

## **Discourse Particle *suda* in Papuan Malay: *Its Meanings and Functions***

### **ABSTRACT**

Discourse particle *suda* in Papuan Malay (PM) – a hybrid language spoken in Tanah Papua, Indonesia – plays an important role in natural conversations and written exchanges among the speakers. It becomes evident in utterances or sentences from various stories written by named and unnamed authors in blogs and websites and mobilized by the internet for readers. However, there has not been a study on this particle and therefore this study is to investigate its meanings and functions in utterances or sentences in PM. The content analysis, semantic, and pragmatic methods are used to explore the meanings and functions of this particle in twenty-five utterances or sentences in which it occurs. The results show that the particle *suda* is not inflected grammatically. It is not a clitic particle so its form does not change regardless of where it appears in an utterance or a sentence. It is both a final-ending type and an initial type. Semantically, it carries more than one meaning. It can have one meaning in one context but entirely

different meaning in another context. Pragmatically, it conveys more than one function, but, it cannot serve as one-word answer to a question. It is categorized as connective particle, illocutionary function particle, modal particle, evidential particle, and focus particle. The findings can be used by future researchers as a guideline, specifically its methodology, for exploring other discourse particles of PM awaiting to investigate. They can also contribute to the scholarship of discourse particles.

Keywords: Papuan Malay; discourse particle; utterance; meaning; function

## **INTRODUCTION**

Tanah Papua with its population of 5, 434, 068 (Biro Statistik Papua dan Papua Barat, 2024) is located in the most eastern part of Indonesia (Map of Indonesia, 2024) and it shares the borderland with the Independence State of Papua New Guinea (PNG) (Map of New Guinea Island, 2024). Papuan Malay (PM) is a hybrid language (a mixture of Papuan languages, Dutch and Malay) that has been spoken by the people of Tanah Papua for many years before Indonesia took over Tanah Papua from the Netherlands as part of its territory in 1969 (Morin, 2018). PM has fourteen discourse particles (Morin, 2020) that are used as part of daily communicative exchanges among the people of

Tanah Papua. Discourse particles are elements in a language that carry meanings and functions in utterances or sentences of which they are a part. They are ‘fully integrated into the syntax of utterances and cannot constitute utterances by themselves’ (Ameka, 1992a:108). They follow ‘a word to show its relationship to other words in a sentence, and/or give that word a particular meaning or nuance’ (Kawashima, 1999:i). And, “formally, they are morphologically invariable and from a functional point of view, they tend to express a speaker’s immediate ‘here-and-now’ attitudes, thoughts, and desires” (Goddard, 2011:165). English has these examples *well, just, oh, now, sort of* and *you know* (Aijmer, 2000) and Bahasa Indonesia (BI) includes *pun* and *lah* (Sneddon, 2010) or *sih, kok, dong, lho* (Karaj, 2021). And some examples in PM are *e, o, kappa, lagi, mo* and *se* (Morin, 2020a; Morin, 2020b; Morin, 2023).

Table 1 indicates that PM has three groups of discourse particles. Group 1 consists of two particles originating from two individual sounds and Group 2 has five particles in the form of words. Both groups do not have primary meanings at all. In contrast, Group 3 includes seven particles with primary meanings in their own right. The occurrence of these particles in each utterance or sentence in every dialogue or conversation and written text depends totally on how interlocutors and/or writers selectively decide to use them in their communication to each other. For this paper we focus on the discourse particle *suda* in Group 3.

**TABLE 1 Three groups of discourse particles in PM**

Group 1 2 particles	Group 2 5 particles	Group 3 7 particles
e	ka	baru (new)
o	kappa	dulu (first time)
	mo	jadi (become)
	se	lagi (again)
	to	saja (only)
		sampe (until)
		suda (already)

(Adapted from Morin, 2020)

The paper is organised as follows: section of *Materials and Methods* will briefly explain where data came from and the methods that were used to do analysis. Section of *Results and Discussion* has two subsections. First, *Meanings and Functions of the Discourse Particle 'suda' in Daily Communication Practices* will show the meanings and functions of discourse particle *suda* in the twenty-five utterances or sentences of daily communicative practices among the speakers of PM in Tanah Papua. Each utterance or sentence will present the equivalent meaning of the particle *suda* in both English and BI, followed by a detailed discussion of the meaning of particle in relation to the utterance types in which it occurs, its position in the utterance, and an analysis of its functions or uses in relation to the social contexts where it occurs. Second, *Classification of the Discourse Particle 'suda' of Papuan Malay* will display the five classifications of the particle as discovered in the utterances or sentences. Lastly, section of *Conclusion* will summarise and conclude the meanings and functions of the discourse particle

*suda* in utterances or sentences used in daily communication of the speakers of PM.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

