Indonesian discourse particles in conversations and written text

David-M Karàj

University of Pavia, davidmkaraj@gmail.com

Indonesian discourse particles
in conversations and written text

David-M. Karàj

Abstract
The aim of the present article is to analyse the four most frequent Colloquial Indonesian discourse particles (*lho*, *kok*, *sih,* and *dong*) and to compare their occurrences in both spontaneous spoken conversations and written texts (articles from an online youth magazine). The latter method is uncommon, as most studies on Indonesian discourse particles focus exclusively on spoken data. My motivation for choosing the term "discourse particles" (instead of, for example, pragmatic particles) is explained and a new language-specific definition of the phenomenon is proposed. First, the particles' meanings as given in various dictionaries are presented, followed by examples from spontaneous conversations. Next, examples from written texts are given, followed by an analysis of possible differences and similarities in meaning. Finally, the possible meanings of the particles are exemplified through sample sentences using semantic explication. By conclusion, I attempt to answer the question of whether the discourse particles in Colloquial Indonesian can be considered as a separate word class.

Keywords
Discourse particles; Colloquial Indonesian; spoken language.

1. Introduction

The aim of the present article is an investigation into the nature of discourse particles in contemporary Indonesian, and a comparison between their usage in spoken conversations and written texts (articles in an online magazine). Indonesian discourse particles are a linguistic phenomenon which has been paid increased interest of scholars in recent years, especially in the context

David-M. Karàj is a PhD candidate in Linguistics at the University of Pavia. His main research interests revolve around the Malay World, its culture, and foremost – its languages, particularly Malay syntax on various stages of language development. He is currently working on a project regarding valency-changing operations in Malay and their synchronic development. David-M. Karàj can be reached at: davidmkaraj@gmail.com.

of so-called "Jakartan Indonesian" (see *inter alia* James Neil Sneddon 2006).[1] However, to the best of my knowledge, no attempt has been made to take a closer look at the particles occurring in writing. It has been observed that elements from the colloquial register enter other domains, in which they would have not normally been present before (for example, in advertisements, announcements, and literature) and appear frequently in the media (television, Internet, et cetera). Therefore, I had assumed that the discourse particles, which were previously considered to be solely used in the spoken language, would also be found in writing. In this article I present four common Colloquial Indonesian (hereafter: CI) discourse particles: *sih*, *kok*, *dong*, *lho* as they appear in various dictionaries. Next, I present examples from colloquial conversations discussing the particles' meanings and cross-examine them using existing research on the topic, and finally I analyse the material found in articles from a popular magazine in order to see whether there are any variations in the meaning of the particles occurring in writing.

1.1 Discourse particles – a problem of definition

One of the first obstacles in the research of discourse particles is deciding how to name these elements and, secondly, agreeing upon a working definition of this phenomenon. In the existing literature we encounter a wide array of terms such as "discourse markers/particles", "pragmatic particles/markers", "emotive particles", and others. In this study I have decided to use the term "discourse particles". I have chosen the term "particles" rather than "markers" as this study discusses the small units of speech rather than phrases which could also serve as discourse markers. I have also decided to use the term "discourse" rather than "pragmatic" or "emotive", as I would like to stress their discursive function in its entirety rather than focusing on singular aspects of their meaning. In the definition of discourse particles, there seems to be no academic consensus (see Andreas Jucker and Yael Ziv 1998; Thanh Nyan 2016: 2), so that I have decided to formulate one definition based on the existing ones, which could specifically serve this study. Most reviewed definitions were not language-specific (Mira Ariel 1998: 223; Yael Maschler 1998: 31; Manfred Stede and Birte Schmitz 2000: 126). Only one of them was specific to Indonesian (Sneddon 2006: 117). Based on the material in this study, I have created a concise definition which, in my opinion, encapsulates the essence of discourse particles in CI:

> Discourse particles are syntactically optional, short speech elements, usually without fixed meaning, providing a comment on what has just been said or done. Their meaning varies depending on the context and position in an utterance.

---

[1] In the present work I do not refer to the language analysed as "Jakartan Indonesian", as my research has shown that the usage of certain elements, including discourse particles, is not confined to the Jakarta variety of Indonesian and is spreading to other parts of the country, such as Surakarta where I collected my data. Therefore, the present article uses the term Colloquial Indonesian (CI).

I find it important to stress the following aspects: (1) optionality; (2) the lack of fixed meaning; (3) their pragmatic function in the ongoing discourse (being a kind of a comment on what just happened or has been said by the interlocutor); and (4) the changes in a particle's meaning depending on its position. The above definition serves as the starting-point for the considerations undertaken in this study.

