

MALAY DISCOURSE PARTICLES
AS SEMANTIC CONSTRAINTS ON
INTERPRETATION

By

AZIMAH BT. SAZALIE

A THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE,
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES

JANUARY 1999

"The copyright of this thesis belongs to the author under the terms of the United Kingdom Copyright Acts as qualified by the University of Strathclyde Regulation 3.49. Due acknowledgement must always be made of the use of material contained in, or derived from, this thesis."

Contents

	Page
Abstract	1
Chapter One: Introduction To The Research	3
1.1 Introduction	3
1.2 The Discourse Particles	5
1.3 Context Selection And Manipulation	7
1.4 Coherence	10
1.5 Conclusion	13
Chapter Two: Traditional Approach To Discourse Particles	15
2.1 Introduction	15
2.2 Coherence	16
2.3 Cohesion In Discourse Organisation	20
2.3.1 Halliday And Hasan's Theory Of Cohesion	22
2.3.2 Studies And Cohesion	25
2.4 Arguments Against Traditional Approach	26
2.4.1 Cohesion And Coherence	26
2.5 Relevance Theoretic Approach	29

Chapter Three:	Relevance Theory	38
3.1	Introduction	38
3.2	Intentions And Communication	39
3.3	The Principle Of Relevance	42
3.4	Inferential Nature Of Communication	46
3.5	Content Accessibility	52
3.6	Logical Entry	54
3.7	Encyclopaedic Entry	55
3.8	Lexical Entry	56
3.9	Rewarding Nature Of Communication	57
3.10	Conclusion	62
Chapter Four:	Constraints On Relevance	64
4.1	Introduction	64
4.2	Manipulation Of Contextual Information	65
4.2.1	Explicitness And Contextual Information	67
4.2.2	Constraints On Implicatures	69
4.3	Linguistic Devices As Constraints	73
4.3.1	Relevance Theoretical Analysis Of Linguistic Devices: Some Examples	77
4.3.1.1	Contextual Implications: Evidence And Conclusion	77
4.3.1.2	Strengthening Of Assumptions	82
4.3.1.3	Elimination Of Assumptions	85
4.3.1.4	Discourse Connectives In Other Languages	89
4.4	Conclusion	93

Chapter Five:	Introduction to Data	94
5.1	Introduction	94
5.2	The Actual Data	96
5.2.1	The Internet Relay Chat (Irc)	97
5.2.2	The Translations	101
5.3	The Appendices	101
Chapter Six:	Strengthening Of Assumptions	103
6.1	Introduction	103
6.2	Malay Connective Particles	104
6.2.1	Lagipun: Structure	105
6.2.2	Strengthening Of Assumptions	106
6.2.3	Lagipun: An Additional Evidence .	109
6.2.4	An Extended Definition Of 'Lagipun'	120
6.2.5	Lagipun And English Discourse Particles	128
6.2.5.1	Moreover And Lagipun	129
6.2.5.2	Besides And Lagipun	136
6.2.6	Conclusion	138
Chapter Seven:	Denials Of Beliefs	140
7.1	Introduction	140
7.2	Weakening And Elimination Of Assumption	141
7.3	Tetapi: Denial Of A Belief	146
7.4	Walaubagaimanapun	153
7.4.1	Walaubagaimanapun: Emphatic Effects	160
8.5	Conclusion	172

Chapter Eight:	Denial And Styles	174
8.1	Introduction	174
8.2	Walaupun: Preliminary	175
8.3	Evidence And Expectation	178
8.4	Desirable And Potential	184
Chapter Nine:	Interrogative Particles	192
9.1	Introduction	192
9.2	Interpretive Use Of Language	192
9.3	The Malay Interrogative Particles	197
9.4	Kan: Structural	200
9.4.1	The Origin Of The Procedural 'Kan'	204
9.4.2	The Procedural Instruction Of 'Kan'	212
9.4.3	The Implication Of A Direct Response	225
9.5	Conclusion	239
Chapter Ten:	General Conclusion	241
10.1	General Conclusion	241
10.2	General Recommendations	243
References:		248
Appendix A:	Key to Transcription Conventions	257
Appendix B:	Translated Data	259

Appendix C:	IRC Sample Data	294
	Data 1	295
	Data 2	312
	Data 3	315
	Data 4	326
	Data 5	339
	Data 6	347
	Ddata2	368

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH

1.1 Introduction

The focus of the thesis will be on the study of a set of discourse particles in Malay language, namely the connectives and interrogative particles. Traditionally, these particles have always been dealt with in the realm of grammar. As a result of this, the discussions or definitions attributed to them have always been devoted to account for what they do superficially. My aim is to extend the traditional definitions following Blakemore's work on semantic constraints of utterance. Her approach is grounded in the context of Relevance Theory by Sperber and Wilson (1995). The core idea of her approach is based on the notion that contextual assumptions can be manipulated and thus ensuring only the intended interpretation process is carried out.

The advantage of using these particles is said to be twofold. First, they ensure only the right contextual assumptions are brought into the interpretation process. Second, and directly as a result of this, they reduce the amount of processing effort needed if compared to processing utterances without them. Both of these conditions directly conform to the principles of relevance.

In short, the intended interpretation of an utterance that contains a particular discourse particle is derived not from the textual information but from the assumptions that the textual information triggers. This is further proven by Blass (1990; 1993) in her studies on connectives in an African language called Sissala. In one of her studies, she concludes "that connectivity in discourse... results from relevance relations between text and context rather than from relations linguistically encoded in the text." (Blass 1990:1) Her findings also show that the principles by which a hearer interprets an utterance are the same across the language. This further suggests that the Relevance Theory can be adopted to define one step further what the Malay particles actually do in the communication process. In other words, it can be used to provide a clearer understanding of the functions of the particles beyond their textual usage in the discourse.

To summarise, the discussion of the discourse particles that I have chosen will be devoted into looking at how these particles help the speaker to manipulate contextual information to achieve the desirable contextual effects in an interpretation process. Specifically, I will be looking at how these particles are used to 'alert' the hearer to kinds of contextual information that he or she has to derive and how this information is to be processed with a newly presented assumption.

1.2 The discourse particles

I use the term 'discourse particles' as a generic term to cover all the non-truth-conditional expressions, both in English and Malay. For example:

(1)

Connective particles:	but, and, also;
Discourse markers:	well, Err, and yknow;
Interrogative markers:	'da' (West Flemish); 'ne' 'ka' (Japanese); 'na' (Greek).

In this study, I choose to look at two types of discourse connectives and an interrogative particle for three reasons. Firstly, I want to show that these words do not affect the propositional contents of the utterance that contained them. As Blakemore (1988a:86) says of connectives, "(it) cannot be analysed in terms of its contribution to the proposition expressed by the utterance that contains it but must instead be analysed in terms of a constraint on the inferential computations that proposition may enter into- or, in other words, its relevance." And this relates to my second reason. I want to show how the discourse particles guide the hearer to the intended interpretations of the utterances that contain them. In other words, I want to show how the context for each interpretation process is constrained by the particles and how this helps in cutting down the processing cost or effort of the interpretation process. Consider, for example, the word 'tetapi':

(1)

Nasi sudah masak 'tetapi' kita tak boleh makan lagi.
Nasi already cook 'tetapi' we no can eat yet.
The rice is cooked 'tetapi' we can't eat just yet.

Briefly in this instance, 'tetapi' indicates that the proposition it introduces should be taken as denying the implication derived from the first proposition. However, not only does it constrain the interpretation of the second proposition, but it also constrains the interpretation of the preceding proposition of the utterance. In this sense, 'tetapi' can be said to be equivalent to English 'but'. Analysed this way, we can say that the definition of 'tetapi' here differs significantly from the traditional definition where, it is merely defined as a link word to join two sentences, clauses or words that are opposing in meanings.

My third reason for doing this research is to show that although some of the particles seem to imply the same function structurally, this does not mean that they can be equated as the same. For example, 'walaubagaimanapun' also gives out an instruction to the hearer to treat the proposition that it introduces as a denial of an expectation derived from the first proposition. Even when this is so, these words cannot be said to be the same and thus cannot be used interchangeably. This is because each of them implies a procedural process that is unique only to either of them. However, the implicit differences between the two particles are not addressed properly by

the traditional approach and thus, in most standard Malay grammar books, these words would be defined as those words that are used to link two sentences that have contradiction in meanings.

1.3 Context selection and manipulation

Central to the study is the idea of manipulating contextual assumptions and at the same time, ensuring the lowest processing effort needed for achieving the optimal relevance. The results of the analysis of Malay connectives and discourse particles support the claim that context selection and manipulation play a big role in successful communication. Although the notion of context is also touched by some traditional approaches to connectives, its main contribution is always lightly discussed. More importance is placed on the actual placement of the connectives in the text and how they relate to previous sentences and utterances with the preceding to make them whole.

Following Relevance Theory, I define context as a representation of the individual's set of beliefs about the world. In a communication process, a communicator controls the interpretation of the sentences he writes or utters by triggering a specific context at each point of a communication act. Only the intended context should be accessed and combined with the new information to make sure communication process is successful.

Basically, the contextual information is stored in the hearer's cognitive memory. Some of the contextual information is stored as conceptual information and some as part of chunks of information or stereotypical knowledge. Access to this information is triggered once any of the concepts is used in an utterance. In other words, the hearer's choice of context in interpreting an utterance is not given prior to the communication process but rather manipulated by the communicator. However, the context chosen is only made on the assumption that the hearer has the intended set of contextual information available to her in her memory. If his assumption is wrong and the hearer does not have the intended contextual information, then his intention to inform the hearer of a certain phenomenon has failed.

The choice of context and eventual interpretation of an utterance can be controlled in two ways, pragmatically and linguistically. When it is controlled pragmatically, the actual meaning of the utterance is left implicit and it is only derivable if used with appropriate contextual assumptions. For example,

(2)

- A: Is Ling coming tonight?
B: He's in bed with flu.

B's response does not answer A's question directly. A has to supply the contextual information (3a) in order to conclude (3b).

(3)

- a. If Ling has a flu, he will not feel like coming tonight.
- b. Ling might not come tonight.

Sometimes, communication can fail if the envisaged assumption that the communicator wishes the hearer to supply is actually not in her cognitive environment or not retrievable during the course of the communication process. When this is the case, this interpretation process will cost the hearer more effort since the intended context is not available or easily accessible. Accordingly, in the above example, A could have also supplied a totally different kind of contextual assumption and derived a totally different interpretation altogether. For example,

- (4) If Ling has a flu, I should not prepare something spicy as usual.

Another way of controlling the selection of contextual information and eventual interpretation of a certain phenomenon is by the use of certain linguistic expressions in the language which give out instructions on how an utterance or utterances that contain them to be processed (Blakemore 1986). The existence of such words eases the interpretation process since they guide the hearer to the intended context and thus to the intended interpretation of the text. In other words, they provide the

communicator with the sole means of manipulating and constraining contextual information. Normally when one of these linguistic expressions is used, for example, in an utterance, the recovery of the interpretation of the utterance as a whole is provided by the context supplied by one segment of the utterance, combined with contextual information introduced by the expression. Blakemore (1992:137) regards these connectives as "imposing constraints on implicatures..." since they force the hearer to "... supply particular contextual information in order to interpret the utterance in accordance with the meaning of such an expression..."

1.4 Coherence

In discourse analysis, the notion of coherence is considered to be important. However, to different writers or researchers, the word means different things. Some studies suggest that the number of connective words that are used in a text affects the level of coherence: the higher the number of connectives used, the more coherent the text is. Others claim that these elements do not contribute to coherence except as a by-product of coherence. There are basically three broad approaches to this notion. The first considers coherence to be the matter of the mind and thus coherence is actually contributed by the recipient to the text. In other words, we assume that a text will be coherent and we would try to decipher what is in front of us in the light of the

assumption we hold. The second approach considers coherence to be solely the property of the text, for example, through the use of cohesive ties in text. In other words, coherence is seen to arise from the text alone and the hearer is just a passive participant in the communication process. Finally, the third approach sees coherence as a result of the interaction between the information in the text and the hearer's background knowledge.

Most studies into the use of connectives are carried out based on Halliday and Hasan's theory of cohesion (1976). They define cohesion as "... a semantic relation between an element in the text and some other element that is crucial to the interpretation of it" (p8). However, the authors' discussion of cohesion can sometimes be confused with another notion that they introduce as 'texture'. They neglect to give a clearer explanation of the difference in meanings, if any, between the two notions. Due to this, sometimes 'texture' is confused 'coherence'. Furthermore, since the authors claim that the existence of cohesion creates 'texture' in text, most research in cohesion tends to equate the number of cohesive markers in a text with the degree of the coherence that the text has. Therefore to them, the higher the number of the cohesive markers, the higher is the degree of coherence that the text has. The higher the degree of coherence the text has, the more comprehensible

is the text. As a result, good and bad texts are measured against the number of cohesive markers used in texts.

However, as have been mentioned above, the comprehensibility of a text does not arise from the amount of connectives that are used, but from the way these connectives help the hearer in context selections. Furthermore, connectivity can still be still perceived even when these particles are absent. This is especially true in discourse initial utterances. This is because according to Blass (1993:99), coherence arises due to "... something deeper... (that is) relations between text and context which any hearer, including the discourse analyst, automatically seeks out". Subsequently, coherence should be perceived not as a result of linguistic connectivity, but as a result of searching for a relevant relationship between two utterances for example. Blakemore (1987:105-125) on the other hand suggests that coherence in discourse arises in two ways:

"(a) coherence (...) arises when information made available by the interpretation of one segment of discourse is used in establishing the propositional content of the next;

(b) (...) coherence (...) arises when the information made available by the interpretation of one discourse segment is used in establishing the contextual effects of the next."

An example for the first type of coherence is as follows:

(5) 'True Lies' is on tonight. I heard it is a good picture.

In interpreting the second utterance, the hearer has to decide whether the speaker is referring to a photograph or a movie. In this instance, using the information that she has derived from the first utterance, she will correctly decide that the concept is used to refer to the movie, 'True Lies'.

The second type of coherence arises from, what Blakemore calls, 'dependent relevant'. Consider example (6) below:

- (6) You can't have more biscuits. After all, you have eaten a whole packet.

In this instance, the discourse particle 'after all' is used to indicate to the hearer that the second proposition given is an evidence for a conclusion that has been established in the preceding proposition. In other words, the relevance of the first proposition is guaranteed with the introduction of the second proposition.

1.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have briefly outlined my intention in carrying out the analysis of a selection of discourse particles in Malay. Central to my analysis is the idea of context manipulation which helps in ensuring desirable contextual effects in an interpretation process. Next, in Chapter Two, I briefly review the traditional approach to

discourse particles in general and discuss why an alternative way of looking at the connectives needs to be considered. Then, in chapter three, I review the notion of Relevance Theory as a theory of communication. In the following Chapter Four I look at the different ways contextual information can be manipulated or constrained. I also review Blakemore's (1987) idea of semantic constraint on relevance. I end the chapter with a review of various discourse particles in English. Next, in Chapters Six, Seven, Eight and Nine, I provide a descriptive explanation of my analysis of the Malay connectives and interrogative particles and my deduction of their functions in context manipulation in the language. My main goal is to show that although superficially, these words can be observed to link two sentences or more at a textual level, their real function in the language is to connect texts to context. This function can only be observed when the connectives are analysed from the perspective of Relevance Theory. Finally, I conclude the study with some general recommendations for future study of discourse particles in Malay.

CHAPTER TWO

TRADITIONAL APPROACH TO DISCOURSE PARTICLES

2.1 Introduction

Traditionally, alongside grammatical correctness, discourse particles such as 'therefore', 'however', and 'also' were seen as those textual elements that give discourse connectivity and thus ease the processing of text (Homburg 1984; Santos 1987; Brodtkin and Young, 1981; Haviland and Clark 1974). This view that comprehension is helped and eased through the use of discourse particles was initiated by Bain (1966) which was subsequently supported and sustained by early literary-based studies (Milic; 1967 Gutwinski 1976). Subsequent studies were predominantly from pedagogical areas. Here, the aim was mostly to find the extent to which these discourse particles, especially connective particles, could be applied as a text analysis system, serve as an index of good and poor writing (McCulley 1985; Fitzgerald and Spiegel 1985; Connor 1984; Witte and Faigley 1981). The findings of the studies were claimed to be especially helpful to the teaching of written text since they could be used to identify the mechanisms and characteristics that differentiate good and poor writings and thus are able to provide "... the teacher with an inventory of points he must incorporate into exercises to develop a

knowledge of this aspect of language use" Widdowson (1979:55).

2.2 Coherence

Another characteristic of discourse that has been the target of research in the area of discourse organisation is the notion of 'coherence' in discourse. This term is widely recognised as very 'vague' and 'subjective' in meaning and thus is difficult to explicate. (van Dijk 1972; 1977a, Bamberg (1984). One of the reasons that contributes to the problem is in the difficulty of solving the question on how to decide whether a discourse is coherent or not. Do the recipients of the discourse make the discourse coherent somehow by working out the meanings of the discourse by themselves or does the discourse itself give forth the essence of being coherent?

Several researchers, for example, Brown and Yule (1983), Charolles (1981,1983, 1989), Fahnestock (1983), and Jonz (1987), consider the recipients to be responsible for making a discourse coherent. To them coherence is basically a 'global quality' that is attributed to a discourse. It is a prerequisite expectation that any potential recipients possess. Brown and Yule (1983:66) further say, "human beings do not require formal textual markers before they are prepared to interpret a text. They naturally assume coherence, and interpret the text in the light of that assumption". In other words, Charolles

(1981, 1983) suggests, coherence "is not an inherent property of discourses but constructed by the interpreters" (1989:3).

Following this, since it is expected of us to comprehend the discourse in the first place, we as the recipients, would be right to hold the assumption that regardless of what shape the discourse is presented, there are meanings encoded in it that we need to decipher somehow. We will also, subconsciously, attempt to make the text coherent somehow, even if it means that we have to reanalyse the text over and over again and will only stop when we think that we have achieved what the writer intends us to achieve in the first place. As a result, the writer's main aim and task when producing the text would be to avoid confusing his addressee more than necessary by producing a text according to what he perceives as the addressee's expectations.

However, several researchers believe that coherence arises from the text itself, for example, Christensen (1965) who sees coherence as a linguistic property as grammar is to sentences. On the one hand, coherence in discourse is viewed as arising from the interactions between the various sentences that form the paragraphs, which are then subsequently united or linked together through transitions using basic and consistently structured thought patterns or logical relationships in our writings (Kaplan 1975; Paulston 1972; Pincas 1970). On the other hand, coherence is viewed to have arisen from

the recurrence of certain semantic features emerging from the textual surface of the discourse, namely connectives or cohesion. These connectives tie and control the propositions underlying the texts together so that they appear in a meaningful sequence. In both of these instances, coherence can then be said to arise from the text alone and the addressee of the said text is viewed as a passive participant in the interaction. All that he needs is the knowledge of the target language in order to understand the linkages and transitions used in the text. If however, any of the links is missing from the text, the text will then be judged as incomprehensible or not coherent.

Other researchers, both in the theoretical and pedagogical fields, such as Witte and Faigley (1981), while accepting cohesion as "an important property of writing quality" which "reflect(s) the invention skills of student writers...", they do not accept cohesion as the main contributor to the coherence in text. They say it is just a part of what makes a text coherent and the other part is "the writer's purpose, the addressee's knowledge and expectations, and the information to be conveyed..." (ibid. 202). In this sense, coherence is viewed as a by-product of the interaction between the addressee and the discourse presented.

This is further supported by the research that advocates schema theory in readings, for example by Rumelhart (1977); Rumelhart & Ortony (1977); Smith (1978);

Carrell (1982; 1983; 1984); van Dijk and Kintsch (1983). The findings from the various research show that the reading process 'constructs' a text and that the reader's prior knowledge, both conscious and implicit, affects the understanding of a text. Meaning and coherence are not inscribed in the text but arise from reader's efforts to build meaning and to consolidate the details in the text into a coherent whole. Although readers are guided by textual cues, they also draw on their own knowledge and expectations to connect gaps and to fill in assumed information.

The interaction between text and reader and its impact on coherence can be best understood in the context of a psycholinguistic reading hypothesis. To perceive a text, competent readers do not read word for word, but they predict meaning from graphic, semantic and syntactic cues, sampling only enough of the text to confirm their predictions. They predict meaning from non-visual information, their prior knowledge and expectations, as well as from the letters on the page. For example, implicit knowledge of the English language helps readers predict meanings of individual words by limiting the possible choices of meaning. Similarly, a knowledge of discourse conventions helps readers predict meaning and structure.

This theory of reading has its background in cognitive science. What is important in this theory is not only the structure and content of the scrutinised text

but also what the reader does with it. Essentially, this theory takes the reader into account: the reading process that he is involved in activates his knowledge which is in turn modified by textual information. One of the characteristics of coherence in this sense is that it allows a text to be understood in real world setting. The quality of the text, its connectedness and wholeness is defined, in part as a fit of a text to its context, which includes the communicator's purpose, the addressee's background knowledge and so on.

2.3 Cohesion In Discourse Organisation

The notion of cohesion has also been greatly discussed in the studies of discourse organisation and many of the studies are carried out specifically on written discourse (McCulley 1985; Neuner 1987; Fitzgerald and Spiegel 1985; Connor 1984). Generally, cohesion is defined as those overt and describable features of text that have the capabilities of linking various sentences or utterances to their preceding and also succeeding sentences or utterances and thus creating a sense of 'unity' in the text. These overt features or cohesive devices act as signposts that guide the addressee of the text to the comprehension of the whole discourse.

The earliest work of cohesion can be traced to that of Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1972). Their book, entitled "A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language" (1985), provides an exhaustive elaboration of

the features that ground a sentence in its context. In the book they discuss the role of grammatical processes "in both the interpretation of a text and in the construction of a text" by paying considerable attention to lexical and other features of textual structure. This is to show, they assert, "as important as is the role of grammar, many factors other than grammar are involved" in the formation of discourse. They see cohesion as the relation that exists between parts of a text and consists of various connective features that interact simultaneously. These features are then divided into four main areas, namely, 'pragmatic and semantic implication', 'lexical linkage', 'prosody and punctuation', and 'grammatical devices'. Only lexical linkages and grammatical devices, however, can be traced formally on the textual surface.

Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) who advocate a 'procedural approach' to text analysis, on the other hand, claim that cohesion is one of the seven standards of textuality that a text (a communicative occurrence) has to meet. The other six are:

- coherence
- intentionality
- acceptability
- informativity
- situationality

They define cohesion as "the components of the SURFACE TEXT i.e. the actual words we hear or see" which are

"mutually connected within a sequence." (p3). It is divided further into five basic categories; recurrence, paraphrase, parallelism, ellipsis and junction.

The most cited and used system of cohesion is the one that is proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) in their book entitled 'Cohesion in English'. Their work on cohesion is done comprehensively and has successfully convinced a large number of researchers of the importance of cohesive devices in the establishment of coherence or texture of text. They also suggest a coding system which potential researchers can employ and subsequently adapt for future research. Possibly because of these two aspects of their book, many researchers (Chapman 1979; McCutchen and Perfetti 1982; Witte and Faigley 1981; Neuner 1987) have taken their theory as a basis for their own studies on cohesion in both written and spoken texts.

2.3.1 Halliday and Hasan's Theory of Cohesion.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) define cohesion as "...a semantic relation between an element in the text and some other element that is crucial to the interpretation of it" (p8). It is a set of linguistic resources that every language possesses for linking one part of a text to another and thus giving text structure or coherence. Central to their theory of cohesion is the cohesive tie system which points to the "relations of meaning that exist within the text" (1976:4). These relations are successfully activated once the presupposed items or

cohesive markers, are met by the presuppositions. In a typical text, therefore, every sentence (except the first) is normally connected to the other surrounding sentence(s) and subsequently the whole text, through the use of cohesion.

However, Halliday and Hasan's discussion of cohesion can sometimes be confused with their notion of 'texture', mainly due to the lack of clear explanation for the difference in meanings, if any. However one can conclude that the authors use the word 'texture' to refer to the outcome of those elements that 'glue' all grammatical units together. Thus, on the one hand, texture within a structural relation of a sentence for example, is "the elements of any structure have, by definition, an internal unity which ensures that they all express part of a text". On the other hand, a complete text also displays a unity within it, which is caused by a different kind of element from those in grammatical units. These elements or "cohesion within a text - texture" (p7) are the non-structural text-forming relations or semantic relations.

Briefly, Halliday and Hasan's cohesion system can be summarised as follows:

a. **Reference**

Reference is defined as a semantic "...relation between an element of the text and something else by reference to which it is interpreted in the given instance". It is divided into three subcategories and they are:

- i. personal referent

Example: The girl found a cat. 'She' brought 'it' home.

ii. demonstratives

Example: Anita loves Singapore very much. She goes 'there' every weekend.

iii. comparatives

Example: She likes ice cream 'more' than chocolate.

b. **Substitution and ellipsis**

Substitution and ellipsis are part of the grammatical relations. On the one hand, substitution arises whenever one item is used to replace another item in the text. Ellipsis, on the other hand, is the omission of an item whose meaning is recoverable from the context of the text. The boundary lines between these two categories and reference are indistinct.

c. **Formal Repetition and collocation**

Formal repetition on the one hand, involves the repetition of an item or use of synonym, near synonym or superordinate term. Lexical collocation on the other hand, involves the connection which arises through lexical items that regularly co-occur.

d. **Conjunction**

Conjunction is represented by certain logical relations, which are divided further into categories:

- additive (and, also);
- adversative (but, however);
- causative (so, therefore)
- temporal (Meanwhile, finally).

2.3.2 Studies On Cohesion As Markers Of Discourse

Halliday and Hasan (1976) claim that it is a characteristic of a text to be cohesive and maintain that a text with higher density of cohesive devices will display a stronger texture. This claim is supported by various pedagogical studies for example, by Witte and Faigley (1981). The result of their study showed that high-rated college essays were denser in cohesive ties when compared to low-rated ones. This finding seems to confirm the claim that cohesion can be used to create coherence in a text.

The results of a study carried out by Fitzgerald and Spiegel (1986) into children's writings also confirmed the significant relationship between cohesion and coherence. Their findings show that in cases where a clear connection materialised, generally, more selective use of cohesive tie tended to be characteristic. They proved that there is "at least minimal documentation that under circumstances cohesion, conceived as a linguistic property of text, can contribute to or emerge from coherence in some degree." (p.278)

This is further confirmed by the results of a study carried out by McCulley (1985) which was based on an analysis of 493 persuasive papers written by seventeen-year-olds. Although his study supports the claims that there is a clear relationship between textual cohesion and writing quality, he concluded that textual cohesion is to be considered only a sub-element of coherence.

Neuner (1987) carried out a study on the relationship of cohesive ties and coherence in 600 good and poor essays produced by 40 college freshman. Although his study showed that there was no difference in the frequency of cohesive ties used, there were significant differences in the uses of the cohesive chains and choices of vocabulary in both types of essays.

2.4 Arguments Against Traditional Approach

2.4.1 Cohesion as Coherence

Other authorities and researchers, for example, Morgan and Sellner (1980), Carrell, (1982), disagree with the idea of using a cohesion system as the sole means of identifying coherent discourse. The catalyst for such disagreement is in the vague definitions that Halliday and Hasan (1976) provide for their proposed concepts of cohesion and texture. A close reading of their book, claimed Carrell (1982), seems to suggest that what Halliday and Hasan actually mean by 'texture' can be construed as what she and other researchers and writers mean by 'coherence'. This is because she says, Halliday and Hasan (1976:2) define 'texture' as "the property of "being text" and "(a) text has texture, and that is what distinguishes it from being something that is not a text. It derives the texture from the fact that it functions as a unity with respect to its environment".

Another reason for questioning the validity of this approach to discourse organisation is the fact that the research done in this area of study normally disregards the importance of the participants' background knowledge in the interpretation process. Most of the opposition comes from those who work in the area of schema theory which has its origin in research in cognitive science. This theory says that human knowledge is stored in packages called schemata and these packages consist of both general and specific knowledge. Schema theory suggests that texts have no intrinsic meaning and the comprehension of text is the result of interaction between the reader's background knowledge and the text.

Ensuing from this theory, one of the earliest and most influential oppositions to cohesion theory has come from Morgan and Sellner (1980). They disagree with the studies that equate a large number of cohesive markers with a coherent text where a mere counting of the number of cohesive markers in a text is used as a basis of judging good or bad text. They also disagree with the suggestion that cohesion markers should be employed in order to provide a high level of coherence in text. However, they claim that cohesion is only the effect of coherence and it is the addressee of the text that brings all the needed resources to comprehend a text.

Another strong opposition comes from Carrell (1982, 1983, 1989). He also disagrees with the use of cohesion as a measurement of 'texture' or in his term, 'coherence'

in text. Although he agrees that cohesion theory can contribute and help in the teaching of English as a foreign or second language, she cautions researchers and teachers alike, to be aware that cohesion does not create coherence. It may only be viewed as those elements that make explicit "... meanings which are present covertly because of a text's coherence" (1982:690). In other words, cohesion is a product of the text's coherence, not the cause of it.

Another author that claims cohesion is an effect of coherence text is Beaugrande (1984). Although he maintains that a text that contain cohesive items is generally coherent, he also believes that there are other factors or standards that contribute to the coherence of the text as a whole. For example, he suggests, apart from the cohesive markers, the communicator and addressee's intention and attitudes will also affect and make the texts cohesive or coherent and as a result, a text "may be cohesive, but not fully coherent (see example 1), or coherent, but not fully cohesive (see example 2)":

- (1) The slithy toves did gyre and gimble in the wabe
(Lewis Carroll)

- (2) As far as I know/no one yet has done the/in a way
obvious now and interesting problem of//doing a/in
a sense a structural frequently study of the
alternative//syntactical/uh/in a given
language/say/like English/the
alternative//uh/possible structure (Charles
Osgood)

2.5 Relevance Theoretic Approach

Blass (1990, 1993) who advocates Relevance Theory in verbal communication also argues that successful comprehension of a discourse is not due to high usage of cohesive relations. In other words, the connectivity that is perceived superficially over a text, or connectivity among utterances for example, do not directly contribute to the successful of the interpretation of the text or utterances. However what contributes to this comprehension is "... something deeper... (that is) relations between text and context which any hearer, including the discourse analyst, automatically seeks out" (Blass 1993:99). Furthermore, she says, what is essentially being communicated in the communication process is the 'content' or 'meaning' of the communicated stimulus, not the linguistic information. In order to access this intended content, the communicated stimulus has to be enriched to the point it expresses a determinate propositional content before it can enter the interpretation process. This is not the case with the earlier approach to cohesion, which only concerns the forms of the communicated stimulus and how the various stimuli are connected to each other. In this approach, Blass says, cohesion is merely perceived as the "... formal relationship between elements of a text" which she feels as "... neither necessary nor sufficient for textuality, and thus inadequate to account for discourse-

formedness" (Blass 1990:16). Consider example (3), taken from Blass (1993:16),

- (3) John can open Bill's safe. He knows the combination.

Here, although 'he' can be used to refer to either John or Bill, the most acceptable interpretation or coherent linkage will be when 'he' is taken to refer to John instead of Bill. And also, a text which is loaded with cohesive markers can still be considered as ill-formed, for example,

- (4) Abdul Hadi went to the cinema on Sunday night. Nabila's mother is related to Abdul Hadi's father and works as a secretary in Shell. Shell is one of the oil companies in Lutong and it attracts many potential private engineering firms to open business in the area. Abdul Hadi loves sitting on the balcony and watches other people go about their businesses in the busy morning.

The two examples (3 and 4) in the above only prove that cohesion is not a sufficient condition for textuality.

Cohesion is also considered as not necessary for the creation of a well formed text. Consider example (5),

(5)

- A: Let's go to the theatre.
B: I have a headache.

Even without any obvious cohesive markers that link the first utterance to the second, most often that not, the

intended interpretation of the second utterance can still be accessed by A.

It has been pointed out, initially by Grice, that the cohesive markers such as 'and' and 'therefore' for example, implicate interpretations other than the ones traditionally identified in the studies of cohesion. For example, traditionally, the conjunct 'and' when used 'cohesively' is said to create an 'additive relation' between two sentences. This word is classified under the heading 'additive' in Halliday and Hasan's categorisation of the conjunctive relations (1987:242). To illustrate, sentence (6a) below is joined to sentence(6b) by the additive item 'and'.

(6)

- a. Really, the sound that went floating out on the air I didn't know I had it in me, and they said it would make my fortune if I sent it to Hollywood.
- b. And I may say it surprised the thief sufficiently that he dropped my handbag and fled.

(taken from Halliday and Hasan 1976:341)

However, in the above example, the two sentences are not merely connected to each other by the connective 'and' which contributes to 'textual' in text but it also gives out interpretations that suggest temporal and causal connections; the thief dropped the handbag after the narrator let out a loud scream and the narrator's scream made the thief dropped the handbag. These temporal and causal interpretations, however, are not mentioned in the

traditional cohesion theory. The most likely reason that these two interpretations are 'missed' by the traditional cohesion theory may lie in the fact that the theory only concerns with looking at the explicit and observable elements of the discourse and how these elements connect the surface discourse. As a result, the implicit contents of the discourse are not given the appropriate attention and thus ignored.

Furthermore, Blass (1993), in her study of Sissala discourse particle 'siÉ', shows that this discourse connective, other than indicating the proposition it introduces is a conclusion, also implies that the premises needed for the interpretation of it are left implicit. Moreover, sometimes 'siÉ' can also introduce a conclusion that has more complex and attitudinal effects embedded in it. This conclusion or proposition expressed is not used descriptively, for example, but interpretively where it echoes somebody else's thought. These effects are not recognisable from the textual elements themselves but only recoverable with the guidance of the word 'siÉ'.