Data for this paper were taken from 200 short stories and/or jokes collected in the previous study (Morin, 2018:117 – 209). We used the content analysis (Krippendorff, 2019), semantic (Riemer, 2010) and pragmatic (Senft, 2014) methods in the research. Results of the content analysis indicate that only found forty-four texts or stories that contain the discourse particle *suda*. From these texts we selected 25 utterances or sentences to focus on. Then, this particle was semantically studied to discover its primary and secondary meanings from each utterance or sentence. These meanings were, then, translated into English together with the utterances that hosted them. We also did either intralingual or interlingual translation into BI as a comparison to PM to show their similarities and differences in word choices and meanings due to their linguistic closeness to each other. Lastly, the pragmatic analysis was used to discover its functions or uses in utterances or sentences on the basis of what situational contexts it existed in.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

In this section we argue that the discourse particle *suda* has a number of meanings and functions which have been used by its speakers for centuries in Tanah Papua. We show its position in utterances or sentences, its meanings and functions in

particular contexts or social practices and its classification. We also show that it is different from the discourse particles in BI in terms of its linguistic form, meanings and functions.

#### **MEANINGS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE DISCOURSE PARTICLE ‘SUDA’ IN DAILY COMMUNICATION PRACTICES**

In PM the word *suda* is a discourse particle which is mostly placed at the end of an utterance or a sentence for different meanings and functions. In some cases it also appears at the beginning of an utterance or a sentence. But, in BI it is a word, not a discourse particle. It is written as *sudah* ‘already’ and it is a time marker which is never positioned at the end of an utterance or a sentence. Below is a discussion on the meanings and functions of the discourse particle *suda* that exists in numerous contexts.

First, the discourse particle *suda* has the meaning of ‘come on’, that is, ‘to encourage someone to do something, especially to hurry or try harder’ (Online Cambridge Dictionary, 2024). In BI it has the meaning of *ayo* which is used for the same purpose but it is always placed at the beginning of an utterance or a sentence that ends with an exclamation mark. Utterance 1 is a directive act, that is, a guardian angel (standing between heaven and hell) was encouraging a sinner in a polite manner in order to jump into the fire of hell because he was reluctant to jump. Similarly, in utterance 2 a shy student of elementary school named Yaklep (the addressee) was politely encouraged by his art teacher (the speaker) to come

forward to the front of the classroom to recite a poem. Whereas, in utterances 3 and 4 the particle *suda* has the meaning of ‘please’ in English and in BI it is *-lah* particle which is used for the same purpose but it is always attached to a verb or a word that ends with an exclamation mark. It is used to

<b>PM</b>	<b>BI</b>
1) Locat <b>suda!</b> <b>Come on, jump!</b>	<b>Ayo, loncat!</b>
2) Yaklep, ko maju <b>suda!</b> <b>Come on, Yaklep,</b> come forward!	<b>Ayo, Yaklep,</b> maju!
3) Ko diam situ <b>suda!</b> <b>Please</b> be quite! or <b>Please</b> shut up!	<b>Diamlah</b> kau! or Diam kau!



FIGURE 1 Traffic board in the heart of Jayapura city

4) Mabuk! Stop Nyetir <b>Sudah!</b> Drunk! <b>Please</b> stop driving!	<b>Mabuk! Berhentilah</b> mengemudi!
---	---

make an order or a request more polite. In this sense, both utterances are directive acts. In utterance 3 the speaker (a teacher) asked a student

in a strong but polite way to shut up from making noises in the classroom and in utterance 4, a polite and persuasive order is from the Papua Traffic Police Department to all drivers to avoid drunk-driving behavior. It is inscribed on the traffic board (Figure 1) and emplaced in each corner of the streets in the heart of Jayapura city and the surrounding suburbs. Here, we can notice that the function of the particle *suda* is to modify a flat directive utterance into (a) an encouraging and persuasive directive utterance (utterances 1 and 2), and (b) a strong and more polite directive utterance (utterances 3 and 4). Thus, the function of the particle *suda* in these four utterances or sentences is to modify a directive utterance from a flat nature to either softer or stronger nature in a more polite way.

Second, the discourse particle *suda* carries the meanings of ‘could you...please’, ‘please’, and ‘let us’ (let’s) in English while *hendaklah*, *hendaknya*, *silakan* (*silahkan*), *mohon* and *ayo* in BI. The speaker (a son) in utterance 5 told the addressee (his father) to ask somebody else to replace him because he could not do what his father wanted him to do. In this case, the particle *suda* has the meanings of ‘please’, ‘it is requested’, ‘you should’ and *hendaklah* or *hendaknya* in BI and therefore ‘could you’ clause which ends with ‘please’ can be used in this father-son relation context to alter a flat requesting utterance into a

<b>PM</b>	<b>BI</b>
5) Suru yang lain <b>suda.</b>	<b>Hendaklah</b> menyuruh orang lain!