2. Methods

The data for this research were gathered during my stay in Surakarta, Central Java, Indonesia, from August 2017 to May 2018. The first part of the investigation was conducted on the basis of spoken conversations among Indonesians (mostly Javanese for whom Indonesian is their second language). The second part is a corpus analysis of the articles of one of the popular online magazines addressed to a young audience: *Brilio.net*.[2] I have analysed the frequency of four particles – *lho*, *kok*, *sih,* and *dong* – their positions in a clause, common collocations, and their possible meanings. Moreover, the study of the particles' meaning would not be complete without taking into consideration dictionary entries, which constitute more or less accurate attempts to illustrate the functions of the particles. Interestingly, few discrepancies were found between dictionary definitions and what linguistic research has shown. For the analysis I have chosen four dictionaries. Two are monolingual: *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (KBBI, The Great Dictionary of Indonesian Language, Badan Bahasa 2016) and the Malaysian *Kamus Dewan* (KD, The Dictionary of Language Bureau, Hajah Noresah bt. Baharom 2007), which includes Indonesian particles among its entries. The other two are bilingual: *Kamus Indonesia-Inggris* (KII, Indonesian-English Dictionary, John M. Echols and Hasan Shadily 2014), and *Kamus Lengkap* (KL, Complete Dictionary, Suwojo Wojowasito and Tito W. Wasito 2007). The examples taken from the articles are presented in the way they were found on the website; I have kept the original spelling of the words which did not meet the commonly accepted conventions in terms of capitalization, punctuation, orthography, and other deviations from Standard Indonesian. I shall begin with a discussion of the particles' meanings according to their dictionary definitions plus examples from spoken language. This is followed by an analysis of the particles occurring in written texts and by a discussion of their meanings through semantic explication, that is, by assigning to each particle a set of explanatory paraphrases which will help us understand their meanings.

3. Study of the particles

This article focuses on four common CI discourse particles: *lho*, *kok*, *sih,* and *dong*. Exploring their meanings is especially interesting in the context of the relationship between Indonesian (and closely related Malay) and Javanese. Contemporary Indonesian and Malay (mostly Malaysian Malay)

---

[2] See http://www.brilio.net/.

are two languages which, in their standard varieties, show a great number of similarities both in grammar and vocabulary, and remain largely mutually intelligible. However, their informal registers differ significantly, including in their discourse particles (see Malcolm Warren Mintz 1994: 402; Tom G. Hoogervorst 2018). Only a few of them occur in both languages (for example *lah*, *nih*, *tuh*, *kan*, *ya*) with differences in their frequency and usage. Some of the particles studied in this article are also present in Javanese (*lho* and *kok*) and are probably borrowed from that language. It is important to note that, in Javanese, the discourse particles occur in both registers of the language – low (*ngoko*) and high (*krama*), while in Indonesian they tend to remain a part of the informal register (with occasional occurrences in the formal language).

For each particle, the search engine returned on average fifty web addresses – forty-eight for *sih*, twenty-seven for *kok*, forty-two for *dong*, forty-nine for *lho,* and twenty-three for *loh* (that is seventy-two in all for what is described here as particle *lho*). It is important to note that in many instances the text occurring in the headline of an article is repeated within the body of the text, sometimes with a slight modification. Therefore, the figures presented in Table 1, even though extracted directly from the search engine, should be treated as close estimates.

Particles		Results
lho	*lho* – total number	278
loh		123
sih		185
kok		150
dong		112

Table 1. Frequency of the particles.

3.1 Existing studies

As mentioned previously, CI is the subject of an increasing number of publications. Some works dedicated to the language spoken by Jakartans include Muhadjir (1981), Henri Chambert-Loir (1983), Fay Wouk (1989), C.D. Grijns (1991), Sneddon (2006), while others attempt descriptions of CI in general (J.S. Badudu et al. 1984; Robert Englebretson 2003; Michael C. Ewing 2005). A significant part of such publications focuses on the sociolinguistic aspects of non-standard language (Abdul Chaer dan Augustina Leonie 2004; R. Kunjana Rahardi 2001) or the language of young people (Siti Perdi Rahayu 1999; Umar Solikhan 2006). Among these publications, few papers pay attention to individual particles (Wouk 1998, 2001; Dientha Yuniar 2013; Y. Miyake 2015), while a more complete overview of CI particles can be found in Sneddon (2006: 117-130). It is important to note that several Indonesian language textbooks also introduce the learner to discourse particles (Yohanni Johns 1993; Ljudmila Demidjuk et al. 2013).

3.2 *dong*

According to both KBBI and KD, the particle *dong* serves as a "sweetener" (*pemanis*) or "softener" (*pelembut*) of the speaker's intentions. However, KII defines the particle as "a mild way of saying something" and underlines that it is used at the end of a sentence. The entry in KL is strikingly similar to the description found in a textbook written by Johns (1993: 33). According to both Johns (1993: 33) and Sneddon (2006: 118), using the particle *dong* implies that the listener is aware of the speaker's intentions, or knows what the speaker is talking about. Let us consider Example (1):

(1)   A: *Autumn in UNS season   ini   masih ada   toh?*
                                    this   still   there.is PART?
             'So, there's still an "Autumn at UNS season"[3] going on there?'

      B: *Masih   **dong**,   edisi   terbaru.*
            still   PART   edition newest
            '**Sure** there is, the newest edition.'

