

'The particle is the meaning, *aya*?': Discourse Particles in Ilocano

Anne Richie G. Balgos

ABSTRACT

This paper explores discourse particles in Ilocano in two parts. The first part examines the versatility of discourse particles in Ilocano, their functions, and how they express the opinions, attitudes, and emotions of a speaker. On the other hand, the second part employs Schacter and Otones' (1972) typology of enclitic particles. As in Tagalog, there were four classes identified in Ilocano pragmatic particles. Class 1 includes *-en* and *pay*. The particle *-en* denotes a sense of completion and punctuality. Meanwhile, *pay* furthers what was previously said. In the same way as Tagalog's Class 1, *-en* and *pay* may not be preceded by other particles and may never occur in immediate sequence with one another as in *-en pay* except when the sequence is *pay=en*. Class 2 particle *man* implies a command that shows impatience. *Man* never precedes a particle in Class 1 and never follows a particle belonging to Class 3 or 4. However, it pays to underscore that the Ilocano particle *man*, in exceptional conditions may follow a particle belonging to Class 3 and 4. The discourse particle *aya* is often used in interrogative expressions to express wonder, surprise, or doubt. On the other hand, *met* expresses

pessimism and emphasis. Finally, *kano* is considered as a reporting discourse particle which expresses that the information is second-hand. In relation to Schacter and Otones's (1972) Class 3, *aya*, *met*, and *kano* can belong to Class 3 (a) which never follow a Class 4 particle and Class 3(b) which may follow a Class 4 particle. The particle *sa* functions in various ways. Inserting *sa* in a sentence will change its meaning from something that is certain to another that is speculative.

Keywords: Ilocano, Tagalog, Philippine languages, enclitic particles, pragmatics

1.0 Introduction

Discourse particles, at first sight, seem to be innocent little words, but they can pose significant problems for automatically processing spoken language. Their abundance (types and tokens alike) varies notably from language to language. Discourse particles have been analyzed in many different frameworks and from various perspectives that often yielded to extreme results. Fischer (1997) claims that there is no method for validating the one or the other analysis other than plausibility.

While discourse particles in general have been considered as “desemanticised” (Beeching, 2004, p. 61), labeled as “coloring particles” (Settekorn, 1977, p. 195) and often dismissed as “fillers” (Beeching, 2004, p. 61), their use in discourse is ubiquitous. Linguists, such as Settekorn (1977), emphasize the necessity to investigate the function of these communicative particles in speech situations since their constant presence cannot be explained solely by a wish from the speaker to “color” or “decorate” discourse (Settekorn, 1977, p. 195). Discourse particles are words that are not uttered because of their propositional content, but because of some pragmatic function for the ongoing discourse.

In English, most studies examine discourse particles as markers from a sociolinguistic and discourse analysis point of view has been very extensive. Among others we can cite those who have conducted quite general studies: Schiffrin (1987) and Brinton (1996) on discourse markers in general while Andersen (1998) analyzed *like*.

Studies on discourse particles have also been done in German. For instance, Golato & Fagyal (2008) explained that *ja-* (yes) is a particle usually used to show acknowledgement. It can also be utilized as a continuer. However, depending on different factors, a doubled *ja*, pronounced either *jaja* (with a falling intonation) or *jaja* (“uttered with a pitch peak on the second ja”) (Golato & Fagyal, 2008, p. 243) is not a “more intense version” (Golato & Fagyal, 2008, p. 241) of the action of “acknowledging”. Instead, these *jajas* have different interactional functions. Golato & Fagyal’s (2008) analysis not only takes into account the sequential placements of the doubled token within a turn, but also takes into account phonetics. Studies have also been done in

Russian. For instance, Bolden (2008) shows that to re-open a conversation, the particle *-to* is used in closing environments.

In Singapore English (SGE), Gupta (1992) identified eleven pragmatic particles and divided them into three different categories along a scale of assertiveness: contradictory (*ma, what*), assertive (*me, ge, lei, na, la, lo*) and tentative (*ho, ha, a*). Gupta (1992) found that the contradictory particles are the least assertive. Similarly, Wong (1994) attempted to explain the meaning of the particles *what, ma*, and *me* in terms of their proposition in discourse. On the other hand, Wee (1998) and Low and Brown (2003) summarized the different discursual functions of these particles.