**Could you ask  
somebody else,  
please?**

more polite one. Utterance 6 is about a request from the speaker (the intruder) to the addressee (the gardener) to calculate all financial costs to be paid for the garden products which had been taken away by accident. Here, the particle *suda* carries the meaning of ‘please’ in English and *silakan/silahkan* in BI, that is, to make a request more polite to the addressee to do something for

**PM**

**BI**

- 6) Nap ko hitung **suda**. **Silakan** anda /  
Bro, **please** calculate kamu menghitung  
that! nya!

his own benefit. Furthermore, the speaker (the customer of a restaurant) in utterance 7 politely requested the addressee (the host/owner) to bring over his lunch. Here, the particle *suda* means ‘please’ in English and *mohon* in BI because ‘please’ or *mohon* usually occurs in utterances with the meaning of ‘request’ which is a direct request

**PM**

**BI**

- 7) Bawa kemari **suda**! **Mohon** membawa-  
**Please** bring it over! nya kemari!

to the addressee in certain contexts such as restaurants and shops. For utterance 8 the speaker (a grandma) made a suggestion to the addressee (her grandson) to go together by motor bike

because she had already sat properly at the back of the rider (the grandson). So, the use of particle *suda* conveys the meaning of ‘let us’ (formal) or ‘let’s’ (informal) in English and *mari* in BI, that is, ‘to make suggestions or to give orders to a group that includes the speaker.’ (Swan, 1996:306). Here, we can see that the particle *suda* changes a directive utterance (ordering) into an assertive utterance (suggesting). On the contrary, utterances 9 and 10 are assertive utterances where the presence of the

<b>PM</b>	<b>BI</b>
8) Ne, jalan <b>suda!</b> Alright, <b>let’s</b> move!	<b>Ayo</b> jalan!
9) Sa kirim sa pu foto lewat imel <b>suda!</b> <b>Let</b> me send my photo by email!	<b>Biar</b> saya mengirim fotoku lewat email!
10) <b>Biar</b> [de ikut paduan suara] <b>suda!</b> <b>Let</b> him join the choir!	<b>Biar</b> [dia mengikuti paduan suara]!

particle *suda* changes their nature. In utterance 9 it means ‘let’ in English and *biar* or *biarlah* in BI where the speaker used the first-person singular imperative ‘let me’ to give instructions to himself to send his photos via email. In utterance 10 it also means ‘let’ in English and *biar* or *biarlah* in BI but the speaker used the third-person imperative ‘let him’ to make a suggestion to someone else, neither to the speaker nor to the addressee. In this case, the

speaker (the father) suggested that his son may join the church choir instead of the karate group. Overall, the function of the particle *suda* in these six utterances or sentences is (a) to modify a directive utterance from a flat nature to either softer or stronger nature in a more polite way (utterances 5, 6 and 7); (b) to change a directive utterance (ordering) into an assertive utterance (suggesting) as in utterance 8, and (c) to change an informing utterance (assertive utterance) into a suggesting utterance (assertive utterance) as in utterances 9 and 10.

Third, the discourse particle *suda* means ‘Why don’t...?’, ‘What about/how about ...?’ in English. BI usually uses the phrase *Bagaimama kalau....?* or *Kalo begitu ...?* which appears at the beginning of an utterance or a sentence for the same purpose. Utterances 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 show how the speakers used the particle *suda* to make and/or reject a suggestion. In this regard, there are four issues to look at. First, the speaker (the future wife) used a combination of particles *suda* and *e* in utterances 11 and 13 for the purpose of begging the addressee (the future husband) with a strong wish that he accepted her suggestions for their wedding time (month). But, in fact, her first suggestion (utterance 11) was refused by her future husband due to the abundance of his office works in the current month. She, then, convincingly assumed that November would be definite so she only used particle *suda* without adding particle *e* to end her second suggestion (utterance 12). Unexpectedly, he disagreed with the reason that he must be very busy to finalize his paper works on his promotion towards the end of November.

Without overwhelming expectation she again made another suggestion (utterance 13) in which a combination of particles *suda* and *e* were reoccurred because this suggestion might possibly