In (1), A is asking a question referring to a set of photographs taken by B on a university campus. In this case, the usage of the particle *dong* in B's reply refers to the facts known by A. The question is rhetorical, as A has seen the photographs and knows that the "Autumn at UNS season" is not yet over.

Another example (2) also refers to a situation known to both interlocutors. A is aware that B is running late but urges them with a rhetorical question; "*Just* a few more minutes (you know)" is only a working translation here, as the precise meaning is along the lines of "I know it's taking longer than usual but I still need some more time".

(2)   A: *Masih lama?*
            still   long
            'Is it going to take much longer?'

      B: *Nggak, sebentar   lagi   dong.*
            no   a.moment   again PART
            'No, **just** few more minutes (just bear with me).'

The particle *dong* also commonly occurs in imperatives as in (3).

(3)   *Program-nya seperti apa? Jelasin   dong!*
       programme like   what   explain PART
       'What is this programme about? Explain, please!'

---

[3] Name of a university in Surakarta, Central Java, Indonesia – Universitas Sebelas Maret.

As can also be seen from the above example, as a mild imperative the particle *dong* seems to give a sense of encouragement. The speaker is probably aware that the information about the programme is going to be followed by a more detailed description, but feels the need to nudge their interlocutor to supply that further information.

Based on the examples above, we can conclude that the dictionary definitions of the particle *dong* are incomplete. The monolingual dictionaries (KBBI and KD) as well as the KL gloss the particle as a softener only, while KII stresses another aspect, that the addressee already knows what the speaker is trying to communicate, which indeed does appear to be the essence of the particle. None of the dictionary entries point out the emphatic character of the particle, while neither Sneddon nor Johns seem to see *dong* as a softening particle and stress only its emphatic character. As observed by Miyake (2015), *dong* might be used as a softener when flirting, when it is usually accompanied by vowel lengthening. Based on the context in which the conversations studied in this paper occurred – informal conversations among peers – it is difficult to discern whether the interlocutors had any reason to strive to be overly polite or to make their requests any milder. An argument in support of this finding is the fact that the particle *dong*, as has been shown in this research, always refers to a reality known by both participants in the discourse. Therefore, the message carried by the particle seems to be close to "do what you were supposed to do".

In the texts of the articles analysed, the particle *dong* occurs in final position (4) with only a few exceptions. One occurrence of the particle in a question has been observed (6). In all the instances, the particle conveys a similar meaning to that described above, implying that the reader already knows that the statement they are presented with is true. In (4) I have put the entire phrase in bold, as the meaning of the particle could not be rendered with a single word (see Section 3.6, Phrases 6, 8, and 12).

(4) *10 fashion unik* '*Kids Jaman Now*', *gaya-nya ngejazz banget dong!*
   10 fashion unique New Generation Kids style jazzy very PART
   '10 unique fashion styles for the up-and-coming generation of kids, **look how cool they are**!'

In (5), for instance, *dong* refers to what can be seen in the photographs accompanying the article. The title seems to imply "it's cool, don't you agree?", assuming that the reader would agree with the view expressed.

(5) *Buat kamu yang juga ngikutin serial atau film dari negara Seribu*
for 2SG which also follow series or movie from country one.thousand

*Pagoda tersebut pasti tahu **dong** kalau aktor-aktor di sana ganteng-nya*
pagoda mentioned sure know PART if actors in.there handsome

nggak ketulungan.
no help

'As someone who also watches movies or series from the country of a thousand pagodas, for sure you know that their actors are so impossibly handsome.'

Example (5) is one of the instances in which the particle is not used in the final position. However, this usage does not change its meaning and, again, could be rendered as "for sure" or "of course you know".

As mentioned before, only one instance of particle *dong* in a question has been noted among the collected data (6). We can see that the function of the particle remains the same as described above. Using it in a question seems to add even more emphasis to the already emphatic character of the particle *dong*.

(6) *Kalau semua makanan memicu kanker, lalu sebaiknya kamu makan apa*
if all food cause cancer then better 2SG eat what

***dong**?*
PART

'If all food causes cancer, then **what on earth** are you supposed to eat?'

3.3 *sih*

The dictionary definitions generally depict the particle *sih* as an emphasizer and/or softener. On the other hand, both Johns (1993: 37-38) and Miyake (2015: 2-5) agree on a sense of irony or sarcasm conveyed by *sih*, as well as a sense of surprise or puzzlement expressed by the speaker. Sneddon (2006: 126) gives a very generic definition of what the meaning of *sih* could be: "a softener or 'smoother', contributing to the smooth flow of the conversation". Similarly, KII defines *sih* as a softener, while the entries in other dictionaries define this particle as an emphasizer. Both KBBI and KD present 'really' or 'sure' as appropriate glosses. The entries from bilingual dictionaries appear to be less clear. KII, however, illustrates *sih* with several examples, which make it easier to grasp its possible functions. KL, on the other hand, suggests two English equivalents – 'yet' and 'though' – without additional comments or examples. As will be shown here, 'though' can very often serve as an appropriate equivalent for *sih*.