Blakemore's study on the cohesive marker 'so' (1987 and 1988a) further supports this finding, that cohesive markers cannot be considered as simply textual elements of text. She also stresses that they only contribute to the inferential processing of text or utterances. She says, other than implying a causal connection, the discourse particle 'so' also implies an inferential instruction.

Let's consider these two examples taken from Blakemore (1988a:184)

(7)

- a. Tom ate the condemned meat. So he fell ill.
- b. Bill insulted Mary. So she left.

(8)

- a. There was \$5 in his wallet. So he hadn't spent all the money.
- b. She's your teacher. So you must respect her.

In example (7), 'so' indicates that there is a causal connection between the two propositions (7a) and (7b) or "... the event described by the proposition it introduces is a causal consequence of the event in the first proposition.." (ibid. 190). Tom fell ill because he ate the condemned meat and Mary left because Bill insulted her.

In contrast, each of the examples in (8a&b), 'so' indicates that there is an inferential connection between the two propositions of the utterances. It introduces an assumption that should be taken as a contextual implication for some state of affairs that has been stated prior to the introduction. Therefore, in the above instances (8a&b) 'so' instructs the hearer to treat the assumptions "he hadn't spent all the money" and "you must respect your teacher" as contextual implications of the utterances that precede them. In this sense, 'so' "constrains the relevance of the proposition it introduces by indicating that it must be interpreted as a contextual

implication of some immediately accessible proposition..."

Blakemore (1988a:190).

These expressions such as 'so' and many others, are what Blakemore (1987; 1988a; 1989; 1990) calls 'linguistic devices' or 'inferential connectives' which a speaker may employ in order to guide his addressee to the kind of contextual effects that he intends in a particular communication process. He uses the connectives to make his implicit intention explicit. However, Blakemore (1988a) points out, these connectives or devices do not affect the propositional content of the utterances that contain them. For example (7a) in the both repeated here as (9),

(9) Tom ate the condemned meat. So he fell ill.

The propositional contents of both utterances are still

(10)

- a. Tom ate the condemned meat.
- b. He fell ill.

If the speaker has uttered (9) without the particle 'so', she might miss the intended interpretation by bringing a totally different contextual assumption into the inferential process. Even if she is able to work out the intended interpretation on her own initiative, the cost or effort required in the process will be significantly higher than when 'so' is used. This is because, in interpreting the utterance, she has to make a decision

which contextual assumption to use from the various assumptions that she has available in her cognitive environment triggered by the concepts in the utterance. This explains the possibility that she could make the wrong choice in the process. If this happens, the processing effort that has incurred will be high and unnecessary. With an utterance that contains 'so' on the other hand, the hearer is actually guided in her search for the most appropriate contextual assumptions needed in processing both segments of the utterance.

Directly following the above, we can say that accessing the right contextual information is an important aspect of verbal communication. The same utterance when processed with different contextual assumptions will convey different interpretations or contextual implications. To illustrate, consider example (11):

(11) The bathroom is free.

Someone who wishes to use the bathroom will take the utterance as implying that he can use it now because nobody is in the bathroom at the time the utterance is uttered. On the other hand, to someone who has just had his whole house renovated, (11) will imply to him that he does not have to pay the cost for the renovation of his bathroom. These two examples show us that the right context for the interpretation of the above utterance must be the one intended. Now consider examples (12&13) below:

(12) He is feeling better.

(13) He has taken two paracetamol.

In interpreting the above examples, the hearer will not be wrong to assume that (12) can either be the evidence for (13) or the conclusion for evidence in (13) or vice versa. However, either way, she needs to access the most appropriate contextual assumption in order for the interpretation process to be successful. For example, if she thinks the speaker has meant for (12) to be the evidence for (13), then the interpretation process will include the processing of (12) in contextual assumption (14):

(14) If he is feeling better then he has taken two paracetamol.

(13) He has taken two paracetamol.

If otherwise, then she will have to access the contextual assumption (15) instead.

(15) If he has taken two paracetamol then he is feeling better.

(12) He is feeling better.

In either case, the connectivity between the two utterances is established with the use of appropriate contextual assumption. As we have seen, the same kind of connectivity is also achieved when we use discourse

particles such as 'so' as in example (9). In other words, the contextual assumptions (14) and (15) could have easily been derived if discourse particles are used instead to show the hearer what kind of interpretation process she needs to undertake in processing the utterances.

To conclude, we can say, with or without the discourse particles, connectivity in discourse can still be maintained. In this light, therefore, connectivity should be perceived, as claimed by Blass (1993:99), to be a result of following the principle of relevance. Directly from this, Blass argues, the study of discourse then should not be about building a theory of how the connectivity is realised superficially, but should be sensitive to the role of contextual information and inference in communication as advocated by the Relevance Theory. In the next two chapters, I will look at the role of contextual assumption and inference and its implication for the studying of discourse particles. I will start with a brief review of the Theory of Relevance to communication by Sperber and Wilson (1995). Then, in Chapter Four I will look at the different ways contextual information can be manipulated or constrained following the work of Diane Blakemore (1987).

CHAPTER THREE

RELEVANCE THEORY

3.1 Introduction

A communication process normally involves at least two participants: a 'communicator' whose intention is to impart a piece of information and an 'addressee', who will take for granted that whatever information the communicator wishes to impart in the interaction, in one way or another, will be beneficial to her. In the communication process, the information that is being conveyed is essentially the representation of one's thoughts or one's beliefs, in this case the communicator's, which once transmitted, will somehow reconstruct and enrich what Sperber and Wilson (1995) describe as the addressee's 'cognitive environment'. The cognitive environment of an addressee or any individual consists of "merely a set of assumptions which the individual is capable of mentally representing and accepting as true" at the point of communication (Sperber and Wilson 1995:46). Seen this way, communication can then be defined as an act with a purpose for participants, the 'transmission' and the 'digestion' of beneficial information. That both of these actions are purposeful is recognised by both communicator and addressee and this makes the communication event successful.

3.2 Intentions and Communication

It is impossible for any communicator to have a total control over his addressee's actual thoughts in any act of communication and also for him to reproduce his exact thoughts in his addressee. However, what he is capable of doing instead is to enrich his addressee's cognitive environment by making known to his addressee a certain phenomenon. This phenomenon may consist of a set of thoughts {I} that the communicator holds to represent the actual state of the world (Sperber and Wilson 1995:2). The intention to make this set of assumptions known to the addressee is called the informative intention of the communicator and defined as,

- (1) **Informative intention:** to make manifest or more manifest to the audience a set of assumptions.
(Sperber and Wilson 1995:58)

To make his intention manifest, the communicator has to produce a stimulus that is strong enough to engage the addressee's interest and willingness to process it. This intention to make his informative intention manifest is what Sperber and Wilson call the communicative intention of the communicator, and is defined as,

- (2) **Communicative intention:** to make it mutually manifest to addressee and communicator that the communicator has this informative intention.
(p61)

According to Sperber and Wilson (1987; 1995) a verbal stimulus is the best stimulus that a communicator can use to relay these intentions effectively. This is because a verbal stimulus "... helps focus the attention of the addressee on the relevant information, and thus contributes to the fulfilment of the informative intention" (p62). For example a lecturer who says, "No, I can't see you because I'll be busy the whole day." to his student who has asked him if she could see him later during the day, intends his utterance to be interpreted literally. He uses a stimulus in communicating his intended meaning and as far as he is concerned, he has chosen the most appropriate stimulus for the representation of his thoughts to his addressee.

Furthermore, Sperber and Wilson claim, when the utterances are made manifest, "...the communicator creates the following situation: it becomes mutually manifest that the fulfilment of her informative intention is, so to speak, in the hands of the addressee. If the assumptions that she intends to make manifest to the addressee become manifest, then she is successful; if the addressee refuses to accept assumptions as true or probably true, then she has failed in her informative intention." (p63)

A nonverbal stimulus on the other hand, is not considered as the best form of communication because, most often if not always, the processing of it merely presents various weak interpretations. For example, a wife on seeing her husband entering the nursery deliberately

establishes an eye contact with him and then tilts her head towards the baby's cot and at the same time, puts her finger against her closed lips. Her various actions signify various possible messages and the likeliest one of them might be "Be quiet, the baby is asleep." The other interpretations might be: "Go and see the baby" or "I'm staying with the baby" or "The baby is now in the cot." or "I have moved the cot to the corner of the room" (if earlier on the cot was in the middle of the nursery) and so on. In other words, Sperber and Wilson (1995:174) say, "... there is no limit to the number of ways he (the addressee) can represent her (the communicator's) behaviour to himself: there may be a whole nebula of alternative interpretations, all closely similar in import and comparable in relevance ... one can never be sure which of a variety of assumptions made manifest by the communicator she herself actually had in mind."

In contrast, verbal stimulus restrains the addressee from making various interpretations other than the one that the communicator intends the addressee to consider. In the example above, the expressed meaning of the lecturer's utterance is the one and only interpretation that is intended by the lecturer. There are times when an utterance also presents very close interpretations and has to be interpreted beyond its unique propositional form (Sperber and Wilson 1995:179). However, the variety of interpretations can be easily discounted since each of the interpretations will be very different from each other.

For example, the utterance (3) taken from Sperber and Wilson (1995:175)

(3) He's a bastard.

can be interpreted as (3a-d),

- a. Peter is a nasty man.
- b. Bob is a nasty man.
- c. Peter is illegitimate.
- d. Bob is illegitimate.

These four interpretations of (3) are all possible but only one of them is the intended interpretation in a particular communication process. What the recipient needs to do here is close the gap that exists between the semantic representations of linguistic description of the utterance and the actual message intended by the communicator.

3.3 The Principle of Relevance

The Principle of Relevance is defined as,

(4)

Principle of Relevance

Every act of ostensive communication communicates the presumption of its optimal relevance.

(1995:158)

According to this principle, every utterance always promises adequate contextual effects relative to ease of processing. With this guarantee in mind, an addressee of an utterance can always go ahead and interpret the utterance confidently and the first interpretation obtained will be taken as the one and only interpretation meant by the communicator. For example, Shila could use one of these utterances (5a, b & c) as her response to Sue's question in (5),

(5)

Sue: Want to watch 'True Lies'?

Shila answers,

- a. No.
- b. I only watch romance.
- c. I only watch romance and I'm a Muslim.

Although all of Shila's answers (a-c) above convey the same intended meaning, (5a) is still the most relevant response for Sue's query since it answers her question directly. This is because, the next two utterances require more processing effort to access the appropriate assumptions for the effective interpretation of them. However, following the Principle of Relevance, the fact that Shila chooses to utter them implies that not only Shila wishes her to know that she does not want to watch the movie, but also the additional information contained in the utterance. This extra information alone will

compensate the extra effort needed to process the longer utterance. This balancing of effort and effect contributes to the 'presumption of optimal relevance' as stated by the principle and defined as,

(6)

Presumption of optimal relevance

- (a) The ostensive stimulus is relevant enough for it to be worth the addressee's effort to process it.
- (b) The ostensive stimulus is the most relevant one compatible with the communicator's abilities and preferences.

(Sperber and Wilson 1995:270)

The balancing of effort and effect in any interpretation process is important in Relevance Theory. Ideally the effort should always be at its lowest which means that the steps taken towards the intended meaning will be at its shortest. The less the processing effort is required, the more relevant the utterance will be to the addressee. The more relevant the utterance is to the addressee, the more effect it will have on the addressee's cognitive environment. Therefore, it is important that the communicator's choice of stimulus should preferably be or appear to be the one that will not present the addressee with too much effort in the process (Sperber and Wilson 1995:156). Consider the above example again, repeated here,

(7)

Sue: Want to watch 'True Lies'?

Shila: I only watch romance.

In a situation where Shila reasonably believes that Sue knows that the movie "True Lies" is an action movie, Shila would intend Sue to use this premise to process her answer which will yield this implication,

(7e) Shila does not want to watch True Lies.

However, it can also be argued that Shila's answer could also suggest that she will go to a movie with Sue as long as Sue chooses to watch a romantic movie instead. If this is Sue's real intended interpretation, she can be said to have cost Sue unnecessary effort because, in order to get to this second interpretation of utterance, after accessing the first (7e), Sue has to go through various other premises which require more processing effort on Sue's part. Furthermore, there is no guarantee at all that Sue will access the second interpretation since the first interpretation (7e) is relevant enough for Sue to possess in the first place. In this instance, Shila can be said to have violated one of the conditions for the presumption of optimal relevance, which states that the stimulus or utterance used should always be "as relevant as possible to the addressee." (Sperber and Wilson 1995:270). So, wherever possible, say Sperber and Wilson (1995:270), "the communicator should choose the stimulus

that appears most relevant to the addressee, since this will make her communication most likely to succeed." In other words, if Shila intends Sue to access the second interpretation, she should have chosen another most appropriate stimulus which calls "...for the least processing effort ...Unless the communicator is merely pretending to communicate, it is in her interest to be understood, and therefore to make it as easy as possible for the addressee to understand her" (Sperber and Wilson 1995:157).

The second condition of the presumption of optimal relevance also stresses that the choice of stimulus to use in any act of communication also depends on the communicator's abilities. This because there are times during a communication act when a communicator could not find the most suitable stimulus to employ to represent his meaning and thus, he has to choose instead an alternative that might cause his addressee extra effort in processing the utterance (as illustrated above). Even when this is the case, the communicator could have been said to have chosen the most relevant stimulus, within his ability at that particular time of communication.

3.4 Inferential Nature of Communication

Briefly according to the traditional approach to verbal communication, namely the 'code model', the aim of communication process is to reproduce the communicator's

exact thoughts in the addressee's mind through a shared code (linguistic knowledge). What is being transmitted in the process is the communicator's actual thoughts, which are depicted in a set of shared codes or signals and when these codes are deciphered, the exact representation of the communicator's actual thoughts will be the end results. In other words, as Katz (1966:104) described it:

"The speaker's message is encoded in the form of a phonetic representation of an utterance by means of the system of linguistic rules with which the speaker is equipped. This encoding then becomes a signal to the speaker's articulatory organs, and he vocalizes an utterance of the proper phonetic shape. This is, in turn, picked up by the addressee's auditory organs. The speech sound that stimulates these organs is then converted into a neural signal from which a phonetic representation equivalent the one into which the speaker encoded his message is obtained. This representation is decoded into a representation of the same message that the speaker originally chose to convey by the addressee's equivalent system of linguistic rules."

However, as has been mentioned previously, the semantic representations of the utterances, most of the time, present gaps that need to be closed because by themselves they do not provide the addressee with the intended contents of the messages or thoughts that the communicator wishes to impart. What the utterances do present however, are some kind of 'blueprints' (the term is Blakemore's, 1990; 1987) from which determinate propositions or unique propositional forms can be

developed (Sperber and Wilson 1987, 1990). To illustrate further,

(8) She loves the pictures.

This utterance clearly has several referents and senses (9a-d).

(9)

- a. Nabila loves the photographs.
- b. Kamila loves the photographs.
- c. Nabila loves the movies.
- d. Kamila loves the movies.

The addressee's first task is to work out the utterance's unique propositional form by deciding which reference, sense or propositions in (9a-d) that the communicator has intended when he utters (8) before he can actually have the full interpretation of the utterance. The result will be the intended expressed proposition of (8), or an 'explicature' for Sperber and Wilson (1995).

As also been briefly discussed earlier, an utterance can be used to convey a totally different interpretation from its expressed proposition. For example, B's response to A's question,

(10)

- A: Can I see you this morning?
- B: I have a meeting all day.

The expressed propositional content of B's utterance does not answer A's question directly. The addressee has to infer the information that she seeks for from the proposition of B's utterance to get for instance B'.

B'. I cannot see you.

Here, the intended meaning of B's utterance is not the expressed proposition content of the utterance itself. This type of information is what Sperber and Wilson called 'implicature' or what Grice would call 'conversational implicature'.

As have been mentioned earlier, the utterance by itself is still incomplete and needs to be determined into its full propositional content before it can be interpreted. Consider another example,

(11) If you look out from the window, you can see the port.

In its logical form (11) above, the utterance is said to be incomplete and ambiguous. It contains empty constituents and will only be interpretable once definite concepts are placed to fill them (Sperber and Wilson 1995:72). Both **uses** of the pronouns in this example need to be assigned their appropriate references in the world and the word 'port' of the same example needs to be made more specific. Here, does the speaker mean the place where ships dock or the alcoholic drink?

A completed logical form is called a 'propositional logical form' and it is said to represent a definite state of affairs, which carries truth-value. Then once the propositional content of the utterance has been completed, the addressee has to combine the new assumption or assumptions derived from the utterance with old and most importantly, relevant assumptions that are manifest to her at the time of interpretation process. Here, the old assumptions that are available to the addressee constitute what Sperber and Wilson (1995) call the 'context of the interpretation process'. These assumptions consist of the beliefs and assumptions that each individual has about the world.

To Sperber and Wilson (1995), the context for communication is essentially a psychological construct. It consists of knowledge or representations of what the communicator or addressee holds to be true. This set of knowledge plays an important role in any interpretation or communication process. The information contained in the context is used with new information gathered from a communication process to yield new and more relevant information. The new information can be derived from three main sources.

First, new information can be obtained from what an individual can perceive in her physical surroundings. For example, when she sees her friend is wearing a tuxedo or a cat crossing the road, her mind will automatically

attribute a conceptual representation of the perceived stimulus in front of her as

(12) Robert is wearing a tuxedo

In turn, this new information could become relevant and highly accessible in an immediate inferential process she is involved in at the that time. For example, both Robert and A have been invited to go to the same party but A is not sure what to wear. However, when she sees Robert, who is going to the same party, is wearing a tuxedo she can safely deduce from what she perceives that,

(13)

- a. Robert is wearing a tuxedo.
- b. Normally, men wear tuxedos to a formal gathering.
- c. If Robert is wearing a tuxedo, the party must be a formal affair.
- d. She must wear something formal to the party.

Secondly, the assumptions can also be obtained from the addressee's "...expectations about the future, scientific hypotheses or religious beliefs, anecdotal memories, general cultural assumptions, beliefs about the mental state of the speaker..." which are stored in her cognitive memory (Sperber and Wilson 1995:15). For example, an unmarried Muslim couple who have just arrived in another strict Islamic country would not attempt to live together knowing that the act is prohibited and heavily punishable.

Thirdly, an individual's cognitive memory can also consist of information that has been processed in previous or immediate interpretation processes. This processed information includes the contextualised assumptions, complete propositional logical forms and also incomplete logical forms. Recently processed assumptions are first stored in short term memory and then subsequently transferred into the cognitive memory as part of the individual's overall representation of the world (Sperber and Wilson 1995:73). These assumptions or what Sperber and Wilson call as 'factual assumptions' are divided into two categories. The first one is called basic factual assumptions which are "entertained as true descriptions of the world, but not explicitly represented as such". The second category of assumptions is embedded under the attitudes of belief and desire (ibid. 74). Incomplete logical forms on the other hand are stored as assumption schemas in the individual's memory. When they are employed, they will be processed into complete propositional forms in the interpretation process.

3.5 Context accessibility.

The logical form of an utterance is actually made of constituents of psychologically construct concepts and is stored in encyclopaedic memory of an individual. In the memory, each of the concepts functions as a signpost under which various sets of other conceptual information are

attached which will be activated whenever a concept that they are attached to is being processed during an interpretation process. For example, the concept 'toiletries' would have conceptual elements such as shampoo, conditioner, toothpaste and so on attached to it. As constituents of a logical form on the other hand, concepts act as triggers for the utilisation of deductive or inferential rules.

The two functions of a concept are complementary: "...when the address of a certain concept appears in a logical form being processed, access is given to the various types of information stored in memory at that address" (Sperber and Wilson 1995:86). Thus in any interpretation process, the propositional form that the addressee will determine will be constrained by the concepts that are attached to the logical form. The context that will be selected will also be constrained by the conceptual information that is attached to the propositional contents of the utterance.

In other words, the conceptual information that is attached to a concept can consist of a deductive rule, other related information that denotes the concept further or a linguistic information of the concept. All of these related particulars of the concept will be stored accordingly to the kinds of information they are and they can be accessed through three types of entry in the memory: logical, encyclopaedic and lexical.

3.6 Logical Entry

The logical entry for a concept is a restricted, finite and unchanging entry and consist of a set of inference rules. Each of these rules comprises of "a set of input and output assumptions: that is, a set of premises and conclusions" (Sperber and Wilson 1995:86). For example, the 'modus ponendo ponens' rule of the concept 'if.. then',

(14)

Modus ponendo ponens
Input: (i) P
(If P then Q)
Output: Q

This inference rule comes to play when the concept 'if ... then' becomes a part of an assumption at the moment of a communication act. The output of this occurrence will be the removal of the concept. To illustrate,

(15)

Input: (i) Shila is not feeling well.
If Shila is not feeling well then the class is cancelled.
Output: The class is cancelled.

After a length of time and usage, this entry will eventually become complete and the set of rules can be said to have been mastered by the individual.

3.7 Encyclopaedic Entry

It has been mentioned above that a concept acts as a signpost in the cognitive environment of an individual, under which extended information about it is attached, and this extended information is stored in the 'encyclopaedic entry' of the concept. The extended information of the initial concept can in turn be expanded further by the information that is attached to it and so on. For example, the encyclopaedic entry for 'Sarawak', can trigger (16),

(16)

- a. Abu is from Sarawak.
- b. Sarawak is in Malaysia.
- c. Malaysia is next to Singapore.
- d. Aminah's husband is from Singapore.
- e. Aminah still owes me some money.

From the above, it can be said that the accessibility of the assumptions triggered by the concept and its elements can be extended further and further, provided that each of the concepts and its extended elements are present in the individual's cognitive environment. The encyclopaedic entries of a concept do not only consist of factual assumptions as above but also information schema which will only be turned into of a set of complete factual assumptions once triggered.

However, different individuals might have different information stored under the encyclopaedic entry of the same concept depending on how she or he acquires the

information. Unlike the logical entries, the information contained in the encyclopaedic entries is changeable and frequently updated. Inevitably, after going through several interpretation processes, the encyclopaedic entries will become bigger and bigger as new information is added each time the concept is called upon to play. Eventually, in the next communication act, a particular concept can be extended exhaustively. For example,

(17)

- a. Abu stays in Miri.
- b. Miri is in Sarawak.
- c. Niah Cave and Mulu Cave are in Sarawak.
- d. Mulu Cave has the biggest opening in the world.

Each of the concepts above can be extended further and further. However, in any communication act, an individual will stop accessing the encyclopaedic entries of a concept once she has accessed the one that provides her with enough contextual effects.

3.8 Lexical Entry

The lexical entry of a concept consists of linguistically signification of the words or concepts used in an utterance. In other words, the entry comprises of syntactical and phonological information of a particular concept in an utterance.

Sperber and Wilson (1995:90) say that for an interpretation process to succeed, an individual must be

able to access these three entries coexistently. The "(R)ecovery of the concept of an utterance involves the ability to identify the individual words it contains, to recover the associated concepts, and to apply the deductive rules attached to their logical entries". However, not all concepts have these three entries attached to them. For example, the word 'then' lacks the encyclopaedic entry and the word 'Scotland' on the other hand, lacks the logical entry.

3.9 Rewarding Nature of Communication

As has been established earlier on, human beings tend to pay attention to something that they think will benefit them. This tendency is especially true in communication process where the aim of the addressee is to better their cognitive environments and thus expand their knowledge of the world. A communicator who is a knowledge seeker himself, is aware of the importance of providing a relevant and ostensive stimulus which he hopes will attract his addressee's attention and subsequently, will lead her to the successful interpretation of the stimulus. The addressee on the other hand, is aware of this and all she has to do next in the communication process is to trust her communicator's sincerity in giving her the relevant information and then go ahead and interpret his stimulus accordingly.

But how does the information improve the cognitive environment of the addressee? According to Sperber and Wilson, the cognitive environment of the addressee is improved if the utterance made manifest yields some effects to the addressee. However, a mere duplication of an existing information will not be considered as creating any effect in the cognitive environment. Neither will an introduction of a new information which is not related at all to the existing information be considered as contributing the betterment of the addressee's cognitive environment. To take a simplest example, an information about how to look after a puppy will be considered as not relevant and thus not profiting to a professional veterinarian. By the same token, the same information will also be considered as not relevant and does not have any effect at all to a Muslim boy who has never seen a puppy in his life since it is against his religion to have dogs as pet. However, the same information will be beneficial to a young girl who has been given a puppy for her birthday a month before.

Basically, new information can create three types of contextual effects: contextual implication, the strengthening of assumption and the elimination of assumption. Each of these is created when the new information is integrated with an existing information in the addressee's cognitive environment. I will describe each of the effects in turn.

Firstly, a contextual implication is only derived when a new assumption is processed with an existing assumption. For example, let's say, Mijaa holds an assumption (18)

(18)

If Sabry ignores me at the office today, then he is still annoyed with me.

When she sees him later at the office that day, he walks past her without saying anything. This new information (19) when processed with the existing assumption (18) will yield contextual implication (20). For example:

(18) If Sabry ignores me at the office today, then he is still annoyed with me.

(19) Sabry ignores me at the office today.

(20) Sabry is still annoyed with me.

In other words, the conclusion or contextual implication can only be derived when the new information is processed together with the existing or old assumption. According to Sperber and Wilson (1995: 112), contextual implication is also called 'dependent strengthening' since "... the strength of the conclusion depends not only on the added premise P but also on the context C: P affects, does not fully determine the strength of its contextual implication". Therefore, in the above case, the strength of Mijaa's belief in (20) also depends on the strength of (18).

Secondly, a new piece of information can also be relevant as an additional information that strengthens an existing information further. For example, Mijaa is now believes that Sabry is still annoyed her and this information is still accessible in her immediate cognitive environment. Later that day, a mutual friend says:

(21) Sabry is avoiding you.

This new information is relevant as an additional information which if processed in a further contextual assumption (22) will imply conclusion (23) which is the same as conclusion (20). For example,

(22) If Sabry is avoiding me, then he is still annoyed with me.

(21) Sabry is still avoiding me.

(23) He is annoyed with me.

The belief that Sabry is annoyed with her achieves further strength when (18&19) are combined with (22&21). The strength of the third conclusion should be stronger than either (20) or (21). This type of strengthening is what Sperber and Wilson call 'independent strengthening' which they say "... arises when a single conclusion is independently implied by two different sets of premises".

Finally, newly presented information can also cause the existing information to lose its credibility. When this is the case, the strength of the existing information will be weakened and eventually eliminated from the

hearer's cognitive environment. Suppose that Mijaa goes to see Sabry to find out for herself if he is really still annoyed with her and she hears him telling somebody on the phone that he is not annoyed with Mijaa. Mijaa, on hearing this, will form an assumption (24):

(24) Sabry is not annoyed with me.

This assumption is inconsistent with the assumption that she had formed earlier. In this case, she will confidently reject her earlier assumption rather than the new one because she heard him say it himself.

However, achieving contextual effects is only one part of a dual relationship in improving cognitive environment. The other part concerns the processing effort required to achieve these effects. The balancing of these factors in any interpretation process is fundamental in Relevance Theory. Ideally, the effort should always be at its lowest. The less processing effort is required, the more relevant the utterance will be on the hearer's cognitive environment. Therefore, it is important that the communicator's choice of stimulus should preferably be or appear to be the one that will not present the addressee with too much effort. However, there are cases when the processing effort needed seems to be higher than usual but still considered as necessary. Compare the following examples:

(25) A: What are we going to cook tonight?
B: We're not going to cook at all tonight.

(26) B: I've booked a table for two at the new restaurant in the city for tonight.

In interpreting (26), the hearer is 'forced' to access the contextual assumption (27) in which the information in (26) will be processed to derive contextual implication (28).

(27) If we are going to dinner at the new restaurant in the city tonight, then we do not have to cook.

(28) We're going to dinner at the new restaurant in the city tonight.

(29) We do not have to cook.

In this instance, although B's answer in (26) seems to involve an extra processing effort if compared to his answer in (25), the extra effort is compensated by the extra effects. In other words, not only the hearer receives an answer to her question, she is also receiving an extra information that enriches the answer.

3.10 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have briefly described the fundamental aspects of Relevance Theory of Sperber and Wilson (1995). Central to their theory of communication is the notion of optimal relevance, which is grounded in the principle of relevance. An utterance will achieve an optimal relevance when it achieves enough contextual effects with the lowest

processing cost. In the final section, I have shown how contextual effects can contribute to and improve an individual's cognitive environment. I have also shown the possibilities of making sure only the intended effects are achieved by imposing constraints on the contextual assumptions that can be brought into a particular interpretation process. This notion that contextual assumptions can be constrained will be the essence of my analysis of the Malay discourse particles. Next, in Chapter Four, I will discuss this notion further by demonstrating how the context selection is constrained.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONSTRAINTS ON RELEVANCE

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will review the notion of looking at the non-truth-conditional particles (Grice 1975; Karttunen and Peters 1975) as 'semantic constraints on relevance'. The term is first coined by Blakemore (1987), following the framework of Relevance Theory (Wilson and Sperber 1990; Sperber and Wilson 1995), in her study of the connectives 'and', 'also', 'so' and so on in English. She introduces the idea of looking at these words as containing procedural information rather than conceptual information. In other words, treating the words not as contributing to the propositional contents of utterances, but as guidance to the correct interpretation processes and conclusions. Her study has subsequently triggered various other studies covering other non-truth-conditional particles in English (Itani-Kauffmann 1990; Ifantidou-Trouki 1992, 1993; Jucker 1993;) and also, in other languages (Blass 1990; Rouchota 1990; 1993; Itani 1992, 1993; Haegeman 1993; Takeuchi 1997)

I will start this chapter by looking at how contextual information can be manipulated using explicit and implicit utterances and how this manipulation will affect the effort put into accessing the contextual information needed. Then I will review the notion of

explaining the use of these discourse particles according to Relevance Theory. In subsequent sections, I will review the different discourse particles both in English and other languages and show how they constrain the accessibility of contextual information in each interpretation process that contains them. My intention is then to show how the idea of explaining the use of these particles as constraining the contextual assumptions can be a useful alternative approach to the study of Malay's own non-truth-conditional particles.

4.2 Manipulation Of Contextual Information

Relevance Theory presents some important insights on how a speaker can control the interpretation of his utterance so that only the intended contextual effects will be obtained. Therefore, he has to control the interpretation process in such a way that will ensure only the intended contextual information is used. At the same time, he also has to ensure that the cost for accessing the contextual information is reduced significantly. It is in the interests of a hearer who is searching for relevance that the speaker should produce an utterance whose interpretation calls for less processing effort than any other utterances that he could have made. But equally, given that the speaker wishes to communicate with the hearer, it is in his interests to make his utterance as easily understood as possible.

First of all, in selecting his most relevant utterance, the communicator has to decide on what kind of information needs to be explicit or implicit. He has to bear in mind that both types of information have their own advantages and disadvantages. In one instance, an explicit utterance may help the smooth running of the interpretation process but hinder it in another. The same outcome is also expected of an implicit utterance. Either way, the hearer has to access contextual assumptions for the complete interpretation of the utterance. On the one hand, in solving the 'blueprints' (the term is Blakemore 1987, 1992) of an explicit utterance, into its fully propositional contents, she still has to resort to contextual information. The less the hearer has to access contextual information, the greater is the explicitness of the utterance. On the other hand, in solving an implicit utterance, the hearer also has to access the most relevant contextual information in order to derive the intended interpretation. The contextual information is normally triggered by the utterance itself and this information is what Sperber and Wilson termed as 'implicature'. In the next two sections, I will briefly describe how the interpretations of explicit and implicit utterances are derived.

4.2.1 Explicitness And Contextual Information

Consider the following examples. Let us say that for the past two years, A and B have made it a routine to have a picnic at the Boat Club near the bank of Clyde River every Friday. As he leaves for work one Friday, he utters, (1a):

(1a)

B: See you later.

Using the set of contextual assumptions that A associates with the habitual outing that they always have every Friday afternoon, she enriches the utterance (1a) to its complete propositional content in (1b):

(1b) B will meet A at the Boat Club near the river bank of River Clyde where they always have their picnic for the past two years.

It is obvious that the information, 'the Boat Club near the river bank of River Clyde where they always have their picnic for the past two years' is not supplied by the 'blueprints' of the utterance. Rather, it is provided by the set of contextual information that is available to A at that moment. Now, consider (1c):

(1c) See you at the bank.

Even though, (1c) is more explicit than (1a), A still has to spend some effort in accessing the right contextual

information in order to interpret B's utterance. She has to decide when B utters (1c), did he mean the river bank of the Clyde River or the bank where he works. In doing so, she has to make a decision based on a set of contextual information in (2):

(2)

- a. If he means the river bank, then she will see him at the Boat Club near the Clyde River.
- b. If he means the Bank of Scotland, then she will meet him at work.

Now consider a slightly more explicit utterance (1d):

(1d) See you at the Boat Club.

Here, we can see although A still needs to access her cognitive environment for the relevant contextual assumptions in order to interpret this utterance, the effort needed to do this will be considerably lesser than the effort needed for interpreting (1a) and (1c). The effort will be reduced more significantly if B's utterance has been (1e):

(1e) See you at the Boat Club near the bank of Clyde River where we always have our picnic for the past two years.