- | <b>PM</b>   | <b>BI</b>   |
|---|---|
| 11) Kitong kawin bulan Oktober <b>suda</b> e.<br><b>Why don't</b> we get married in October?<br><b>I am begging you!</b>  | <b>Bagaimana kalau</b> kita menikah bulan Oktober?<br><b>Saya mohon!</b>                    |
| 12) <b>Kalo begitu</b> [kita kawin bulan] November <b>suda!</b><br><b>What about</b> [getting married in] November <b>instead?</b>  | <b>Bagaimana kalau</b> kita menikah bulan November <b>saja?</b>                             |
| 13) Oh, <b>kalo begitu</b> [kita kawin bulan] Desember <b>suda</b> e?<br>Well, <b>how about</b> [getting married in] December <b>instead?</b><br><b>I am begging you!</b> | Oh, <b>bagaimana kalau</b> [kita menikah bulan] Desember <b>saja?</b><br><b>Saya mohon!</b> |
| 14) Nanti Januari tahun depan <b>suda.</b><br><b>Why don't</b> [we have it in] January next year?   | <b>Bagaimana kalau</b> Januari tahun depan?   |
| 15) <b>Bagaimana kalo</b> sa kase bapa 2000   | <b>Bagaimana kalau</b> saya memberikan  |

**suda.** Rp.2000 kepada  
**Why don't** I give bapak?  
you Rp. 2,000?

be rejected with some other reasons. It is true that her suggestion was once again declined. But, instead of rejecting with the reason that December would be the busiest month due to the Christmas parties he, then, proposed January in the following year without adding particle *e* to follow *suda*. Second, utterances 14 and 15 follow the same pattern, that is, an informing utterance ends with particle *suda* to indicate that the speaker made a suggestion for the first time. However, by combining particles *suda* and *e* as in utterances 11 and 13 indicates that the speaker (the future wife) strongly wished for a yes answer from the addressee (the future husband) about their wedding plan because culturally she was not at the position of making the final say. While, the particle *suda* standing alone at the end of utterance 14 shows that the speaker (the future husband) had the final voice and he did not expect any refusal from the addressee (the future wife). Third, in PM the phrase *kalo begitu* 'if so' (utterances 12 and 13) is the common phrasal marker which is only used when making another suggestion and ends with the particle *suda*. In this case, the particle *suda* means 'instead'. In contrast, BI uses the same phrase *bagaimana kalau* either to begin a suggestion or to propose another one after the first one is rejected that ends with the word *saja* 'only' or 'just'. For the latter, the occurrence of particle *suda* 'instead' must be placed at the end of a *bagaimana kalau* utterance or sentence to mark a renewed

suggestion. Finally, utterance 15 gives picture of how the speaker (a son) proposed the only two thousand rupiahs he owned without expecting any further suggestion to raise this amount because the addressee (his father) was aware of this condition so he may not do so. This shows another way of particle *suda* plays the emphatic role for the suggestion phrase *bagemana kalo* ‘why don’t...?’ in PM that no further suggestion is deemed necessary. In brief, the presence of the particle *suda* changes (a) an informing utterance (assertive utterance) into a suggesting utterance (assertive utterance) as in utterances 12 and 15; (b) an informing utterance (assertive utterance) into a suggesting utterance (assertive utterance) and begging utterance (directive utterance) respectively as in utterances 11 and 13, and (c) a promising utterance (commissive utterance) into a suggesting utterance (assertive utterance) as in utterance 14.

Fourth, the discourse particle *suda* has two meanings. First, it means ‘be about to’ that is to indicate that something is about to happen immediately and something is certain or highly probable. In BI it means *sebentar lagi* ‘in a moment’. Second, it means ‘must’ that is ‘to suggest that there are excellent arguments for believing something’ (Swan, 1996) In BI it means *pasti* ‘certain’. In utterance 16 the speaker (a son) used the particle *suda* for emphasizing a prediction that a future event is on the way or starting to happen. This is because the speaker had already eaten lunch prepared by his mother and experienced an awful taste which was about to cause him passed out. In this sense, it is also used

to make a hyperbolic statement after the word *mati* 'die' or 'dead' containing an exclamatory tone. The same particle also occurs in utterance 17 when the

<b>PM</b>	<b>BI</b>
16) Mamaeee, sa mati <b>suda!</b> Oh, gosh! I'm <b>about to</b> pass away.	Waduh, saya <b>sebentar lagi</b> mampus!
17) Adoo, ini suanggi <b>suda!</b> My God! This <b>must</b> be a ghost/satan.	Aduh, ini <b>pasti</b> setan!
18) Yoo, betul <b>suda</b> . Yes, this <b>must</b> be true.	Ya, <b>pasti</b> betul.

speaker (an adult man) talked to the addressee (another adult man) when they walked past a dark village cemetery in the middle of the night and they heard the children voices coming from the cemetery. The speaker was certain that those sounds must be from the ghost/satan because this graveyard is actually far away from the village and there are no people's houses around. Similarly, in utterance 18, the speaker used the particle *suda* because he wanted to convince the addressee that a bat must be a hybrid of bird and mouse on the basis of its look. In summary, the occurrence of the particle *suda* is used (a) to confirm that something is really starting to happen (utterance 16); (b) to strengthen a belief on something based on the facts

(utterance 17), and (c) to confirm that an agreement is given on the basis of the facts (utterance 18).