The analysed data show that *sih* is very often used to mark rhetorical questions with a mild sense of irony, see (7).

(7) *Kamu sayang dia, nggak sih?*
2SG love 3SG no PART

'You love her or not?'

Miyake (2015: 3) argues that *sih* might show the lack of eagerness of the speaker, coupled with the aforementioned sense of mild irony. In (8) *sih* could be understood as "yes, that's also true but there's nothing you can do about it".

(8) A: *Bukan hanya itu, sering ada   orang   yang   tidak mengerti*
       not   only that often   there.is people which not   understand
      istilah-nya.
      terminology
      'That's not the only problem, there are many people who don't understand what it means.'

    B: *Iya juga sih,   aku   sering gitu.*
      yes also PART 1SG   often   this.way
      'Yes, **true,** I'm often like that myself.'

The particle *sih* has also been found to play an important role when the speaker is hesitating or unsure about whether they would be able to describe the reality accurately. Often the particle was used when the speaker forgot certain information and was asking again for confirmation, see (9).

(9) *Kos-nya   di mana   sih?*
    boarding.house in where   PART
    'Where was your boarding house, **again**?

What is important to note here is that *sih* also forms idiomatic expressions with question words, such as *masa sih?* ('how come?'; see Miyake 2015: 5), *apa sih?* ('what on earth is that?'), *bagaimana/gimana sih?* ('how on earth?'), *kenapa sih?* ('why the heck?'), as well as question tag *nggak sih?* ('right?', 'isn't it?'), and one construction used when contrasting or comparing two ideas (see Johns 1993: 28; Miyake 2015: 3-4). An example of the latter is given in (10).

(10) *Ganteng   sih,   ganteng   tapi jahat banget.*
     handsome PART handsome but nasty very
     '**Sure**, he's handsome but he's [also] a nasty bit of work.'

In written texts, the particle *sih* mostly occurs in questions as a rhetorical marker, and no significant differences in the meaning or position of the particle were revealed.

3.4 *kok*

In the case of *kok*, both Sneddon (2006: 123) and Johns (1993: 21) agree that this particle occurs in questions expressing surprise, suggesting 'how come' as an English equivalent. In statements, *kok* serves as an emphatic particle which could simply be rendered as 'you know'. In questions, it mostly occurs in the initial position, while in statements it usually takes the final position. For this particle, the dictionary entries are relatively consistent in their definitions. The

KBBI generally sees *kok* as an emphatic particle in statements and, in questions, as an approximate equivalent of the question word 'why'. KD essentially echoes this definition, suggesting that the particle *kok* might be used when the speaker is surprised or angry. KII's definition concisely summarizes what Johns (1993: 21) has written on the topic. What is important to note here is that the KII entry underlines the fact *kok* very often denies what the interlocutor has said. Similarly, Johns (1993: 21) argues that it could also be used to mark a contradiction or rebuttal of what someone has said. Only the entry in KL seems to be inaccurate. The authors suggest that 'though', 'well', or 'dear me' could serve as appropriate English equivalents of the particle *kok*. The previous studies and the language material analysed in this paper do not support that argument.

In questions, the particle can occur at the beginning or at the end of a clause, and always conveys the meaning of surprise or even shock, as in (11).

(11) A: *Bodoh kamu*!
stupid 2SG
'You're stupid!'

B: *Kok bisa begitu*?
PART can this.way
'How can you talk to me like that!?'

In most cases, the particle gives us a sense of the speaker's surprise. Sometimes it can also carry a shade of annoyance, as in (12).

(12) *Ada di situ kok, deskripsi-nya.*
there.is in there PART description
'It is all there, [look] in the description!'

In (12), the speaker seems to have expected the addressee to have read the description and is surprised that they are still asking questions about something which was supposed to be clear.

In written texts, the particle *kok* occurs most frequently in questions. It rarely takes strictly initial position, but is rather a part of fixed tags, such as *kok bisa?* ('how come?', 'how is that possible?') or *kenapa kok?* ('why?', 'why is that so?'). In statements, this particle seems to contradict the facts known or believed by the readers, sometimes carrying a meaning along the lines of "you think that X? No, we're going to show you that it's not!", as in (13).

(13) *Balkon rumah-mu sempit? Bukan masalah kok*!
balcony house-2SG.POSS narrow not problem PART
'Is your balcony narrow? That's not a problem!'

3.5 *lho*

The particle *lho* (occasionally also spelled *loh*, *lo,* or *lha*), however common, is the least well described in lexicographic works. Both definitions in KBBI and KD are very similar and suggest that the particle *lho* is used to express the speaker's surprise. The definitions of KII and KL, on the other hand, treat the particle mostly as an exclamation, suggesting 'hey!' or 'look!' as appropriate equivalents. An important fact is that *lho* is the only particle marked as *Jv* (Javanese) by one of the dictionaries (KII). In no other definitions can we find suggestions as to the origin of the particles. In the examples in this section taken from speech, the particle was transcribed as *lho*. In phrases collected from instant messaging, the original spelling was kept (*lho*, *lha*, or *loh*).