B's utterance in (1e) is indeed more informative than (1a), (1c) and (1d) because it significantly reduces the processing effort spent on solving the gap between the

logical forms of the utterances and their propositional forms. It will also be the most relevant if the expressed propositional content of the utterance is actually the intended meaning that the speaker considers relevant for the hearer to access. However, if it is otherwise, then the utterance would incur irrelevant effort and time because not only there are extra 'blueprints' need to be filled out, there are also extra bits of information, triggered by the concepts attached to the logical form of the utterance that the hearer has to resolve.

4.2.2 Constraints On Implicatures

Briefly, a speaker who has specific interpretation in mind may also direct his hearer towards that interpretation by choosing to use an implicit utterances. As with explicit utterance, an implicit utterance can also be used to ensure only a certain set of contextual information is accessible. For example (3)

(3)

Anita:	Let's go to the disco later.
Azizah:	Badul will be there tonight.

Although the explicature of Azizah's utterance does not seem to be the one that Anita is expecting, it will trigger for example, set of contextual information (4) which is related to Badul.

(4)

- a. Azizah does not like Badul.
- b. Azizah has a fight with Badul last night.
- c. Azizah and Badul are sworn enemies

Bearing in mind that Azizah is being sincere in her intention to communicate, she would then go ahead and attempt to process the utterance. She will work out that Anita, in mentioning that Badul would be at the disco that night and thus making the set of information about Badul manifest, is indicating that this set of information that relates to Badul is relevant and should therefore be used in the interpretation process to recover the intended contextual implication (5). For example let us say (4a) has become manifest, Azizah will process this information in the context of (6) to derive contextual implication (5):

- (6) If Azizah does not like Badul, then Anita does not want to go (wherever he will be).
- (5) Azizah does not want to go.

In this sense, not only does Azizah's utterance provide Anita with the requested information, it also provides Anita with an extra information which represents Azizah's reason for not wanting to go to the disco that night. Azizah could have given Anita a direct response in declining her offer to go to the disco but the extra effects would then be missing. Consider another example,

- (7) Father: Is a Proton Saga powered steering?
Azeman: Salina drove a Proton Saga for her driving lessons.

Azeman's intention is for his father to derive (8)

- (8) Proton Saga is not powered steering after all.

on the basis of contextual information (9)

- (9) One of the regulations for driving school is to use a non-powered steering car when giving out driving lessons.

In both of the examples above, the hearers' choices of contexts and eventual interpretations of their utterances are said to be constrained pragmatically or non-linguistically. The actual meanings of the utterances are left implicit in both instances and only derivable if used with the appropriate contextual information or assumptions. The contextual assumption for utterance (7) for example, is triggered by the concept 'driving lessons' which triggers further assumptions about the actual driving school and its regulation. When it is combined with the new information, the question to Azeman's father will be answered and an extra new information, 'the driving school that Salina went to used Proton Sagas' is obtained.

In brief, I have shown how the cost of interpretation process can be reduced by controlling the hearer's access

to contextual information using both explicit and implicit utterances. The choice to use either explicit or implicit utterance is influenced by what kind of contextual effects that the speaker wishes to impart. For example (10):

(10)

- A: Why do you want me to cook now?
B: Because I'm hungry.

If B's intention is for A to know that he is hungry, then his utterance in (10) above will be considered as relevant and most appropriate at that time. The expressed propositional content is also the explicature or the intended meaning of his utterance. The contextual information needed to solve the logical form and access the meaning is minimal. If however, his intention is to convey not only the fact that he is hungry, but also to inform her the reason why he is hungry, then (11) below will be the most relevant and most appropriate utterance to use.

(11) Because I didn't eat anything since last night.

In interpreting this utterance, A has to access contextual assumption (12) to derive the implication (13):

- (12) If B has not eat anything since last night, then B is hungry.
(13) B has not eaten anything since last night.
(14) B is hungry.

4.3 Linguistic Devices As Constraints.

In the preceding sections I have shown how explicit or implicit utterances can be used to help facilitate the interpretation process by controlling the hearer's search for relevance. I have shown that in using an implicit utterance, each speaker of the above examples is able to restrict the kind of contextual information that the hearer is able to access so that the outcome will only be the intended contextual effects. However, this is not the only way the accessibility of contextual information can be controlled. Another is using a word or expression which gives out a specific instruction on how an utterance that contains it is to be processed. The existence of such word is first noted by Grice (1968,1975). He says that the presence of this word in an sentence will help in determining "...what is implicated, besides helping to determine what is said" (Grice 1975:44). One of the examples he gives is with the word 'therefore' as illustrated by (15):

(15) He is an Englishman; he is therefore brave.

The above utterance implies that the person it refers to is brave because he is an Englishman. However, the speaker of the utterance could not be accused of saying something false if, for example, it is discovered later on that the person in question is not actually an Englishman. The consequential meaning, which Grice (ibid. 45) refers

to as 'conventional implicature', is conventionally implicated by 'therefore'. Ensuing from this, several studies (Karttunen, 1974; Karttunen and Peters 1975, Stalnaker 1974; 1975) have been carried out to account for similar words that seem to imply underlying instructions which cannot be explained through grammar.

One of the studies, following Relevance Theory, is carried out by Blakemore (1987; 1988a; 1998b; 1989; 1992). According to her, these expressions, which she calls 'linguistic devices' or 'inferential connectives' may be used by a speaker to control the kinds of contextual assumptions that a hearer will access and bring into a specific interpretation process. She agrees with Halliday and Hasan (1987) in so far as defining the function of these devices as facilitators, to guide a hearer along the right interpretations of texts or utterances. However, she claims that what these devices 'tie' together in any interpretation process is not the surface 'items' of texts or utterances as traditionally have been suggested (McCulley 1985; Neuner 1987), but the propositions that underlying the texts or utterances. The expressions work solely as semantic constraints on relevance by specifying how the propositions given are to be integrated. Recall that according to Relevance Theory, in interpreting an utterance, a hearer is always aiming at improving her representations of the world by gaining enough contextual effects at the end of the interpretation process. These contextual effects are gained in three ways: contextual

implication, strengthening and contradiction. However, according to the principle of relevance, the efforts needed to recover these effects must also be low. These objectives are achievable with the help of such expressions as mentioned above since they specify the kinds of contextual assumptions that the hearer must retrieve and bring into the interpretation process. The advantage of this is that the amount of effort needed will be reduced significantly since the hearer is deliberately guided towards the intended contextual effects. To illustrate, compare (15) with (16):

(15) He is an Englishman; therefore he is brave.

(16) He is an Englishman; he is, after all brave.

The speaker of utterance (15), intends to conclude that the person that he refers to is brave due to the fact that he is an Englishman. Meanwhile, in uttering (16) he intends to prove that the person mentioned is an Englishman due to the fact that he is brave. Both of these intended interpretations are possible argues Blakemore (ibid.), because the speakers have successfully accessed the contextual assumption (17):

(17) All Englishmen are brave

Therefore, we can say, the linguistic devices, 'after all' and 'therefore', in a way, 'force' the hearer to access the most relevant contextual assumptions in the

interpretation of the above utterances so that only the intended interpretations are achieved.

The idea of treating linguistic devices as semantic constraints on relevance has attracted various other similar studies on the different kinds of non-truth-conditional expressions in English. Subsequently the idea is not only constrained to those expressions in English but has also extended to the studies of similar expressions in other languages. These studies prove that contextual assumptions can be manipulated in such way that results in reducing the effort needed and achieving the intended contextual effects. The findings also support Blass's claim that "... the principles by which hearers use contextual information in interpreting utterances in discourse are universally the same" (1990:1).

These devices, however, do not contribute to the propositional contents of the utterances. Therefore, although (15) and (16) imply different inferential processes, the expressed propositional contents of each are still (18) and (19):

(18) He is an Englishman.

(19) He is brave.

In other words, with or without the particles, the propositional contents of each segment of the utterances remain the same.

4.3.1 Analysis Of Linguistic Devices: Some Examples

In the following sections, I will review the different studies that have been done on a selected few expressions according to the contextual effects that they bring about. These studies form the foundation for my own study of similar expressions in Malay.

4.3.1.1 Contextual Implication : Evidence and Conclusion

Remember that although examples (15) and (16) imply different inferential processes, the expressed propositional contents of each are still (18) and (19). To repeat, while (19) on the one hand is offered as a conclusion for (18) in the interpretation of example (15), in example (16) on the other hand, (19) is offered as an evidence for the (18). However, in both processes, it is important the contextual assumption (17) is supplied.

(17) All Englishmen are brave

Now consider the following example:

(20) He is an Englishman. So he is brave.

The interpretation process implied by example (20) above can be said to be the same as the interpretation process for example (15), where proposition (19) is offered as a conclusion for the premise (18). Or in other words, the linguistic devices 'so' and 'therefore' both indicate that

the proposition that each of them introduces should be treated as the contextual implication for an evidence expressed in the preceding proposition. This interpretation process necessarily involves the contextualisation of (18) in the set of assumptions suggested by (17). For example:

(21)

- a. If he is an Englishman, then he is brave.
- b. He is an Englishman.
- c. He is brave.

However, the opposite interpretation is implied for example (16). The linguistic device 'after all' indicates that the proposition it introduces should be treated as the evidence for a contextual implication derived from the preceding proposition. The hearer has to derive contextual implication (22c) after processing (19) in the set of assumptions suggested by (17). For example:

(22)

- a. If he is brave, he is an Englishman.
- b. He is brave.
- c. He is an Englishman.

'After all' always introduces an evidence for some contextual implication that has been made manifest prior to the introduction. For example, if we reverse the order of propositions in example (16) to (16'), the interpretation process necessarily involves the contextualisation of (18) in the set of assumptions suggested by (17):

(16') He is brave; he is, after all an Englishman.

This seems to suggest that 'after all' is the same or expresses the same instruction as 'because', for example:

(23) He is brave because he is an Englishman.

Although this is true to some extent, 'after all' should not be equated with 'because' due to the fact that it has in its function the instruction that indicates the proposition that it is introducing is somehow known to the hearer. An information which has already been made manifest or known to the hearer is still relevant as a reminder. Blakemore (1987: 82) says, "(a) reminder is relevant only in the contexts that do not contain the information it expresses" and in the case of 'after all', the reminder that it introduces is to be taken as evidence for the contextual implication that precedes it. In other words, she says, 'after all' "... indicates that she has grounds for thinking that although the proposition it introduces is contained in some part of the hearer's accessible memory, it is not contained in, or implied by, the initial context" (ibid. 83).

'After all' can also be compared to 'you see', which also introduces an evidence of a conclusion, for example

(24):

(24) He is brave; he is, you see, an Englishman.

Again, although the instruction that this expression gives can be said to be similar to 'after all', it is wrong to think that they are implying the same inferential instructions. This is because, in contrast to 'after all', 'you see', in this instance and also in other instances, is used to introduce an information that the speaker considers as new to the hearer.

Now let us return to example (15) and (20) repeated below:

(15) He is an Englishman; therefore he is brave.

(20) He is an Englishman. So he is brave.

I have shown that 'so', like 'therefore' introduces an assumption that should be taken as a conclusion for some state of affairs that has been stated prior to this. However, in some cases, 'so' does not imply this instruction. For example, consider (25) below, taken from (Blakemore 1987: 86):

(25) There's \$5 in my wallet. So I didn't spend all the money then.

In this example, the speaker is not indicating that the proposition that introduces by 'so' is a conclusion of the first proposition. This is proven by the fact that 'therefore' cannot be interchanged with 'so' in this utterance. For example (26):

(26) *There's \$5 in my wallet. Therefore I didn't spend all the money then.

'So' in (25) is understood to comment on a remark that is made previously. In this case, the speaker is taken to ponder on her previous remark. Another example (27):

(27)

A: I went to see Mijaa today.

B: So, you decided to talk to her after all.

In this case, B is commenting on A's decision to see Mijaa when previously in another conversation, she has indicated to B that she and Mijaa were not on good terms. 'So' can be also be used in a situation where the usual preceding utterance is absent. For example:

(28)

(Mijaa washes the dishes)

A: So, you've decided to clean up.

Here, the proposition of A's utterance is derived from an evidence that is visually perceived.

Although all of the above examples seem to show the different uses of 'so', there is only one basic instruction of 'so', that is to introduce a proposition which to be understood as a consequence of some state of affairs, either explicitly expressed or non-linguistically represented.

4.3.1.2 Strengthening Of Assumptions

In the above, I have briefly described the function of three discourse particles, 'so', 'therefore' and 'after all'. The first two are basically used to introduce a contextual implication and the last one is to provide an evidence for a conclusion. However, the interpretation process does not only consist of the presenting an evidence that will derive a new conclusion or vice versa. Sometimes, there are cases when these conclusions or assumptions are further strengthened and thus create a better-evidenced belief. Directly following this, our cognitive environment will be further improved. Apart from these particles, there are also other linguistic devices in English that help with the strengthening of a given assumption. One of these particles is 'moreover'. Now consider (29):

(29) Betty has gone to the post office.

The above utterance can be interpreted in various ways, depending on what kind of contextual assumptions it is processed in. For example (30):

(30)

- a. If Betty has gone to the post office, then she must have gone to post some letters.
- b. Betty has gone to the post office.
- c. Betty must have gone to post some letters.

According to Blakemore, although the speaker of (29) might have guaranteed the truth of his utterance in (29), he has not guaranteed that the truth of (30). Next, he utters (31):

(31) Moreover, the letters on the table are no longer there.

'Moreover' indicates that the proposition that it introduces is another premise that should imply the same conclusion as (29c). Therefore, in interpreting the assumption implied by (31), the hearer should access contextual assumption (32a) to yield (32c):

(32)

- a. If the letters are no longer on the table, Betty must have gone to post the letters.
- b. The letters are no longer on the table.
- c. Betty must have gone to post the letters.

Although in this instance the conclusion of the speaker's utterance merely duplicates another conclusion derived from an earlier utterance, his utterance in (31) is still relevant as an additional premise that supports the validity of the previous conclusion. In other words, by giving "... a proposition that is a premise for the deduction of a conclusion that (he) had already conveyed, the speaker is able to increase the strength of (his) guarantee of its factuality" (ibid. 93). Consider a further example:

(33) Betty has gone to the Smith's Bakery. Moreover it is Sarah's birthday tonight.

Again, the conclusion that the hearer will derive for the first segment of the utterance depends largely on the contextual assumptions that she brings into the interpretation process. A possible interpretation process will be (34):

(34)

- a. If Betty has gone to the Smith's Bakery, then she intends to buy some bread.
- b. Betty has gone to the Smith's Bakery.
- c. Betty intends to buy some bread.

Earlier I said, 'moreover' indicates the proposition it introduces should produce the same conclusion as the preceding proposition's. Following this instruction, it is obvious that conclusion (34c) is not achievable using the second proposition's. Therefore, encouraged by the speaker's use of 'moreover', the hearer will go on to process the second proposition further. For example,

(35)

- a. If Betty has gone to the Smith's Bakery, then she must have gone to buy a cake.
- b. If tonight is Sarah's birthday, then Betty must have gone to buy a cake.

This interpretation is only possible when contextual assumption (36) is provided:

(36) We need a birthday cake for Sarah.

Now, according to this analysis, not only 'moreover' constrains the interpretation of the proposition that it introduces, it also constrains the interpretation of the preceding proposition.

The two examples demonstrate the two uses of 'moreover' identified by Blakemore (1987). In the first example, 'moreover' "... indicates that the two propositions are connected by the fact that they are premises for the same conclusion..", whereas in the second example, it "... indicates that the propositions it connects are combined as premises in the same argument". However, in both cases, it "constrains the hearer's choice of context so that the proposition in the first sentence is interpreted as evidence for a specific conclusion" (ibid. 97).

4.3.1.3 Elimination Of Assumptions

In the previous section, I briefly described the use of a discourse particle that introduces an assumption that is supposed to be treated as an additional premise. This premise is used to strengthen or increase the strength of an assumption and thus, guaranteeing the factuality of the assumption. There are also a number of discourse particles in English that seem to suggest that the proposition that it introduces is contradicting and thus

denying an expectation that is created a proposition that precedes it. Some examples of these particles are 'however', 'nevertheless' and 'but'. However, even though they seem to indicate the same inferential instruction, they are not always interchangeable. In this section I will describe the use of the most common contradicting connective in English, namely 'but'.

In processing an information that has just been given to us, we create our own expectations on how that piece of information affects our beliefs and how existing beliefs affect that piece of new evidence. For example, if somebody utters:

(37) We will go to the movie at 5 today.

If the hearer believes that the speaker is being sincere, then it is not wrong for her to expect that later at five that evening, she will be going to a movie with the speaker. Also it has been their routine to meet up at a bookstore at four everyday before they go home together. Therefore it is safe for her to assume that she will see him at four at the bookstore that day before they go off to the cinema. The hearer expects (37) since the speaker himself has suggested it. She also expects the second event to happen because it is an established expectation or repetitive phenomenon created by the routine that the speaker and her has made over a period of time.

Therefore in interpreting (37), the hearer will derive (38c):

(38)

- a. If we are going to the movie at 5 today, then we will see each other at 4 at the bookstore.
- b. We are going to the movie at 5 today.
- c. We will see each other at 4 at the bookstore.

However, the speaker, knowing that the hearer will create this expectation, then utters (39):

(39) We will go to the movie at 5 today but I won't see you at the bookstore.

His intention here is to explicitly deny the hearer's expectation in (38c) by introducing a contradicting proposition. According to Blakemore (1987:127), this "... new information is relevant by virtue of the fact that it leads the hearer to abandon an existing assumption". Therefore in this case, the hearer has to revise her expectation and abandon her existing assumption (38c) that day. Next let us say the speaker utters (40) instead:

(40) We will go to the movie at 5 today but I have to attend a meeting at 4.

In this instance, the hearer's expectation in (38c) is implicitly denied. Here, she is expected to process the second segment of the utterance to derive (41c):

(41) a. If he has to attend a meeting at 4, then I will not meet at the bookstore at 4.

b. He has a meeting at 4.

c. I will not meet at the bookstore at 4.

The hearer knows that this is how the assumption conveyed by the second part of the speaker's utterance. This knowledge is triggered by 'but' which always indicates that the proposition that it introduces is meant to deny the implication or expectation created by the preceding proposition.

There are also cases when 'but' is used to deny an expectation created by another speaker. For example (42):

(42)

A: I don't want to go to the movie.

B: But we have promised to meet the Jones at five.

In this instance it is still understood that B is introducing a proposition with 'but' that denies the expectation that is created by A's assertion.

Following from the above, we can say that in each case, the hearer is 'forced' "... to process the proposition which 'but' introduces in a context which she can derive a proposition logically inconsistent with one assumed to have been derived from the proposition expressed by the utterance of the first clause" (Blakemore 1987:130) In other words, 'but' constrains the contextual assumption that the hearer will bring into interpreting the second proposition.

However, Rouchota points out, not only 'but' constrains the interpretation of the proposition that it introduces, sometimes, it also constrains the interpretation of the preceding proposition. Consider the following example, taken from Rouchota (1993:69):

(43) Tom is a dancer but he is not gay.

In this instance, the implication of this utterance is essentially (44):

(44) All male dancers are gay.

However, the speaker does not expect the hearer to entertain this thought prior to his utterance in (43) and she indeed does not entertain this assumption in her cognitive environment. Nevertheless, 'but' forces her to interpret the first segment of the utterance to derive a conclusion that is in conflict with the second. Since she does not entertain the thought that all male dancers are gay, she can safely deduce that what the speaker wishes to contradict her own belief that Tom is gay based on her assumption in (44).

4.3.1.4 Discourse Connectives In Other Languages.

As I have mentioned above, there are also similar studies done on discourse particles but based on other languages than English. One of the studies is by Blass (1993a; 1993b) who looked at a conjunctive word 'siÉ'.

This word is similar to English 'so' and 'therefore' described above. For example (taken from Blass 1933b:99),

(45a) Mánbuke minníbíbiní tié dihí wuu ní.
Aardvark in black-man ground place all.
'The Aardvark is to be found in the whole of Africa.'

(45b) V siÈ cò baka rán ná há wi tunni kinkan
kene
it so likes field in the which not trees all
has.
So it likes the Savannah.

In this instance, 'siÉ' signals to the hearer that (45b) is a conclusion from the evidence provided by proposition (45a). The utterances are processed as follows:

(45c)
Premise 1: If the aardvark is to be found in the whole of Africa, then it likes the Savannah.
Premise 2: The aardvark is to be found in the whole of Africa.
conclusion: It likes the Savannah.

In order to derive this conclusion however, the hearer has to, first, derive the contextual assumption (premise 1) from other premises (45d-e).

(45d) An animal likes the environment in which it lives.
(45e) Many parts of Africa have Savannah.

Like English 'so', 'siÉ' can also be used to introduce a conclusion, but the evidence for it is left implicit. For example (taken from Blass 1993b:102) as in (46):

(46)

(preceding conversation:

J: Have you taken out the fish?

C: Yes, we have taken some and left some.)

J: I siÈ n weri È.
you so NEG me well done
'So you haven't treated me very well.'

Nánwultí gckó
fish neck
'The neck of the fish.'

In the above example, the evidence of the conclusion 'So you haven't treated me very well' is left implicit. Here the evidence can be perceived (only little bits of the fish is left) and thus not necessary to be made explicit. The last statement 'The neck of the fish' highlights the fact that not much edible fish is left but this by itself is not enough to support the conclusion that the hearer and the rest of the addressed people have not treated the speaker well. Additional premises are required and Blass (ibid. 102) suggests that the interpretation process involves premises such as these:

(47)

- a. The neck of the fish has very little flesh.
- b. The person who gets the neck will have very little flesh.

and when these premises are processed with (c), conclusion (d) is gained;

(47)

- c. J was left the neck of the fish, which has very little flesh.
- d. J was left very little flesh.

The conclusion (d) still does not explain why the hearer has not treated the speaker very well. The hearer needs to access further premises with which (d) can be processed. Consider (e and f):

(47)

- e. If somebody leaves an unfair share of food to somebody then he does not treat him well.
- f. The neck of the fish is an unfair share of food.

When these premises are processed with (d), the intended conclusion (48) can then be accessed.

(48) They did not treat her well.

From the above examples, 'siÉ' can be concluded to help "...comprehension by indicating the type of inference process the hearer is expected to go through: clearly, a major part of this inference process relies on implicit premises not explicitly encoded in the text." (Blass 1993b:103).

Other studies that look at the various discourse particles other than the connectives, include those

looking at interrogative particles, for example, the particle 'da' in West Flemish (Haegeman 1993), 'na' in Greek (Rouchota 1993) and 'ne' and 'ka' in Japanese (Itani 1992; 1993). Like the connective particles, the interrogative particles also constrain the interpretation processes by specifying how the propositions that they introduce in interrogative utterances are to be processed.

4.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I have reviewed the two ways an information can be conveyed: explicitly and implicitly. I showed how contextual assumptions can be manipulated and constrained using some words or non-truth-conditional expressions. I have also reviewed the use of some of the particles. My intention here is to demonstrate how the manipulation of contextual information can help in making sure only the intended contextual effects are achieved. They also help in reducing the processing effort by ensuring the needed contextual information is easily accessible. I have also reviewed some examples of discourse particles from another language, namely, by Blass. Her study shows that the principles which hearers use in interpreting utterances are also universally used.

The next five chapters will be on the discussion of the uses of some examples of discourse particles in Malay in terms of their roles in constraining the contextual information in interpretation processes.

CHAPTER FIVE

INTRODUCTION TO DATA

5.1 Introduction

In this study, I use the term 'discourse particles' as a generic term to cover all the non-truth-conditional particles in Malay. Blakemore (1987) uses the terms 'linguistic devices' or 'inferential connectives' to mean the same thing. The term that I am using will cover three areas of the non-truth-conditional particles, namely, 'discourse connectives', 'discourse markers' and 'interrogative particles'.

Presently, most of the discourse particles are defined according to what they do structurally. Therefore, the purpose of the current study is to discern and define the functions of each selected discourse particles according to what they do inferentially. Specifically, the definitions will cover how each discourse particle guides the hearer to the intended contextual effects, by imposing constraints on the contextual assumptions that they can bring into the communication process. It is not the aim of the study to build a different typology of discourse particles in Malay, but to create a path for other researchers to take similar studies into the vast number of discourse particles in Malay.

The discussion is based purely on the researcher's intuition as Malay language user. An earlier attempt made to use of other Malay language users to explain their choices of certain discourse connectives proved fruitless since it was very difficult to get them to think of the particles beyond their structural instructions.

Furthermore, when shown some of the particles that show similarities in their instructions, for example 'tetapi', 'walaubagaimanapun' and 'walaupun', the participants became confused. However, this is not to say that they are not competent as language users.

Below are the list of discourse particles that I have decided to analyse:

a. Lagipun

'Lagipun' introduces an additional premise to strengthen a prior conclusion. Part of the reason I choose 'lagipun' is because it can be mistakenly thought to be similar to English 'moreover'. In my discussion, I will compare 'lagipun' with 'moreover' and 'besides' and then highlight their differences.

b. Tetapi

This discourse connective is the most typical contradicting connective in Malay. It can be said to be equivalent to English 'but'. The purpose for choosing 'tetapi' is to make it as a basis for comparing and discerning the next two connectives in this study.

c. Walaubagaimanapun

Traditionally, 'walaubagaimanapun' is defined as having the same function as 'tetapi'. Sometimes, it is defined to have an extra emphatic effect embedded in its instruction. However, I will show, this effect is as a result of the actual inferential process that it indicates.

d. Walaupun

'Walaupun' can also be mistakenly thought to have the same inferential instruction as 'tetapi'. However, in the discussion, I will show the interpretation process that involves is even more complex than 'tetapi'. It encourages the hearer to access further thoughts or state of affairs that the speaker entertains as desirable and potential.

e. Kan

'kan' does not contribute to the propositional contents of the question that it is attached to. Its main objective is to encourage the hearer to retrieve a set of existing assumptions into her immediate contextual environment and then treat it as a justification for a claim or request that the speaker has made before the question.

5.2 The Actual Data.

Most of my discussion of the discourse particles will be based on examples taken from a collection of chat samples that I have collected from the Internet Relay Chats (IRC). The chat samples do represent authentic conversations even though technically, they are not a form of oral communication. However, the texts in the samples emulate real-life conversations, where spoken words or

gestures associated with verbal communication are carefully spelled out accordingly. This means that most words are not spelled according to the standard forms, but rather they are literally spelled as they are pronounced. The participants that are involved the chats are from different Malay ethnic backgrounds. Although a so-called standard Malay is used, some participants do mix the use of the standard Malay with their dialects. In other words, the types of language used in the chats are a mixture of standard and regional Malays with occasional use of English words and phrases.

All data was collected from a chatroom called #Dusun. At its busiest, the room will accommodate about 20 participants. The age range of the participants is from 16 - 40 years old. In the next section, I will describe the use of IRC in general.

5.2.1 The Internet Relay Chat (Irc)

As has been mentioned above, Internet Relay Chat (IRC) deals only in words and relies only upon words as a channel of meaning. Conventions of gesture and intonations are not possible to be transmitted but the common tendency is to simply verbalise physical cues, for instance literally typing 'hehehe' to represent a laughter. The participants also use a 'shorthand' for the description of physical conditions using a system of textual characters, for example:

:-) or :) a smiling face, as viewed side-on

:-(or : (an 'unsmiley': an unhappy face
 8-) someone whose eyes are opened wide in
 surprise.
 :-P someone sticking out their tongue
 >:-O someone screaming in fright, their hair
 standing on end
 @}-`-,-`-- a rose

Consider another example,

(1)

(a) McMANAMAN: yg kale2 tuh?
 the coloured ones?
 (b) TemPee: sub- tu kan adek ipar aku...
 sub - that is my sister in law..
 (c) McMANAMAN: ooooo
 ooooo
 (d) TemPee: tak pe ahhh,,,
 nevermind
 (e) trantula: 8 black tenetters of the year ehhehe
 8 black tenetters of the year ehhehe
 (f) TemPee: kalo dio marah aku... aku tarik balik
 adek aku
 if she's mad at me.. I'd take back my
 sister..
 (g) TemPee: hehheheh
 (h) padifield: ehehhehe

In (g) and (h) both TemPee and padifield are laughing at a
 comment that TemPee has previously made. Due to the
 physical setup of IRC program, the fact they are laughing
 at the same time cannot be shown. (c) on the other hand
 is a representation of a sound normally made by a hearer
 to indicate 'an understanding of a certain phenomenon' has
 finally been understood by her.

Most of the times, the spellings of certain words are
 also modified to represent the pronunciations of such

words as they would be made in oral communication. For example,

(2)

- a. aleen: tak kot..
- b. aleen: I don't think so..
- c. aleen: bod cakap ker?
- d. Aleen: Did bod tell you?
- e. aleen: mijaa..
- f. aleen: ober.ober.. du u rid me?
- g. ikhtiar: yer..

'ker' in (c) is another informal variation of the word 'kah', and 'ober..ober.. du u rid me?' is meant to represent 'over over, do u read me?'. All these words are spelled to imitate the way they are pronounced orally. Regional dialect also affects the way certain words are pronounced and this is also shown in some of the transcripts that I have collected. For example,

(3)

- a. mijaa`: kelak aku dcc kau
I'll dcc you.
reti ndak kah kau tok?
- b. lebai2: apa hal teak
What's up?

In the above extract, Mijaa` and Lebai2 are talking in another dialect of Malay language and they modify the spellings of the words according to the sounds of the words as pronounced in their language. For example,

(3) mijaa`: kelak aku dcc kau

'kau' (you, in English) is pronounced and spelled exactly as it would be in the dialect. However, in (4a) and (4b) below, the spellings or pronunciations of the same referent are different:

(4)

- (a) TemPee: mak padii ari nih ko.... masak pe..
mak padi hari ni kau.. masak apa..
mak padi day this you.. cook what..
Mak Pada, what are you cooking today?
- (b) kodik: woi demo buat ghapo tu
[ex] you do what that
What are you doing?

'ko' in (3a) is another way of pronouncing 'kau' but 'demo' in (3b) is dialect variation of the word. Another example, is the word 'pe', a short form of the word 'apa' (what) and the pronunciation of it has been inflected and spelled as such. However, in (b), it is pronounced and spelled as 'ghapo'.

(5)

- a. mijaa`: alaa sis..... jgn lah tenet
come on sis.. don't private chat.
- b. mijaa`: edora.. join ler
edora, join the conversation.
- c. nisa`: laa sis baru jek aaa tenet
'laa' sis, I've just started to chat.

(dusun 9/12/97 3:43:17am)

In the above examples, the word 'lah' (discourse particle) is pronounced and spelled in three ways. In (a), it is

typed as 'lah', whereas in (b) it is typed as 'ler' and in (c) it is typed as 'laa'.

5.2.2 The Translations

Again, I will use the actual chatlines as typed by the participants and wherever needed I will edit and provide the standardised spelling of each illegible and regional dialect spelling. Thus, the first line of each example would be the actual unedited text from the sample together with the nick of the person 'talking' (refer to 6a). The second line is the 'standardised' text to show how the words would have been spelled in Standard Malay (refer to 6b). The third italicised line is the word for word translation of the text into English and the last line is the actual translation into English (refer to 6c).

(6)

- a. <Nenaz> tu apott tu aaa tunggu zai tu
- b. Itu apott itu lah tunggu zai tu.
- c. *That apott that [dp]-lah wait zai*
that.
- d. Apott has been waiting for Zai.

5.3 The Appendices

In order to save space, the actual chat samples in Appendix C have been reduced significantly. The actual translated extracts that I have used for my analysis are compiled in Appendix B. I have tried to make the extracts as comprehensive as possible for easy reference. I have

also provided a glossary for the symbols and keys that I will be using in the translation in Appendix A.

CHAPTER SIX

STRENGTHENING OF ASSUMPTION

6.1 Introduction.

In this chapter and the coming three chapters, I aim to investigate how the selected Malay discourse particles help the hearer to access the most relevant contextual information in any interpretation process. The discussion will be divided into two areas: connective particles and interrogative particles. This chapter and the subsequent two will focus on the discussion of connective particles. The last two chapters will be reserved for the discussion of interrogative particles and the conclusion for the thesis.

My aim in initiating this kind of study is, following Relevance Theory, to extend the definitions of the discourse particles as currently prescribed by the Malay grammar books. A brief comparison of each particle with an English discourse particle of similar function will be carried out whenever applicable. Otherwise, the discussion will be explanatory in nature and approached along the line that contextual information can be constrained and selected with the help of the discourse particles to achieve contextual effects when processing a new information.

As have been mentioned in Chapter Three, a new information when processed in the context of an old one

will produce a contextual implication. The same new information can be used as an additional evidence that strengthens an existing assumption. Finally, it can also be used as an evidence that will contradict the truth and thus, weaken the strength of an existing assumption and eventually lead to its elimination. In all three instances, the accessibility of the relevant contextual assumption is crucial to the interpretation process.

Following this, the use of discourse particles can be said to be very important in ensuring successful interpretation. The speaker can guide the hearer, with an appropriate discourse particle, to the intended contextual effects by specifying exactly how an utterance is to be processed. It does this by encouraging the hearer to access only the right contextual assumptions and thus reduces the processing effort.

In this chapter, I will be looking at one of the discourse particles in Malay, namely, 'lagipun'. I claim that 'lagipun' instructs the hearer to interpret the proposition that it introduces as an additional assumption or premise that promotes the strengthening of an assumption implied by the preceding proposition.