In the Philippines, there has not been a study on Ilocano particles. Although Lim and Borlongan (2011) examined discourse particles in Tagalog in Philippine English, so far, it is only Rubino's (1997) reference grammar and Dita and Roxas (2011) study on Philippine languages that attempt to look into the intricacies of Ilocano, as an Austronesian language.

Hence, this paper explores discourse particles in Ilocano in two parts. The first part examines the versatility of discourse particles in Ilocano; their functions; and how they express the opinions, attitudes, and emotions of a speaker. On the other hand, the second part employs Schacter and Otones' (1972) typology of enclitic particles, which they define as "[a] small but important class of words that occur in certain fixed word-order relations to other sentence elements" (p. 82). It should be noted here that Rubino (1996) uses the term invariable particles to what Schacter and Otones call as enclitic particles. Since the descriptive apparatus being used in this paper is that of the latter, the term enclitic particles will also be used in this paper. Enclitic particles carry a range of functions and meanings, which may denote force, modality, orientation, politeness, and the like and that will be the focus of this paper.

There are 18 enclitic particles in Tagalog and Schacter and Otones (1972) identify four classes. In the study, although there are 8 discussed enclitic particles, only seven will be tested using the said typology. The table below shows Schacter and Otones's (1972) and classification of enclitic particles and the Ilocano counterparts of this paper:

Table 1. *Ilocano articles based on Schacter and Otones (1972)*

CLASSES of particles		TAGALOG
Class 1		<i>na, pa</i>
Class 2		<i>man</i>
Class	a:	<i>ba, din, kasi, ho, lamang,</i> <i>nga, po</i>
	b:	<i>daw, muna, naman</i>
Class 4		<i>kaya, pala, sana, tuloy, yata</i>

Table 2. *The typology of Tagalog particles by Schacter and Otones (1972)*

CLASSES of particles		ILOCANO
Class 1		<i>-en and pay</i>
Class 2		<i>man</i>
Class	a:	<i>aya, met</i>
	b:	<i>kano</i>
Class 4		<i>sa</i>
Class 5		<i>ngarud</i>

This study used the descriptive research design because its main goal is to describe the data and characteristics about what is being studied. In addition, this design provides better understanding of the occurrences and functions of enclitic Ilocano particles in radio commentaries of Bombo Radyo and Aksyon Radyo in Laoag, Ilocos Norte. Data were collected from the two pioneering radio stations in the said province. Since the study aimed to determine how Ilocano discourse particles function, sample sentences showing the occurrence of these particles were extracted and analyzed.

The two radio stations news commentary programs that tend to last for 30 minutes. Furthermore, they assign a radio news commentator (usually the station manager) to give an extended discussion of a news

headline. Different from a news broadcast which is usually read from a newspaper, a radio news commentary is usually spontaneous so that commentators have very limited or no time to prepare or rehearse. The radio commentators are native speakers of Ilocano. Although they occasionally code-switch from Ilocano to Tagalog and Ilocano to English, the dominant language in the corpus is Ilocano. The data came from the transcribed utterances of the trilingual radio news commentators in Laoag City, Ilocos Norte.

2.0 Sample Utterances

2.1 Part 1: Common discourse particles in Ilocano and their functions

To explain the versatility of the 12 Ilocano discourse particles, sample sentences from a corpus of radio commentaries in Laoag, Ilocos Norte were lifted and analyzed.

2.1.1 The particle *ngatan* expresses speculation.

- (1) Napan=ka man **ngata=n** naginsisimpet a nagdamdamag?
Go ERG. 2s PAR PAR pretending.to.be.polite LIG in
asking I guess you pretended again to be polite in asking.

In the sentence, *ngatan*, as an expression of assumption, follows the particle *man* that denotes repetition. Therefore, aside from speculation, *ngatan*, when preceded by *man*, which denotes a verb in the past tense, expresses performance of action expressed by the verb in the contemplated aspect.