Fifth, in utterance 19a the speaker (the grandpa) used the particle *suda* with the meaning ‘let’ in English and *biarkan* in BI to give instructions to himself to go to the market by using the first-person singular imperative ‘let me’. In the same utterance (19b) this particle can take the role ‘do’ or ‘of course’ in English and *tentunya* in BI to emphasize that he had committed to go to the market later by himself. In utterance 20 the speaker

<b>PM</b>	<b>BI</b>
<p>19) Nan sa ke pasar <b>suda.</b> (a) <b>Let me</b> go to the market later.  (b) I will <b>do / of course</b> go to the market.</p>	<p><b>Biarkan</b> saya pergi ke pasar nanti!  <b>Tentunya</b> saya pergi ke pasar.</p>
<p>20) Ko tu kaka pu hati, jantung, tulang rusuk, pokoknya smua-smua <b>suda.</b> You are my heart, my rib bone, all in all [you’re] <b>only just</b> everything for me.</p>	<p>Kamu adalah hatiku, jantungku, tulang rusukku, intinya <b>kamulah</b> segalanya!</p>

(the boyfriend) seduced the addressee (the girlfriend) with sweet words and the particle *suda* was used to emphasize those affectionate words. In this sense, the particle *suda* can be translated into

English as ‘only just’ and into BI as particle *-lah* ‘simply’. In conclusion, the occurrence of the particle *suda* in both utterances is used to change an informing utterance (assertive utterance) into a promising utterance (commissive utterance).

Sixth, apart from its occurrence at the end of the utterance as discussed above it also appears at the beginning of an utterance or a sentence with different meanings and functions. In this case, its functions in utterances 21, 22 and 23 are as a consequence linker, a filler, a request softener, and a conjunction respectively. First, the speaker used the particle *suda* ‘so’ in utterance 21 to indicate something which was a consequence of what was stated in the previous utterance. Here, the speaker told a story to the addressee about a father assigning his son to feed their pig while he was away. In fact, when the father returned home from his journey he learned that the son disobeyed his request. To continue the story the speaker began this utterance by using the particle *suda* as a connector to the previous information. It can be translated into English as ‘since that is so’ and BI as *jadi*. Second, as a filler, the particle *suda* was used by the speaker in utterance 22 to maintain the flow of the story and the cohesion of it and also to keep the addressee’s attention to the story being told. It can be translated into English as ‘you know’. Third, in utterance 23 the speaker (the art teacher) asked the addressee (the student) to sing a

**PM**

**BI**

- |                              |                             |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 21) <b>Suda</b> , de panggil | <b>Jadi</b> , dia memanggil |
| Joni baru de                 | Joni kemudian               |

bicara.                      berbicara dengannya  
**So**, he summoned  
 Joni and then  
 he talked with  
 him.

22) **Suda**, tete ko                      Kakek mulai  
 bongkar tatawa                      tertawa sekeras-  
 bokar-bokar suda                      kerasnya.  
 mo.  
**You know**, grandpa  
 bursts out laughing  
 just louder and louder

23) **Suda**, ko nyanyi                      **Tidak masalah**,  
 yang ko bisa saja.                      kamu boleh  
**It doesn't matter**                      menyanyikan  
 you can sing                      lagu apa saja yang  
 whatever song                      kamu sudah tahu.  
 you know.

song but he declined because he did not know what song to sing. Then, the speaker used the particle *suda* which can be translated into English as 'no matter' or 'it does not matter' and into BI as *tidak masalah* for two functions (a) to encourage the addressee (the student) to come forward to the front of the class to sing a song no matter what it sounds (utterance 22), and (b) as a conjunction it is used by the speaker to join clauses together in an utterance or a sentence (utterance 23) and keep the conversation smooth. To sum up, the occurrence of the particle *suda* in these utterances is used to keep a communicative exchange fluent, coherent, and easy to understand.

Seventh, the particle *suda* is preceded by the particle *saja* in utterances 24 and 25. This is a combined particle. In both utterances the particle *saja suda* can be translated into English as ‘please just’ and into BI as *mohon kiranya* and/or *silakan* to make a request more polite. In utterance 24 the speaker (the patient) told the addressee (the doctor) to stop pulling out the nail which was pierced into one of his foot because it was so painful. The speaker requested the addressee to bend it and leave it there. Similarly, the speaker (the mother) in utterance 25 asked the addressee (the son) to eat the only available food on the dining table for his lunch without complaining on its kind. Thus, the presence of the particle *saja suda* in both utterances is used to make a request stronger because there is no other options to choose from.