6.2 Malay Connective Particles

In Malay, the functions of connective particles have always been defined by the grammarians who only tend to prescribe how these particles should be used in the

grammar or syntactically. Therefore, not surprisingly, a connective particle tends to be defined as a word that is used to link, for example, a clause with another clause, a phrase with another phrase or a sentence with another clause or word (Fang and Hassan 1994). In the next section, I will describe the structural use of 'lagipun'.

6.2.1 Lagipun : Structure

Traditionally, 'lagipun' is defined as a 'link word' that joins a preceding sentence with another sentence or another clause. It is used both in spoken and written discourse. Syntactically, 'lagipun' is always appended to the second sentence or clause. For example,

(1)

[Dia tak sedih bila kucing dia mati,] lagipun [dia ada banyak lagi kucing yang lain.]

He no sad when cat he die, [cp]-lagipun he has many more cat [rel]-yang other.

He didn't feel sad when his cat died [lagipun] he has many other cats.

The second segment of the sentence can also be used as a separate sentence from the preceding sentence. For example,

(2)

<tUn-> ala..doyan kan ker ubat domam
 alah.. durian kan kah ubat demam.
 [dm]-alah... durian [qp]-kan [qp]-kah
 medicine fever

<tUn-> laa.aku nak aa cikit pun jadik aaa
lah.. aku nak lah sikit pun jadi lah
[dm]-lah.. I want [dm]-lah little [cp]-pun
happen [dm]-lah
I want just a little (it doesn't matter how
little)

<tUn-> lagipun aku dah baik laaaa
lagipun aku sudah baik lah.
[cp]-lagipun I already good [dm]-lah
(lagipun) I have recovered (from my fever)

(Appendix Extract 1: 1698-1702)

Nevertheless, in either structure, the function of the connective is still perceived as linking the preceding sentence with the second sentence or clause that it introduces. However, I will show that the relationship between the preceding segment and the segment introduced by 'lagipun' is not only structural but also inferential. Nevertheless, this relationship is not included in the current definition and therefore, needs to be extended further. I will now turn to the discussion of 'lagipun' as an inferential connective in the ensuing section.

6.2.2 Strengthening Of Assumptions

Recall that according to Relevance Theory, every utterance creates an expectation of relevance. A relevant utterance is the one that will reward the hearer with some contextual effects. For example,

(3)

- a. <Tulipz> ella, tolong ambik buku kite kat alin..
ella, tolong ambil buku kita dekat alin..
ella, help take book our at Alin
Ella, could you help me get my book from Alin.
- b. <ella` > alin dah pergi UK belajar
alin already go UK study.
Alin has gone to the UK to study.
- c. <ella`> minggu lepas..
week past
Last week.

(Appendix B Extract 3:2360-2362)

We can say here that Ella's indirect response forces Tulipz to access assumption (4a) in order to derive (4C₁). At the same time, it explicitly informs Tulipz of her reason why she cannot do so, that is, Alin is no longer in Malaysia.

(4)

- a. If Alin has gone to the UK to study, then Ella is not able to get my book at Alin's.
- b. Alin has gone to the UK to study.
- C₁ Ella is not able to get my book at Alin's.

Ella's indirect response here conveys two pieces of information simultaneously. First, she provides the answer requested by Tulipz by implying it in her utterance and second, most importantly, she is able to support this

answer (C_1), with a proof or an evidence explicitly conveyed by her utterance.

Next, she utters the following:

(3)

- d. <ella`> kite ngan adoll pi airport antar..
 kita dengan adoll pergi airport
 hantar.
 we with adoll go airport send
 Adoll and I went to the airport to see
 her off.

(Appendix B Extract 2:2363)

This utterance, on the other hand, provides an additional support to her claim that Alin is not in Malaysia by indicating that she went to see Alin off herself. The assumption when processed in the context of (5b), will derive C_2 as a conclusion. In other words, the proposition of Ella's utterance in the above also implies and supports her assertion that she will not be able to get Tulipz's book at Alin's.

(5)

- a. Ella and Adoll went to the airport to see Alin off to the UK.
b. If she has gone to the UK, then Ella will not be able to get my book off her.

C_2 . Ella is not able to get my book off Alin's.

Now, according to Sperber and Wilson (1995:112), a conclusion will achieve further strengthening when two sets of premises which independently imply it are combined

together in an interpretation process. Therefore, if for example, we use (4a-b) in the context of (5a-b), the conclusion that we get, let say C_3 , should be even greater in strength or as Blakemore (1987) says, will be 'better-evidenced' than C_1 or C_2 . Thus, in a way, the degree of confidence with which Tulipz entertains the truth of the initial conclusion (C_1) is even greater since it is now supported by the extra evidence. Therefore, the extra efforts spent in processing the indirect response and also, the extra evidence given by Ella in (eld) are compensated by the 'stronger' contextual effects that Tulipz achieves as a result.

6.2.3 Lagipun: An Additional Evidence

The example above demonstrates one of the ways how an assumption can be strengthened. Another way, is by constraining the contextual assumptions in such a way that the intended strengthening of the initial conclusion is definitely achieved. This can be done with the use of a connective particle 'lagipun' which I will briefly describe in this section.

The inferential function of 'lagipun' is better demonstrated by the following example of 'lagipun' in (6):

(6)

- a. Aserk: nanti aku..belanja hang kenny
roger..nak?..
later I..pay [dl]-you kenny
roger..want?..

- I'll take you out for Kenny Roger
later, if you want?
- b. zaiYani: tak nak aku serkk
tak nak aku Aserk.
no want I Aserk.
I don't want to, Aserk.
- c. zaiYani: lagipun aku tak suka makanan barat.
[cp]-lagipun I no like food west
I don't like western food.

(Appendix B Extract 3: 95-97)

In this example, the intended assumption of Zaiyani's utterance is explicitly communicated and represented as C₁ below:

(7)

C₁ Zaiyani does not want to go Kenny Roger's.

Following her reply of refusal, Zaiyani provides a premise, prefaced by 'lagipun', which seems to be offered as an evidence for her refusal. However, I will show here and elsewhere in the chapter that the premise should not be treated as an assumption that directly affects her decision, but only as an additional assumption used to support or back up her decision. This is because Zaiyani's refusal is not directly caused by her dislikes of western food but because of some other reasons which she has chosen not to make explicit here. Therefore, to say it does means to equate 'lagipun' with another connective particle, 'sebab' in Malay. For example,

(8)

- a. Zaiyani tak nak pergi ke Kenny Roger's sebab dia tak suka makanan barat.
Zaiyani no want go to Kenny Roger's because she no like food western.
Zaiyani does not want to Kenny Roger's because she does not like western food.

'Sebab' here shows a causal relationship between the first segment of the utterance with the second. Here, the fact that she does not like western food is offered as a premise or evidence that directly contribute to her decision not to take Aserk's offer to take her to Kenny Roger's. This interpretation, however, is not implied by the example with 'lagipun'. Now, consider another example (9):

(9)

- a. <Andaga> Hang drive malam tak?
 You drive night no?
 Do you drive at night?
- b. <PedanG> dak lah..
 tidak lah..
 no [dm]-lah
 No.

The answer to Perisai's question is represented by the explicature of Pedang's utterance in (9b), which is (9b`),

(9b`) C₁ Pedang does not drive at night.

Perisai would understandably assume that Pedang must have a reason for his decision not to drive at night. This assumption could lead Perisai to infer various assumptions from Pedang's reply above. For example,

(10)

- a. Pedang does not drive at night because he is scared.
- b. Pedang does not drive at night because he always leaves work at 5 in the evening.

These assumptions are possible but whether they are relevant or not are not actually guaranteed by Pedang. In his striving to seek the most relevant information, Andaga resorts to asking a direct question why in (9c), to which Pedang responds with (9d):

(9)

- c. <Andaga> napa Pedang?
kenapa Pedang?
why Pedang?
Why Pedang?
- d. <PedanG> sebab aku rabun lahhhh..
sebab aku rabun [dm]-lah.
because I'm short-sighted

The assumption of Pedang's utterance in (9d) is provided as a justification for his answer in (9b`). However, he then continues his utterance with (9e) below:

- e. <PedanG> lagipun jalan selalu busy.
[cp]-lagipun road always busy
(lagipun) the road is always busy (at
night).

(Appendix B Extract 4: 198-205)

Following what I have said earlier, the function of 'lagipun' here is not to introduce the second proposition as a premise that has a direct effect on Pedang's decision not to drive but as an additional premise that adds an extra strength to his decision. To treat the second premise as an additional premise which increases the factuality of C_1 necessarily requires the implication of the second proposition to be at least similar, if not totally the same to C_1 . In other words, we can say that 'lagipun' constrains the contextual assumptions needed to interpret the proposition that it introduces so that the implication derived will at least be similar to C_1 . Therefore, in processing the proposition that it introduces, Perisai must access the contextual assumptions (11a-c) below in order to access C_2 which, if not totally the same, should at least be similar to C_1 :

(11)

- a. Busy road is dangerous.
- b. If the road is busy at night, then it is dangerous.
- c. The road is busy at night.

- d. The road is dangerous at night.
 - e. If the road is dangerous at night, then Pedang will not drive at night.
- C₂ Pedang will not drive at night.

First and foremost, the implication of the proposition that is prefaced by 'lagipun' in the above is essentially (11d) - 'the road is dangerous at night'- which, subsequently has the effect of implying C₂. C₂ is very similar to C₁ in the sense that it implies that Pedang will also not drive under this circumstance which in turns provides the needed additional support.

Not only that, 'lagipun' can also constrain the contextual assumptions used to determine the conclusion of the preceding utterance. This becomes useful in the event when the implication of the preceding proposition is not explicitly expressed. For example:

(12)

- a. <Perisai> oi pedang...
Hoi Pedang
- b. <Perisai> meh main bola petang nihhh..
Meh main bola petang ini.
[dl]-come play ball evening this.
Let's go and play football this evening
- c. <Pedang> malas lah..
lazy [dm]-lah..
I'm lazy.
- d. <PedanG> lagipun kat luar tu ujan...
lagipun kat luar itu hujan..
[cp]-lagipun at outside that rain
(lagipun) it is raining outside.

(Appendix B Extract 5:161-164)

The explicature of Pedang's answer (9c) is

(12c`) Pedang is lazy.

Just like his utterance in (9b), the explicature of his utterance in this example might convey all sorts of conclusions if contextualised with irrelevant contextual assumptions. For example,

(13)

- a. If Pedang is lazy, he will only want to play less energetic games.
- b. Pedang is lazy.
- c. He will only want to play less energetic games..

However, if this is not the intended conclusion, with 'lagipun' Pedang can constrain Perisai from accessing it or any other conclusions for that matter in two ways. This is because first, it indicates that any other interpretations, except the one that implies the same or similar conclusion as the one that is derived from the proposition that is introduced by 'lagipun', should not be derived. Second, related to this, the implicated conclusion should be the one that the premise is evident for. Thus, for example, if the implication of the proposition that is introduced by 'lagipun' is C_2 , as shown

in (9d`), the assumption for the preceding utterance must be one that is at least very similar to C₂ below:

(9d`)

- a. If it is raining, then Pedang will not play football this evening..
- b. It is raining.

C₂ Pedang will not play football this evening.

In short, 'lagipun' implies that the implication of the preceding proposition should be the same or similar to C₂ above. Therefore, the intended conclusion is not any of (13a-c) but the one that indicates that Pedang does not want to play football at all. In order to derive this, Perisai has to access the correct contextual assumption as in (14a) and then processes it with the assumption derived from Pedang's response in (9b`). The implication of Pedang's response is thus C₁:

(14)

- a. If Pedang is lazy, then he does not want to play football this evening.
- b. Pedang is lazy.

C₁ Pedang does not want to play football this evening.

If however, Perisai has indeed correctly accessed C₁ prior to interpreting C₂, then his deduction is reconfirmed by the implication supplied by the proposition that is introduced by 'lagipun'.

Briefly, following the analyses of the examples above, we can say that the advantage of using 'lagipun' is that it specifically implies how the proposition that it introduces is to be interpreted in relation to the preceding proposition. It indicates that the implication of the proposition it introduces should be the same or similar to the implication of the preceding proposition. Therefore, for example, when an explicitly expressed conclusion is absent in the preceding proposition, the hearer will know that the conclusion that she derives for the first proposition should be consistent with the one implied by the proposition introduced by 'lagipun'.

However, this is not the main inferential instruction of 'lagipun'. It is only a part of the instruction which 'prepares' the context for the next inferential process. Now, recall again that according to Sperber and Wilson (1995), the strengthening of assumption arises when a set of premises is contextualised in another set of premises, with a condition that each of the sets when used separately implies the same conclusion. Directly following this argument, I would like to suggest that the same effect of strengthening will also arise when the conclusions of both set of premises merely display a close similarity to each other. In other words, the second premise or assumption introduced by 'lagipun' in the above is still relevant as an additional assumption used in the context of the first with the effect of strengthening the explicature of (9b), although the conclusion derived from

it is only similar to the conclusion of the first. Thus, the result of contextualising the second assumption derived from (9e) with the first assumption derived from (9d), necessarily conveys a better-evidenced C_3 , if compared to when it is derived just using the preceding evidence.

It is hardly surprising, given the function of 'lagipun' as defined so far, that the particle is normally used in argumentative contexts or in circumstances, where the speaker will first provide proofs or evidence to support an assertion or claim, followed by another proof or evidence, prefaced by 'lagipun', to additionally support the assertion or claim. The assertion or claim (C_1) is either made explicit or implied prior to the giving of an evidence. In most cases, the assertion or claim is made explicit or easily accessible to the hearer. For example, in (9) on the one hand, the assertion is made explicit since it is a direct answer to a question posed by Andaga. In (12) on the other hand, the assertion is implicit but easily accessible as a direct refusal to Perisai's invitation since the response to an invitation is either yes or no. However, this does not contradict my claim that 'lagipun' plays a role in constraining the interpretation of Pedang's utterance in (12c) so the implication will be the same or similar to the implication of the proposition introduced. It still does play a role in constraining the interpretation in the sense that it makes sure that it is the right interpretation that the

hearer has accessed before she can go on to interpret the rest of the utterance.

Such inferential instructions, however, are absent from any of Ella's utterances in (4). Tulipz, on her initiative, might have correctly accessed the conclusion C_1 from Ella's utterance in (4). However, there is no guarantee that she would have accessed C_2 from (3d). Even if she is able to work out C_2 , there is still no guarantee that she would be able to combine the premise used to derive it in the context of (4a-b) above, in order to receive the better-evidenced C_3 . Whereas in (9d), 'lagipun' signals to Perisai what kind of interpretation process that he has to do in order to access the intended effects and thus unlike the inferential process of (3), 'lagipun' reduces the costs of interpreting (9) and (12). In other words, with 'lagipun', the interpretations of Pedang's utterances in both examples are constrained in such a way that only the intended contextual assumptions and contextual effects are accessed.

However, I would like to argue, the function of 'lagipun' as outlined in this section, is still underspecified. I will show that 'lagipun' suggests more than just implicating what kind of conclusion both the preceding proposition and the proposition that it introduces is to be derived and how they are to be treated in relation to each other. This, I will explore in the following section.

6.2.4 Extended Definition Of 'Lagipun'.

In this section, I aim to extend and enrich the initial definition of 'lagipun' which I have outlined in the previous section. This is because as I have claimed at the end of the previous section, the outlined function of 'lagipun' given previously is still underspecified and therefore, needs to be extended to cover other underlying inferential instruction that it may suggest. In order to do this, let us go back to example (9) repeated below.

(9)

- a. <Andaga> Hang drive malam tak?
You drive night no?
Do you drive at night?
- b. <PedanG> dak lah..
tidak lah..
no [dm]-lah
No.
- c. <Andaga> napa Pedang?
kenapa Pedang?
why Pedang?
Why Pedang?
- d. <PedanG> sebab aku rabun lahhhh..
sebab aku rabun [dm]-lah.
because I'm short-sighted
- e. <PedanG> lagipun jalan selalu busy.
[cp]-lagipun road always busy
(lagipun) the road is always busy (at night).

(Appendix B Extract 4: 198-205)

In the previous section, I have shown how the proposition introduced by 'lagipun' in (9e), is processed in (11) to a

conclusion which is similar to C_1 or the explicature of (9b):

(9b')

C_1 Pedang does not drive at night.

(11)

- a. If the road is busy, then it is dangerous.
- b. If the road is busy at night, then it is dangerous.
- c. The road is busy at night.
- d. The road is dangerous.
- e. If the road is dangerous at night, then Pedang will not drive at night.

C_2 Pedang will not drive at night.

When the above set of premises are contextualised in the context of the preceding premise (9b), the result will be the better-evidenced conclusion C_3 . However, in order for C_3 to be perceived as better-evidenced than C_1 or C_2 , it should always be greater than both C_1 and C_2 and should not merely duplicate the strength either C_1 or C_2 .

Now, I would like to claim here that not only 'lagipun' implies that the premise presented is to be treated as an additional premise to strengthen C_1 but also, as having a greater strength than the first premise. Therefore, for example, with 'lagipun', Pedang is indicating that he is introducing an assumption which is not only relevant as an additional premise, but also relevant as a stronger premise for guaranteeing the

'factuality' of his utterance in (9b). However, before I go on, I want to point out here that the proposition itself, may not necessary always, in its own right, bear a strong connotation. Rather, the interpretation that it is stronger is mainly indicated by the use of 'lagipun'.

Therefore, if Pedang has uttered the following instead of (9), the fact that he is short-sighted is now offered as a stronger assumption compared to the preceding assumption or other possible assumptions given prior to it.

(15)

- c`. <Andaga> napa Pedang?
kenapa Pedang?
why Pedang?
Why Pedang?
- d`. <PedanG> sebab jalan selalu busy..
sebab road always busy
because the road is always busy (at night).
- e`. <PedanG> lagipun aku rabun
[cp]-lagipun aku rabun
(lagipun) I'm short-sighted.

In other words, the strength of the premise is not inherent in the premise itself. It might be a stronger assumption for one person but not necessary so for the next. However, does this mean the information that 'lagipun' is presenting is not presented as a true information? I would argue that this is not the case. The information is indeed presented as representing the belief that the speaker is entertaining which, he is presenting as relevant to his hearer. For example,

(16)

- a. Pergi lah tidur.
Go [dm]-lah sleep.
Go to sleep.
- b. Awak demam tu.
You fever that.
You have a fever.
- c. Lagipun cerita kat TV tu dah habis.
[cp]-lagipun story at TV that already end.
The film you were watching has ended.

If we compare the two notions mentioned above - 'being ill' and 'watching TV', most of us would intuitively consider 'being ill' as more important than 'watching TV', and thus, would consider it as a stronger justification than the latter for urging someone to rest or sleep. However, following my claim about 'lagipun', we can say in the above example, the opposite is being implicated, that is, 'watching TV' is considered as having a greater justification than 'being ill'. Why is this so? In order to explain, we have to take into account the contextual assumptions brought into the conversation. For example, let us say that for the speaker, what he considers as important is the fact that the hearer is ill but for the hearer, it is otherwise. Realising that using the first premise as a means to justify his advice that the hearer should go to bed might not be seen as a strong incentive, he then uses 'lagipun' to introduce the second premise, which he knows will provide stronger support to the advice he has given.

This analysis leads to another relevant question - what is the purpose of delaying a stronger assumption if the introduction of it by itself is most probably more than enough to guarantee the factuality of the conclusion in the first place? The delaying of a stronger premise is not done deliberately. The first premise is normally the most manifest assumption at that point of the conversation and thus, the most accessible information that the speaker possesses. Therefore, in the above example, since it is the belief of the speaker's that 'being ill is more important' than 'watching tv', he would logically access this information first to support his advice. However, realising that somehow the validity of his advice might not produce the intended effect, he introduces another assumption with 'lagipun' which he believes to be stronger since he knows that the hearer himself perceives it as important.

Not only that, the most manifest and accessible assumption at the point of conversation also refers to the assumption that contributes directly to a claim or an assertion made by the speaker. Consider another example:

(17)

- a. Canda: nanti tolong antor assignment aku....
 nanti tolong hantar assignment aku..
 wait help send assignment I..
 Help me to hand in my assignment
 later..
- b. everlong: tak boleh canda.. aku dah lambat dah
 nih..

- tak boleh canda.. aku sudah lambat
sudah ini..
*no can canda.. I already late already
this*
I can't Canda. I'm late as it is.
- c. Canda: tak pe aaaa.. tolong lah..
tak apa lah.. tolong lah.
no what [dm]-lah.. help [dm]-lah
It's alright. Please help.
- d. everlong: tak boleh le.. lagipun aku tak lalu
building hang..
tak boleh lah.. lagipun aku tak lalu
building hang..
*no can [dm]-lah.. [cp]-lagipun I no
pass building [dl]-you*
I can't. (lagipun) I don't pass your
building.

(Appendix B Extract 6: 1961-1967)

Here, to Everlong, the most manifest state of affairs that directly influences his belief that he cannot hand in Canda's assignment for him in (17b), is the fact that he is late. He thus presents this assumption as such to Canda. The following assumption with 'lagipun' is then offered as an additional assumption when he realises that from Canda's immediate response, he does not consider the evidence or the reason that he has given to be strong enough. This is shown by Canda's attempt to persuade him to help him with the handing in his assignment.

Therefore, in a way, Everlong is saying even if he would have liked to help Canda but the fact that he is not going near Canda's building makes it impossible for him to change his earlier assertion. However, how do we know

that the assumption that is introduced by 'lagipun' does not directly influence Everlong in making his claim? To answer this, let us consider the following example:

(18)

- a. <shanee`> awak nanti leh ke duk ngan Nina ngan
Din?
awak nanti boleh kah duduk dengan Nina
dengan Din?
*you wait can [qp]-kah stay with Nina
with Din?*
Do you think you can stay with Nina
and Din?
- b. <emas`> bolehhh
boleh
can
Yes, I can.
- c. <emas`> saya buat hal saya
I do affair my
I mind my own affairs
- d. <emas`> lagipun joe ok duduk ngan orang kawin
*[cp]-lagipun joe ok stay with people
marry*
Joe was OK when he stayed with married
people.

(Appendix B Extract 7:307-321)

In this example, it is very clear that the assumption introduced by 'lagipun' in the above example is not part of the reason that contributes to Emas' claim that he will cope staying with Din and Nina. It is used only as an additional assumption that implies similar conclusion to Emas' claim in (18b). If for example, he has meant it to be as another reason that directly contributes to his decision, he would have to rephrase his utterance to

include this meaning. The additional assumption is also stronger than the assumption implied by (18c) since it has been proven previously by Joe and thus provides an extra support that he needs to make his assertion in (18b) even stronger.

Following this, we can then say that the first premise in an utterance that contains 'lagipun' is always interpreted as being the 'actual' assumption that specifically provides proof or evidence for the preceding conclusion or implication. Therefore, both premises that precede 'lagipun' in example (9) and (12) are given as the actual reasons that directly influence Pedang's decision not to drive in (9) and not wanting to play football in (12). In other words, they are his 'personal' reasons. However, in both cases, the strength of the premises are not convincing enough to uphold either assertion since the evidence given for each assertion could easily be dismissed or questioned. Therefore in (12) for example, Perisai could have persuaded Pedang to go to the field and just watch him play football. However, by using 'lagipun' Pedang introduces another premise to strengthen his refusal. In a way he is indicating that the fact that it is raining is strong enough to prevent him from playing football even if he does not feel that lazy that day. As a result, if Perisai was thinking of persuading him to play even when after he has said he is lazy for example, he is then effectively prevented from doing so after interpreting this utterance. Also in (12), we can say

that Pedang is indicating that even if for whatever reason his first reason should not hold, he will still not drive at night due to the fact that the road is busy and thus dangerous. In other words, in an event should his initial reason fails to convince Andaga, the second reason, which is presented as stronger, should be enough to increase the strength of his decision not to drive.

6.2.5 Lagipun And English Discourse Particles: Additional Premise

There are several connective particles in English which indicate that the propositions that they introduce are to be treated as additional premises. Basically in most cases, their function is to substantiate the factuality of certain states of affairs which have already been made manifest earlier in the utterances that precede them. However, it will be difficult to compile all of these words under one function since not all of them can be interchangeable. By the same token, it will also not be appropriate to simply equate any of them with 'lagipun', even though the latter also introduces an additional premise or evidence. In this section, I aim to briefly compare the function of 'lagipun' with two of these particles in English, namely 'moreover' and 'besides'. I have chosen these two particles, especially 'moreover', because it can be argued that some of the examples of 'lagipun' that I have described can be said to be very similar to 'moreover' and also, 'besides'. In the

case of 'moreover', the similarity might suggest two things. First, 'moreover' can be translated to 'lagipun' or vice versa and second, like 'moreover', 'lagipun' might have a second use. However, I will show that either suggestion is not possible since first and foremost, the extended definition of 'lagipun' describes a different function from 'moreover' and second, the Malay discourse particle is only employed in certain circumstances.

6.2.5.1 Moreover And Lagipun

The first example of the connective particles that I will look at is 'moreover'. Blakemore (1987:91-97) in her analysis of the word identifies two uses of 'moreover'. The first is to indicate "that the two propositions are connected by the fact that they are premises for the same conclusion" and the second, to indicate "that the propositions it connects are combined as premises in the same argument". I have also briefly described the inferential uses of 'moreover' in Chapter Four. However, for the purpose of the current discussion, it will be necessary for me to repeat some of the points that I have touched in the previous description.

In this discussion, I will use the same two examples, (19) and (20), used by Blakemore to demonstrate the two uses respectively:

- (19) Susan has bought a tracksuit. Moreover, she had salad for lunch.
- (20) Tom is here. Moreover, he's bought his guitar.

I will begin the discussion with the first use. Briefly , 'moreover' indicates that the conclusions for both propositions in (19), must be (21).

(21) Susan intends to lose weight.

This conclusion is achieved by constraining the contextual assumptions that are brought into play in the interpretation processes of both propositions. Blakemore suggests that in order to access the intended conclusion in (21), the hearer necessarily has to access these two assumptions:

(22)

- a. If Susan has bought a tracksuit, then she intends to lose weight.
- b. If Susan ate salad for lunch, then she intends to lose weight.

In this sense, 'moreover' can be said to constrain "not only for the interpretation of the proposition it introduces, but also for the interpretation of the proposition in the preceding sentence." (ibid. 93). In this particular interpretation process, the hearer is instructed to interpret the first proposition in (19) as an evidence for conclusion (21) and the second as an additional evidence that guarantees the factuality of (21).

The second use of 'moreover' on the other hand, is also used to introduce an additional premise but this time, it guides the hearer to a particular conclusion which she would not have been able to access at all had she depended on the first premise alone. In other words, unlike the first use of 'moreover' as described above, the two premises implied by utterance (20) are to be combined together as premises in the same argument to achieve first, the conditional premise in (23a) and then the intended conclusion in (23e):

(23)

- a. If Tom is here and he has brought his guitar, then we can have some music.
- b. Tom is here.
- c. If Tom has brought his guitar, we can have some music.
- d. Tom has brought his guitar.
- e. We can have some music.

The main point here is that the contextual assumption - conditional premise (23a), and the conclusion (23e), will only be accessible with the introduction of the second premise by 'moreover'. However, like the first use of 'moreover', this use of moreover also "...constrains the hearer's choice of context so that the proposition in the first sentence is interpreted as evidence for a specific conclusion..." and the second as an additional evidence for that same conclusion (Blakemore *ibid.* 97). To summarise, the first use of 'moreover' on the one hand,

guarantees the factuality of a conclusion that is introduced by the preceding proposition. The second use of 'moreover, on the other hand, helps the hearer to access a conclusion which would have been unobtainable without the second premise prefaced by 'moreover'.

Part of the instruction implied by the two uses of 'moreover' is similar to the instruction that is implied by 'lagipun', that is, to indicate that the proposition it introduces should be taken as an additional assumption in an utterance that contains it. As we have seen, in both uses of 'moreover', the conclusion for the first premise C_1 should be the same as the conclusion for the second C_2 . This condition is necessary in order to make sure that the factuality in (19) is guaranteed and the derivation of an intended conclusion in (21) is achieved. However, for 'lagipun', this condition is not necessary since the second premise does not contribute directly to the 'forming' of the preceding conclusion. In other words, if 'lagipun' is used instead of 'moreover' in the above example, the decision to eat salad for lunch, for example, will not be treated as a direct result for Susan's intention to lose weight. Rather, it will be treated solely as an extra evidence (eating salad is one of the ways of losing weight), to be combined into the ongoing argument. The reason for the combination is for the strengthening of a state of affairs as implied by the preceding utterance.

In this sense, 'lagipun' can be said to be similar, if not the same, to the second use of 'moreover', where the two premises in the utterance that contains either of them are combined in the same argument to derive a particular contextual effect. For 'moreover', the effect will be the derived contextual implication which is unobtainable from the interpretation of the first premise alone. If we look at the interpretation process of (20) again, we can deduce that the importance of accessing the conjunctive assumption in (23a) first to derive the conclusion in (23e). However, in the case of 'lagipun', the importance is not placed on working out the conclusion of the first premise but to strengthen a certain conclusion that has been made manifest by the preceding proposition. This is because, first, in most cases, the intended contextual implication for the first premise is always easily accessible. The point here is that, although 'lagipun' plays a role in constraining the conclusion for the first and second propositions of the utterance that contains it, this role is only secondary if compared to the role played by 'moreover'.

Second, the constraining only comes into play when the state of affairs that needs to be strengthened is vaguely implied and needs to be reconfirmed. Furthermore, 'lagipun' is usually used in an argumentative context or in circumstance where an earlier assertion or claim has been made and backed up with an evidence or proof that can either be explicitly or implicitly given. For example,

the assertion in (9), on the one hand, is explicit because it is a direct answer to a question posed by Andaga. In (12) on the other hand, the assertion is implicit but easily accessible as a direct refusal to Perisai's invitation since the logical response to an invitation is either yes or no.

Therefore, if we substitute 'moreover' in both (19) and (20) with 'lagipun', the utterances would be regarded as incomplete. For example:

- (19b) Susan dah beli tracksuit. 'Lagipun', dia makan salad tengahari tadi.
Susan has bought a tracksuit. Lagipun, she had salad for lunch.
- (20b) Tom sudah datang. Lagipun, dia ada membawa gitarnya.
Tom is here. Lagipun, he's bought his guitar.

First of all, the interpretations that are implied by 'moreover' for both cases are not accessible when 'lagipun' is used instead. Second, both sentences, like I have said, seem oddly incomplete. For either example, certain information such as 'why Susan has bought the tracksuit' and 'why is it important to declare that Tom is here' need to be specified first, either explicitly or implicitly. For example:

(19c)

- A: Susan memang bersungguh nak hilangkan berat badan.
Susan really serious want lose weight body..
Susan is really serious about losing weight.
- B: Macammana awak tahu?

How you know?

How do you know?

A: *Sebab dia dah beli seluar trek.*

Because she already buy pant track.

Because she has bought herself a tracksuit.

Lagipun dia dah mula makan salad saja waktu makan.

Lagipun she already start eat salad only time eat.

Lagipun she has already started to eat salad only.

(20c)

A: *Radio kita rosak. Kita tak dapat main musik untuk malam ini.*

Radio we broken. We no can play music for night this.

Our radio is broken. We can't play any music tonight.

B: *Jangan bimbang. Tom ada kat sini. Lagipun dia ada bawak gitar die.*

No worry. Tom have near here. [cp]-Lagipun he have bring guitar he.

Don't worry. Tom's here. Lagipun he's bought his guitar with him.

In other words, unlike 'moreover', 'lagipun' is used when the speaker feels there is a chance that the first premise will not be strong enough to uphold the truth or factuality of the conclusions given. In other words, whenever there is a feeling that the first evidence given is felt to be too weak to support an assertion or claim that has just been made, 'lagipun' will be used to provide the needed additional proof or evidence.

Again, unlike 'moreover', 'lagipun' indicates that the assumption that it introduces is not just merely an additional evidence or proof but is greater in strength if

compared to the first evidence. In other words it cannot merely replicate the strength of the preceding premise since the introduction of it is due to the realisation that the first premise might not have enough strength in itself to uphold the conclusion it is evidenced for.

6.2.5.2 Besides And Lagipun.

Another discourse particle in English that seems to display the same function as 'lagipun' is 'besides'. For example (25), taken from Blakemore (1992:140):

(25)

A: Will you make pancakes?

B: I haven't really got time tonight. Besides there's no milk.

(numbering the same as Blakemore's)

Briefly, according to Blakemore, the first segment of B's reply implies that he will not make pancakes and his reason being that he does not have time to do so that night. Then B continues with 'besides' in the second segment of his utterance to indicate to A that the proposition it introduces should be taken as an additional evidence that strengthens the factuality of the preceding assumption. In order to access this interpretation, Blakemore says that the hearer must derive (26) from both segments of B's reply.

(26) B will not make pancakes.

However, following my argument for 'lagipun', I want to suggest that B in a sense must have a good reason for wanting to make the implication of his preceding assumption stronger. He has, after all, made his first 'excuse' why he will not make pancakes that night, explicit to A in the preceding utterance. One explanation would be because he feels if he had not continued his utterance as above, his first response might possibly lead A to offer to help him make the pancakes, for example, so that not much time is needed if two of them are doing it. This response and many other responses to the same effect are possible. However, whatever his reason might be, he feels that he has to introduce an additional reason that will strengthen his claim and thus, making his first answer more definite. In a way, B is saying, even if he could spare a little time to make the pancakes, he would still not be able to do so since there is no milk left. Seen in this way, we can say 'besides', just like 'lagipun', suggests that the evidence that it introduces does not, in the first instance, contribute directly B's decision not to make pancakes. Rather, it suggests that the assumption that it introduces, is to be treated as an additional premise which is greater in strength than the first premise and thus, should be able to uphold the strength of the initial conclusion, should the preceding premise fails to do so. This additional assumption then should be contextualised in the preceding assumption to

yield the same conclusion and thus strengthening the initial conclusion.