2.1.2 The particle *met* implies pessimism in some cases.

- (1) Awan **met** la *ngamin=en* damag ti proyekto idiyay
makuna a gym.
NEG. PAR PAR PAR PAR news DET project LOC
so-called LIG gym.
There has not been any news yet on that project in the
gym.

In the sentence, it can be seen that *met* three more particles namely *la*, *ngamin*, and *-en*. This interesting occurrence of four particles in one Ilocano utterance all the more emphasizes negated constructions. Hence, the speaker stresses pessimism over the absence of something that should have been attained long ago.

2.1.3 *The particle -en implies completion.*

- (2) Maawata=ko=**n** ti problema ti munisipyo.
 Understand ABS.1s PAR DET problem DET
 municipality.
 Now, I understand the problem of the municipality.

In the utterance, the particle *-en* indicates an immediate initiation or performance of the action. At first glance, it would seem that the action (understand) in the sentence is continuing and resuming and is in the contemplative aspect but has been performed and initiated at the same time.

Interestingly, this Ilocano particle functions in various ways. Firstly, the particle *-en* follows consonants and diphthongs. For example:

- (4) Napan=**en** a nagsala.
 Go PAR PAR LIG dance
 She already went to dance.

If the particle *-en* is deleted from the sentence, the meaning will change, as in:

- (5) Napa=**n** a nagsala.
 Go PAR LIG dance
 She went to dance.

It can be observed that in the first sentence, when the particle *-en* is used, the predicate verb is in the perfective aspect while in the second sentence (without *-en*), the verb is in the past tense. Moreover, the inclusion of the particle *-en* may denote that the action is relatively new or that dancing was not a common action of the person being referred to.

Secondly, the particle *-n* comes after vowels. To illustrate:

- (6) Kaykayat na=**n** ti tumulong.
Like PART LIG help
Now he/she likes to help.

Thirdly, it may be attached to a verb predicate. For example:

- (7) Nakita=ko=**n** ti agpaysu nga ugali na.
See ABS PAR DET true LIG attitude his GEN.3s
Now, I see his/her true colors.

Fourthly, it may be merged with a noun predicate. For example:

- (8) Oras=**en** ti pinagluwalo.
Time PAR to pray ABS.1s
The time has come for us to pray.

Lastly, it may be attached to an adjective phrase. For example:

- (9) Napintas=**en** ti dalan tayu.
Improved PAR DET roads IN ABS.1p
We already have improved roads.

In all the above cited sentences, it can be observed that the particle *-en* may be added to predicate verbs in the contemplated aspect in order to express immediate initiation or completion of the action.

*2.1.4 The particle **aya** is often used in interrogative expressions to express wonder, surprise or doubt.*

This sentence shows how *aya* expresses apprehension.

- (10) Asino=da pay, **aya**, dagiti nalalaing a tumaray
tatta?
Who ABS.3pPAR PAR DIS.PLU able LIG run now
Who indeed are the other able ones who will run today
(in the elections)?

As can be seen, *aya* comes after the interrogative word *asino* (who). Moreover, the apprehension is reinforced because the action in the sentence *tumaray* (run for office) is something that could be prevented but was not prevented (The broadcaster expresses apprehension on people who run for office even if they are not qualified).

On the other hand, this sentence illustrates how *aya* becomes an expression of disbelief.

- (11) **Aya?** Innala=naka gayam ni Mayor?
 PAR get ERG.3s+ABS.2s PAR PER Mayor
 Really? So Mayor got you?

It is interesting to note how in the extract, *aya* becomes a one-word question as in *Really?* In addition, it can be observed that the particle may function as a question marker in a yes-no question. Then again, *aya* is not obligatory as long as the speaker uses a rising intonation pattern. For example:

- (12) Innala=na ka gayam ni Mayor?
 get ERG.3s+ABS.2s PAR PER Mayor
 Mayor got you?

2.1.5 The particle *ngarud* has many functions. One of them is affirmation.

- (13) Nangeg ku **ngarud** diyay speech na. Nagmayat sika!
 Heard ERG.1s PAR DIST speech ABS.3s meaningful!
 I heard his speech. It was meaningful!