PM	BI
24) Suda dok, kas bengkok paku itu <b>saja suda.</b> Alright doc, <b>please</b> <b>just</b> bend the nail.	Baik dok, <b>mohon</b> <b>kiranya</b> bengkok- kan pakunya.
25) Anak, ko makan <b>saja suda.</b> Son, <b>please just</b> eat.	Anak, <b>silakan</b> makan <b>saja.</b>

Overall, the discourse particle *suda* consists of single particle as noticed in utterances 1 – 10, 12, 14 – 23 and combined particle as seen in utterances 11, 13, 24 – 25. There are fourteen meanings and nine functions.

## **CLASSIFICATION OF THE DISCOURSE PARTICLE ‘SUDA’ OF PAPUAN MALAY**

The above discussion suggests that PM has met five out of the six categories of discourse particles as proposed by Goddard (2011:166) such as connective particles, illocutionary function particles, modal particles, evidential particles and focus particles. Below is a brief discussion of each category and relevant utterances that support.

### **CONNECTIVE PARTICLES**

Discourse particle *suda* meets the category of connective particles which ‘function as certain types of logical connection between propositions within an utterance or a sentence’ (Goddard, 2011). In this sense the particle *suda* has three meanings and three functions as appearing in utterances or sentences of PM. First, it means ‘so’ (utterance 21), that is, to connect two related ideas being uttered by the speaker that may sound like this ‘It follows from what I have said’. Here, its function is to keep the flow of the conversation smooth and maintain its logical cohesion of it. Second, it means ‘you know’ (utterance 22) which is a filler in a daily conversation where the speaker uses it as a strategy to give him/her time to think what to say next. Its function is to attract the addressee’s attention on what is being described or said by the speaker and also maintain the smooth flow of the conversation. Third, it means ‘no matter’ or ‘it does not matter’ (utterance 23) which is a conjunction that is used by the speaker to join clauses together in an utterance or a sentence and keep a conversation or communicative exchange

fluent, coherent, and understandable.

#### ILLOCUTIONARY FUNCTION PARTICLES

Pragmatic analysis above suggests that the particle *suda* is classified as one of the illocutionary function particles in PM. Illocutionary function particles are analogous to questioning and exclamatory particles (Goddard, 2011) in utterances or sentences produced by interlocutors in a communicative exchange. In theory, an illocutionary function or illocutionary point is another name for illocutionary act in speech-act theory (Nordquist, 2018; Searle, 1979). In this sense, there are four types of illocutionary act's functions such as competitive (ordering, asking, demanding and begging), convivial (offering, inviting, greeting, thanking and congratulating), collaborative (asserting, reporting, announcing and instructing) and conflictive (threatening, accusing and reprimanding) (Leech, 1983; Nayoan and Hellystia, 2022). These functions are also demonstrated through the use of discourse particle *suda* in utterances and sentences of PM as discussed earlier.

First, the function of the particle *suda* in each utterance is to change the mood of that particular utterance from one nature to another within the same type of illocutionary act. For example, utterances 1 – 4 (ordering utterances), 5 – 7, 24 and 25 (requesting utterances) are competitive acts. The occurrence of the particle *suda* changes the tone in each of them from a flat nature to either softer or stronger nature in terms of politeness and commitment.

Second, the presence of the particle *suda* in each utterance changes the sub-type of that particular utterance to another sub-type within the same type of illocutionary act. For example, utterances 8 – 12 and 15 change from reporting or informing utterances to suggesting utterances. These utterances are types of the collaborative act.

Third, the use of the particle *suda* in each utterance is to change its illocutionary type, that is, from one type to another type. For example, there is a change from an ordering utterance (competitive utterance) to a suggesting utterance (collaborative utterance) as in utterance 8, a change from an informing utterance (collaborative utterance) to a begging utterance (competitive utterance) as in utterance 13, a change from a promising (commissive utterance) to a suggesting utterance (collaborative utterance) as in utterance 14, and lastly, a change from an informing utterance (collaborative utterance) to a promising utterance (commissive utterance) as in utterances 19 and 20.

To sum up, the discourse particle *suda* plays its illocutionary function acts in three kinds of acts such as competitive, collaborative, and commissive. There is a change not only from one kind to another but there is also a change within the same illocutionary act.

#### MODAL PARTICLES

Discourse particle *suda* is classified as one of the modal particles in PM. According to Thurmair (as translated in van Kemenade & Links, 2020:3), ‘modal particles essentially serve to tie in an

utterance with the cohesion of the interaction. They serve to refer the interlocutors to shared knowledge, to assumptions or expectations on the part of the speaker or hearer; it can be shown that there is a reference to a previous utterance...’ In addition, they also soften ‘what is being said (although they can also be used to make statement more forceful) and they can add extra emphasis’ (Weinert, 2007). In other words, they reflect the mood or attitude of the speaker and highlight the focus of the utterance. They can also be used to mark hesitation of speakers (Vyatkina & Johnson, 2007).