6.2.6 Conclusion

In this chapter I have shown how a connective particle, particularly, 'lagipun' is employed to constrain two sets of contextual assumptions so that only the intended effects are achieved. First of all, in section 6.2.3, I discussed very briefly the function of 'lagipun' and then in section 6.2.4, I extended my definition of the particle to cover the other underlying inferential process that it implies. Basically, 'lagipun' indicates that the assumption of the proposition it introduces is to be taken as an additional premise. It should be used as an extra evidence or proof to reinforce a certain state of affairs, a claim or decision, which has been explicitly or implicitly implied in the preceding utterance. Sometimes, prior to the use of 'lagipun', a premise or an evidence is given as a direct cause for the existence of that state of affairs. However, in some occasions the given evidence is perceived by the speaker himself as not strong enough to sustain the existence of the state of affairs. As a result, an additional premise which is also greater in strength is needed to reinforce its strength. Following Sperber and Wilson's definition of 'independent strengthening', I suggest that although the two set of premises involved in the utterances containing 'lagipun' only display a similar, if not the same conclusion, the

above notion is still encapsulated in the procedural instruction carried by 'lagipun'. This approach to 'lagipun' is preferred since the evidence introduced does not have a direct consequence to the decision that has been made by the speaker. It is merely introduced as an extra evidence that supports the claim since a similar situation will produce similar or the same conclusion.

CHAPTER SEVEN

DENIAL OF BELIEFS

7.1 Introduction

The set of information that we have gathered during a communication process will be readily available in our short term memory for a period of time after which, it will be transferred to our long term memory and thus will be less accessible. Prior to and after the transfer, the set of information and also the other stored assumptions may be used in various other interpretation processes where the potential for any of them to be strengthened or weakened and eventually eliminated exists. When the factuality of the information receives a further strengthening, the beliefs that the set represents become better-evidenced and stronger. It can also lose its credibility due to the introduction of a new set of information which contradicts its existence as a true representation of the world. When this is the case, the strength of the information will be weakened and eventually eliminated.

The purpose of the present chapter is to discuss how the second process can be achieved by using specialised connectives like 'tetapi' and 'walaubagaimanapun' in Malay. These connectives instruct the hearer to contradict, weaken and eventually erase a particular conclusion by introducing another conclusion which is in

conflict with it. My aim will be to examine these connectives and eventually ascertain their functions according to the instructions that they give.

7.2 Weakening And Elimination Of Assumption.

An assumption receives its strength from the premises that are used to derive it. The greater in strength the premises are, the more reliable the assumption is perceived to be. As I have shown in the previous chapter, sometimes the same assumption can receive further strengthening with the introduction of a set of new evidence that substantiates its truth further. Consider the following example:

(1)

- a. <ella`> sis.. dengar cite terbaru milo ngan
lilimerah dak?
 sis.. dengar cerita terbaru milo
 dengan lilimerah tak?
 *sis.. hear story latest milo with
 lilimerah no?*
 Sis, have you heard the latest story
 about Milo and Lilimerah?
- b. <JemCiKu> eh tak de.. hari tu kata dah tak ada
apa2 dah?
 eh tak ada.. hari itu kata sudah tak
 ada apa-apa sudah?
 *eh no have.. day that say already no
 have what-what already?*
 No. Did they say that they don't have
 anything going on anymore?
- c. <JemCiKu> nape nisa?
 kenapa nisa?
 why nisa?
 Why Nisa?

**PAGE
MISSING
IN
ORIGINAL**

*yesterday friend we say, milo still
ask her out [nl]-week once..*

My friend told me yesterday that Milo still takes her (Lilimerah) out once week.

Unexpectedly, Ella introduces a proposition which is inconsistent with the expectation in (2). This piece of information inevitably forces Jemciku to revise her belief in (2) and also question the validity of any of the assumptions in (3a-b) or any related other assumptions that she might have entertained prior to hearing Ella's utterance in (4). However, before Jemciku makes the decision to eliminate any of these assumptions, she has to, according to Sperber and Wilson (1995:114), take into account the strength of the two assumptions. If the strength of the two assumptions can be measured, the weaker of the two will be eliminated. Therefore, if for example Milo has told Jemciku himself that he really does not like Lilimerah but does not have the heart to tell her so, then the strength of at least one of (3a-c) can be considered as greater than the new assumptions (5). If no further evidence is provided to weaken the existing assumptions, then the new information will be eventually rejected.

On the other hand, if the assumptions implied by Ella's utterance in (4) is further proven to be true, Jemciku's initial assumption in (2) and any other assumptions that support its truth will likely to be

eliminated from her encyclopaedic memory and replaced by a new belief (3) for example:

(5) Milo still likes Lilimerah.

Now, if this is the intended conclusion that Ella wishes Jemciku to make, then her intention is successfully communicated. However, it is possible that the set of assumptions that Ella is hoping Jemciku to retrieve in interpreting her utterance may or may not exist in the Jemciku's actual cognitive environment. If she has made the wrong assumption about the kinds of assumptions that Jemciku possesses, then the intended contextual effects will not be met. There is also a possibility that Jemciku will access a totally different set of contextual assumptions and related conclusions into the interpretation process, for example:

(6)

- a. If Milo takes Lilimerah out, he must feel sorry for Lilimerah.
- b. Milo takes Lilimerah out.
- c. Milo must feel sorry for Lilimerah.

Conclusion I: Milo must feel sorry for Lilimerah.

- d. If Milo feels sorry for Lilimerah, he is treating Lilimerah well despite the fact that he hates her

Conclusion II: Milo is treating Lilimerah well despite the fact that he hates her.

- e. If Milo is treating Lilimerah well despite the fact that he hates her, Milo is a nice person.

Conclusion III: Milo is a nice person.

This kind of interpretation process could go on depending on what Jemciku assumes Ella wishes her to conclude from her utterance. However, Ella can avoid this potential misinterpretation by making her intention clearer. One way to do this is by giving further information and explanation until the intended contextual effect is achieved. Another more economical way is by guiding Jemciku to right interpretation with the help of the most appropriate discourse particle.

In the sections that follow, I will discuss two such connectives in Malay, namely 'tetapi', and 'walaubagaimanapun'. Traditionally, they are defined according to what they do syntactically, that is to join two words, phrases or sentences that are opposing in meanings together. As a result, the tendency is to equate the two connectives as carrying the same general function and then lump them under one category. However, I will show, although each of them seems to indicate the same function, the exact inferential process that each gives differs from one another. This in turn suggests that they should be separated according to what they do inferentially and not what they do syntactically. This will be the objective of my discussion which will start with a brief description of the connective 'tetapi'. Then

it will be followed by a brief comparison between it and the connective 'walaubagaimanapun'. Finally, I will discuss in details the differences, if any, and then build a separate definition for each.

7.3 Tetapi: Denial Of A Belief

The most typical contradicting connective in Malay language is 'tetapi' which is used both in spoken and written discourse. Sometimes the spelling and thus the pronunciation of the word is shortened into 'tapi'. However, the variation does not in any way affect the basic function of the word as a connective. Therefore, in the discussion that follows and also elsewhere, I will use either word interchangeably to refer to the same connective.

Basically, 'tetapi' has the same procedural instruction as 'but' in English. Its main instruction is to introduce a proposition which is relevant as a denial of an expectation implied by the preceding proposition. As a result, my analysis of 'tetapi' will follow Blakemore's description for 'but' (1987; 1989). First consider the following example:

(7)

<emas`>	projek burn cam ne? projek burn macamma? <i>project burn how?</i> How's Burn's project going?
<shanee`>	sian kat burn ler.. kesian dekat burn lah.. <i>sympathy near burn [dm]-lah..</i>

- I sympathise with Burn.
- <emas`> ler burn dah ada isteri
 lah burn sudah ada isteri
 [dm]-lah burn already have wife
 Burn has a wife.
- <shanee`> ada isteri tapi tak reti nak tolong wooo
 ada isteri tapi tak mengerti nak tolong
 wooo
 have wife [cp]-tapi no understand want
 help [ex]-wooo
 He has a wife tapi she doesn't know how
 to help.

(Appendix B Extract 25: 34-40)

Following the definition of 'but', 'tetapi' indicates that the proposition it introduces is inconsistent with the assumption that is derived from the preceding proposition. In other words, it indicates that the second segment of Shanee's utterance is introduced as a denial of expectation that Shanee believes Emas' possesses. In other words, prior to processing Shanee's utterance with 'tapi' in the above, Emas is expected to have derived (8c) through the contextualisation of (8b) in (8a):

(8)

- a. If Burn has a wife, then he gets some help with his project.
- b. Burn has a wife.
- c. Burn gets some help with his project.

If Emas believes and trusts that the new assumption is stronger than the preceding assumption, the result of the interpretation will eventually lead to the elimination of assumption (8c) and also its contextual assumption (8a)

from his cognitive environment. Now consider a further example:

(9)

- a. Iguana tanya namakupan; cappucino tak der ke?
Iguana tanya namakupan; cappucino tak ada kah?
Iguana ask namakupan; cappuccino no have [qp]-kah?
Iguana asks Namakupan; You don't have cappuccino, do you?
- b. Namakupan: ade tapi gula abis
 ada tapi gula habis
 have [cp]-tapi sugar finish.
 Yes, I have but I have ran out of
 sugar.

(Appendix B Extract 9: 1191-1193)

Iguana's query here can be seen as an indirect request to be served cappuccino and the assumption that is being entertained by him prior to processing Namakupan's response is essentially (10):

- (10) Namakupan will serve me cappuccino (if there is any).

Namakupan's utterance with 'tapi' is different from Shanee's. Here, the contradicting conclusion that she wishes to convey is implicitly given by her indirect answer with 'tetapi'. However, Iguana will be able to work out with the help of 'tapi' that whatever implication that Shanee's utterance introduces, it necessarily has to be the one that directly denies his expectation in (10). In other words, 'tetapi' forces Iguana to only infer a specific conclusion implied by the second segment of

Namakupan's reply and this implication should be in contrast with (10). In order to access the intended implication, Iguana has to contextualise assumption (11b), derived from Namakupan's response, in contextual assumption (11a) to access the implication (11c):

(11)

- a. If there is no sugar left, then there will be no cappuccino served.
- b. There is no sugar left.
- c. There will be no cappuccino served.

In both examples, Shanee and Namakupan assume that the contextual implications or expectations (8c) and (10) are respectively being entertained by Emas and Iguana prior to the introduction of the information intended to deny them. In other words they are aware that their hearers are entertaining some expectations that they know are not relevant or no longer relevant at that the time of conversation and therefore wish to deny. However, it is also possible that Emas and Iguana might have brought totally different contextual assumptions into the interpretation processes and thus derived totally different contextual implications. However, this does not mean that the interpretation process has collapsed. Instead, following Rouchouta (1993), 'tetapi' will 'alert' Emas and Iguana to revise their interpretations by reinterpreting the preceding proposition accordingly.

Following this, it is also possible to say that Shanee, in making the utterance with 'tetapi' above,

actually intends to inform Emas of her previous own expectation that is currently denied by the second proposition. Even if Emas does not know, prior to the conversation that Shanee had believed that Burn's wife would help him with his project, he will be able to deduce that this is so after interpreting her utterance. In other words, 'tetapi' forces Emas to access (8c) as what Shanee had believed and now is being denied. Resulting from this observation, it can be said that 'tetapi' can also be used to constrain the kind of contextual assumptions that a hearer brings into processing the preceding utterance. To show this, let us return to examples (1) (part of it has been deleted for convenience) and (4), repeated below:

(1)

- d. <ella`> iyer.. milo ada kate kat nisa dia tak suke sangat kat lili dah.
 ya.. milo ada kata dekat nisa dia tak suka sangat dekat lili sudah.
 yes.. milo have say near nisa he no like very near lili already.
 Yes. Milo did say he really doesn't like Lili anymore.

(Appendix B Extract 8: 1262)

(4)

- <ella`> semalam kawan kita kata, milo masih ajak die keluar seminggu sekali..
 yesterday friend we say, milo still ask her out [nl]-week once..
 My friend told me yesterday that Milo still asks her (Lilimerah) out once week.

Let us say that Jemciku possesses (12) in her cognitive environment after she found out that Milo and Lilimerah are no longer together.

(12) Milo has stopped taking Lilimerah out.

Jemciku will not be wrong, in interpreting Ella's utterance in (4), to abandon her belief in (12) since the new information has devalued its strength. However, there is no guarantee that this contextual effect is indeed the one that Ella has intended since she has not specifically indicated in her utterance that she wishes Jemciku to deny her original belief. By the same token, if Ella has intended her utterance to deny the above belief, there is also no guarantee that Jemciku will definitely recognise this intention. A totally different interpretation process might instead suffice and all sorts of irrelevant assumptions would also be accessed and processed. The effort required would be highly unnecessary since Jemciku is in no way near achieving the intended interpretation. Now, let us consider Ella's original utterance as stated in example (13) below:

(13)

<ella`> tapi semalam kawan kita kata, milo
 masih ajak die keluar seminggu
 sekali..
 [cp]-tapi yesterday friend we say,
 milo still ask her out [nl]-week
 once..

But my friend told me yesterday that Milo still asks her (Lilimerah) out once week.

Firstly, 'tapi' indicates to Jemciku that the proposition that is attached to it is meant to deny a specific implication that Ella has grounds for thinking that she has derived. Secondly, it indicates to Jemciku that this is the only assumption that should be entered in the interpretation process. Nevertheless, there is also a chance that the contextual assumption might not be accessible to Jemciku at that point of interpretation process simply because the contextual assumptions that Ella has thought Jemciku has available are different from hers. However, 'tetapi' prevents Jemciku from accessing the irrelevant contextual assumptions other than the one that implies a contextual implication which is in contrast to the one introduced in the second segment. In other words, Jemciku is only required to form the necessary contextual assumptions (14) below in order to derive (12) above.

- (14) If Milo really does not like Lilimerah anymore, then he has stopped taking Lilimerah out.

Lastly, related to the first, no other subsequent interpretation is required once (12) has been denied, weakened or even eliminated. Therefore, while it can still be argued that (13) could still imply any of the assumptions in (3) and also in (6), the fact that Ella

uses 'tapi' in her utterance, specifies that she wishes the implication of the proposition she introduces to only deny and eliminate the contextual implication (12).

7.4 Walaubagaimanapun

Earlier in the chapter, I identified 'tetapi' and 'walaubagaimanapun' as two examples of contrastive particles that may be used to contradict, weaken and eventually erase an assumption by introducing a proposition that is in conflict with it. However, in saying that 'walaubagaimanapun' and 'tetapi' exhibit the same function, does not mean that they can be automatically likened to each other since each of them. I will argue that they have their own unique inferential instructions. Thus, if 'walaubagaimanapun' is interchanged with 'tetapi' in (15) for example, the interpretation requirement for the utterance will, not surprisingly, be different from that of the original interpretation.

(15)

<ella`> walabagaimanapun semalam kawan kita kata,
milo masih ajak die keluar seminggu sekali..
*[cp]-walaubagaimanapun yesterday friend we
say, milo still ask her out [nl]-week once..*
Walaubagaimanapun my friend told me
yesterday that Milo still asks her
(Lilimerah) out once week.

Apart from being defined as carrying the same function as 'tetapi', 'walaubagaimanapun' is also traditionally defined as having an emphatic directive embedded in its instruction (Masri 1997). This might also explain why there is a different interpretation requirement when 'walaubagaimanapun' is replaced with 'tetapi' in (15). However, to say 'walaubagaimanapun' as having an emphatic instruction is not enough to explain the difference. We have to work out why this emphatic instruction is associated with 'walaubagaimanapun' but not 'tetapi'.

Briefly in this section, I will compare the difference or differences between 'tetapi' and 'walaubagaimanapun' and then in the section that directly follows this, I will try to explain the differences according to the inferential processes that each of them indicates. The end result will be to separate the definition of 'walaubagaimanapun' from that of 'tetapi' and form an independent definition that will be unique to each connective. Ensuing from this, a large part of my discussion will then involve comparing in 'walaubagaimanapun' with 'tetapi'. Let us begin with (16) below:

(16)

- a. <jetman> hei edoraaaaa..dah makan ke
 hei edora.. sudah makan kah
 hey edora.. already eat [qp]-kah
 Hey Edora! Have you eaten?
- b. edoraku tunggu orang belanja jer
 edoraku tunggu orang belanja saja

edoraku wait people pay only

Edoraku is waiting for somebody to pay (for her meal).

- c. <jetman> *edora..economy meleset..*
edora..economy meleset..
edora..economy recession..
Edora, the economy is in recession..
- d. <edoraku> *aku tau, ekonomi meleset..*
I know, economy recession..
I know, the economy is in recession..
- e. <edoraku> *tetapi hang kena belanja gak....*
'tetapi hang kena belanja juga....
[cp]-tetapi you have pay also....
But you still have to treat me to a meal.

(Appendix B Extract 10: 2269-2273)

In the above, the final utterance (16e) with 'walaubagaimanapun' has been modified to include 'tetapi' instead to suit the purpose of the ensuing discussion. However, I will return to the original example when I start comparing the two connectives in detail later.

Now, let us first of all, examine Jetman's response in (16c). His indirect reply here essentially implies an assumption (17b) which when contextualised in contextual assumption (17a) will result in contextual implication (17c). This assumption when processed with other contextual assumptions, for example (18a-c) will result in a number of other contextual implications, including a conclusion that contradicts the expectation that Edoraku makes prior to his reply.

(17)

- a. If the economy is in recession, then Jetman is having problem with money.
- b. The economy is in recession.
- c. Jetman is having problem with money.

(18)

- a. If Jetman is having a problem with money, then he cannot treat me to a meal.
- b. If Jetman is having a problem with money, then he will not be too generous with his money.
- c. If Jetman is having a problem with money, then he cannot afford to eat out himself.

In response to this, Edoraku confirms the truth of the explicature of Jetman's response with her utterance in (16d) and its subsequent assumptions in (18a-c). However, with 'tetapi', she indicates that she intends to reject only a specific assumption in (18) by introducing a proposition which conveys contradicting assumption (19) below:

(19) Jetman has to treat her to a meal.

Next, let us examine Edoraku's original utterances, stated as (20a-b) below:

(20)

- a. <edoraku> aku tau, ekonomi meleset..
I know, economy recession..
I know, the economy is in recession..
- b. <edoraku> gaineipun hang kena belanja gak....
'walaubagaimanapun' hang kena belanja juga....
[cp]-'walaubagaimanapun' you have pay also....

You still have to treat me to a meal
(I don't care).

Here, just like 'tetapi', 'walaubagaimanapun' indicates that the second proposition of the utterance carries a specific assumption (19) which is also to be taken as in opposition with expectation (18a). However, the similarity of the procedural process ends here. Unlike 'tetapi', 'walaubagaimanapun' indicates that the introduced conclusion is not only to be used to deny the expectation implied by the preceding proposition but also all of the assumptions that will imply this expectation. Recall that according to Sperber and Wilson (1995), if one of the contradicting assumptions is stronger than the other and no further proofs are immediately given to revive its strength, then the weaker one will be erased along with the other assumptions that implies it. Therefore, in the case of 'tetapi', since only a specific expectation is identified and then duly denied, the possibility for other assumptions, for example (18b-c) in the above, to uphold its strength after the interpretation process is still likely. In contrast to this, the introduction of a conclusion by 'walaubagaimanapun' is not only meant to weaken the expectation that may have been made manifest due to the introduction of the second proposition but also other assumptions that implied the contextual implication. As a result, the strength of the presented assumption (19) will increase and very hard to dispute. This in turn explains the attributed belief that

'walaubagaimanapun' has embedded in its instruction an emphatic directive. I will explain this further in the next section. For the moment, let us consider a further example (21):

(21)

- a. <minah> sis.. aie nak masuk askar sis, sedih
le..
sis.. aie nak masuk askar sis, sedih
lah.
sis.. aie want enter army sis, sad
[dm]-lah
Sis, Aie wants to join the Army Sis.
I'm so sad.
- b. <cozza> mak ayah die tak kate pe ke?
mak ayah dia tak kata apa kah? .
mother father he no say what [dm]-kah?
His parents didn't say anything, did
they?
- c. <minah> ayah bangkang.. sis tau lah ayah die..
garang..
ayah bangkang.. sis tau lah ayah dia..
garang..
father against.. sis know [dm]-lah
father his.. fierce
His father is against it. Sis, you
know what his father is like, fierce.
- d. <minah> hmm bagaimanepon... dia pi daftar nama
die semalam..
hmm walaubagaimanapun .. dia pergi
daftar nama dia semalam..
walaubagaimanapun... *he go register*
name he yesterday..
He went on to register his name
yesterday.

(Appendix B Extract 11: 1629-1634)

Briefly, the implication that Cozza should have derived from the first part of the utterance as indicated by 'walaubagaimanapun' is (22):

(22) Aie will not register his name.

If she has failed to derive this, she will be forced to retrieve it by accessing contextual assumption (23) below:

(23)

If Aie's father oppose to him joining the army, he will not register his name.

However, the primary function of 'walaubagaimanapun' is to introduce a contradictory conclusion which denies not only (22) but all of the accessible assumptions related to the preceding proposition. The possibility that the other assumptions could help it increases its strength is in a way indicated as unlikely. For example, in interpreting (21c), Cozza would probably have accessed (22) and also the related assumptions below:

(24)

- a. Aie is scared of his father.
- b. Aie has never made his own decision.
- c. Aie always listens to his father without questions.

However, in interpreting the second proposition, 'walaubagaimanapun' indicates to Cozza that these assumptions are no longer reliable because they do not

have any effect at all in preventing Aie from registering with the army.

In this section, I have briefly identified two main differences between 'walaubagaimanapun' and 'tetapi' as outlined in (25). I will discuss them further in the following section.

(25)

- a. The emphatic use of 'walaubagaimanapun' exists.
- b. All assumptions that imply the expectation are erased.

7.4.1 Walaubagaimanapun: Emphatic Effects

Earlier in the discussion of 'walaubagaimanapun', I mentioned that traditionally, it is defined to be an emphatic version of 'tetapi'. In the previous section, I suggested that this notion is derived due the fact that 'walaubagaimanapun' not only instructs the hearer to abandon the expectation but also any of its related assumptions. In contrast, I said the proposition that 'tetapi' introduces is meant to only deny a specific expectation that the speaker thinks he entertains at the time the utterance is made. To illustrate further, consider the following example:

(26)

Nasi dah masak dah tapi kita tak boleh makan lagi.
Rise already cook already [dl]-tapi no can eat again.

The rice is cooked but we can't eat yet.

Here, the implication of the first proposition is assumption (28) which is in conflict with explicature (29) as expressed by the proposition introduced by 'tetapi':

(27) If the rice is cooked, we can eat.

(28) We can eat.

(29) We cannot eat yet.

Following my definition of 'tetapi', the only assumption that the hearer in the above example will abandon will be the implicated expectation (28) and its contextual assumption in (27). The question now is how does the hearer know that this is the only contextual assumption that she is supposed to abandon? In order to answer this, let us consider the first segment of utterance (26). On the one hand, other than implying (30a), we can say that the proposition (the rice is cooked) also implies (30b-d) below:

(30)

a. If the rice is cooked, then we can eat.

b. If the rice is cooked, then we can take it to mum's.

c. If the rice is cooked, then you've proven that you can cook.

d. If the rice is cooked, then we can start heating up the other dishes.

On the other hand, it is possible that the same contextual implication implied by the preceding proposition to be derived from this set of assumptions:

(31)

- a. If the rice is cooked, then we can eat.
- b. If we have nothing else to cook, then we can eat.
- c. If we are hungry, then we can eat.
- d. If father is here, then we can eat.

Having established this, let us go back to example (26).

Recall that 'tetapi', like 'but' instructs the hearer to choose a specific contextual implication to be denied.

Following this, we can deduce that the contextual implication (28) is in actual fact accessed from the set of possible contextual assumptions in (30). Therefore, from this set, the hearer is instructed to only select and deny contextual assumption (30a) along with its implication. Next let us consider the same utterance and this time, with the discourse connective

'walaubagaimanapun' as in (32):

(32)

Nasi dah masak dah 'walaubagaimanapun' kita tak boleh makan lagi.

Rise already cook already [dl]-tapi no can eat again.

The rice is cooked 'walaubagaimanapun' we can't eat yet.

The instruction here is also for the hearer to select and deny contextual implication (28). However, unlike 'tetapi', this time, the hearer is instructed to select it from the set of contextual assumptions in (31). Following from this, we can say, unlike 'tetapi',

'walaubagaimanapun' indicates to the hearer that the proposition that it introduces is in actual fact an implication for a selection of contextual assumptions. Therefore, when the implication is denied, all of the possible contextual assumptions are also denied. However, how does the hearer know that this is the intended interpretation? To answer this, let us examine example (33) below. The conversation itself is very long and some of it has been left out deliberately for convenience. However, a complete translation is attached in Appendix B.

(33)

- a. <poyon> bila hang nak pulang cd aku tu?
when [dl]-you want back cd I that?
 When are you going to return my cd?
 (.../)
- b. <tembok> aku tak boleh.. tak ada masa.. aku
 keje.. takpahaman hang nih
 aku tak boleh.. tak ada masa.. aku
 kerja.. tak paham hang ini.
*I no can.. no have time.. I work.. no
 understand [dl]-you this.*
 I can't. I don't have the time. I'm
 working. You just don't understand.
- c. <poyon> aku tak peduli.. hang keje ke.. hang
 letih ke..
 aku tak peduli.. hang kerja kah.. hang
 letih kah..
*I no care.. [dl]-you work [qp]-kah..
 [dl]-you tired [qp]-kah*
 I don't care if you're working or
 tired..
- d. <poyon> hehe.. hang ada hal
 ngan anak bini pun aku tak kira..
 hehe.. hang ada hal dengan anak bini
 pun aku tak kira..

[laughs].. [dl]-you have problem with
son wife [dp]-pun I no count..

Even if you're having problems with
your family, I don't care.

e. <poyon>

hang anto gak..

hang hantar juga..

[dl]-you send also..

You have to return (the cd).

(Appendix B Extract12: 2885-2900)

Briefly, Tembok expects Poyon to give him more time to return the cd he has borrowed by giving Poyon two reasons why he has not returned it sooner. The assumptions of his utterances are (34a-b), as listed below:

(34)

- a. If Tembok is busy, then he does not have the time to return the cd.
- b. If Tembok has work to do, then he does not have the time to return the cd.
- c. If Tembok is tired, then he does not have the time to return the cd.
- d. If Tembok has problem with his wife and children, he does not have the time to return the cd.

However, Poyon denies this request and indicates that the two assumptions and any other assumptions that have caused him not returning the cd (he suggests another two himself, assumptions (34c-d)) are no longer relevant and thus denied as unacceptable. In a way, he is indicating that these assumptions will not help in persuading him to change his demand. In other words, he is rejecting all of the possibilities that might help Tembok bidding his time.

This intention is further echoed later in the rest of the conversation (33') as illustrated below:

(33')

(.../)

- a. <poyon> senyap lah shahrinn.. aku nak cd aku..
quiet [dm]-lah shahrinn.. I want cd I..
Be quite Shahrin. I want my cd.
- b. <tembok> tak paham bahas ke... tak boleh..
tak paham [sp]-bahasa kah.. tak boleh..
no understand language [qp]-kah.. no can..
You don't understand that I can't?
- c. <poyon> hang tak boleh..
[dl]-you no can..
You can't..
- d. <poyon> gaimanapun.. hang anto shahrinnn..
walaubagaimanapun hang hantar shahrin..
[cp]-walaubagaimanapun [dl]-you send shahrin
You have to return (the cd, I don't care).

(Appendix B Extract 12: 2917-2921)

This time, Poyon uses 'walaubagaimanapun' to indicate what he has explicitly expressed to Tembok previously. Here, he is also implicitly saying that he is still rejecting Tembok's request and all of the assumptions that might imply and support it later. This further confirms my earlier claim that the actual contextual implication that 'walaubagaimanapun' is denying is derived from a different

set of contextual assumptions from 'tetapi'. Consider another similar example (35) below:

(35)

- a. gMie: aku nak tido dahhh..
 aku nak tidur sudah..
 I want sleep already
 I want to go to sleep now.
- b. Namakupan: jangan lahh... aku sorang2 nih
 jangan lah.. aku seorang-orang ini.
 Don't [dm]-lah.. I one-one this
 Please, don't. I'm on my own.
- c. Namakupan: jangan lah tido... hang tak suka aku
 ke?
 jangan lah tidur... hang tak suka aku
 kah?
 don't [dm]-lah sleep... [dl]-you no
 like me [qp]-kah?
 Please don't go to sleep. You don't
 like me?
- d. gMie: eishh sapa kata tak suka.. tapi aku
 ngantuk lah..
 eishh siapa kata tak suka.. tapi aku
 mengantuk lah..
 [ex] who say no like.. but I sleeply
 [dm]-lah
 I never said that but I'm sleepy.
- e. Namakupan: alaa... sekejap je.. ko kan baik
 alah.. sekejap saja.. kau kan baik.
 [dm]-alah.. while only.. you [qp]-kan
 nice
 Just for a while. You're nice person.
- f. gMie: laa aku tau aku baik tapi aku esok aku
 keje...
 lah.. aku tau aku baik tapi esok aku
 kerja...
 [dm]-lah I know I nice but tomorrow I
 work..
 I know I'm nice but I'm working
 tomorrow.

- h. gMie: aku nak temankan hang... tapi aku tak boleh
I want friend [dl]-you... but I no can
 I want to stay with you, but I can't
- i. Namakupan: walaubagaimanapun.... ko kena duk sini gak...
walaubagaimanapun.... kau kena duduk sini juga.
walaubagaimanapun.... *you have sit here also*
Walaubagaimanapun... you have to stay.
- j. gMie: walaubagaimanapun.... aku nak tido gak....
walaubagaimanapun.... aku nak tidur juga...
walaubagaimanapun.... *I want sleep also...*
Walaubagaimanapun... I want to go to sleep.

(Appendix B Extract 13: 1050-1070)

In this example, Namakupan is trying to persuade Gmie to stay in the chatroom with her. Namakupan gives him some reasons for him to stay and in each case, Gmie denies the expectation that is created by every one of the assumptions that Namakupan has given in (36a-c). Gmie expects that the reasons he gives, which create the assumptions in (37), will support his denials and thus accepted by Namakupan. For example:

(36)

- a. If you like me, then you will not go to bed.
- b. If you are nice person, then you will not go to bed.
- c. If you are my friend, then you will not go to bed.

(37)

- a. If I am sleepy, then she will let me go to bed.
- b. If I have to work early tomorrow, then she will let me go to bed.

Then at the end of the example above, both Namakupan and Gmie uses 'walaubagaimanapun' to contradict each other. With 'walaubagaimanapun', each of them is telling the other that the expectations that they are entertaining are denied and not only that, all of the assumptions that create these expectations are to be abandoned. However, I would like to point out the significant difference between Gmie's use of 'tapi' and 'walaubagaimanapun'. On the one hand, when he uses 'tapi' in utterances (35d) and (35f), he is understood to be denying the expectation and the contextual assumption that directly implies it. On the other hand, when he uses 'walaubagaimanapun', he indicates that he is denying all of the assumptions in (36a-c) and any other that might create this expectations. Due to the kind of instruction that 'walaubagaimanapun' gives, Namakupan's request in the above may sound like an order and Gmie's denial this time sounds more like a retaliation.

I have said earlier, the possibility for an implication denied by 'tetapi' to regain its strength due to the fact that only one particular contextual assumption is being denied and not the rest. For example, in (26), the hearer could respond by saying that she is hungry, and therefore, wishes to eat anyway. The same response,

however, is prevented in the example with 'walaubagaimanapun' in (32).

There are cases, when 'walaubagaimanapun' is interchanged with 'tetapi', the contextual implication that is to be denied will also be changed. This is especially true in cases where the conclusion of the second proposition that is introduced by 'tetapi' is implied. The explanation for this directly relates to the kind of proposition that 'walaubagaimanapun' actually introduces. To illustrate, let us say that the speaker utters (38) with the same intention to deny contextual implication (28):

(38)

The rice is cooked but we have guests.

The intended contextual implication is derived from contextual assumption (39a) as shown below:

(39)

- a. If we have guests, then we cannot eat.
- b. We have guests.
- c. We cannot eat.

If we substitute 'tetapi' with 'walaubagaimanapun' as in (40), the utterance becomes unacceptable in this context:

(40)

*The rice is cooked 'walaubagaimanapun' we have guests.

The explanation for this might be because the proposition that 'walaubagaimanapun' introduces is the actual information or the explicature of the utterance. Therefore, unlike 'tetapi' which can introduce an implicit utterance, 'walaubagaimanapun' can only introduce an explicit utterance. In other words, the conclusion that 'walaubagaimanapun' introduces is the explicature of the second utterance. Therefore, in interpreting (21), the hearer will know that it is the actual explicature of the second utterance that is to be used as the denial and not any other conclusions that might be implied by the proposition (41), for example (42c):

(21)

- d. <minah> hmm bagaimanepon... dia pi daftar nama die semalam..
 hmm walaubagaimanapun .. dia pergi daftar nama dia semalam..
 walaubagaimanapun... he go register name he yesterday..
 He went on to register his name yesterday.