Another function of *ngarud* is confirmatory. For example:

- (14) Sige, mapan ta **ngarud**.
 Hurry, go EX.2pl PAR
 Hurry, let's go!

In the sentence, the speaker simply enhances his confirmatory statement and make it sound as a conviction.

Although this may not be the last function of *ngarud* in Ilocano discourse, it was noted that it may also be a way to augment verification.

- (15) Ustu ta kunam **ngarud**?
 Right DIST said ABS.2s PAR
 Is what you said right?

2.1.6 *The particle kuma insinuates hope or necessity.*

- (16) Adda= n to **kuma** met ngarud ti seminar=ko.
 EXI PAR PAR PAR PAR PAR DET GEN. 1s
 I should also have a seminar.

Interestingly, there could be five particles in one utterance in Ilocano discourse. It can be seen that *-n* denotes the past aspect, *to* expresses futurity; *kuma* implies hope for something that is absent, *met* insinuates that whatever is hoped for may have been attained by others, and *ngarud* intensifies the longing. The following sentence will show how deleting each of the particles will change the meaning of the sentence:

- (17) Adda=**n** ti seminar=ko.
 EXI PAR DET GEN. 1s
 I now have a seminar.

The sentence merely expresses a relatively new or altered situation being one in a contemplated aspect.

- (18) ? Adda **to** ti seminar=ko.
 EXI PAR DET GEN. 1s
 I will have a seminar.

The sentence plainly states futurity.

- (19) Adda **kuma** ti seminar=ko.
 EXI PAR DET GEN. 1s
 I hope to have a seminar.

The sentence insinuates speaker's hopeful attitude.

- (20) Adda **met** ti seminar=ko.
EXI PAR DET GEN. 1s
I also have a seminar.

The sentence expresses addition to something that already exists.

- (21) Adda **ngarud** ti seminar=ko.
EXI PAR DET GEN. 1s
I have (emphasized) a seminar.

The sentence implies emphasis on what the speaker has.

Therefore, it can be argued that particles play an important role in conveying messages and they carry relative semantic and pragmatic meanings.

2.1.7 *gayam*

The particle *gayam* states discovery of new information.

- (22) Immay **gayam** ni Congressman.
Came PAR DET Congressman.
Oh, the Congressman came.

In the sentence, the radio commentator re-tells information which he/she might have gotten from a reliable source. Moreover, *gayam* insinuates that the re-telling is necessary and important.

2.1.8 *kano*

The particle *kano* signifies second-hand information

- (23) Isu **kano** ngarud met ti imbaga ni kapitan.
That PAR PAR PAR DET said DET captain
That's what the captain said.

It is worth highlighting that re-ordering the particles may result to change in meaning or ungrammaticality of the sentence. For example:

- (24) Isu **ngarud** kanu met ti imbaga ni kapitan.
That PAR PAR PAR DET said DET captain
That's what the captain said.

In this sentence *ngarud* puts emphasis to the definite pronoun *isu* (that).

- (25) Isu **ngarud** met kanu ti imbaga ni kapitan.
That PAR PAR PAR DET said DET captain
That's what the captain said.

On the other hand, the focus of the sentence is *met* which highlights addition of information.

- (26) Isu met kanu ngarud ti imbaga ni kapitan.
That PAR PAR PAR DET said DET captain
That's what the captain said.

The sentence below, the speaker uses the particle *ngarud* to insist on the information that he relays.

- (27) Isu **met** ngarud kanu ti imbaga ni kapitan.
That PAR PAR PAR DET said DET captain
That's what the captain said.

Part 2: Classifications of the Ilocano discourse particles

2.2.1 Class 1: *-en and pay*

The first particle belonging to Class 1 is *-en*. For example:

- (28) Naipatakder=**en** diyay baru nga ospital.
The new hospital has been built.

- (29) Adda=**(e)n** dagidiyay duwa nga ambulansiya.
The two ambulance units are now available.

In the given sentences, the radio commentator discusses the recent completed projects of the local government of Laoag, Ilocos Norte. Moreover, he/she seems to imply that the said hospital is only one among the government projects that are due for completion.

