9. Hence, the particle *jâ'* in Muz's turn is equivalent to "indeed, the fact that".

**The particle *jâ'*, en*jâ'*, and Indonesian *ya***

From the above discussion, it is worth noticing that the particle *jâ'* cannot perform a complete turn in the talk but is able to enact as a second pair part in the sequence. The *enjâ'*, and Indonesian *ya* on the other hand, can appear in a complete turn and third position as closing (see example 1; Wouk 2001). The position of *(en)jâ'* in the second position is closely comparable to Raclaw's (2013) study on 'no'-prefaces in English conversation. In this position, 'no'- prefaces can function as a response of a prior turn and shift marking (Raclaw, 2013). On the contrary, 'no' in turn-initial position functions as a transition marker (Schegloff, 2001). Interestingly, Madurese speakers use the particle *jâ'* merely in two positions, namely in turn-initial position (excerpt 1 & 2) as in example 3 or turn-medial as in example 4. It cannot occur in a final position such as in example 5.

Example 3

```
1  AX   Jâ' e-kala' kabbih engkok taoh
        PRT OV-take all    I      know
        That all is taken I know
```

In this example, particle *jâ'* occurs in turn-initial position. It pragmatically functions as an emphatic marker. For the fact that it is a declarative sentence, the presence of particle *jâ'* prefaces declarative sentence emphasis the statement that the speaker expresses. In the next example, *jâ'* is in a turn-medial position.

Example 4

```
1  AX   Engkok taoh jâ' e-kala' kabbih
        I      know PRT OV-take all
        I know that all is taken
```

When particle *jâ'* is in turn-medial, its functions is equivalent to "that" in noun clause that explains the verb *taoh* "know". I categorize this type of function as a complemetizer. In the following example is position of *jâ'* that cannot occur.

Example 5

```
1  AX   engkok taoh e-kala' kabbih jâ'*[iv]
        I      know OV-take all    PRT
        I know that all is taken
```

The use of the particle *jâ'* in turn-final position is not accepted in Madurese and it cannot appear in such position in the sense that it does not bring any pragmatic function.

**CONCLUSION**

To recapitulate, the particle *jâ'* in the conversation are diverse in terms of its sequences and turns. The particle *jâ'* can occur in either first (initiating) or second (responsive) position (Excerpt 3 and 4). Unlike the particle *oh* that can be used in first, second, and third position (Heritage, 2013), the present data show that the particle *jâ'* cannot be used as sequence closing. Furthermore, the present particle is predominant in turn-initial positions (Excerpt 1 and 2). Compared to the particle *ya* or *kan* (Wouk, 1998, 1999, 2001), the latter particles can appear in turn-initial, turn-medial, and turn-final positions and pragmatically vary very considerably.

The present study also takes a look at the sentence types in which the particle appears. Besides the sequence and turn position, the types of sentences can bring a significant portrayal of

pragmatic function because the type of sentence can show the type of speech acts of the particle. For instance, the use of the particle *kan* in interrogative sentence may evoke to show a "confirmation" (Wouk, 1998). As a results, the data show an interesting fact that the particle *jâ'* can appear in declarative (Excerpt 5), interrogative (Excerpt 6), and imperative sentence (Excerpt 7)

In section 4, the distribution of the particle *jâ'* in sentence types, sequences, and turns of conversation has been shown thoroughly. Based on those results, the pragmatic functions of the particle *jâ'* are formulated as follows: as topic shift, as prohibitive marker, and as emphatic marker. The particle *jâ'* can be used to change to the topic of conversation as it is exemplified in excerpt 8 and to address a new topic as in excerpt 9. In this function, the particle appears in initial position. The similar function can also be found in English particle *now* (Aijmer, 2002) or Turkish particle *ya* (Corcu, 2006) which occurs in turn final position.

In accordance with the previous function, the particle *jâ'* is worth to have the function as a prohibitive marker. It works like prohibitive marker *jangan* in *bahasa Indonesia*. The speech acts that are enacted from this function may vary depending on the context. It may be used to make a warn, command, or order. Research on prohibitive markers has also been done in Greek particle *μη(ν)* (Chondrogianni, 2011). It introduces a prohibitive marker when it is not preceded by subjunctive particle *νά*. The meaning can be understood as "preventive and negative warnings" (Chondrogianni, 2011:138). The particle *jâ'* in the present data can be used to give a warn (excerpt 10 and 11).