(Appendix B Data4: 1634)

(41) He went to register his name yesterday.

(42)

- a. If he went to register his name yesterday, then he deliberately defies his father.
- b. He went to register his name yesterday.
- c. He deliberately defies his father.

By the same token, if the speaker in (40) has wished to imply (29) with his utterance, he can be said to have chosen an inappropriate discourse connective or he could rephrase his utterance to imply that the reason they cannot eat as in (43):

(43) The rice is cooked 'walaubagaimanapun' we cannot eat because the guests are here.

In this instance, although the speaker specifically indicates why they cannot eat yet, the hearer will still interpret the use of 'walaubagaimanapun' as to indicate that the rest of assumptions (31) should also be denied and thus prevents any counter response.

Briefly, we can define 'walaubagaimanapun' in two stages. First, it introduces an explicature which denies an expectation that is implied by the preceding proposition. The preceding proposition is in actual fact one of the assumptions that implies this expectation. Second, and directly related to this, it instructs the hearer to abandon all of the assumptions that imply this expectation and thus, eliminate the possibility for the expectation to regain its strength. 'Tetapi' on the hand, instructs the hearer to deny a specific expectation that is derived from the first proposition. The expectation is in actual fact one of the expectations that can be derived from the preceding proposition. As a result, it only instructs the hearer to abandon the contextual assumption that directly implies the expectation.

7.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have looked at two contrasting connectives, 'tetapi' and 'walaubagaimanapun'. I have shown that both connectives are used to introduce a proposition that is in conflict with the preceding proposition. As a result, the preceding proposition is denied and then abandoned. Even though this is so, I have argued, the function of each of them still cannot be defined as one. I have argued that the expectation for each connective is derived from different sets of assumptions. For 'tetapi', the intended expectation is derived from a set of possible expectations implied by the preceding proposition. Whereas, for 'walaubagaimanapun', the expectation is actually an expectation of a set of contextual assumptions. As a result of this, I propose a different definition from the traditional, for each of the connectives. On the one hand, 'tetapi' is defined as instructing the hearer to deny a specific contextual implication that is in direct conflict with the conclusion that it introduces as well as its contextual assumption. On the other hand, 'walaubagaimanapun' is also defined as instructing the hearer to deny the contextual implication and its contextual assumption that implies it, however, unlike 'tetapi' it also instructs the hearer to deny every other contextual assumption that suggest this contextual implication. Earlier in the chapter, I mentioned that traditionally, 'walaubagaimanapun' is defined to be an emphatic version of 'tetapi' or having an emphatic

directive. I explained that this phenomenon arises due to the fact that 'walaubagaimanapun' instructs the hearer to deny all of the assumptions that are related to the expectation and thus, eliminate any possibility for the expectation to regain its strength. I also mentioned that unlike 'tetapi', 'walaubagaimanapun' always introduces explicit utterances.

CHAPTER EIGHT

DENIAL AND STYLES

8.1 Introduction

In the previous two chapters I examined three examples of connective particles in Malay, namely 'lagipun', 'tetapi' and 'walaubagaimanapun'. I showed how each of them guides the hearer to the intended contextual effects by indicating how the assumptions implied by the propositions are to be manipulated and interpreted. In Chapter Six, I showed how an additional premise increases the strength of another conclusion and in contrast, in Chapter Seven, I showed how the existence or the truth of another conclusion is denied by the introduction of another assumption or conclusion.

In the previous chapter, I discussed the differences between 'tetapi' and 'walaubagaimanapun' and then proposed a separate definition for the two according to the inferential instruction that each gives. The main difference between the two lies in the constraints that each particle imposes on the accessibility of contextual assumptions. Basically, I claimed that 'tetapi', the most common connective in Malay, is employed to deny a specific expectation and a contextual assumption that directly implies it. The same instruction is also given by 'walaubagaimanapun'. However, in this case, not only does it instruct the hearer to deny a specific

expectation, but also to deny every assumption that implies it. As a result, the possibility for the expectation to regain its strength is refrained. The proposition that precedes 'walaubagaimanapun' on the one hand, is one of the contextual assumptions that implies the expected conclusion. The proposition that precedes 'tetapi', on the other hand, is one of the many conclusions implied by the contextual assumption.

This chapter is a continuation of Chapter Seven. The aim of the chapter is to examine and extend the definition of yet another discourse particle, namely 'walaupun'. I will start my discussion with a general description of 'walaupun' in the following section.

8.2 Walaupun : Preliminary

Structurally, 'walaupun' is attached to one of the clauses or segments of an utterance. The clause that contains it can precede or follow the other clause, for instance, examples (1&2).

(1)

- a. <blackCrow> haji khutbah tu berdedikasi
betuiiii.. hehehe
haji khutbah itu berdedikasi betul..
hehehe
haji khutbah that dedicated right..
[laugh]
Haji Khutbah is dedicated.
- b. <Ratu_Meen> berdedikasi cam ne?
berdedikasi macamma?
dedicated how?
Dedicated (in what way)?

- c. <blacKcrow> ye lah.. walaupun dia sakit.. dia mai
 kerja gak..
 ya lah.. 'walaupun' dia sakit.. dia
 [dl]-mai kerja juga..
 yes [dm]-lah [cp]-walaupun he ill..
 he [dl]-come work also..
 Well, walaupun he's ill, he still
 comes to work.

(Appendix B Extract 14: 1844-1848)

(2)

- a. polong: chehhh makanan barat.. tapi chinese
 food hang maakn kan?
 cheh.. makanan barat.. tapi chinese
 food hang [sp]-makan kan?
 [ex]-cheh.. food west.. but chinese
 food [dl]-you eat [qp]-kan?
 Western food! But you do eat Chinese
 food?
- b. zaiYani: bila pulak aku makan makanan cine?
 bila pula aku makan makanan cina?
 when [dm]-pula I eat food china?
 When did I ever eat Chinese food?
- c. zaiYani: tak sanggup aku makan walaupun aku
 kebuluq
 tak sanggup aku makan walaupun aku
 kebulur
 no willing I eat walaupun I starving
 to death.
 I'll never be willing to eat (Chinese
 food) walaupun I'm starving to death.

(Appendix B Extract 15: 98-109)

In either use, the instruction of the particle remains the
 same. The only difference, if any, will probably more to
 do with styles and the shifting of the background
 information. These phenomena, however, will not be

discussed in depth since they are not in the realm of the aim of the present study. Nevertheless, I will use both types of examples in my analysis to show that the core procedural instruction of the connective in both uses is the same.

In general, if we examine the above examples, we can see that the two propositions in each example are in opposition to each other. Recall that the principle of relevance entitles the hearer to expect that she can obtain adequate contextual effects for no unjustifiable effort. Therefore, in interpreting utterance (2), Polong would have expected Zaiyani to take any food, be it Chinese or Western if she is dying from hunger. The same applies to Tok Khutbah's decision to go to work when he is ill. Regardless of these desirable expectations, namely 'to eat when one is dying from hunger and 'to rest when one is ill', unexpected conclusions or states of affairs are derived instead. This seems to suggest that just like 'tetapi' and 'walaubagaimanapun', the aim of the interpretation process that involves 'walaupun', is also to introduce a contradictory assumption to deny the other assumption. However, I want to claim that this is not how 'walaupun' should be defined and I will elaborate on this further in my discussion over the next few sections. To begin with, I will start my discussion with a comparison between 'walaupun' and 'tetapi' in the following section.

8.3 Evidence And Expectation

Consider the following example (3) with 'tetapi' and its conflicting propositions in (4a-b):

(3)

- a. <emas`> makan cukup
 makan cukup
 eat enough
 (I'm) eating well..
- b. <emas`> tapi kurus gak ni
 tapi kurus juga ini
 but thin also this.
 But (I'm) still thin.

(Appendix B Extract 16: 382-383)

(4)

- a. Emas eats.
- b. Emas is still thin.

(5) Emas has gained some weight.

Following the instruction for 'tetapi', the contextual implication for the assumption implied by (4a) will be in opposition with the explicature in (4b). (4a) in this instance, is the evidence for the expected contextual implication in (5). This analysis can be summarised as (6) below:

(6) (E)C {tetapi -C}

Note: E is an evidence for conclusion C which is denied by -C

Bearing this analysis in mind, let us examine Blackcrow's utterance with 'walaupun' in (2), repeated below as (7) for convenience:

(7)

<blackCrow> ye lah.. walaupun dia sakit.. dia mai kerja gak..
ya lah.. 'walaupun' dia sakit.. dia [dl]-mai kerja juga..
yes [dm]-lah [cp]-walaupun he ill.. he [dl]-come work also..
Well, walaupun he's ill, he still comes to work.

(Appendix B Extract 14: 1848)

The propositions of both segments of Blackcrow's utterance are as follows:

(8)

- a. Tok Kutbah is ill.
- b. Tok Kutbah goes to work.

(9) Tok Khutbah does not go to work.

We can tentatively say for the moment that like an utterance with 'tetapi', an utterance with 'walaupun' also contains some information that seems to contradict the other information or assumption. However, unlike utterance with 'tetapi', the assumption that is being negated is implied in the proposition that 'walaupun' introduces. In other words, the evidence for the implication to be denied is made manifest by 'walaupun', whereas with 'tetapi', the evidence is supplied by the

preceding utterance. This instruction of 'walaupun' can then be summarised as (10) below:

(10) {walaupun (E) C} -C

Now let's consider example (1), renumbered as (11) for convenience, to see if the same analysis can also be applied. In this example, 'walaupun' clause is in the second segment of the utterance:

(11)

- a. zaiYani: bila pulak aku makan makanan cine?
bila pula aku makan makanan cina?
when [dm]-pula I eat food china?
When did I ever eat Chinese food?
- b. zaiYani: tak sanggup aku makan walaupun aku
kebuluq
tak sanggup aku makan walaupun aku
kebulur
*no willing I eat walaupun I starving
to death.*
I'll never be willing to eat (chinese
food) walaupun I'm starving to death.

The propositions for Zaiyani's utterance in (11b) are (12a-b):

(12)

- a. Zaiyani is not willing to eat Chinese food.
b. Zaiyani is starving to death.

(13) Zaiyani is willing to eat Chinese food.

Again, the evidence of the expected state of affairs in (13) is made manifest by 'walaupun'. The summary of the instruction is as follows:

(14) -C {walaupun (E) C}

What I am trying to establish here is that in both cases, 'walaupun' always introduces an evidence for some contextual implication that is in opposition with the other proposition that either follows or precedes it. This fact alone should be taken as a condition not to equate 'walaupun' with 'tetapi'. Seen this way, we can say that the procedural process for interpreting an utterance with 'walaupun' is in direct opposite to the procedural process for interpreting an utterance with 'so'. Recall that in interpreting an utterance with 'so', the hearer is encouraged to treat the proposition that it introduces as a contextual implication for an evidence expressed by the proposition that precedes it. To illustrate consider (15) below:

(15) Tok Khutbah is ill. So he doesn't go to work.

Following the definition that has just been given, Tok Khutbah's decision not to go to work is taken as a direct result from him being ill. However, this interpretation is only possible given the contextual assumption in (16):

(16) If Tok Khutbah is ill, he does not go to work.

We can say, following the principle of relevance, the conclusion that 'so' gives is one that anybody would have

strongly expected to happen given the evidence that precedes it.

By the same token, we can say that the evidence that 'walaupun' introduces also strongly implies the desirable expectation (16). However, this expectation would not be derived at all if the hearer does not entertain a further assumption, for example,

(17) One should rest when one is ill.

This assumption is derived based on what she perceives as desirable and potential. Nevertheless, as signalled by 'walaupun', even given the evidence, the desirable state of affairs is still unexpectedly not realised. The same interpretation applies in example (11) where 'walaupun' encourages the hearer to access the desirable state of affairs in (18), which if processed with the evidence given will imply (19):

(18) One should eat if one is dying of starvation.

(19) Zaiyani should eat the chinese food.

In this instance, Zaiyani explicitly indicates that this desirable expectation will not be met by her regardless of what is going to happen to her. Let's consider a further example:

(20)

- a. <PemadaM> aikkk dah kawin tengok lelaki lagi?
aik sudah kawin tengok lelaki lagi?
[ex]-aik already married look at man still?

You're married and (yet you still)
look at other men?

b. <aitakute> ala.. lelaki lain pun tengok pompuan
walaupun ada sepuluh anak dah..

alah.. lelaki lain pun tengok
perempuan 'walaupun' ada sepuluh anak
sudah..

[dm]-alah men other [dp]-pun look
woman 'walaupun' have ten kid already.
(Why not). Other men also look at
other women walaupun they already have
ten kids.

(Appendix B Extract 17:921-924)

In this example, Aitakute's response to Pemadam's question implies that ideally, a married man with or without children should not be looking at other women. However, she indicates, in a not-so-ideal situation which is her real world, the desirable expectation is not met. Instead, the unexpected (22) happens regardless of the desirable expectation in (21):

(21) A married man should not be looking at other women.

(22) A married man who even has ten children still look at other women.

Following the analyses of the examples given so far, we can tentatively say 'walaupun' introduces an evidence which implies a state of affairs that is desirable and potential. However, this definition has yet to encapsulate the full function of 'walaupun'. The question now is, to whom does the expectation is desirable and in

whose world is it considered as potential. I will address these questions in the following section.

8.4 Desirable And Potential

According to Sperber and Wilson (1984; 1995), a propositional form of an utterance may be entertained as an actual state of affairs or a desirable state of affairs. The first is represented by ordinary assertions, for example (23), uttered by Mijaa while holding a mug:

(23) He bought it for only 40 pence.

The propositional content of this utterance is represented by (24) below, which describes a state of affairs that the speaker entertains as true in the actual world.

(24) Sabry bought a mug for only 40 pence.

An utterance can also be uttered to describe a desirable state of affairs. For example (25), uttered by Mijaa upon arriving at a restaurant:

(25) I wish I hadn't come.

An utterance can also be uttered to describe a potential and desirable state of affairs. For example (26), uttered by Mijaa after buying herself a lottery ticket:

(26) I want to be rich!

The difference between examples (25) and (26) is in the realisation of the state of affairs. In uttering (25), Mijaa knows that the desirable thought that she has just described cannot be realised but when she utters (26), she knows that her hope and desire to get rich could be realised if she wins the lottery.

Following these two definitions, Sperber and Wilson (1988:148-151) say that imperatives, as opposed to declaratives, describe states of affairs that are both potential and desirable. A potential world to them, on the one hand, is a world that is "...compatible with the individual's assumptions about the actual world which may therefore be, or become, actual...". A desirable world, on the other hand, is "...one that individual regards as desirable from someone's point of view, not necessarily his own" (pp. 148). In interpreting an imperative, a hearer has to decide to whom the desirable thought is relevant, is it to the speaker or to herself or to somebody else.

Now let's go back to examples (7), (11) and (20), repeated here as (27), (28) and (29) below:

- (27) ye lah.. walaupun dia sakit.. dia mai kerja gak..
 ya lah.. 'walaupun' dia sakit.. dia [dl]-mai kerja
 juga..
 yes [dm]-lah [cp]-walaupun he ill.. he [dl]-come
 work also..
 Well, walaupun he's ill, he still comes to work.
- (28) tak sanggup aku makan walaupun aku kebulug
 tak sanggup aku makan walaupun aku kebulur

*no willing I eat walaupun I starving to death.
I'll never be willing to eat (chinese food)
walaupun I'm starving to death.*

- (29) *Lelaki lain pun tengok perempuan 'walaupun' sudah
ada sepuluh orang anak.
men other [dp]-pun look woman 'walaupun' already
have ten people kid.
Other men also look at other women walaupun they
already have ten kids.*

In interpreting each of these examples, each hearer has to access the following desirable states of affairs (17), (18) and (21) respectively.

- (17) One should not go to work when one is ill.
(18) One should eat if one is dying of starvation.
(21) A married man who has children should not be looking at other women.

These assumptions must be supplied in order to derive the contextual implications or the desirable expectations such as 'Tok Khutbah should not have gone to work' or 'Zaiyani should eat the Chinese food' that are implied by the evidence introduced by 'walaupun'. Although the utterances themselves are not examples of imperatives, the implications of the evidence introduced by 'walaupun' are similar to those given by an example of imperatives, specifically, an advice. In each case, the speaker is 'implying' that given the evidence, a certain desirable and potential state of affairs should have materialised but regardless of this, it has not and as a result of

this, an effect of unexpectedness is created. Each of these phenomenon can be summarised in the followings:

- (29) Even when Tok Khutbah is ill, in which case he should have stayed at home, he still goes to work.
- (30) Even when I'm dying of starvation, in which case I should have eaten the chinese food, I would not eat the chinese food.
- (31) Even when the other men are married with ten children, in which case they should not look at other women, they look at other women.

In each case, 'walaupun' introduces an evidence which implies an implication that the speaker regards as desirable and potential to Tok Khutbah in (29), to the speaker herself in (30) and to a group of people in (31). The state of affairs can also be desirable and potential to the hearer herself. Before I go on to redefine the instruction for 'walaupun', let us consider a last example (32) below.

- (32) Walaupun hidup awak susah, awak tak boleh marah kepada mak bapak awak.
'Walaupun' life you difficult, you no can angry to mother father you.
'Walaupun' your life is difficult, you cannot blame your parents.

Following the analysis of 'walaupun' that has been done so far, the desirable and potential state of affairs that one should access from this example is necessarily the one in (33):

- (33) One should blame somebody else if one's life is difficult.

Although this assumption is possible, and thus could have been considered as desirable and potential for some, it is not the intended assumption of the speaker's in (32). I would argue that this assumption is entertained by the hearer instead. The utterance (32) can be envisaged to have been made following another utterance or cause of action that indicates the hearer is indeed blaming her parents for her difficulty. In this case, the speaker's utterance in (32) is interpretively used to represent the thought and its implicated assumption in (33) that the speaker attributes to the hearer. Then with his next utterance, he explicitly denies or contradicts this expectation. Following this, we can say that 'walaupun' always introduces an evidence that implies a desirable and potential expectation but somehow is not realised in the real world.

In essence, part of this definition also entails the instruction given by 'tetapi'. For example, in interpreting an utterance in (34) below, the expected conclusion which is derived from the first proposition is also denied by the opposite conclusion introduced by the particle.

- (34) Zaiyani is dying of starvation tetapi she refuses to take the chinese food.

However, there must be a reason why a speaker chooses one discourse particle over the other. The explanation for this is as follows. If the speaker's choice of utterance is governed by the principle of relevance, his choice on using a particular discourse particle must also be governed by the same principle. As a result, depending on how he intends his utterance to be interpreted, he must ensure the interpretation that his utterance conveys is the first one consistent with the principle of relevance. This suggests that his choice to use 'walaupun' instead of 'tetapi' can also be governed by the same principle.

Now, compare (34) with these two examples (35) and (36) below:

(35) Zaiyani is dying of starvation walaubagaimanapun she refuses to take the chinese food.

(36) Zaiyani refuses to take the chinese food, walaupun she is dying of starvation,

Basically, in all examples, each of the three discourse connectives implies that an expected contextual implication (37), is being denied:

(37) Zaiyani eats the Chinese food.

However, the last two examples encourage the hearer to process the utterance further. As a result, further contextual effects are implied. For example, in processing the utterance with 'walaubagaimanapun' in the above, the hearer is instructed to not only deny the

expectation that implies (37), but also to eliminate every contextual assumption that implies it. As a result of this process, an emphatic effect is also derived. On the other hand, 'walaupun' instructs the hearer to process the utterance further by accessing a state of affairs that the speaker regards as desirable and potential for Zaiyani and thus, when the expectation does not materialise, the sense of unexpectedness is created. However, none of these contextual effects are implied by the utterance with 'tetapi' in (34).

Briefly, we can conclude that although 'tetapi', 'walaupun' and 'walaupun' imply similar outcomes, they still cannot be interchanged with each other without us losing the extra effects that the last two connective particles imply. The extra effects are triggered by the additional inferential processes that 'walaupun' and 'walaupun' require the hearer to make in interpreting utterances that contain any of them. Following this, the particles can then be defined as follows:

- a. 'Tetapi' instructs the hearer to interpret the proposition that it introduces as carrying a conclusion that denies the expectation made prior to the introduction.
- b. 'Walaupun' instructs the hearer to interpret the proposition that it introduces as carrying a conclusion that denies not only the expectation made prior to the introduction, but all the contextual assumptions that imply that expectation.

- c. 'Walaupun' instructs the hearer to interpret the proposition that it introduces as an evidence that unexpectedly produces inconsistent conclusion. The unexpectedness arise given the fact that the evidence itself strongly implies desirable and potential contextual assumptions and conclusion.

CHAPTER NINE

INTERROGATIVE PARTICLES

9.1 Introduction

The purpose of the current chapter is to investigate the use of another type of discourse particle, interrogative particle. Many similar studies (Itani, 1992; 1993; Rochouta, 1990; Haegeman 1993) have also been done on this type of discourse particles. Interestingly, the results of the studies confirm that, like the other discourse particles- connectives and discourse markers - interrogative particles also show that, firstly, they do not contribute to the propositional content of the utterances that contain them and secondly, they also guide the hearer to the intended interpretation process. In this study, I have chosen only one interrogative particle, 'kan' to investigate. I will start the discussion with a brief description of the interpretive use of utterances as defined by the Relevance Theory.

9.2 Interpretive Use Of Language

According to Sperber and Wilson (1995; 1988), thoughts or beliefs can be represented by an utterance, either descriptively or interpretively. On the one hand, an utterance is used descriptively when it represents 'some state of affairs in virtue of its propositional form

being true of that state of affairs..." (Sperber and Wilson 1995:228) . It can also be used to describe a certain thought that the speaker entertains to be true. An example of a descriptive use of utterance is an ordinary 'assertion'. For example (1):

(1)

<buGz> aku tak pu'a ati tul lerr ngan budak nihh
Aku tak puas hati betul lah dengan budak
ini.
*I not satisfy heart right [dp]-lah with
child this.*
I'm not really pleased with this girl.

(Appendix B Extract 19:575)

On the other hand, an utterance can also be used not only as a description of a certain state of affairs or thoughts of the speaker, but it can also be used to represent another thought that he attributes to somebody else. In other words, an utterance can be used interpretively to represent "some other representation which also has a propositional form - a thought, for instance - in virtue of a resemblance between the two propositional forms..." (ibid. 229). For example, a free indirect speech as shown below:

(2)

- a. <NADIA98> rindu giler la ko ya canda
Rindu gila lah kau ya Canda?
Miss crazy [dp]-lah you yes Canda?
You miss him like crazy, yes Canda?
- b. <Canda> hehehe

- [laughs]
- c. <Canda> yer la..
 Ya lah.
 Yes [dp]-lah.
 Yes.
- d. <Canda> dia kata nak datang ke manchester..nak
 jumpa
*He say want come to Manchester.. want
 meet.*
 He says he wants to come to Manchester
 to meet.

(Appendix B Extract 20: 437-440)

In (2d), Canda interpretively uses his utterance to resemble the proposition of Calte4923's in (3).

- (3a) Calte4923: I want to come to Manchester to meet
 you.

The propositional content of the above utterance is (4):

- (4) Calte4923 wants to come to Manchester to meet
 Canda.

In this instance, the propositional proposition of Canda's utterance can be said to literally resembles Calte4923's.

Interrogative utterances, which are the main concern of this chapter are said to be specialised cases of interpretive use (Sperber and Wilson 1988:147). They are generally divided into yes-no questions and wh-questions. A yes-no question typically has both a complete logical form and propositional content. The propositional content

of the question interpretively represents a desirable state of affairs that the speaker regards as relevant, if true. To illustrate consider

(5) Mijaa: Do you want to go to the cinema?

The question represents a desirable state of affairs or thoughts which has the proposition, "Izand wants to go to the cinema". This desirable thought is relevant to Mijaa and it will achieve relevance if Izand confirms that it is indeed true. A wh-question on the other hand has only an incomplete proposition. However, the logical form of the proposition "may be entertained as a less than literal interpretation of a fully propositional form that the speaker regards as desirable to someone". Therefore for an example, the answer for the question, "Why did you come here?" will be the completion of the incomplete logical form "I came here because ____." In other words, as claimed by Sperber and Wilson (1988:151), "wh-questions, like yes-no questions, are interpretively used to represent relevant answers".

Interrogative utterances can also be divided in terms of the relevance of their answers to the participants in the communication process. Some interrogatives are used to elicit information and if this is the case, the answers to the utterances would be considered as relevant to the speaker. For example in (5), the desirable or relevant answer will be the one that confirms the proposition of the question. However, even if Izand declines Mijaa's

invitation to go to the cinema, her response is still considered as relevant to Mijaa. Although it is not the expected answer, it contains a relevant information which will change Mijaa's cognitive environment or expectation which in turn will prepare her for the next course of action.

There are also examples of interrogative utterances that are relevant not to the speaker, but to the hearer. These utterances include rhetorical, expository, self-addressed and indirect questions (Sperber and Wilson, 1995) which theorists such as Bach and Harnish (1979) and Searle (1969) seem to have found problematic to explain in terms of the standard speech-act theory. Therefore, following Sperber and Wilson, a rhetorical question is employed not because the speaker wishes to elicit an information from his addressee which will be relevant to himself, but instead to indicate that the information is for and relevant to the addressee.

In various studies of the interrogative particles in other languages (Blass 1990; Itani 1992; Rouchota 1993), it is understood that the main function of the interrogative particle is to help the hearer to decide to whom the answer to the interrogative utterance is relevant. If it is relevant to the speaker, then the hearer will work out the most relevant answer that is available to him that the speaker seeks. If it is relevant to the hearer, then she will retrieve the relevant information for herself and works out how it is

relevant to her. Blakemore (1992:115) draws a parallel comparison between imperative and interrogative utterances. On the one hand, she says, in interpreting an imperative utterance, "... the hearer's task is to make an assumption about the identity of the person to whom the speaker regards the state of affairs represented as being desirable." On the other hand, in interpreting "... an interrogative her task is to identify the individual to whom the speaker regards the thought represented as being desirable (relevant)".

9.3 The Malay Interrogative Particles.

Generally, in Malay, interrogative utterances are basically divided into two categories: open and close-ended questions (Asmah 1986). An open-ended question, on the one hand, is defined as a question that requires either a noun phrase (6a) or an adverbial (6c) as an answer. For example,

(6)

- a. <freego> izand...tu saper yg nak wat gathering tu?
 izand.. itu siapa yang nak buat gathering itu?
 izand.. *that WHO [rel]-yang want do gathering that?*
 Izand, who wants to do the gathering?
- b. <izand> free.. Hakimi yang nak buat.
 free..Hakimi [rel]-yang want do.
 Free, Hakimi wants to do it.
- c. <freego> kat mane ek?
 dekat mana ya?

near *WHERE* yes?

Where (is going to do it)?

d. <izand>

dia kate nak buat kat sunway pyramid
dia kata nak buat dekat Sunway Pyramid
she say want do near Sunway Pyramid
She says she wants to do it in Sunway
Pyramid.

(Appendix B Extract 21: 2552-2555)

A close-ended question on the other hand is defined as a question that calls for either a yes or no answer. It is further divided into two types of questions which are distinguishable by the 'particles' that accompanied them. The first type of question is always accompanied by the interrogative particle 'kah' in (7) and the second is always accompanied by either 'bukan' or 'tak' ('no' in English) or 'ya' ('yes' in English) in (8):

(7)

<LEBuhRAYa> dora: umah dia dekat ngan umah MAYa kah?
dora: rumah dia dekat dengan rumah Maya
kah?
dora: *house he near with house Maya [qp]-*
kah?
Dora: Is house near Maya's house?
<putri`Ha> yer.. dekat..
ya.. dekat.
yes.. near
Yes. Near.

(Appendix B Extract 22: 1463-1466)

(8)

<KingFahd> ade sapa nampak sue tak???...ade projek
baik ni aku nak bagi dia
ada siapa nampak sue tak???... ada projek
baik ini aku nak bagi dia.
*have who see sue [qp]-no?.. have project
good this I want give her.*
Have anybody seen Sue, no? I have a good
project to pass to her.

(Appendix B Extract 23: 183)

However, as shown by the IRC samples that I have collected, there are several other interrogative particles which are available in the language that are not mentioned in any of the grammar books that I have consulted (Asmah 1986, Masri 1981, Fang and Hassan 1994). This might be because the particles are used exclusively in spoken discourse and thus, might only be categorised as informal. For the purpose of this study, I have chosen to look at only one interrogative particle in Malay, namely 'kan', for example:

(9)

<azrin> babe you tengah buat apa tu
babe you tengah buat apa itu?
babe you [t]-middle do what that.
Babe, what are you doing?
<azrin> esok jumpa boyfren kan?
esok jumpa boyfriend kan?
tomorrow meet boyfriend [qp]-kan?

(Appendix B Extract 24: 622-626)

My aim will be to discern the inferential instruction that 'kan' gives and propose a tentative definition. However, there seem to be two uses of 'kan' in Malay language. One is inherent in the grammar and the other is always attached to a question. It would be worthwhile to investigate the use of the first 'kan' before I go on with discussing the use of the second. I will start this in the following section.

9.4 Kan : Structural

As I have mentioned at the end of the last section, there seem to be two types of 'kan' in Malay. The first type of 'kan' I said, has a structural role and the second has a procedural role. In other words, the first one is inherent in the syntax and is normally known as a verb particle and the second helps in the interpretation of the utterances that contain it.

Before I go on, let us start by looking at the characteristics of the nouns, adjectives and verbs in Malay and how they are different from each other in general. Unlike English, Malay is not an 'inflecting language' (Fang and Hassan 1994) where for example, in English, the noun 'bus' can be inflected into 'buses' to indicate its plural form and the adjective 'pretty' can be inflected into 'prettier' when it is used to compare two objects. However, in Malay, the noun 'bas', the equivalent word for 'bus' in English, cannot be inflected into 'bases' to show its plural form for example, but

instead, as with all Malay nouns, the word is simply repeated twice. In other words, the plural for 'bas' in Malay is 'bas-bas'. As with the nouns and adjectives, the English verbs are also marked through inflections in order to show the changing tenses. For example,

(10)

- (a) Mary goes to the shop near the factory.
- (b) Mary went to the shop near the factory.
- (c) Mary is going to the shop near the factory.

Also in contrast to English, the different tenses in Malay are simply marked through the use of time indicators. For example,

(11)

- (a) Abu sedang membaca buku cerita.
Abu (at this moment) reading book story.
Abu is reading a story book.
- (b) Abu membaca buku cerita pagi tadi.
Abu reading story book morning (after).
Abu was reading a story book this morning.

Basically, according to Fang and Hassan (1994), there are three identified ways to identify these groups of words - verbs, nouns and adjectives in a sentence. First, we need to look at the kinds of particles that are appended to the words. Second, the kinds of prepositions that follow or precede them and lastly their positions or functions in a sentence. In other words, in order to

resolve a word into its appropriate category, we need to examine its environment in a sentence.

Now, let us return to the structural 'kan'.

Generally speaking, the structural 'kan' is normally known as a 'verb particle' or a particle that is combined with another word to make up a verb (Asmah 1986, Fang and Hassan 1994). It is one of the many important verb particles in the language which consequently has the task of distinguishing a verb from an adjective or a noun in a sentence. For example with a noun 'teman' (friend in English):

(12)

<shanee`> saya duk teman kan die je.. takut die
 panik.. tu je
 Saya duduk teman kan dia saja.. takut dia
 panik.. itu saja
 I sit [n]friend-kan he only.. fear he
 panic.. that only.
 I only accompany him, just in case he's
 panicking, that's all.

(Appendix B Extract 25: 56)

Or with an adjective, 'kurus' ('thin' in English):

(13)

* temBOK tengah kuruskan badan
* temBOK [asp] [adj]thin-vep'kan' body.
TemBOK is slimming down.

(Appendix B Extract 26: 2143)

The above examples illustrate how a noun or an adjective is transformed into verbs with the particle 'kan' in an utterance. However, this is not to say that any nouns or adjectives can be transformed into verbs if appended to the verb particle 'kan'.

Sometimes, 'kan' or rather, the suffix 'kan' can also be joined by two other verb particles, either the prefixes 'me-' or 'di-' in transforming a word into a verb. For example,

(14)

Ali menjalankan syarikat bapanya dengan lancar.
Ali [vip]di[walk]vep-kan father[pn]-nya with
smoothly.
Ali runs his father's company smoothly.

or

(15)

Rumah itu dibelikan oleh Encik Abu.
House that [vip]di-buy-kan-particle by Encik Abu.
That house is bought by Encik Abu.

Nouns or adjectives are not the only words that the suffix 'kan' are appended to. It can also be appended to another verb in the language. For instance, the verb 'beli' ('buy' in English):

(16)

<Z-O> nape? nak beli ape?
 kenapa? nak beli apa?
 why? Want buy what?

Why? What do you want to buy?
<Lizaa> nak mintak ko belikan aku installerr
nak minta kau belikan aku installer.
want ask you [vb]beli-'kan' I installer.
I want you to buy me an installer.

(Appendix B Extract 27: 1544-1546)

It is worth mentioning here that the transformed verb with the particle 'kan' will always be used in either an imperative or declarative sentence and predominantly used in spoken discourse. The other type of transformed verbs, with the combination of 'me-kan' or 'di-kan', on the other hand, are said to be typical of written discourse. While the circumfix 'me-kan' always appears in a reported speech, the circumfix 'di-kan' always appears in the passive. Although, it is possible to use these verbs in spoken discourse, the utterances would always be considered as very 'formal'.