The second particle of Class 1, *pay*, conveys addition to something that already exists. For example:

- (30) Ada **pay** ti proyekto ti munisipyo a libre nga bakuna.
In addition, the municipal government has a free vaccination project.
- (31) Mabalin **pay** nga ag-request iti lugan nu mapan idiyay health center.
You can even request for transportation services when going to the health center.

In the given sentences the speaker seems to remind the interlocutor that there are actually current projects facilities of the government which may seem to be forgotten if not unknown which the latter needs to know.

It can be said that *-en* and *pay* may belong to Class 1 of Schacter and Otane's (1972) typology of particles because *-en* and *pay* may never occur in immediate sequence with one another and are never preceded by any other enclitic particles.

Therefore, the following sentences are ungrammatical:

- (32) ? Naipatakder=**en pay** didiyay baru nga ospital.
The hospital was even built already.
- (33) ? Naipatakder=**en san** didiyay baru nga ospital.
I think the hospital has been built.

- (34) ? Ada=**(e)n kanu** didiyay duwa nga ambulansiya.
They said that the two ambulance units are available.
- (35) ? Ada=**(e)n pay** dagidiyay duwa nga ambulansiya.
Even the two ambulance units are already available.

However, it is interesting to note that when one expresses an addition that has been completed. These two particles can be in an utterance provided *pay* precedes *-en*. For example:

- (36) Naipatakder **pay=en** didiyay baru nga ospital.
The hospital was even built already.
- (37) Ada **pay=en** dagidiyay duwa nga ambulansya.
Even the two ambulance units are already available.

It is worth highlighting that occurrence of *pay=en* would not only mean completion or punctuality but an achievement of a goal that has long been planned or an objective realized that has not been expected.

Therefore, in relation to Schacter and Otones's (1972) Class 1 of particles, *-en* and *pay* may not be preceded by other particles and may never occur in immediate sequence with one another as in *-en pay* except when the sequence is *pay=en*.

2.2.2 Class 2: *man*

Man is the only particle that belongs to Class 2. For example:

- (38) Di ka **man** ket nasakit ti ulok.
Please stop it; I'm having a headache.

In the sample sentence, the speaker orders his interlocutor to stop insisting on his/her points because it is stressful to listen to them. It can also be noted that although the sentence appears to be a command, the speaker makes sure that his/her impatience is justified by the fact that he/he has a headache. In a sense, *man*, as a particle to express impatience, may usually respond to an utterance which could trigger and justify, at the same time, a feeling of annoyance.

Similar to Schacter and Otones's (1972) Class 2, *man* never precedes a particle in Class 1 and never follows a particle belonging to Classes 3 or 4. Thus it is ungrammatical to say:

- (39) ? Di ka **man=en** ket nasakit ti uluk.
Please stop it; I'm having a headache.
- (40) ? Meeting **man aya** ti kuna ni Mayoren?
Did Mayor say there will be a meeting again?
- (41) ? Awan **man met** ti sungbat dan kadagidiyay
parikot ti taon.
There has not been any answer to any of the
people's questions.
- (42) ? Napan **man kanu** dagidiyay maestran idiyay
opisina.
The teachers went to the office again.

However, it pays to underscore that the Ilocano particle *man* in exceptional conditions may follow a particle belonging to Class 3 and 4. To illustrate:

- (43) ? Meeting man aya ti kuna ni mayoren? can be
corrected as
- (a) Meeting **man aya=n** ti kuna ni
Mayoren?
Did Mayor say there will be a meeting
again?

- (b) Meeting **aya man=en** ti kuna ni Mayor?
Did Mayor say there will be a meeting
again?

In sentence 43a the speaker insinuates exasperation on the meeting scheduled by the Mayor because perhaps there have been meetings in the past which may not have addressed the issues raised by the Mayor's constituents. Therefore, another meeting which cannot assure any solution causes the speaker to feel upset.

- (44) ? Awan **man met** ti sungbat dan kadagidiyay
parikot ti taon can be rephrased to

(a) Awan **ma=met man=en** ti sungbat da
kadagidiyay parikot ti taon.
There has not been any answer to any of the
people's questions.

and

(b) Awan **met man=en** ti sungbat da
kadagidiyay parikot ti taon.
There has not been any answer to any of the
people's questions.