It is important to note that many works, particularly those analysing Javanese distinguish, the particle *lha* (only initial) from *lho* (other positions).[4] In the collected material, the particle *lha* occurred in this form only in few cases in written texts. In speech, however, even when occurring in the initial position it was pronounced as /lɔ/ and is therefore analysed as an equivalent of *lho*. Since this article is primarily concerned with CI, I have decided to not make a distinction between *lha* and *lho* here.

At the beginning of a clause, the particle *lho* expresses the speaker's surprise (Johns 1993: 80; Sneddon 2006: 123; Miyake 2015: 5), as can be seen in (14).

(14) *Lho*! *ada*   *flash*!
      PART there.is flash
      'Oh [I didn't know] the flash was on!'

Miyake (2015: 9) observes that in initial position, *lho* could be contrasted with particle *kok*, however *lho* is more emphatic. As observed in (15) *lho* has an additional function of introducing contrasting information. In (15) A is trying to convince B that he was wrong and emphasizes that the previous statement was true.

(15) A: *Gak bisa mas,*   *aku baru sampai di Jakarta.*
          no   can older.brother 1SG new arrive in PN
          'I can't, I have just arrived in Jakarta.'

      B: *Kamu bohong lagi*!
          2SG lie   again
          '**There you going,** lying **again**!'

---

[4] Consider, for example, Bambang Kaswanti Purwo (1976) and Soepomo Poedjosoedarmo (1982). However, this distinction is not made in E.C. Horne (1961).

A: *Lha   beneran, mas*!
       PART   true   older.brother
       'No! I'm **really** telling you the truth!'

Miyake (2015: 5) observes the role of *lho* in introducing new information. In (16) however, we observe a reaction to new information expressed by *lho*. The interlocutors were discussing outdated teaching methods used in the classroom. When informed about the teachers' age, the speaker reacted.

(16)   *Lha,   kalau guru-nya sudah   tua pasti begitu*.
         PART if   teacher   already old sure that.way

         '**Well**, if the teachers are on the old side, that's the way it's going to be.'

In final position, the particle *lho* commonly occurs in imperatives, often with a sense of warning (see Miyake 2015: 6), as in (17).

(17)   *Jangan   ke sana,   ada   banyak motor,   lho*!
         do.not   to there there.is much   motorbike PART

         'Don't go there! There are a lot of motorbikes!'

In other instances, the particle *lho* in final positions serves emphatic purposes, frequently occurring in exclamations. One interesting instance was found in which the particle was used to emphasize the right information. In (18), A initially gave wrong directions (*barat* 'west'), later correcting himself by adding *lho* to stress that the second information was the correct one. It is worth mentioning here that in CI, particularly in so-called colloquial Jakartan Indonesian, there is a specific self-correcting particle *ding* (with a variant *deng*),[5] which, however, has not been found in the material collected for this study.

(18)   A: *Di sebelah barat masjid*.
              in part   west mosque
              '[It's] to the west of the mosque.'

         B: *Barat*?
              west
              '[To the] west?'

         A: *Di sebelah utara, lho*.
              in part   north PART
              '[No, actually] to the north.'

In the written texts analysed here, the particle *lho* occurs in final position, with only one exception observed (20). Yet, in this instance, *lho* separates the topic of the sentence from its comment. Most occurrences of this particle have

---

[5] See D. Gil and U. Tadmor (2007).

been observed in the titles of popular articles. Given the style of these articles and their character, *lho* serves as an additional emphasis in order to attract the readers' attention.

(19) *Ini   sangat pas untuk kamu,   karena   sepertinya akan datang*
      this   very   fit for   2SG   because   it.seems   FUT   coz

      seseorang yang   kamu nantikan selama ini lho!
      someone   which   2SG   wait   until   this PART

      'It's [a] very good [prediction] for you, as it seems that someone you've been waiting for will [finally] come.'

In (19) we observe the typical emphatic meaning of the particle with an additional shade along the lines of "you will see that this is going to be the case!".

As mentioned above, (20) is the only instance of particle *lho* in a non-final position. In this example, the particle *lho* separates the topic from the comment and puts emphasis on a described character, who is supposed to be known to the readers. In this example, the combination *itu lho* (literally: *that* PART) seems to carry the meaning of "you know, that one"; "you know whom I'm talking about", et cetera. This example illustrates the typical conversational usage of the particle – the title of the article has features of a spontaneous phrase which might be found in a dialogue ("You remember him? It was that guy ...").

(20) *Kamu masih ingat   serial kartun Marsupilami? Itu lho   si*
      2SG   still remember   series cartoon PM   that PART   CLASS

      ekor panjang nan   serba   guna dengan kulit warna kuning.
      tail long   which everything   use   with   skin   colour yellow

      'Do you still remember cartoon series Marsupilami? That's that yellow guy with long, multi-purpose tail.'