9.4.1 The Origin Of The Procedural 'Kan'

Before I go on to discuss the procedural use of 'kan' in a sentence or in an utterance, it will be useful here to compare it with the structural 'kan'. As has been mentioned earlier, the structural 'kan' is always appended to a word, which can be a noun, an adjective or even another verb. Sometimes, it is accompanied by two other verb particles, the prefixes 'me-' and 'di-', to make a verb in a sentence. Consequently, this means that the structural 'kan' always plays a role in determining the

conceptual representations of a sentence or an utterance that contains it. It is an integral part of a sentence which contributes to the propositional content of the sentence or the utterance that contains it. Unlike the structural 'kan', the procedural 'kan' on the other hand is not affixed to any specific words in a sentence. It is usually considered as a separate 'entity' from the proposition carried by the utterance that contains it. Consequently, we can say that the procedural 'kan' has a role in determining how the conceptual representations of the sentence or an utterance that contains it to be processed. For example, the propositional content of (17) below with or without 'kan' is (d2) and the propositional content of (18e) is (19),

(17)

<Lizaa> 4 u enrolled to utm ko kat MPIK kan?
 Before you enrolled to UTM kau kat MPIK kan?
Before you enrolled to UTM you at MPIK, kan?
 Before you enrolled at UTM, you were at MPIK
 'kan'?

(Appendix B Extract 28: 1627)

(17a) Before Z-0 enrolled at UTM, Z-0 was at MPIK.

(18)

a. <Liza`> kelas SADM bawak cik norhayati ramai yg
 fail ..
 kelas SADM [cs]bawah Cik Norhayati ramai
 yang fail.
*class SADM under Miss Norhayati many that
 fail.*

- Many fail the SADM class under Miss Norhayati.
- b. <Z-O> mak oiii
Mak Oi.
Oh Mother.
Oh Mother! (an exclamation)
- c. <Z-O> bahaya nih
bahaya ini.
danger this.
This is dangerous.
- e. <Liza`> aik .. pepasal lak bahatye .. kan ko daj
amik
aik.. apa pasal pula [cs]bahaya.. kan kau
[cs]dah ambil.
[ex], what why [dp] danger, 'kan' you already take.
Why is it dangerous? kan you already
took (the subject)?

(Appendix B Extract 29: 1715-1718)

(19) Z-O has taken the subject before.

Also, while the structural 'kan' is mostly associated with declarative or imperative sentences, the procedural 'kan' on the other hand is solely associated with interrogative utterances and spoken discourse.

Some will argue that 'kan' is actually derived from the collapsing of the word 'bukan' which means 'not' in English. However I will argue that this is not so. 'Bukan' is a word which is used as a question prompt whose function is very similar to English's question prompt 'isn't it' or 'doesn't it'. However, before I go on any further, it is worth mentioning here that 'bukan' is not really a combination of the word 'kan' with a word 'bu',

which does not exist in Malay. Now, if we compare the above examples with the examples with 'bukan', we can see that there is a similarity between the two expressions. The notion that they are of the same word is proven to be true even further by the fact that it is also possible to replace 'kan' with 'bukan' in some instances, without changing the propositional content of the utterance and also without violating the grammatical rules. Hence, for example,

(17`)

<Lizaa> 4 u enrolled to utm ko kat MPIK bukan?
 Before you enrolled to UTM kau` kat MPIK bukan?
Before you enrolled to UTM you at MPIK, bukan?
 Before you enrolled at UTM, you were at MPIK bukan?

(Appendix B Extract 28: 1627)

(18e`)

<Liza`> aik .. pepasal lak bahatye .. bukan ko
 daj amik
 aik.. apa pasal pula [cs]bahaya.. bukan
 kau [cs]dah ambil.
*[ex], what why [dp] danger, 'bukan'you
 already take.*
 Why is it dangerous? 'bukan' you already
 took (the subject)?

(Appendix B Extract 29: 1715-1718)

This seems to support even further the speculation that 'kan' is actually a shortened version of 'bukan'.

Nevertheless, if it is true that 'kan' is derived from, or means the same as the word 'bukan', then it will also be possible to substitute 'bukan' with 'kan' in any other examples of sentences or utterances with 'bukan'. Yet, this is not the case as shown by the following example, where (20e) becomes grammatically unacceptable when 'bukan' is substituted with 'kan':

(20)

- a. <lomang> bukan rimo la sue .. mysterious guy
bukan Rimo lah Sue.. Mysterious guy.
is not Rimo [dp]-lah Sue.. Mysterious guy.
It is not Rimo Sue. Mysterious guy.
- b. <LadySue^> sapa lomang??
 Siapa Lomang?
Who Lomang?
 Who is it Lomang?
- c. <LadySue^> sapa lomang?? ko ker?? *ahaks*!
 Siapa Lomang? Kau kah? *laughs*
*Who Lomang? You [qp]-kah? *laughs**
 Who is it Lomang? Is it you?
- d. <LadySue^> behtu?? kalu bukan ko sapa lak??
 Habis itu? Kalau bukan kau siapa pula?
Finish that? If is not you who [nt]-pula.
 So? If it is not you, who is it then?

(Appendix B Extract 30:980-995)

- e. <LadySue^> *behtu?? kalu kan ko sapa lak??
 *Habis itu? Kalau kan kau siapa pula?

Now consider the following examples:

(21)

- a. <LadySue^> kuota 4 tu canda!
kuota 4 itu Canda!
quota 4 that Canda!
That's the four quotas Canda!
- b. <TengokAja> yer la..
Ya [dp]-lah.
Yes [dp]-lah.
Yes, I know.
- c. <TengokAja> memang la kuota 4..
Memang lah kuota 4.
[nt] [dp]-lah quota 4.
I know it has four quotas.
- d. <TengokAja> tapi kita ni bukan termasuk dalam
senarai 4 tu
tapi kita ini bukan termasuk dalam
senarai 4 itu.
*but we this bukan included in list 4
that.*
but I'm not included in that list of
4.

(Appendix B Extract 31:466-470)

The propositional content for (21d) above is (21e)

(21e) TengokAja is not included in the list of 4 quotas.

This time when 'bukan' in (21d) is substituted with 'kan' as in (21f), the utterance is grammatically acceptable.

(21f).

<TengokAja> tapi kita ni kan termasuk dalam senarai 4
tu
tapi kita ini kan termasuk dalam senarai
4 itu.
but we this kan included in list 4 that.
but we are included in that list of 4.

However, the propositional content of the utterance changes. When 'bukan' is substituted with 'kan' the proposition content of (21f) becomes (21g).

(21g) TengokAja is included in the list of 4.

Let's consider another similar example and see if the same effect is achieved after the changing.

(22)

<PemadaM> anim bukan pakar bahasa
Anim bukan specialist language.
Anim is not a language specialist.

(Appendix B Extract 32: 984)

The proposition expressed by (22) is (22a):

(22a) Anim is not a language specialist.

However, when 'kan' is inserted in 'bukan' slot as in (23), the proposition of the altered utterance is (23`):

(23)

<PemadaM> anim kan pakar bahasa
Anim dp[kan] specialist language.

Anim kan is a language specialist.

(23`) Anim is a language specialist.

I have shown above that when 'bukan' is changed with 'kan' in an utterance two things happen. The sentence either becomes grammatically unacceptable or the propositional content of the utterance changes. If 'kan' and 'bukan' are the same words, for example the former is derived from the collapsing of the latter, then the changes should not have produced ungrammatical sentences in some instances and altered the propositions in the others. This strongly suggests that 'bukan' has its own conceptual meaning and thus forms part of the propositional contents of the utterances that contain it. Accordingly, it is safe to say that 'kan' is an independent word, specifically, a procedural particle that is not derived from the word 'bukan'.

However, having said that, we still have to account for (17'&18e') and also (21f&23). When 'kan' is swapped with 'bukan' in (17'), the utterance is still acceptable which might suggest that 'kan' is actually the same as 'bukan'. However, if we examine the original sentences against the modified sentences, we will find that the procedural processes for both of these sentences are different. When 'bukan' is swapped with 'kan' in the last two examples on the other hand, not only the propositional contents of the utterances are changed, the forms of sentences are also changed. The modified utterances with

'kan' become interrogatives whereas the original utterances are either declaratives or imperatives. This finding is interesting because not only it suggests that 'kan' differs from 'bukan' both in meanings and procedural instructions, it also suggests the procedural 'kan' belongs solely to interrogative utterances. However, I would like to point out here that almost all of examples of the procedural 'kan' in the chat samples are not marked with the normal question mark signs, as would have been expected. This is representative of what happens in spoken discourse, where the questioning intonation of the utterances containing 'kan' tends to weaken and sometimes hardly detectable at all. It is possible that speakers have deliberately abandoned the question mark signs or the appropriate intonation since it is widely understood that 'kan' has always been an exclusive interrogative particle and thus needs not to be expressed as such.

9.4.2 The Procedural Instruction Of 'Kan'.

Having established that 'kan' is actually a procedural particle, let us turn to its structure and then examine its procedural instruction. Generally, 'kan' can appear at three positions in an utterance: at the beginning of an utterance (24a), at the end (24b) or intersentially (24c). These three positions can be simplified as follows:

(24)

- a. Kan [Sentence].
- b. [Sentence] kan.
- c. [Noun phrase] kan [Verb phrase]

which are respectively represented by the followings:

(25)

- a. <TengokAja> dia comel....kan awak suka dia
he cute.. [dp]-'kan' you like him.
He's cute, you like him, don't you?
- b. * LadySue^ suka dia??
* LadySue^ like him??
- c. <LadySue^> hehehehehehe
(laughs)

(Appendix B Extract 33: 433-437)

(26)

- a. <Izand> teapottttttttt
teapot (nsxx's other nickname)
- b. <Izand> apo mimpi ko dalam ni pepagi nih
apa mimpi kau dalam ini pagi-pagi ini?
what dream you in this morning-morning
this?
What did you dream coming here early
in the morning?
- c. <nsxx> sajo la weii cuti **kan**
Saja lah wei cuti kan.
nt-saja dp-lah ex-wei holiday [dp]-kan
No particular reason, it is a holiday.

(Appendix B Extract 34: 1945-1947)

(27)

- a. <izand> tata..bukan domina..lotus notes 4.5
tata.. not domina.. lotus notes 4.5.

- b. <TaTa> ye la lotus notes kan guna concept
 domino
 ya lah lotus notes 'kan' guna concept
 domino.
 Yes [dp] lotus notes 'kan' use concept
 domino.
 Yes (I know) but lotus notes uses
 domino concept, (doesn't it?).

(Appendix B Extract 35:1876-1878)

As a procedural particle, 'kan' should not affect the propositional content of the utterance that contains it. In other words, irrespectively of its position, the propositional content of (25a) above and (28a&b) below should remain as (29).

(28)

- a. <TengokAja> dia comel.... awak suka dia kan
 b. <TengokAja> dia comel.... awak kan suka dia

(29)

LadySue suka Freego.
 LadySue likes Freego.

Furthermore, I will show in the remaining of the chapter, as well as sustaining the propositional content, the procedural instruction that 'kan' produces in this three positions will also remain unchanged. However, having said that, it will also be interesting to know if the actual contextual effects would also remain the same in all three positions.

The next task is to find out what kind of procedural process does 'kan' require the hearer to do in interpreting the utterance that contains it. In order to this, let us consider again examples (25), (26) and (27) above. Each of the 'kan' questions above seems to have the appearance of a 'yes-no' question with a complete propositional form which are interpretively used to represent or resemble relevant states of affairs that the speaker attributes to the hearer. For example, the proposition of TengokAja's utterance (30) below is relevant if LadySue verifies that she indeed likes Freego; (31) will be relevant to Nsxx if his addressee will confirm that that day is indeed a holiday and (32) will be relevant for Tata if Izand indeed agrees that lotus notes are using domino concept.

- (30) Ladysue likes Freego.
- (31) Today is a holiday.
- (32) Lotus notes are using the domino concept.

However, I will argue this is not strictly the case. This is not kind of instruction that 'kan' is indicating. This is because, with an appropriate questioning intonation, every utterance in the above could still be considered as a yes-no question if 'kan' is omitted. When this is strictly the case, the request for a yes-no answer is strongly required. For example, if TengokAja in the above example had wished to elicit a positive answer he could have rephrased his question as (33) or if he had wished to

elicit a negative answer he could have rephrased her question as (34).

(33)

- a. <TengokAja> dia comel.... awak SUKA dia?
he cute.. you like him.
He's cute, you LIKE him?

(34)

- a. <TengokAja> dia comel.... awak TAK suka dia?
he cute... you no like him.
He's cute, you DON'T like him?
He's cute. Don't you like him?

The propositions of both examples above, "Ladysue likes Freego" and "Ladysue does not like Freego" are interpretively used to represent the desirable thoughts that Tengokaja considers as relevant to him, if true. At the same time, having worked out what is relevant to the speaker, the hearer will then provide the speaker with the requested information.

In contrast, when 'kan' is used in the utterances, the 'request for information' is no longer relevant. This is supported further by the absence of either an explicit or implicit positive or negative response in the subsequent exchanges of each of the above examples. For example, the subsequent exchanges of (26) are as follows:

(35)

- d. <nsxx> ijand samat taun baru
izand selamat tahun baru.
Izand safe new year.

- Izand, Happy New Year.
- e. <Izand> teapot..samat tawun baru
 teapot.. selamat tahun baru.
Teapot.. safe new year.
 Teapot, Happy New Year.

(Appendix B Extract 36: 1949-1952)

Here, Izand does not respond to Nsxx's question with a yes-no answer. The same thing also happens in Tata and Izand's conversation (27), shown in (36) below:

(36)

- b. <TaTa> ye la lotus notes kan guna concept domino
 ya lah lotus notes 'kan' guna concept
 domino.
*Yes [dp]-lah lotus notes [dp]-kan use
 concept domino.*
 Yes, lotus notes uses domino concept,
 (doesn't it?).
- c. <izand> ver4.5
 Version 4.5
- d. <TaTa> yang ko buek tu buek apo? mail?
 yang kau buat itu buat apa? Mail?
[rel]-yang you do that do what? Mail?
 The one that you're doing is what for?
 Mail?
- e. <izand> bukan
 No.
- f. <izand> application system
application system.
 (I'm doing) application system.

(Appendix B Extract 37:1878-1884)

Again, the extract shows that no yes-no answer is made as a response to Tata's utterance with 'kan'.

Furthermore, it is also interesting to note that Tata himself, does not wait for his question with 'kan' to be answered. Instead, he proceeds with another question immediately after his utterance with 'kan'.

Following the above, we can say that the presence of 'kan' has nothing to do with a yes-no question. Without it and with an appropriate intonation, the question becomes a typical yes-no question. When 'kan' is employed, it seems to cancel the instruction for a yes-no answer or even for any kind of direct response. However, every utterance is made because of a reason and therefore, there must be a reason for instructing the hearer to cancel the yes-no question in the above examples. In order to find out the reason, let us examine a simplified example (37) below:

(37)

- a. A: Tolong ambil microwave saya kat rumah Ahmad nanti.
Help take microwave I at house Ahmad later.
Please, get my microwave at Ahmad's house later.
- b. B: Tak boleh kut.
No can [dp]-kut.
I don't think I can.
- c. A: Awak nak pergi ke rumah Ahmad nanti kan?
You want go to house Ahmad wait [dp]-kan?
You are going to Ahmad's house later [dp-kan]?

In the above, A tells B to get her microwave at Ahmad's house. However, B informs A that he would not be

able to do so. The obvious reason might be because he is not going to be at Ahmad's at all. However, let's say Ahmad has told A that B has made an arrangement a few days earlier to be at his house later that day. Upon hearing B's reply, A works out that since a few days have passed, this piece of information may no longer be in B's most immediately accessible context, but is contained in some other larger accessible context. This explains B's response to her request. In order to encourage B to retrieve this piece of information, A somehow must make the proposition manifest to B. One way of doing this is to explain to B that Ahmad has told her that he is expecting B at his house later that day, and hence her request. This might involve a lot of information to be digested which in turn might cause too much effort on the part of the hearer. Another way is by making her intention manifest with the procedural word 'kan'. In the example, 'kan' indicates that the utterance being posed as carrying an information that is supposed to be available in the hearer's accessible memory and therefore should be retrieved for the purpose of the present communication process. As a result, 'kan' indicates that the information it introduces is relevant not to the speaker, but to the hearer. In short, this means that the utterance is not to be treated as a typical request for a yes-no answer, instead it is to be treated as a reminder of a proposition, which the speaker desires to be true and relevant to the hearer.

Furthermore, the information is relevant to the hearer not only as a reminder but as, claimed by Blakemore (1992:99), a guarantee "that certain information is available for the interpretation of subsequent utterances". This is because normally when we remind somebody of some information, we are saying that the information will be relevant if it is retrieved and processed in the most current context. This means that 'kan' has an added function other than the abovementioned. Therefore, A in the above example, essentially has two reasons for making B retrieve a particular information. First, to make the information available or manifest. Second is for B to process the information in the most current context and achieve the desired effect as exhibited below:

(38)

- a. If I'm going to Ahmad's house later on, then I will be able to get the microwave for A.
- b. I'm going to Ahmad's house later on.
- c. I will be able to get the microwave for A.

The retrieved information not only refutes B's claim that he is not able to do what A has asked of him, the conclusion from the subsequent interpretation process which includes it also justifies A's request.

Using this deduction of 'kan', we can now attempt to provide a clearer explanation for each of my earlier examples of 'kan'. For example in (36b), it is not Tata's wish for Izand to confirm that Lotus Notes are indeed

using a Domino Theory. What he wishes instead is for Izand to view his utterance as a reminder of a fact that she might have forgotten. As a result, Izand will then access her cognitive environment for the relevant information and subsequently retrieves it into her current context for the next stage of the interpretation process. In this particular example, the reminder serves as a support or justification for Tata's earlier equation of Domino Theory with Lotus Notes:

(39)

- a. If Lotus Notes use Domino Theory, then Tata is right to equate it with Domino Theory.
- b. Lotus Notes use Domino Theory.
- c. Tata is right to equate it with Domino Theory.

The same explanation is also applicable to example (26). Izand questions Nsxxx's early appearance in the chatroom. To this, Nsxxx responds with a 'kan' utterance. In processing this, Izand works out that she is to check her cognitive environment for the existing information and once found, she is to retrieve it into her current contextual environment. Subsequently the retrieved contextual information will then be processed as an explanation for Nsxxx's earlier appearance in the chatroom, together with the proposition of Nsxxx's earlier utterance.

However, it is not Tengokaja's intention to imply that Ladysue has forgotten that she likes Freego when he utters (25). Rather, his intention is to ensure that

Ladysue will only retrieve a particular information among other potentially salient contextual information regarding Freego into her present context. Before I go on, let us examine the utterances made prior to Tengokaja's utterance with 'kan'. Due to the lengthy conversation, I will only include selected few utterances that I consider relevant to the present discussion. (The complete translation of Ladysue and Tengokaja's conversation is appended to Appendix B Extract B). In the conversation, Ladysue and Tengokaja (or Canda) give out reasons why they like staying where they are and try to better each other's. Subsequently, Tengokaja utters (40a).

(40)

- a. <TengokAja> tapi kat sana tak der freego!!
tapi dekat sana tak ada Freego!!
but near there no have Freego!
But there you don't have Freego
(Malaysia).
- b. <TengokAja> dia comel....kan awak suka dia
he cute.. [dp]-'kan' you like him.
He's cute, you like him, kan?
- * LadySue^ suka dia??
* LadySue^ like him??
* LadySue^ likes him?
- c. <LadySue^> hehehehehehehe
[laughs]

(Appendix B Extract 33: 428-438)

In processing (40a) Ladysue is expected to access contextual assumption (41a) and process it with assumption (41b) to derive conclusion (41c):

(41)

- a. If Freego is not in Malaysia, then Malaysia is not the best place to be.
- b. Freego is not in Malaysia.
- c. Malaysia is not the best place to be.

However, Tengokaja works out that there is a chance that Ladysue might fail to achieve conclusion (41c). Furthermore, the utterance might have triggered various other assumptions about Freego which could relay irrelevant conclusions. Bearing this in mind, Tengokaja decides to guide Ladysue into choosing the most relevant proposition by interpretively representing the desirable thought or state of affairs with his question with 'kan'. The intention is to highlight the most relevant information to Ladysue and prevent her from accessing the other contextual information. Ladysue on the other hand sees this information as relevant enough to be retrieved and should be processed as a justification to Tengokaja's previous utterance.

At this point before I go on, I would like to summarise what I have said about 'kan' in the discussion so far. I have suggested that the procedural particle 'kan' have three related functions. Firstly, it indicates that the question that contains it is not to be treated as a typical request for a yes-no answer. Secondly, it instructs the hearer to treat the information that it carries as being used interpretively to represent a

desirable thought that the speaker submits as available in the hearer's cognitive environment. Although the proposition is available in the hearer's cognitive environment, it might not be immediately accessible to her. Following this, we can say that 'kan' is primarily used to remind the hearer of an information that might literally or partly 'resemble' the proposition presented. Once retrieved, the information should then be retrieved into her present context. Finally, 'kan' also indicates that the information retrieved should be treated as more than just a reminder and should be processed in the context of what has occurred before. Therefore, if the previous sentence, for example, is an assertion, the retrieved information will be brought into the next interpretation process as an information whose implication will support it. On the other hand, if the previous utterance conveys a request, the retrieved information will be processed as a justification for the request. If we amalgamate the three identified functions described above, we will be able to tentatively formulate a definition of 'kan' as carrying a single function, shown below:

- (42) To remind the hearer of a certain proposition that should be available in his or her cognitive environment and thus, should be retrieved into the present context for further interpretation process.

9.4.3 The Implication Of A Direct Response.

Earlier in this section, I highlighted that when 'kan' is used in a question, a verbal response is not required. This observation is backed up by the examples of 'kan' taken from the IRC samples. The results of the subsequently analysis of the examples explains the lack of verbal response as directly due to the presence of 'kan' and the procedural instruction that it gives. However, there are cases where the questions with 'kan' are verbally answered. For example,

(43)

- a. A: Tolong ambil microwave saya kat rumah Ahmad nanti.
Help take microwave I at house Ahmad later.
Please, get my microwave at Ahmad's house later.
- b. B: Tak boleh kut.
No can [dp]-kut.
I don't think I can.
- c. A: Awak nak pergi ke rumah Ahmad kan?
You want go to house Ahmad [dp]-kan?
You are going to Ahmad's house dp-kan?
- d. B: Ya tapi saya banyak kerja hari ini..
Yes but I many work day this..
Yes, but I have lots of work to do today.

B's response in the above implies that he is going to Ahmad's house later that day. This seems to suggest that part of the function of 'kan' after all includes a request for a yes-no answer and therefore contradict my previous claim about 'kan'. If the observation is correct, then

the earlier definition needs to be reformulated in order to take into account this finding. However, before attempting to reformulate the definition, I will try to work out an alternative explanation for B's explicit response first. In order to do this, we must begin by examining A's intention for asking the question. As has been discussed earlier, A's main intention for making the utterance with 'kan' is to provide a justification for her request for B's help. In order to do this, she must provide B with the most relevant contextual assumption that will derive the intended conclusion (37). With 'kan' she identifies the intended assumption as a prior arrangement made by B to be at Ahmad's house later that day which is interpretively represented in her next utterance. I suggest that A must have gained this information from Ahmad, or even from B himself prior to this conversation. If this is not the case, the exchanges should have transpired differently. A would have to make certain that B is indeed going to Ahmad's before she could ask his help in getting her microwave, for example,

(44)

- A: Awak pergi ke rumah Ahmad kah nanti?
You go to house Ahmad [dp]-kah later?
Are you going to Ahmad's house later?
- A: Tolong ambil microwave saya kat rumah Ahmad nanti.
Help take microwave I at house Ahmad later.
Please, get my microwave at Ahmad's house later.

A's question in (44) suggests that she does not know if B is going to Ahmad's and her aim to elicit this information before she could ask for his help. In other words, she has to set up a strong context for her next utterance. Or she could have just made an assumption that B is going to Ahmad's and asks his help anyway as in (45). Here, it is not her main concern if her assumption is wrong.

(45)

A: Kalau awak pergi ke rumah Ahmad nanti,
If you go to house Ahmad later,
If you go to Ahmad's house later,

boleh tak awak tolong ambil microwave saya kat
rumah Ahmad nanti.

*can not you help take microwave I at house Ahmad
later.*

Please can you get my microwave at Ahmad's house
later.

However, the conversation with 'kan' does not follow either these patterns. A makes a request, B rejects it and then, A poses the question with 'kan'. Her reason is to reinforce her request as being possible with an information that she desires to be most relevant and with which she is confident to be true, both to her and B. The most relevant information in this particular situation is the one she has obtained earlier on from Ahmad. In other words, A has to choose an information which she confidently feel represents a proposition that exists in B's cognitive environment. Consider another example:

(46)

- a. <Ratu_Meen> heheheh....mijaa.....sonok tak *****
[laughs]... mijaa.. seronok tak *****
[laughs]... Mijaa.. fun no
[censored]*****
[laughs]. Mijaa, is it fun *****?
- b. <mijaa`> meen.. bebaik
meen.. baik-baik.
meen.. good-good.
Meen, careful.
- c. <mijaa`> tak baik tau tanya25 bende cam tu
tak baik tahu tanya-tanya benda macam
itu.
no good know ask-asik thing like that.
It's not nice to ask such thing.
- d. <Ratu_Meen> ekekekke
[laughs]
- e. <Ratu_Meen> eleh mijaa
[dp]-eleh Mijaa.
- f. <Ratu_Meen> kite kan sama status
we [dp]-kan same status
We've the same status.
- g. <mijaa`> iye... tapi ko tau ler bend25 ni tak
leh cit25 cam tu
ya... tapi kau tahu lah benda-benda
ini tak boleh cerita-cerita macam itu.
*yes...but you know [dp]-lah thing-
thing this no can story-story like
that.*
Yes... but then you know we shouldn't
be discussing things like this.

(Appendix B Extract 38:1663-1673)

In the above conversation, Ratu Meen asks Mijaa a question which Mijaa finds rather embarrassing and says so to Ratu Meen. However, Ratu Meen feels otherwise and decides that she needs to find the most relevant contextual information that will back this up. However,

it is worth mentioning here that the most relevant information is not the fact that both of them are married but the implication of this fact. This decision again shows that the chosen information to be processed as providing support for previous utterance is interpretively used to represent a desirable thought that she attributes to Mijaa.

Both of the above analyses further maintain my claim that a question with the procedural 'kan' is not to be considered simply as a request for an information on the part of the speaker. However, any information implied is relevant not to the speaker but to the hearer and a verbal answer of any kind is therefore, not required. Next, we have to account for the fact that both B and Mijaa provide answers to the questions with 'kan' that are posed to them. In order to do this, we need to investigate their intentions for responding to the questions. Remember that in entertaining a question, a hearer has to decide to whom the answer to the question is relevant to. If it is relevant to the speaker, then she has to work out the most relevant information as indicated by the question and to provide it accordingly. Normally, the most relevant answer is reflected by the proposition that is represented by the question itself. If however, the represented proposition is relevant to the hearer, then she is not required to provide a response to the question since whatever information she is getting is beneficial only to her. Thus, following the same argument, it will be safe

to say, whenever an answer is provided in response to a question, that answer is meant to be relevant to the person who asks the question. In other words, the answers given by both B and Mijaa are implied by them to be respectively treated as relevant to A and Ratu Meen and therefore should be processed to achieve further contextual effects.

How these contextual effects are relevant to A and Ratu Meen can only be discerned after the rest of B and Mijaa's utterances are taken into account in the analyses. To do this, let us first of all, examine the semantic representations of the first part of each utterance. (47) is a determinate propositional content of B's utterance in (43) which implies (47`) and (48) is a determinate propositional content of Mijaa's utterance (46g) which in turn implies (48`). (47`) supposedly provides the needed justification for A's earlier request and (48`) provides the needed support for Ratu Meen's earlier claim.

- (47) B is going to Ahmad's house.
- (48) Both Ratu Meen and Mijaa are married.

- (47`) I should be able to take your microwave from Ahmad's.
- (48`) We should not feel embarrassed discussing personal information.

I want to suggest that both answers by B and Mijaa are interpretively used to implicitly echo the implications suggested by A and Ratu Meen's utterances (47` & 48`) Also, in both cases they imply that the

implications might only be true in a set of possible worlds and thus, disassociate themselves from the truth of the implications. In other words, B is saying that although the retrieved information implies (47`), he is not guaranteeing it to be as certain as A has implied. This is confirmed by his use of the procedural particle 'tapi' or 'but' in English to introduce a contradictory information. With this information, he is saying that 'in a real world', judging by the amount of work that he is still to finish, he might not be able to go to Ahmad's after all and thus, will not be able to get the microwave for her. In other words, although he is not denying that the information that A has given him is relevant in a possible world, her expectation for the retrieved proposition to justify her request might not suffice in the real world if B cannot finish his work before he is due at Ahmad's

The same argument applies to Mijaa's utterance which echoes the implication of Ratu Meen's utterance (48`). Here, like B, she indicates that she does not endorse the implicated proposition as her own "... but (only) as a faithful representation of a thought she attributes to (Ratu Meen), and to which she wants to express her reaction" (Sperber and Wilson 1988:145). Her reaction becomes apparent in the later part of her utterance with 'tapi' which introduces the necessarily contradictory information. In a way, she is saying that the implication of Ratu Meen's utterance would only be true in a possible world where talking about 'personal things' among married

people is permissible and hence, not embarrassing. However, the fact that it is not permissible in their culture automatically cancels or weakens this claim as valid in the real world.

Following the above, we can say that by verbally answering the questions, B and Mijaa are indicating that first of all, the utterances presented are to be treated as relevant to their addressees. The implications of the utterances are interpretively used to echo the implications of their addressee's own initial utterances, which B and Mijaa disassociate themselves from. Second, the propositions of the echoic thoughts are to be used as contextual information in the next interpretation processes where they will be integrated and thus, contradicted with the new contextual information.

Thus, whenever the question with 'kan' is unexpectedly answered, the indication is that any intended implication that is originally associated with it is interpretively used to represent the thought that the 'questioner' attributes to the addressee. This again supports my claim that every piece of information introduced by a question with 'kan' is indeed meant to be relevant only to the hearer and should be used to support the speaker's previous utterance. When otherwise happens, the expectation for the proposition to be contradicted arises as shown by the following example. In the example, Nenaz begins the conversation by telling Nsxx that she has unsuccessfully been trying to install Photoshop software

into her computer. Nsxx tells Nenaz to use an installation program on a cd because everything she needs will be included. However, the installation program prompts her for other disks in order to continue with the installation and then Nsxx asks (49a):

(49)

(...)

- a. <nsxx> aik ko pakai cd kan
aik kau pakai cd kan.
[exp]-aik you use cd [qp]-kan.
Are you using CD?
- b. <NenaZ> iyer ler...
ya lah.
yes [dp]-lah.
Yes.
- c. <NenaZ> pakai cd..
use cd.
I'm using CD.
- d. <nsxx> dah tu..?
Sudah itu..?
After that?
Then?
- e. <nsxx> pe maksud ko?
apa maksud kau?
what mean you?
What do you mean?
- f. <NenaZ> tapi tak boleh lah..
but no can [dp]-lah.
But still cannot.

(Appendix B Extract 39: 120-125)

In the above, Nenaz verbally answers Nsxx's question which interpretively used to echo Nsxx's earlier claim that the cd contains everything she needs for the

installation. This implicitly signals to Nsxx that Nenaz is disassociating herself from the validity of the claim. Contrary to Nsxx's expectation, Nenaz does not continue her response and this makes Nsxx presses her for the relevance of her response. He has to do this twice before Nenaz provides him with the necessary information. As expected, the information provided is the one that contradicts Nsxx's claim about the cd having everything ready for the installation.

At the same time, there are also instances when the information presented by the speaker's question is not in the hearer's cognitive environment at all. When this happens, the hearer will normally express her surprise at the speaker's suggestion that it is and verbally expresses her denial of the existence. For example, (50):

(50)

- a. izan: izan tahu ada banyak izan...
 izan know have many izan..
 Izan knows there are many izans.
- b. weck: izan ni kat tmn pelangi jb kan
 izan ini dekat taman pelangi jb kan.
 izan this near garden pelangi jb [dp]-kan
 Izan stays at Pelangi Garden in JB?
- c. izan: alamak weck....silap oghang le....
 alamak weck....silap orang lah....
 [ex]-alamak weck....wrong people [dp]-
 lah.
 Oh no Weck! You got the wrong person.
- d. izan: nie izan BBU....
 ini izan BBU...
 this izan BBU...
 This Izan is from BBU.

(Appendix B Extract 40: 774-778)

Earlier in the conversation, Izan claims that she is new to the chatroom and thus, does not know anybody there. However, some of the chatters believe she is one of the regulars who is pretending to be somebody else. Then Weck, in order to prove that they are right, confidently discloses a piece of information that he feels will support their suspicion. However, contrary to his expectation, Izan denies this and also shows her surprise at his confidence in her response. This is because Izan recognises that 'kan' implies the proposition conveyed is strongly represented to be available in her cognitive environment.