We can look at some utterances that prove this classification. In utterance 3 the speaker (female teacher) used it to indicate a strong message on her anger with higher pitched-voice to the addressee (male student) who made noises in the classroom that disturbed other students. Similarly, in the same classroom context, the speaker (female teacher) expressed her furious feeling to the addressee (male student) due to his refusal to sing a song in front of the class. She used the particle *suda* at the beginning of the utterance to emphasize her anger (utterance 23). In utterance 16 the speaker (a son) used the particle *suda* at the end of this exclamatory utterance to emphasize how fearful he was after eating food that would probably cause him dead. Utterance 20 consists of sweet words of adoration from the speaker (a boyfriend) to the addressee (his girlfriend). He used the particle *suda* to emphasize how deep his true love may prevail.

#### EVIDENTIAL PARTICLES

Discourse particle *suda* is categorized as one of the evidential particles in PM. Ifantidou (2001) points out that ‘an utterance has an evidential function if and only if it overtly *communicates* evidential information, whether this information is linguistically encoded or pragmatically inferred’. In this sense, evidential particles are deemed important in a communicative exchange between interlocutors because they certify the speaker’s sources of perception, knowledge, attitude, and utterance through the use of ‘see’, ‘know’, ‘think’ and ‘say’ (Goddard, 2011; Kawalya, 2023). Besides, they ‘encode not only what a speaker knows or how he knows it; but also what an addressee can be taken to know, or *should* know, or apparently (perhaps culpably) *fails* to know’ (Haviland, 1987).

From the utterances or sentences as discussed earlier we can see the reason why the particle *suda* is classified as evidential particle. In utterance 10 both the speaker (husband) and the addressee (wife) discussed about their son who chose to join the church choir instead of a karate training group. The speaker, then, used the particle *suda* in his utterance to conclude their conversation which means that both agreed on what they saw, that is, their son is now joining the choir. Likewise, the speaker in utterance 17 used the particle *suda* to confirm to the addressee that the children’s voices they heard when they walked past the cemetery in the middle of the night was, for sure, the voices from the ghosts as the villagers always believe because there is no people’s houses in such

as remote place. Similarly, in utterance 18, the speaker used the particle *suda* to confirm to the addressee that they actually have the common understanding on where bat is originally from. The speaker in utterance 19 also used the particle *suda* to convince the addressee that he would do what they already agreed upon. In utterances 21, 22 and 23 the speakers used the particle *suda* at the beginning of the utterances to conclude what the speaker and addressee had discussed earlier.

#### FOCUS PARTICLES

Discourse particle *suda* is one of the focus particles in PM because it meets what focus particles are about. Goddard (2011) argues that focus particles indicate how something figures in relation to other potential or real alternatives, either excluding them (like *only*, *merely*) or adding to them (like *also*, *too*, *even*). In addition, Favaro (2021) points out that ‘focus particles prototypically operate as markers of information structure and contribute in different ways to the propositional content of a sentence.’ In this sense, we can see that the particle *suda* has the meaning of ‘only just’ (utterance 20). Separately, the word ‘just’ means ‘with nothing to spare’ or ‘with nothing in reserve’ but when it comes together with ‘only’ it functions as an emphatic marker (Swan, 1996). Thus, the presence of the particle *suda* implicitly informs us that the boy (the speaker) in the story was truly falling in love with his girlfriend so he expressed his true love in sweet words to convince his girlfriend (the addressee) that he really meant what he said.

## CONCLUSION

I have shown that the discourse particle *suda* plays an important role in creating natural human-to-human conversations and written exchanges in a variety of social contexts either in actual or virtual manner among the speakers of PM in Tanah Papua and beyond.

This particle has the following features. First, grammatically, it is not inflected. It is not a clitic particle and therefore it stays in the same form regardless of where it appears in an utterance or a sentence. Second, structurally, the positional occurrence of this particle in utterances or sentences suggests that it is both final-ending type and initial type. Third, semantically, it means one thing in one context but something entirely different in another context and therefore there are fourteen meanings discovered in this study. Lastly, pragmatically, it has nine functions in various contexts. It cannot function as one-word answer to a question.

After displaying some differences between PM and BI it is implied that both languages are linguistically close to each other but they have some differences and this particle is among others. In fact, this particle has already crystalized as an integral part of PM and therefore it serves as in-group markers for the speakers of PM. Such a crystallization of discourse particle *suda* suggests that its process of appropriation and revaluation has already taken place for multiple years because the speakers have been having the positive attitudes and perceptions on the use of PM.