In the texts analysed, *lho* functions mostly as an emphasizer. Only a few instances of *lho* as a particle expressing surprise have been noted. They have been found in articles in the form of a collection of photos/memes with comments on them. They are also quite common in articles which are structured like lists ("listicles").

3.6 The meanings of the particles

Based on the material gathered for this study, we can see that the particles do not easily fall into neat categories, largely because many functions of the described elements overlap. We can roughly divide the studied particles (*dong*, *kok*, *sih,* and *lho*) into two groups: "emphasizers" and "particles expressing surprise" (Table 2).

Emphasis	Expression of surprise
kok in final position in statements	*kok* in final position in statements
dong in statements and imperatives	*kok* in questions
sih in statements	*sih* in questions
lho in final position	*lho* + *kok*
lho in initial position	

Table 2. Functions of the particles.

By "emphasizer", I mean particles which carry a meaning similar to "It is certainly X" or "You will see that it is X". The particles expressing surprise convey meanings along the lines of "I was sure that X was the case but it is not" or "It is usually X, why is it Y now?". The peculiarities of each particle will be addressed in more detail later in this section.

As we can observe in Table 2, only the particle *dong* does not play any role in expressing surprise. The particle *kok* can serve both purposes when used in statements, depending on the context, yet only when used in questions, does it imply the speaker's surprise. The particle *sih*, in turn, does not yield a clear definition. Even though this particle might possibly express surprise, in most instances it is used with sense of irony or sarcasm. Therefore, we do not, in most cases, speak of *genuine* surprise. Of the particles described, *lho* is most probably the easiest to define: it serves purely emphatic purposes, except when it co-occurs with the particle *kok*.

Another important role played by discourse particles is their function in introducing or commenting on new information. Particles which usually provide a comment on the new information are: *sih* (ironic attitude), *kok* (surprise), and *lho* (surprise, more emphatic). Particles playing a role in introducing a new information are *sih* (contrasting) and *lho* (new message or reintroducing information). Based on the above findings, the particles could be paraphrased in the following way:

lho:
1. "How come [you say] Y!? I told you that [it is] X!"
2. "Oh! I had no idea that [it is] X!"
3. "Look, it is X!" [the addressee has no previous knowledge or presumption about what is going to happen] alternatively: "Look what I found!"
4. "No, X is not always the case!"
5. "You know" [or: "You should remember" in: <phrase> + *itu lho* ('that, lho'; 'that's it')]
6. "Don't/do that because X" [X usually not expressed, exists in the mind of the speaker as their previous observation]
7. "What!?"; "How come!?" [expressing strong surprise]
8. "No way!" [indicating obstacle]
9. "That's what I think" or: "That's the way it is"
10. "X. Period!" [ending an argument; reinforcing an insult]

sih:
1. "Oh! This is so X!" [X usually expressed by an adjective]
2. "It is X, don't you think?" [expressed as a tag *nggak sih?* – 'isn't it?']
3. "Do you think I am going to believe that?" [idiomatic *masa sih?* which could be rendered as 'really?' or 'seriously?']
4. "What/Who could that be?" [with question words *apa sih? siapa sih?* – 'what *sih*? who *sih*?']
5. "But what exactly!?"
6. "What on earth!?"
7. "It was supposed to be X, why is it Y?" [often implying: "what have you done?"]
8. "Also true, but there's nothing you can do about it"
9. "Yes, that's true, you're right" [very often as *iya, juga sih* – literally: 'yes, also *sih*']
10. "It is X <hesitation> oh yes, definitely X *sih*" [often followed by further explanations]
11. "<question> I know I've already asked, remind me again please" or "What was that, again?"
12. "It is X, indeed, but Y" [in idiomatic "<adjective> *sih* <adjective>, *tapi* ('but') <another adjective>"]

kok:
1. "It is usually X, why is it Y now?"
2. "How come! It is impossible that X"
3. "Wow, this thing is quite/too X!"
4. "It is X, why would you think otherwise?"
5. "It is X, didn't you see?"
6. "It is X, you see, I wish/would expect it was Y"
7. "Wow! X, I thought it can't be X"
8. "It's/here's X, didn't you see?"
9. "No, it is not what you think, it should be this way"
10 "I thought it was going to work but it actually doesn't"

dong:
1. "Obviously it is X"
2. "Come on, do it!" [in imperatives, giving a sense of encouragement, or as a dare]
3. "Please, just do it"
4. "Do it! You should have already done it!"
5. "It is X, like you didn't know"
6. "Don't you think it's X?"
7. "I know that you know!"
8. "Don't you agree?" [with a presumption that the addressee will express an agreement]
9. "It's not what you think, it's actually X"
10. "Is it X?"
11. "Of course it is X!" [implying: "why would you expect otherwise?"]
12. "Look, it is X, don't you think!"

3.7 COLLOCATIONS

In the material studied I have also analysed the most common particle collocations occurring on the *Brilio.net* website. Quite surprisingly, very few fixed expressions showed up. In most instances the collocates were found between clauses. Therefore, not all results can be considered valid collocates. Such instances have been ignored in the description below.