In sentence 44a, the speaker expresses impatience on the delayed feedback on the questions raised by the concerned barangay representatives. It can be gleaned that such delay seems to aggravate the impatience because the matter might be highly important and is supposed to be addressed as soon as possible.

- (45) ? Napan **man kanu** dagidiyay maestran idiyay
opisina can be recast to

(a) Napan **man kanu=n** dagidiyay maestran idiyay
opisina
The teachers went to the office again.

and

- (b) Napan **kanu man=en** dagidiyay maestran
didiyay opisina.
The teachers went to the office again.

In sentence 45b, the speaker implies frustration on the idea that the teachers went to the office of the head again. It is possible that the action of going there is deemed irrelevant or useless. Moreover, the speaker seems to express that the teachers might be sacrificing their duties for going to the said office during school hours; thus, leaving their students short changed.

As can be observed, *man* can precede particles in Class 3 if the:

1. *aya* that follows *man* precedes =n (43a);
2. *met* that follows *man* precedes *man=en* (44a);

and

3. *kanu* that follows *man* precedes *man=en* (45b).

In addition, *man* can be followed by particles in Class 3 if *man* is also preceded by another particle in the utterance such as *aya* in 43a; *met* in 44a; and *kanu* in 45b. Hence, in relation to Schacter and Otones's (1972) Class 2, the particle *man* does not in any way precede the particles in Class 1 and would in no way follow a particle belonging to Classes 3 and 4 unless the particles in said classes are followed by a third or fourth particle in the utterance.

2.2.3 Class 3: *aya, met, kano*

The discourse particle *aya, met, and kano* belong to Class 3.

This is an example for *aya*:

- (46) Asino da pay **aya** dagiti mangayat nga tumaray tatta? Who else plans to run for office?

In this sentence, the speaker conveys his doubt on the candidates for government's positions because as mentioned in the commentary, it seemed that everyone wanted to run for office all of a sudden. This does not only imply sarcasm but also doubt on the leadership qualities of those who filed to run for office due to personal reasons.

On the other hand, *met* expresses pessimism and emphasis. This can be illustrated by the sentence that follows:

- (47) Awan **met** la gaminen iti solusyon kadagiti problema ti barangay.

The problems at the barangay level do not have solutions yet.

Cynicism is expressed in this sentence. Although the speaker seems to expect a solution from the government which may come not very soon, he/she suggests that the expected solution is next to impossible.

Finally, *kano* is considered as a reporting discourse particle which expresses that the information is second-hand. For example:

- (48) Imbaga **kano** ngarud met diyay kapitan da.
It was also told by the barangay captain.

In the sentence, the speaker reports that the information came from the barangay captain although he/she heard it from a different source. In addition, the use of this particle implies that the speaker tries his best to transmit the information as truthful as possible.

In relation to Schacter and Otones's (1972) Class 3, *aya*, and *kano* can belong to Class 3 (a) which never follow a Class 4 particle while Class 3(b) which may follow a Class 4 particle (see below).

The particle *aya* belongs to Class 3 (a):

- (49) ? Napan **aya sa** ti padanum diyay budget?
Did the budget go to the irrigation system?

Similarly, the particle *kano* belongs to Class 3 (a):

- (50) ? In-file **kano sa** ni Madam diyay kaso.
It was said that madam filed the case.

Unlike *aya* and *kano*, the particle *met* belongs to Class 3(b):

- (51) **Awan met** kuma a ti kakasta nga policy panggep ti labor.
Labor polices like that should not be applied.

In this sentence, the speaker shows glumness over the labor policies implemented. It can be deduced that from the pessimism that the speaker is coming from, he/she hopes that on-going confusions on the said policies be stopped.

- (52) **Dakkal met** sa ti inusar da nga pondo dita nga kalsada.
A huge amount was allegedly used for that road.

On the other hand, in this sentence, the speaker uses *met* for emphasis. It does not show any pessimism but it stresses the fact that a great deal of fund was used for the construction of a particular road; that is why the issue cannot be ignored.

Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the ungrammaticality of *kano* followed by *sa* can be corrected if the verb in the sentence can be corrected if the particle *-n* is encliticized in *kano*. This can be explained by the following sentences:

- (53) ? In-file **kano sa** ni Madam diyay kaso.
In-file **kano=n sa** ni Madam diyay kaso.
It was said that Madam filed the case.

When the ungrammaticality of the sentence is corrected, it can be observed that the particle *-n* is added to the first of the three particles in order to express past tense of the verb *inted* (give). It is interesting that aside from the inflection of the verb *inted* into *inted* in order to denote past tense, the first particle in the sentence *kano* is also required to be inflected (*kano=n*) in Ilocano discourse.

Hence:

- (54) ? Inted **kano sa** ni Mayor diyay pondo dan becomes
Inted **kano=n sa** ni Mayor diyay pondo dan.
It was said that Mayor already gave their fund.

Therefore, Schacter and Otones's (1972) Class 3 and its two subgroups apply to the Ilocano particles *aya*, and *met* belongs to Class 3(a) which cannot be followed by a Class 4 particle (*sa*), and *kano* belongs to the Class 3(b) which may be followed by a Class 4 particle (*sa*).

2.2.4 Class 4: *sa*

The particle *sa* is the only particle that belongs to Class 4. The following sentences will illustrate the use of *sa*:

1. To convey speculation

Apay makasuron **sa** met diyay lakay?
Is the old man annoyed?

To explain this occurrence of *sa*, it is important to note that inserting *sa* in a sentence will change its meaning from something that is factual to another that is speculative. In Sentence 1, the speaker speculates that the old man (politician) might be annoyed because of the criticisms on his leadership style.

Should the sentence be *Apay makasuron met diyay lakay?*, without the particle *sa*, it will mean *Why would the old man be annoyed?*

It seems clear that without the particle *sa*, the speaker implies that the old man (politician) does not have any reason to be annoyed.

2. To express uncertainty

Makitan *sa* ti madi nga ugali nan aya?
Don't you think his/her true colors are starting to show?

The speaker asks a question in order to clarify if his interlocutor thinks the same way on the behavior of a public servant. Moreover, this question, being a yes-no in format seems to prod a yes answer; otherwise, the conversations flow will be disrupted. Since the speaker attempts to build on a brewing misbehavior of a public servant, if his/her interlocutor disagrees, the speaker will not be able to expound on his argument.

In addition, although deleting *sa* in an Ilocano yes-no question would transform the sentence into a declarative sentence, maintaining *aya* may keep the interrogating nature of the sentence with *aya* functioning as a confirmatory particle. For example:

Makitan ti madi nga ugali na.
His/her true colors are showing now.

As can be seen in the sentences, the speaker is sure that person being pertained to is starting to show his true colors. It might also be worth highlighting that deleting *sa* in the sentence to express speaker's certainty on an opinion.

On the other hand, this is what happens if the particle *aya* stays in the sentence.

Makitan ti mad inga ugali na *aya*?
His/her true colors are showing, right?

As can be seen, the particle *aya* maintains the yes-not nature of the question and such signals the need for corroboration.

3. To imply uncertainty or lack of conviction

Haan kun **sa** kaya ti kasta nga trabaho.
I think I cannot do such job.

In the sentence, the speaker hesitates if he/she could carry out the duties of a politician. It appears that he/she lacks confidence in accepting a political duty compared to the political figures discussed during the radio commentary.

Now, should the particle **sa** be deleted from the sentence, the meaning will change. For example:

Haan kun kaya ti kasta nga trabaho.
I can't take that kind of job anymore.

The speaker this time is sure about his/her negative attitude towards a job. Also, it can be inferred that the speaker has long been doing the job and he/she feels that the time has come for him/her to stop doing it once and for all. Therefore, the addition or deletion of **sa** in the sentence changes the meaning of a sentence from 1) speculation to certainty; 2) interrogative to declarative sentence; and 3) lack of conviction to determination.

3.0 Conclusion

This paper attempted to identify the functions of Ilocano discourse particles; describe their use; and discuss pragmatic meanings associated with them by following the typology of Schacter and Otones (1972) for Tagalog and making use of data from radio commentaries.