The last function of the particle *jâ'* in the present study is that it functions as an emphatic marker. As in Fraser's (1990, 1996) elaboration, the English expressions *really, indeed,* or *definitely* fall into this function category. Thus, the standard English translation for the particle *jâ'* in this category may be best represented by *really*, *indeed,* or *definitely*. The speaker may use this particle as an emphasis in a ways that he or she aims to gain the audience's attention and achieve the communicative goal (Han, 2011). The particle *jâ'* therefore has provided a salient picture on how a particular pragmatic particle in one language may have diverse functions depending on the position it occurs.

Intriguingly, the particle *jâ'* emanates various pragmatic meanings across those positions. Furthermore, sentence types where *jâ'* occupies enrich its illocutionary acts that enable speakers to "do thing with words" (Austin 1962, as cited in Kendrick & Torreira, 2016). It shows a topic shift when it is used in an interrogative sentence. It gives an act of warning or prohibition for imperative sentences, and an emphasis to the importance of the statement in declarative sentences.

In addition to the above mentioned conclusion, the present study may also make a significant contribution to Madurese linguists to further extend the category and meaning possibilities of the particle *jâ'* in both Madurese dictionary and Madurese book. Besides, non-Madurese speakers who are willing to communicate with Madurese can be more aware of using the most appropriate *jâ'*. Misuse of such particle may lead to miscommunication or ambiguity. Of course, the last proposition needs more thorough investigation whether or not it may bring about such a serious effect in communication.

Future researchers can further examine the relations of particles with preferred or dispreferred responses. In several occurrences, there is always a gap before the speaker initiates then sequences. The particle *jâ'* prefaces in Madurese conversation tends to enact the a similar pragmatic function to "no" prefaces in English (see Raclaw, 2013). Besides, the politeness factor can also be considered for further research on how it is used among differences social classes of interlocutors. As a matter of fact, Madurese speakers highly regard the politeness system in their speaking. Hence, they may use different types of particles to convey the same pragmatic meaning.

## REFERENCES


Aijmer, K. (2002). *English discourse particles: Evidence from a corpus*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co

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

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.

Corcu, D. (2006). Analysis of discourse particle in relations to the information structure of text & dialogues: Examples from Turkish. In *Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (10-ICAL).*

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

Defour, T. (2007). *A Diachronic Study of the Pragmatic Markers "well" and "now"*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Ghent, Ghent.

Ethnologue. (2015). Madurese language. Retrieved August 12th 2015 from https://www.ethnologue.com/language/mad

Foolen, A. (2011). Pragmatic markers and the notion of speaker attitude. Gisle Andersen & Karin Aijmer (eds.), *Pragmatics of Society*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 217-242.

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. (2006). Toward a theory of discourse markers. In K. Fischer (Ed.). *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Press.

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.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

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

Heritage, J. (2013). Turn-initial position and some of its occupants. *Journal of Pragmatics, 57*(3), 331-337.

Ikranagara, K. (1975). Lexical particles in Betawi. *Linguistics, 165*, 93-108.

Kendrick, K. H., & Torreira, F. (2015). The timing and construction of preference: A quantitative study. *Discourse Processes, 52*(4), 255-289.

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

Raclaw, J., & Fox, B. (2013). *Indexing inferables and organizational shifts: 'No'-prefaces in English conversation* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Colorado, Boulder.

Schegloff, E. A. (2001). Getting Serious: Joke - serious "no". *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*(12), 1947-1955.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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

Traugott, E. C. (1999). The rhetoric of counter-expectation in semantic change: a study in subjectification. In A. Blank, & P. Koch. (eds.), *Historical semantics and cognition*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

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.

Wouk, F., & Arafiq. (2010). *The Particle Kai in Bahasa Bima*. Proceeding from *6th Conference on East Nusantara Languages*, Kupang, Indonesia.

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

[i] *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)

[ii] I think this is a filler, it has no meaning. FIL: FIller

[iii] Category here refers to students' financial category when they first enroll to the university. They are divided into three main categories; category one is for financially disadvantage students, category two is for cannot be able to pay above average, and category three is for students who can pay above the average

[iv] ungrammatical