## REFERENCES

- Aijmer, Karim. (2002). *English Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ameka, Felix. (1992). Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 18, 101-118. Retrieved June 30, 2024 from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229068257\\_Interjections\\_The\\_Universal\\_Yet\\_Neglected\\_Part\\_of\\_Speech](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229068257_Interjections_The_Universal_Yet_Neglected_Part_of_Speech)
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2020). Population of Papua, South Papua, Highland Papua, Central Papua Provinces. Retrieved June 20, 2024 from <https://papua.beta.bps.go.id/id/infographic?id=156>
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2020). Population of West Papua and Southwest Papua Provinces. Retrieved June 20, 2024 from <https://papuabarat.bps.go.id/>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (2024). Come on. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/come-on>
- Favaro, Marco. (2021). Where does reanalysis start? Discourse Inferences and Meaning variation in the Semantics of Focus Particles. *Journal of Historical Syntax*. Volume 5, Article 37: 1–32, 2021. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://historicalsyntax.org/hs/index.php/hs/article/view/145/76>
- Godard, Cliff. (2011). *Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haviland, W. (2011). *Anthropology: The Human Challenge*. 13th ed. Canada: Wadsworth.

- Ifantidou, Elly. (2014). *Pragmatic Competence and Relevance*. Athens: John Benjamins B.V.
- Karàj, David-M (2021) "Indonesian discourse particles in conversations and written text," *Wacana, Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*: Vol. 22: No. 2, Article 3.  
<https://doi.org/10.17510/wacana.v22i2.909>
- Kawalya, Deo. (2023). The structure and semantics of the Luganda near-synonym evidential particles *nti* and *mbu*. *Studies in African Linguistics*, Volume 52 Supplement 14. Retrieved June 5, 2024 from  
<https://journals.flvc.org/sal/article/view/130961>
- Kawashima, Sue A. (1999). *A Dictionary of Japanese Particles*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Krippendorff, Kalus. (2019). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Long Group Limited.
- Map of Indonesia. Retrieved June 20, 2024 from  
<https://www.worldatlas.com/maps/indonesia>
- Map of New Guinea Island (Tanah Papua in the West and Papua New Guinea in the East). Retrieved June 20, 2024 from  
<https://www.google.com/maps/@-5.5246525,140.9039529,6z?entry=ttu>
- Morin, Izak. (2018). Understanding the language ideologies of Papuan Malay. Ph.D Thesis. La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia. **42823\_SOURCE01**
- Morin, Izak. (2020a). Discourse Particles of Papuan Malay: e and o. *Journal of Language & Education Policy* 1(5), 59-71. DOI: 10.48150/jlep.v1no5.2020.a4  
<https://jlepnet.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/4.pdf>

- Morin, Izak, (2020b). Discourse Particles of Papuan Malay: kappa and lagi. *Journal of Language & Education Policy*. 1(5), 72-78.  
DOI: 10.48150/jlep.v1no5.2020.a5  
<https://jlepnet.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/5-2.pdf>
- Morin, Izak and Jeremina Kio. (2023). The Meanings and Functions of Discourse Particles in Papuan Malay: mo and se. *Journal of Language & Education Policy*. 4(1), 32-43.  
DOI: 10.48150/jlep.v4no1.2023.a4  
<https://jlepnet.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/4-1.pdf>
- Nayoan, Monique Sharon and Devi Hellystia. (2022). The Function of Illocutionary Act in a Novel Entitled One of Us is Lying. *Jurnal Elektronik Universitas Gunadarma*. 16(5), 29-36. Retrieved June, 25, 2024 from  
<https://ejournal.gunadarma.ac.id/>
- Nordquist, Richard. (2018). Illocutionary Force in Speech Theory: Glossary of Grammatical and Rhetorical Terms. Retrieved June, 15, 2024 from  
<https://www.thoughtco.com/illocutionary-force-speech-1691147>
- Riemer, Nick. (2010). *Introducing Semantics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John R. (1979). *Expressing and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Senft, Gunter. (2014). *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Routledge.
- Sneidon, James N. et al. (2012). *Indonesian Reference Grammar*. 2nd edition. Melbourne: Allen & Unwin.
- Swan, Michael. (1996). *Practical English Usage: International Student's Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Thurmair, Maria. 1989. *Modalpartikeln und ihre Kombinationen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111354569>
- van Kemenade, A. & Links, M. (2020). Discourse Particles in early English: Clause structure, pragmatics and discourse management. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 5(1): 3.  
<https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1020>
- Vyatkina, Nina & Johnson, K. E. (2007). Teaching German Modal Particles: A Corpus-Based Approach. *CALPER Publications*. Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research. The Pennsylvania State University. Retrieved July 1, 2024 from  
[https://langacq.weebly.com/uploads/2/1/1/8/21189980/german\\_modals.compressed.pdf](https://langacq.weebly.com/uploads/2/1/1/8/21189980/german_modals.compressed.pdf)
- Weinert, Regina. (2007). *Spoken Language Pragmatics: An Analysis of Form-Function Relations*. New York: Continuum.