Class 1 includes **=en** and **pay**. The particle **=en** denotes a sense of completion and punctuality. Meanwhile, **pay** furthers what was previously said. In the same way as Tagalog's Class 1, **=en** and **pay** may not be preceded by other particles and may never occur in immediate sequence with one another as in **=en pay** except when the sequence is **pay=en**. Class 2 particle **man** implies a command that shows impatience. **Man** never precedes a particle in Class 1 and never follows a particle belonging to Class 3 or 4. However, it pays to underscore that the Ilocano particle **man**, in exceptional

conditions may follow a particle belonging to Class 3 and 4. The discourse particle *aya* is often used in interrogative expressions to express wonder, surprise, or doubt. On the other hand, *met* expresses pessimism and emphasis. Finally, *kano* is considered as a reporting discourse particle which expresses that the information is second-hand. In relation to Schacter and Otnes's (1972) Class 3, *aya*, *met*, and *kano* can belong to Class 3 (a) which never follow a Class 4 particle and Class 3(b) which may follow a Class 4 particle. The particle *sa* functions in various ways. Inserting *sa* in a sentence will change its meaning from something that is factual to another that is speculative or something that is certain which may be affirmed by another.

Hence, one can see how this work contributes to the understanding of the interplay among discourse particles, their functions and meanings. Since these small words may carry big meanings, or since their absence or deletion may imply a totally different message, one can assume that in discourse, the particle could possibly be the message. Lastly, there has been little work on Philippine language pragmatics and it is hoped that this paper may be able to provide insight on Philippine and Austronesian language pragmatics.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1	Subject Relation
2	Direct Object Relation
3	Indirect Object Relation
ABS	Absolutive
DET	Determiner
DIST	Distal
EXI	Existential
ERG	Ergative
GEN	Genitive Case
IN	Instrumental Relation
LIG	Ligature
NEG	Negative
PAR	Particle
PER	Personal
PLU	Plural

Pronouns

1, 2, 3	person
s	singular
p	plural
d	dual (plural)
e	exclusive (plural)
i	inclusive (plural)

WORKS CITED

- Andersen, G. (1998). *Are tag questions questions? Evidence from spoken data*. Paper presented at the 19th ICAME Conference, Belfast, Northern Ireland, May 20-24.
- Beeching, K. (2004). Pragmatic particles-polite but powerless? Tone group terminal *hein* and *quoi* in contemporary spoken French. *Multilingua*, 23, 61-84.
- Bolden, G. B. (2008). Reopening Russian conversations: The discourse particle *-to* and the negotiation of interpersonal accountability in closings. *Human Communication Research*, 34, 99-136.
- Brinton, L. (1996). Pragmatic markers in English. Grammaticalization and discourse functions. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dita, S. N., & Roxas, R.E.O. (2011). Philippine languages online corpora: Status, issues, and prospects. *Proceedings of the 9th Workshop on Asian Language Resources collocated with IJCNLP 2011*, pp. 59-62.

- Gupta, A. F. (1992). The pragmatic particles of Singapore Colloquial English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18, 31–57.
- Lim, J., & Borlongan, A. M. (2011). Tagalog particles in Philippine English: The cases of *ba*, *na*, *'no*, and *pa*. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 42, 58-74.
- Low, E. L. & Brown, A. (2003). *An Introduction to Singapore English*. McGraw-Hill, Singapore.
- Fischer, K. (1998). Validating semantic analyses of discourse particles. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11, 111-127.
- Golato, A. and Fagyal, Z. (2008). Comparing single and double sayings of the German response token Ja and the whole of prosody: A conversational analysis perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41(3), 241-270.
- Rubino, C. (1997). A reference grammar of Ilocano (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Schacter, P., & Otones, F. T. (1972). *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1989). *Approaches to Discourse*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Skettekorn, W. (1977). *Pragmatics and discursive rhetoric*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1, 195-209.
- Wee, L. (1998). The lexicon of Singapore English. In J. Foley et al. (Eds.). *English in New Cultural Contexts: Reflections*. Singapore: Singapore Oxford University Press, pp. 175–200.
- Wong, J. O. (1994). *A Wierzbickian approach to Singlish particles*. MA dissertation, National University of Singapore.