Most of the observed collocations occurred between a particle and (in order of frequency):
a) another particle;
b) a preposition;
c) a modal verb;
d) another discourse particle.

An exception has been observed in case of particle *lho*, which collocates readily with non-modal verbs, common nouns, and adjectives.

The particle *sih* most frequently co-occurs with words such as *tapi* ('but'), *nggak* ('no'), *gini* ('like this/this way'), which reveals its role in contrasting information. For the particle *kok*, the most common collocate was the word *bisa* ('can'), forming an idiomatic phrase *kok bisa?* ('how is that possible?', 'how come?', 'how dare you?'). Other common collocations include *nggak kok* ('*kok* no!') and *kok begini/begitu* ('like this/that *kok*!'), which convey a nuance of surprise. The particle *dong* collocated with some common verbs, as it is frequently used in combination with imperatives. The most common collocate observed was *kamu dong* ('you *dong*') which could be translated as 'it's you, you're the one (not anybody else)!'. Among other combinations, no other phrases which could be considered fixed expressions were found. Similarly, in case of the particle *lho*, establishing any particular rule for collocation is difficult if not impossible. As mentioned above, the particle expresses surprise (more emphatically than the particle *kok*) and plays an important role in introducing new information.

In the examples discussed earlier, it has been observed that in most instances, the particle *lho* occurs in phrase-final position, so that no idiomatic expressions showed up. The collocates are mostly nouns, adjectives, and non-modal verbs, for example: *dunia* ('the world'), *bahagia* ('happy'), *luas* ('wide'), *coba* ('to try'), *asli* ('original'), *ternyata* ('apparently'), et cetera.

4. CONCLUSION

This study has taken a closer look at discourse particles used in contemporary Colloquial Indonesian and their function in both spoken and written environments, explaining their functions and illustrating them with examples. It is important to repeat that the academic concept of "discourse particles" can still be considered somewhat fuzzy (see Jucker and Ziv 1998: 2). Therefore, I found it essential to construct a specific definition for the purpose of this study.

A vital part of the present analysis was to cross-examine the particles as used in speech with dictionary entries and the findings of other researchers. The discrepancies revealed between the dictionary definitions (especially

KBBI) and the research material were not strikingly deep, nonetheless a revision of the entries is needed, as the major part of the definitions can be potentially misleading. The findings in Section 3 are in line with current research on the usage of Indonesian discourse particles, allowing few novel insights about the nature of the particles to be obtained. The most accurate descriptions of the particles have been given by Johns (1993), Miyake (2015), and Wouk (1989, 1999a, 1999b). However, the particles discussed by Wouk, *ya* and *kan*, were not described in the present study.

Even though the Colloquial Indonesian particles have been described extensively, very little attention has been paid to these speech elements occurring in written text. The analysis undertaken here shows that there are not too many differences between the functions of the particles in spoken and written language. All the particles analysed in this paper were found in the example sentences used for the present analysis, and all of their functions were also revealed in the written texts without differences in meaning. Understandably, in the written texts we can readily extract collocations and fixed expressions, which appear more frequently. As I have shown, the character of the articles analysed in this study triggers certain types of expressions. Discourse particles are especially common in clickbait titles, which are almost always questions, imperatives, or very emphatic statements, as their main purpose is to attract the readers' attention.

It is also important to underline that the relationship between the writer and the reader, their roles, and the amount of common knowledge they share are not as easily discernible as in face-to-face communication. This shared knowledge is particularly important in the study of the particles' functions, because, as stated earlier, they provide a sort of situational commentary on the ongoing discourse. Nonetheless, the articles found at *Brilio.net*, besides being subdivided into thematic categories (which immediately give us hints about their contents), are copiously illustrated with photographs to which the texts of the articles often refer. Therefore, the visual elements play an important role in building the common ground (supported by the usage of informal style) between the author and the reader, which becomes a basis for a kind of a dialogue between the two. This puts the style of the material closer to spoken conversation. Unlike news articles, the material analysed features overt expressions; the authors explicitly share their evaluation of the described reality by means of direct, colloquial language, while making abundant use of discourse particles.

This study has shown that the particles discussed do not change the meaning of a given utterance, but rather imbue them with a certain flavour, making them more expressive and natural. Therefore, it is understandable that the particles prevail in the language of advertisements and commercials, as well as the language of longer texts. One conclusion is certain, we are going to observe an increase in the usage of Indonesian discourse particles, as it dovetails with the extensive use of colloquialisms nowadays.

ABBREVIATIONS

1SG	first person singular
2SG	second person singular
CI	Colloquial Indonesian
CLASS	classifier
Jv	Javanese
FUT	future tense marker
KBBI	Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia
KD	Kamus Dewan
KII	Kamus Inggris-Indonesia
KL	Kamus Lengkap
PART	particle
POSS	possessive
PN	proper name

REFERENCES

Abdul Chaer and Augustina Leonie. 2004. *Sosiolinguistik perkenalan awal*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Ariel, Mira. 1998. "Discourse markers and form-function correlations", in: Andreas H. Jucker and Yael Ziv (eds), *Discourse markers; Descriptions and theory*, pp. 223-260. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. [Pragmatics and beyond new series 57.]

Badan Bahasa. 2016. *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. [Available from: www.kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/; accessed on 26-1-2019.]

Badudu, J.S., Lesmanesya, Livian Lubis, and Muchtar. 1984. *Morfologi bahasa Indonesia (lisan)*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Bambang Kaswanti Purwo. 1976. *Presupposition in the Javanese particles "lho-lha-kok-rak-mbok-ta-ki-je"; A semantic and syntactic study*. PhD thesis, Institut Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Malang.

Chambert-Loir, Henri. 1983. *Citra masyarakat Indonesia*. Jakarta: Sinar Harapan.

Demidjuk, Ljudmila, Ahmad Sujai, Jenni M.T. Harjatno, and Vladimir V. Sikorsky (eds). 2013. *Učebnik indonezijskogo jazyka* [Manual of Indonesian language]. Moscow: Moscow University Press.

Echols, John M. and Hasan Shadily. 2014. *Kamus Inggris-Indonesia*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Englebretson, Robert. 2003. *Searching for structure; The problem of complementation in colloquial Indonesian conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ewing, Michael C. 2005. "Colloquial Indonesian", in: K. Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, pp: 227-258. London / New York, NY: Routledge.

Gil, D. and U. Tadmor. 2007. "The MPI-EVA Jakarta Child Language Database". [A joint project of the Department of Linguistics, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology and the Center for Language and Culture Studies, Atma Jaya Catholic University.]

Grijns, C.D. 1991. *Jakarta Malay; A multidimensional approach to spatial variation.* Leiden: KITLV Press.

Hoogervorst, Tom G. 2018. "Utterance-final particles in Klang Valley Malay", *Wacana*, *Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia* Vol. 19 No. 2: 291-326.

Horne, E.C. 1961. *Beginning Javanese.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Johns, Yohanni. 1993. *Bahasa Indonesia; Langkah baru, Book 3.* Canberra: Periplus Editions.

Jucker, Andreas H. and Yael Ziv (eds). 1998. *Discourse markers; Descriptions and theory.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Maschler, Yael. 1998. "*Rotsè lishmoa kéta*? 'wanna hear something weird/funny [lit. 'a segment']?'; The discourse markers segmenting Israeli Hebrew talk-in-interaction", in: Andreas H. Jucker and Yael Ziv (eds), *Discourse markers; Descriptions and theory*, pp. 13-159. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mintz, Malcolm Warren. 1994. *A student's grammar of Malay and Indonesian.* Singapore: EPB.

Miyake, Y. 2015. "Pragmatic particles and information structure in colloquial Indonesian dialogue", in: *Proceedings of the second international workshop on information structure of Austronesian languages*, pp. 103-114. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Muhadjir. 1981. *Morphology of Jakarta dialect; Affixation and reduplication.* Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, Universitas Atma Jaya.

Noresah bt. Baharom, Hajah. 2007. *Kamus Dewan* [Dictionary of the Language Bureau]. Fourth edition. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Nyan, Thanh. 2016. *Context construction as mediated by discourse markers; An adaptive approach.* Leiden: Brill.

Poedjosoedarmo, Soepomo. 1982. *Javanese influence on Indonesian.* Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University.

Rahardi, R. Kunjana. 2001. *Sosiolinguistik, kode dan alih kode.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Rahayu, Siti Perdi. 1999. "Slang dalam bahasa Jawa; Analisis kasus di Malioboro Yogyakarta". MA thesis, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta.

Sneddon, James Neil. 2006. *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian.* Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics 581.]

Solikhan, Umar. 2006. *Bahasa gaul; Sebuah slang dalam bahasa Indonesia.* Semarang: Balai Bahasa.

Stede, Manfred and Birte Schmitz. 2000. "Discourse particles and discourse functions", *Machine translation* 15(1-2): 125-147.

Suwojo Wojowasito and Tito W. Wasito. 2007. *Kamus lengkap.* Bandung: Hasta.

Wouk, Fay. 1989. *The impact of discourse on grammar; Verb morphology in spoken Jakarta Indonesian.* PhD thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.

Wouk, Fay. 1998. "Solidarity in Indonesian conversation; The discourse marker 'kan'", *Multilingua* 17(4): 379-406.

Wouk, Fay. 1999a. "Gender and the use of pragmatic particles in Indonesian", *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(2): 194-219.

Wouk, Fay. 1999b. "Dialect contact and koineization in Jakarta, Indonesia", *Language Sciences* 21: 61-86.

Wouk, Fay. 2001. "Solidarity in Indonesian conversation; The discourse marker 'ya'", *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(2): 171-191.

Yuniar, Dientha. 2013. "'Ya' as discourse marker; Indonesian stand–up comedy strategy in producing laughter", *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature* 2(6): 103-110.