Briefly, the analysis of all the examples above show how the speakers' direct responses to the questions posed to them are to be interpreted. Their responses indicate that the propositions do indeed represent the intended desirable thoughts that the speakers have attributed to them. However, in these instances, both of the hearers are merely guaranteeing the relevance of the utterances, specifically their implications, in a set of possible worlds and then disassociate themselves from them. And then to prove their points, each of them introduces another proposition with 'tapi', which in effect contradicts the speakers' initial implications. As a result, the conclusions of the latest interpretation processes are the ones that the hearers hold to be relevant and thus, weaken the speakers' initial

implications. In example (49) on the other hand, the fact that the hearer finds it surprising that the speaker thinks that she possesses the information that he introduces only suggests that the speaker is very confident of its existence. This in turn suggests that everytime when the procedural 'kan' is used, a strong degree of certainty is entertained that the thought that the proposition represented will be available to be retrieved and used in the immediate context.

The propositions that the communicator wishes the hearer to retrieve in all of the examples given so far are explicitly expressed in each utterance with 'kan'. For example repeated here,

(51)

- a. <TaTa> ye la lotus notes kan guna concept domino
ya lah lotus notes 'kan' guna concept domino.
Yes [dp]-lah lotus notes [dp]-kan use concept domino.
Yes, lotus notes uses domino concept, (doesn't it?).
- b. <TengokAja> dia comel.... awak suka dia kan
he cute.. you like him [dp]-'kan'
He's cute, you like him, kan?
- c. <Ratu_Meen> kite kan sama status
kita kan sama status.
we [dp]-kan same status
We've the same status.

However, there are also cases where the propositions are not explicitly expressed in the questions. Even when this is the case, the instruction that the particle 'kan' gives, repeated as (52) below, remains the same,

- (52) To remind the hearer of a certain proposition that is available in his or her cognitive environment and thus, should be retrieved into the present context for further interpretation process.

To illustrate,

(53)

- a. <NenaZ> tu apott tu aaa tunggu zai tu
Itu apott itu lah tunggu zai tu.
That apott that [dp]-lah wait zai that.
Apott has been waiting for Zai.
- b. <zaiYani> oits...heheeh muahsssss kat nenaz
[ex]-oits.. [laugh][kiss] at nenaz.
[ex]
- c. <NenaZ> heheh kan pott??
[laughs] 'kan' pott??

(Appendix B Extract 41: 147-150)

In (53a), Nenz tells Zaiyani that Apott has been waiting for her to appear in the chatroom. Her utterance is interpretively used to represent Apott's earlier utterance and will only be desirable or relevant to Zaiyani if Apott supports its existence. Thus, in order to prove that Apott has indeed been waiting for Zaiyani,

she needs Apott to retrieve the desirable proposition from his short term memory into the current context. The proposition might no longer be in Apott's short term memory because several interpretation processes have occurred since he last mentioned that he was waiting for Zaiyani. In order to do this, she utters (53c) with the actual proposition left implicit since it has been made manifest in (53a). Furthermore, the full propositional content of her utterance will be solved through the process of disambiguation, reference assignment and enrichment. Since there are more than two participants in the conversation, Nenaz has to indicate that the question is specifically directed to Apott and not Zaiyani. However, the contextual effect derived from this interpretation process, indicated by lack of respond from Apott, is intended for Zaiyani because it supports Nenaz's earlier claim that Apott has been waiting for her.

To rephrase, 'kan' is a special kind of interrogative particle in the sense that it does not require the hearer to verbally respond to the question posed. It is similar to a rhetorical question which instructs the hearer to treat the information it carries as more like a reminder which is to be retrieved into her current contextual environment. However, 'kan' cannot simply be defined as a reminder because there are cases where the information that is carried by it has already existed in the hearer's immediate contextual environment. What it does instead is to make certain information more manifest than others and

indicate that it is relevant to the subsequent inferential process. In other words, 'kan' instructs the hearer to retrieve only a specific information. If the information is not immediately available, the speaker will explicitly specify it in his utterance with 'kan' and if it is recently used, the speaker will implicitly indicate it to the hearer.

9.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I investigated the use of the interrogative particle 'kan' in Malay. Firstly, I have shown that the use of the interrogative 'kan' is different from another 'kan' particle in Malay. Although the interrogative 'kan' is used very often in spoken discourse, the particle has not been addressed formally. Some might argue that 'kan' is another version of the question prompt 'bukan' and thus, having the same function, however, I have shown very briefly that this is not the case. Further study into the differences between the two words will show that the instruction that both give differs.

Secondly, the results of my analysis show that 'kan' does not contribute to the propositional contents of the question that it is attached to. The results also reveal that although 'kan' appears to encourage a yes-no answer, closer analysis of the particle shows that its main objective is to instruct the hearer to treat a proposition that it is interpretively conveyed by the question as

relevant to her and not to the speaker. In other words, it alerts the hearer to a set of assumptions in her cognitive environment that is relevant enough to be retrieved into her immediate contextual environment. It also instructs the hearer to treat the information highlighted by the speaker with 'kan' as a justification for a claim or request that the speaker has made before the question.

Finally, I have also shown that on the one hand, when the question with 'kan' is responded with an affirmative, it is always because the hearer wishes to contradict a claim or deny a request that has been made by the speaker. On the other hand, when 'kan' is answered with a negative answer, the hearer always shows her surprise at being asked at all. This is because, I claim, 'kan' always indicates that the proposition that it introduces is strongly represented to be available in the hearer's cognitive environment.

CHAPTER TEN

GENERAL CONCLUSION

10.1 General Conclusion

The purpose of the present study has been to explicate the functions of discourse particles in Malay language. The analysis and discussion are carried out following Blakemore's work on semantic constraints on relevance which fits into the framework of Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson 1995). The main idea of the approach is based on the principle of relevance. The presumption of relevance encourages the hearer to access adequate contextual effects in the smallest and most accessible context for the least effort. Therefore, it is most important for a speaker who wishes to be understood to choose an utterance that ensures the most relevant contextual assumptions are available to the hearer and the advantage of using the particles is that it ensures exactly this.

The findings of the study further support the claim that discourse particles cannot be considered as simply textual elements of text. They also contribute to the inferential processing of text or utterances by making the implicit intention explicit. Following this, for each discourse particle that I have looked at, I recommended an extended definition that describes how a particular discourse particle guides a hearer to the intended

contextual effects, by imposing constraints on the contextual assumptions that they can bring into the communication process. In Chapter Six of this thesis, I show how the connective particle 'lagipun' constrains an interpretation process by specifying that not only the assumption it introduces is to be treated as an additional evidence or proof that reinforces a certain state of affairs, but also as having a greater strength than the initial evidence. In Chapter Seven, I show how two contrasting connectives, 'tetapi' and 'walaubagaimanapun' are used to introduce a proposition that is in conflict with the preceding proposition. As a result, in both cases, the preceding propositions are denied and then abandoned. Even when this is so, the two connectives should not be treated as having a common function. This is because each of them encourages the hearer to access a different set of assumptions. Chapter Eight is based on a brief discussion of another discourse connective, specifically 'walaupun'. This connective encourages the hearer to access a state of affairs that the speaker considers as desirable and potential for himself, the hearer or somebody else. Finally, in Chapter Nine, I discussed the use of an interrogative particle 'kan' whose main objective is to encourage the hearer to retrieve a set of existing assumptions into her immediate contextual environment and then treat it as a justification for a claim or request that the speaker has made prior to the question.

As competent speakers of our language, more often than not we know what most relevant procedural word to choose from among all those close related words to convey our intended meanings at that moment of communication. We certainly are not simply choosing any word out of random. However, sometimes we do fail to choose the most relevant procedural words to use not because we are not competent users of the language or not being sincere, but for some reasons or other, the words or connectives that are the most relevant for conveying the intended information are simply not accessible to us at that point of time of the communication process. This could be because of several reasons. Sometimes because we are actually still in the process of acquiring the logical forms of the concepts for our memory systems or because we seldom have the need to use the concepts in our day to day communication process or even because we have not used the concepts before. Instead, we 'choose the stimulus that appears most relevant to the addressee, since this will make (our) communication mostly likely to succeed" Sperber and Wilson (1995:270). In other words, our choices of what the most relevant words to employ are limited by our preferences and abilities at any particular point of a communication process.

10.2 General Recommendations

It has always been the aim of the study, not so much to work out a different typology of discourse particles in

Malay, but to create a path for other researchers to do similar studies using the same approach into the vast number of discourse particles in Malay. Reviews of the IRC texts reveal that there are many other discourse particles in Malay that have not been addressed properly. For example, the discourse markers such as 'lah', 'jom', ; interrogative markers 'kah', 'kut'; connective particles such as 'pun', 'juga', occur frequently in the chat samples.

The discourse marker 'lah' is heavily used in spoken discourse. It is used to 'tone down' the force of imperatives. For example,

(1)

- a. Pergi lah.
Go [lah].
- b. Jangan buat macam itu lah.
Don't be like that [lah].

'Jom' is also associated with the imperative. It is similar to 'let' and 'let's' in English. For example,

(2)

- a. Jom pergi.
Let's go.
- b. Jom kita tengok wayang.
Let us see movie.
Let us go and see a movie.

'kah' is another example interrogative particle in Malay. It is most typical interrogative particle and used in both spoken and written discourse. It is always attached to yes-no questions. For example,

(3)

- a. Dia kah abang awak?
He [kah] brother your?
Is he your brother?

- b. Awak nak datang sini kah?
You want come here [kah]?
Do you want to come here?

'Kut' is different from 'kah' and 'kan'. It is a cross between giving an answer and asking a question. However, the speaker is not committing himself to answer. For example,

(4)

- a. A: Do you know when he is coming?
B: Esok kut?
Tomorrow, (I think but I'm not committing myself to the answer).

- b. A: Why is Abu not here yet?
B: Dia tak nak datang kut?
He no want come [kut].
He probably doesn't want to come (I think but I'm only guessing).

'Pun' and 'juga' on the other hand are very difficult to discern. Both particles can be associated with focus.

Sometimes 'pun' can be swapped with juga, but the reverse is not possible. For example,

(5)

a.

Dia pun begitu.
He [pun] begitu.
Dia juga begitu.
He [juga] begitu.

- b. A: I miss my village.
B: Saya pun rindu kat kampung saya juga.
I [pun] miss near village I [juga].
I also miss my village.

c. *Saya juga rindu kat kampung saya pun.

Some might argue that because of the different functions given out by all of these procedural words are sometimes very slight or even difficult to grasp, it would be easier to just classify them under one category, for example, 'conjunction', as has previously been done to some of them. However, I would like to argue that if closer analysis of these words is done, the results would reveal different kinds of functions for each particle. This has been proven by my analysis of 'tetapi' and 'walaupun'. Furthermore, the results would also reveal that some of the discourse particles encourage a hearer to process the utterance that contains any of them, further in order to access 'extra' contextual effects as have shown by 'walaupun' and 'walaupun'.

Further studies into the various Malay procedural particles would prove beneficial to teachers of Malay language. As with other concepts or structures of the language, the way the discourse particles are used inferentially can help the learners, especially non-Malay learners learn how to use the particles. It has been that the easiest words to learn or acquire both by Malays and non-Malay on one hand, would be those that simply instruct the hearer, for example, to contradict a recently presented proposition with an older one. The hardest ones to learn and acquire and more so to explain on the other hand, are those that do more than just contradict two propositions for example, but also implicate attitudinal meanings in them. These are for example connective particles like 'namun' and 'sedangkan' which have not been discussed in this study. This might also explain why these words are mostly used in written discourse rather than spoken discourse. In spoken discourse, intentions to communicate should always be conveyed using precise and clear stimuli and thus, most of the times, attitudinal meanings are mostly represented by our tone of voice, facial and physical expressions. However, in written discourse, these attitudes are not easily conveyed unless the writer linguistically outlines his attitudes which in turn can be laborious and sometimes can lead to communication inefficiency.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Asmah Hj. Omar (1986) Nahu Melayu Mutakhir, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka: Kuala Lumpur.
- Bain, A. (1966) English Composition and Rhetoric Longman: London
- Beaugrande, de R. (1984) 'Text Production: Towards A Science Of Compositions Vol xi'. In Advances in Discourse Processes, ed. R.O. Freedle. ABLEX Pub.Corp.: New Jersey.
- Beaugrande, de R. and Dressler, W. (1981) Introduction to Textlinguistics, Longman: London.
- Blakemore, D. (1987) Semantic Constraints on Relevance, Blackwell Oxford.
- Blakemore, D. (1988a) ''So' As A Constraint On Relevance'. In R.M. Kempson (ed) Mental Representations: The interface between language and reality. Cambridge University Press:Cambridge.
- Blakemore, D. (1988b) 'The organisation of discourse'. In F. Newmeyer (ed.), Language: The Socio-Cultural Context, Vol. IV: pp. 229-50
- Blakemore, D. (1989) ''Denial And Contrast: A Relevance Theoretic Analysis Of But', Linguistics and Philosophy, Vol.12 pp. 15-37.
- Blakemore, D. (1990) 'Linguistic Form And Pragmatic Interpretation: The Explicit And Implicit'. In L. Hickney (ed), The Pragmatics Of Style. Routledge: London
- Blakemore, D. (1992) Understanding Utterances: An introduction to pragmatics, Blackwell: Oxford.

- Blass, R. (1990) Relevance Relations in Discourse: A Study with Special Reference to Sissala, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Blass, R. (1989) 'Pragmatic effects of coordination: the case of 'and' in Sissala', UCL Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol.1, pp. 32-52.
- Blass, R. (1993) 'Are There Logical Relations In A Text?' Lingua 90:91-110.
- Brockway, D. (1981) 'Semantic constraints on Relevance'. In Parret, H. Sbisa, M., J. Verschueren. (eds), Possibilities and limitations of Pragmatics, John Benjamins: Amsterdam
- Brodkin, D. and Young, R. (1981) 'Composition Correctness Scores'. Tesol Quarterly, Vol.15: 159-167
- Brown, G and G. Yule (1983) Discourse Analysis. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Carrell, P. L. (1982) 'Cohesion is not coherence' TESOL Quarterly v16/4 pp. 479-488
- Carrell, P. L. (1983) 'Three Components Of Background Knowledge.' Language Learning v33/2: 183-34
- Carrell, P. L. (1984) 'Reply to Rankin', TESOL Quarterly v 18/1
- Carston, R. (1988) 'Implicature, Explicature And Truth-Theoretic Semantics'. In R. Kempson (ed.), Mental Representations: The interface between language and Reality. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- Chapman, J. (1979) 'The Perception Of Language Cohesion During Fluent Reading' In M. Wolstaed, P.Kolers and H. Brouma (eds.), Processing Visible Language' Vol. 1. Plenum: New York.

- Charolles, M. (1981) 'Coherence As A Principle In The Interpretation Of Discourse', Text v3, pp. 71-99.
- Charolles, M. (1983) 'Text Connexity, Text Coherence and text Interpreting Processings'. In Sozer, E. (ed), Text Connexity, Text Coherence: Aspects, Methods, Results. Hamburg: Buske.
- Charolles, M. (1989) 'Coherence as a Principle in the Regulation of Discursive Production'. In W. Heydrich, F. Neubauer, J.S. Petofi and E. Sozer (eds.), Connexity and Coherence: Analysis of Text and Discourse. Walter de Gruyter: Berlin
- Christensen, F. (1965) 'A generative rhetoric of paragraph' College Composition and Communication Vol. 16. pp. 144-165.
- Clark, B. (1993) 'Let and let's: 'Procedural Encoding And Explicature'. Lingua 90 pp. 173-200.
- Connor, M. (1984) 'Research Frontiers In Writing Analysis', TESOL Quarterly, v21/4 pp. 677-696.
- Fahnestock, J (1983) Semantic and Lexical Coherence. College Composition and Communication 34/3: p400-416
- Fang, L.W. and A. Hassan (1994) Nahu Melayu Moden Fajar Bakti: Shah Alam
- Fitzgerald, J. and Spiegel, D.L. (1985) 'Textual Cohesion and coherence in childrens' writing', Research in the Teaching of English, Vol.20, pp.263-279.
- Fraser, B (1990) 'An Approach To Discourse Markers' Journal of Pragmatics 14: pp.383-395
- Gorayska, B and Lindsay, R. (1993) 'The Roots Of Relevance'. Journal of Pragmatics 19: pp.301-323

- Grice, H.P. (1975) 'Logic And Conversation'. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds), Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts. Academic Press: New York.
- Grice, H.P. (1968) 'Utterer's meaning, sentence meaning and word meaning', Foundations of Language 4: pp.225-42. Reprinted in Searle 1971: pp.54-70.
- Grice, H.P. (1981) 'Presupposition And Conversational Implicature'. In P.Cole (ed), Radical pragmatics, New York: Academic Press.
- Gutt, E. (1989) 'Translation And Relevance', UCL Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol.1: pp. 75-95.
- Gutwinski, W. (1976) Cohesion in Literary Texts, The Mouton: Hague.
- Haegeman, L. (1993) 'The Interpretation Of The Particle 'da' in West Flemish', Lingua 90: pp.111-128.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976) Cohesion in English, Longman: London.
- Haviland, S.E., & Clark, H.H. (1974) 'What's New? Acquiring New Information As A Process In Comprehension'. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, Vol. 13: pp.512-521
- Homburg, T.J. (1984) 'Holistic Evaluation Of ESL Compositions: Can It Be Validated Objectively', TESOL Quarterly, Vol.18: pp. 87-107
- Ifantidou-Trouki, E. (1992) 'Sentential Adverbs and Relevance', UCL Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol.4: pp.193-214.
- Ifantidou-Trouki, E. (1993) 'Parentheticals And Relevance', UCL Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol.5: pp.193-210.

- Itani-Kauffmann, R. (1990) 'Explicature And Explicit Attitude', UCL Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol.2: pp.52-64.
- Itani, R. (1992) 'Japanese Sentence -Final Particle NE: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach', UCL Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol.4: pp.215-238.
- Itani, R. (1993) 'The Japanese Sentence-Final Particle KA: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach', Lingua 90, Vol.4: pp.129-147.
- Jonz, J (1987) Textual cohesion and second language Comprehension. Language Learning 37/1
- Jucker, A.H (1993) The Discourse Marker *Well*: A Relevance-Theoretical Account. Journal of Pragmatics 19: pp.435-452
- Kaplan, R.B (1975) Cultural thought-patterns in intercultural education. Language Learning Vol.16: pp.1-20
- Karttunen, L. (1974) Presupposition And Linguistic Context, Theoretical Linguistics Vol.1: pp.181-94.
- Karttunen, L. & Peters, S. (1975) Conventional implicature in Montague Grammar, Berkeley Linguistics Society Vol.4: pp.266-278.
- Katz, J. (1966) The Philosophy of Language. Harper and Row: New York.
- McCulley, J.A. (1985) 'Writing Quality, Coherence And Cohesion'. Research in the Teaching of English, v19: pp.269-283.
- McCutchen, D. and Perfetti, C.A. (1982) 'Coherence And Connectedness In The Development Of Discourse Production', Text, Vol.2: pp.113-140.

- Milic, L.G. (1967) A Quantitative Approach to the Style of Jonathan Swift, Mouton: The Hague.
- Morgan, J. and Sellner, M.B. (1980) 'Discourse And Linguistic Theory'. In R.J. Spiro et al Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Hillsdale, N.J
- Neuner, J.L (1987) Cohesive Ties And Chains In Good And Poor Freshmen Essays. Research in the Teaching of English, Vol.21: pp.92-103.
- Paulston, C.B (1972) Teaching writing in the ESOL classroom. Tesol Quaterly Vol.6/1: pp.33-59
- Pincas, A. (1970) Writing in Paragraphs. English Language Teaching Vol.34/2: pp.182-85
- Quirk, R. Greenbaum, S. Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1972) A grammar of Contemporary English, Longman: London
- Quirk, R. Greenbaum, S. Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1985) A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Longman: London
- Rouchota, V. (1990) 'Relevance Theory And Na-Interrogatives In Modern Greek', UCL Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol.5: pp.249-276.
- Rouchota, V (1993) 'But: contradiction and relevance', UCL Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol.2: pp.65-81.
- Rumelhart, D.E., & Ortony, A. (1977) Representation Of Knowledge. In R.C. Anderson, R.J. Spiro & W.E. Montague (Eds.), Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge. Erlbaum: Hillsdale, N.J
- Rumelhart, D.E. (1980) Schemata: 'The Building Blocks Of Cognition'. In Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension Vol.17: pp.2-11

- Sanford, A.J., and S.C. Garrod (1994) 'Selective Processing in Text Understanding'. In M.A. Gernsbacher (ed) Handbook of Psycholinguistic. Academic Press: San Diego
- Santos, T. (1987) Markedness Theory And Error Evaluation: An Experimental Study. Applied Linguistics Vol.8/3: pp. 207-18
- Searle, J. (1971) The Philosophy of Language Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Smith, F. (1978) 'Making Sense Of Reading And Reading Instruction', Harvard Educational Review Vol.47/3: pp.792-798.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1987) Precis of Relevance (plus Open Peer Commentary and Author's Response) Behavioural and Brain Sciences, Vol.10: pp. 697-754
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1995) Relevance: Communication and Cognition. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Stalnaker, R. (1974) 'Pragmatics presupposition'. In, M. Munitz and P. Unger (eds), Semantics and Philosophy: Studies in Contemporary Philosophy. New York University Press: New York.
- Stalnaker, R. (1975) 'Presuppositions'. In D. Hockney, W. Harper and B. Freed (eds), Contemporary Research in Philosophical Logic and Linguistics Semantics. Reidel: Dordrecht.
- Sulaiman, Masri (1997) Tatabahasa Melayu Fajar Bakti: Shah Alam
- Takeuchi, M, (1997) 'Conceptual And Procedural Encoding: Cause-Consequence Conjunctive Particles In Japanese', UCL Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol.9 pp. 127-148

Tierney, R.J. and Mosenthal, J.H. (1983) 'Cohesion And Textual Coherence', Research in the Teaching of English Vol.17: 215-229

van Dijk T. A. and W. Kintsch (1983) Strategies of Discourse Comprehension. Academic Press: New York

van Dijk. T.A. (1977) Text and Context. Longman: London

van Dijk. T.A. (1977a) 'Semantic Macro-Structures And Knowledge Frames In Discourse Comprehension'. In M.A. Just & P.A. Carpenter (Eds.), Cognitive processes in comprehension. Erlbaum: Hillsdale, N.J.

Widdowson, H.G. (1979) 'Directions In The Teaching Of Discourse'. In Brumfit, G.J and Johnson, K. (eds.) The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching
Oxford University Press: Oxford

Wilson, D and D. Sperber (1981) 'On Grice's Theory Of Conversation' In P. Werth (ed.) Conversation and Discourse . Croom Helm: London.

Wilson, D and D. Sperber (1990) 'Linguistic Form And Relevance'. UCL Working Papers in Linguistics Vol.2: pp.95-112

Witte, S.P. and Faigley, L. (1981) 'Coherence, Cohesion and Writing Quality'. College Composition and Communication, Vol.32: pp.189-204.

APPENDIX A
Key to transcription conventions

Key to transcription conventions

- .../ - part of conversation is left out because not relevant for current discussion.
- adj - adjective
- asp - aspect verb
- conj - conjunctive
- cp - connective particle
- cs - correct spelling
- dl - dialect
- dm - discourse marker
- dp - discourse particle
- ex - exclamative/interjection
- exp - non-sensical expression
- n - noun
- nl - numeral class
- nt - not translatable
- p - pronoun
- part - particle
- pn - possessive pronoun
- qp - question particle
- rel - relative clause marker 'yang'
- sl - slang
- t - time indicator
- vb - verb particle
- vb - verb
- vep - verb end particle
- vip - verb intial particle

APPENDIX B
Translated Data

Extracts

Extract 1:

1681. <tUn-> mana yg lain..senyap jer
Mana yang lain..senyap saja?
Where 'yang' other..quiet only?
Where are the others? It's so quiet.
1682. <anai> tun biasakk aa akuu...
Tun biasa lah aku..
Tun usual 'lah' I.
Tun, you know me.
1683. <anai> eheheh
(Laughs)
1684. <tUn-> ler
Lah
'Lah'
1685. <anai> yg lain sebok makan doyan tun
Yang lain sibuk makan durian Tun
'Yang' others busy eating durian Tun.
The others are busy eating durians.
1686. <anai> ehhe
(Laughs)
1687. <Logam> yg lain bot...mane leh cakap
Yang lain bot...mana boleh cakap
'Yang' others bot...where can talk.
The others are bots...they can't talk.
1688. <anai> logam ahaksss
logam (Laughs)
1689. <tUn-> doyan
Durian.
1690. <tUn-> nak jugakkkk
Hendak juga.
Want also.
I want them too.
1691. tUn- lama tak makan doyan nii
Lama tidak makan durian ini.
Long time not eat durian this.
I haven't eaten any durian for ages.
1692. <Logam> tun...tak bole...ko domam
Tun..tidak boleh..kau demam.
Tun.. no can..you ill.
Tun..you can't have any because you're ill.
1693. <anai> ko mintak ngan maut tuu..dia tokey tuu
Kau minta dengan Maut itu..dia taukeh itu.
You ask with Maut that..he dealer that.
You better ask from Maut because he's the dealer.
1694. <anai> tapi eh...nko mana leh makannn
Tapi ya...engkau mana boleh makan.
But yes you where can eat.
But then you can't eat.
1695. <anai> maut betui tuu kan ke ko domamm
Maut betul itu kan kah kau demam.
Maut right that 'kan' 'kah' you ill.

Extracts

1696. <anai> Maut is right. You're ill.
ahakss
(Laughs)
1697. <anai> melopeh laa ekauu
Melepas lah engkau.
Let go 'lah' you.
There goes the durian for you.
1698. <tUn-> ala..doyan kan ker ubat domam
alah.. durian kan kah ubat demam.
[dm]-alah... durian [qp]-kan [qp]-kah
medicine fever
1699. <tUn-> laa.aku nak aa cikit pun jadik aaa
lah.. aku nak lah sikit pun jadi lah
[dm]-lah.. I want [dm]-lah little
[cp]-pun happen [dm]-lah
I want just a little (it doesn't
matter how little)
1700. <Logaam> tu laaa....
Itu lah
That lah
That's the thing.
1701. <Logam> mane lehh...
mana boleh.
where can.
You can't.
1702. <tUn-> lagipun aku dah baik laaaa
lagipun aku sudah baik lah.
[cp]-lagipun I already good [dm]-lah
(lagipun) I have recovered (from my
fever)
1703. <tUn-> alaaaa
(expresses persuasion)
1704. <anai> chettt
(expresses denial)
1705. <Logam> pirahhhh
Pergi lah.
Go lah.
Yeah right!
1706. <anai> banyak la nkonyer baikkk
Banyak lah engkau punya baik.
Many 'lah' you possession baik.
Yeah right!
1707. <Logam> dah baik gi keje laaa
Sudah baik pergi lah kerja.
Already recovered go 'lah' kerja.
If you have, then why don't you go to
work?
- (Appendix C Data4: 1681 - 1707)

Extracts

Extract 2:

2360. <Tulipz> ella, tolong ambik buku kite kat alin..
ella, tolong ambil buku kita dekat alin..
ella, help take book our at Alin
Ella, could you help me get my book from Alin.
2361. <ella` > alin dah pergi UK belajar belajar
alin already go UK study.
Alin has gone to the UK to study.
2362. <ella`> minggu lepas..
week past
Last week.
2363. <ella`> kite ngan adoll pi airport antar..
airport antar..
kita dengan adoll pergi airport hantar.
we with adoll go airport send
Adoll and I went to the airport to see her off.
2366. <ella`> apa lah.. napa tak tau ke?
apa lah.. kenapa tidak tahu kah?
What lah.. why not know 'kah'?
Didn't you know?
2367. <Tulipz> tak... die tak habaq..
tidak.. dia tidak khabar..
no... she not tell..
No I didn't. She never told me about it.

(Appendix C Data3: 2360 - 2367)

Extract 3:

95. Aserk: nanti aku..belanja hang kenny roger..nak?..
later I..pay [dl]-you kenny roger..want?..
I'll take you out for Kenny Roger's later, if you want?
96. zaiYani: tak nak aku serkk
tak nak aku Aserk.
no want I Aserk.
I don't want to, Aserk.
97. zaiYani: lagipun aku tak suka makanan barat [cp]-lagipun I no like food west
I don't like western food.

(Appendix C Ddata2: 95-97)

Extracts

Extract 4:

195. <Andaga> eh Pedang..
196. <Andaga> hang balik drive ke?
Hang balik drive kah?
You home drive 'kah?
Are you driving home?
197. <PedanG> iyer... aku drive
Ya... aku drive
Yes... I drive
Yes I am.
198. <Andaga> Hang drive malam tak?
You drive night no?
Do you drive at night?
199. <PedanG> dak lah..
tidak lah..
no [dm]-lah
No.
202. <Andaga> napa Pedang
kenapa Pedang?
why Pedang?
Why Pedang?
203. <PedanG> sebab aku rabun lahhhh..
sebab aku rabun [dm]-lah.
Because I long-sighted 'lah'
Because I'm long-sighted.
205. <PedanG> lagipun jalan selalu busy memalam..
[cp]-lagipun road always busy
(lagipun) the road is always busy (at
night)..
209. <Andaga> tak cool lah hang pedang...
Tidak cool lah hang pedang...
Not cool lah you pedang..
That's not cool.
212. <PedanG> apa lak tak cool nya..
apa pula tidak cool nya..
what 'pula' not cool 'nya'..
What's not cool about that?

(Appendix C Data5: 195-212)

Extract 5:

161. <Perisai> oi pedang..
Hoi Pedang
162. <Perisai> meh main bola petang nihhhb.
Meh main bola petang ini.
[dl]-come play ball evening this.
Let's go and play football this
evening
163. <PedanG> malas lah..
lazy [dm]-lah..
I'm lazy.
164. <PedanG> lagipun kat luar tu ujan...
lagipun kat luar itu hujan..

Extracts

165. <Perisai> [cp]-lagipun at outside that rain
(lagipun) it is raining outside.
tak ada kawan lah akuuuu...
Tidak ada kawan lah aku...
No have friend 'lah' I...
Looks like there's nobody I know is
going to play.
167. <Perisai> ehehhe
(Laughs)
- (Appendix C Data5: 161-167)

Extract 6:

1961. Canda: nanti tolong antor assignment aku....
nanti tolong hantar assignment aku..
wait help send assignment I..
Help me to hand in my assignment
later..
1962. everlong: tak boleh canda.. aku dah lambat dah
nih..
tak boleh canda.. aku sudah lambat
sudah ini..
no can canda.. I already late already
this
I can't Canda. I'm late as it is.
1963. Canda: ishkkk..
1966. Canda: tak pe aaaa.. tolong lah..
tak apa lah.. tolong lah.
no what [dm]-lah.. help [dm]-lah
It's alright. Please help.
1967. everlong: tak boleh le.. lagipun aku tak lalu
building hang..
tak boleh lah.. lagipun aku tak lalu
building hang..
no can [dm]-lah.. [cp]-lagipun I no
pass building [dl]-you
I can't. (lagipun) I don't pass your
building.
- (Appendix C Ddata2: 1961-1967)

Extract 7:

307. <shanee`> awak nanti leh ke duk ngan Nina ngan
Din?
awak nanti boleh kah duduk dengan Nina
dengan Din?
you wait can [qp]-kah stay with Nina
with Din?
Do you think you can stay with Nina
and Din?

Extracts

319. <emas`> bolehhh
boleh
can
Yes, I can.
320. <emas`> saya buat hal saya
I do affair my
I mind my own affairs
321. <emas`> lagipun joe je duduk ngan orang kawin
marry
Joe was OK when he stayed with married
people.
322. <emas`> janji diorang tak kacau saya
janji diaorang tidak kacau saya
Promise they not disturb me
As long as they don't disturb me.
- (Appendix C Data6: 307-322)

Extract 8

1254. <ella`> sis.. dengar cite terbaru milo ngan
lilimerah dak?
sis.. dengar cerita terbaru milo
dengan lilimerah tak?
sis.. hear story latest milo with
lilimerah no?
Sis, have you heard the latest story
about Milo and Lilimerah?
1259. <JemCiKu> eh tak de.. hari tu kata dah tak ada
apa2 dah?
eh tak ada.. hari itu kata sudah tak
ada apa-apa sudah?
eh no have.. day that say already no
have what-what already?
No. Did they say that they don't have
anything going on anymore?
1261. <JemCiKu> nape nisa?
kenapa nisa?
why nisa?
Why Nisa?
1262. <ella`> iyer.. milo ada kate kat nisa dia tak
suke sangat kat lili dah.
ya.. milo ada kata dekat nisa dia tak
suka sangat dekat lili sudah.
yes.. milo have say near nisa he no
like very near lili already.
Yes. Milo did say he really doesn't
like Lili anymore.
1263. <JemCiKu> iye tau.. siap kutuk2 lagi haa..
Ya tahu..siap kutuk kutuk lagi haa..
Yes know..finish (-----) again
haa..
It's true. They even said bad things
to each other.

Extracts

Extract 10:

2269. <jetman> hei edoraaaaa..dah makan ke
hei edora.. sudah makan kah
hey edora.. already eat [qp]-kah
Hey Edora! Have you eaten?
2270. <edoraku> tunggu orang belanja jer
edoraku tunggu orang belanja saja
edoraku wait people pay only
Edoraku is waiting for somebody to pay
(for her meal).
2271. <jetman> edora..economy meleset..
edora..economy meleset..
edora..economy recession..
Edora, the economy is in recession..
2272. <edoraku> aku tau, ekonomi meleset..
I know, economy recession..
I know, the economy is in recession..
2273. <edoraku> tetapi hang kena belanja gak....
'tetapi hang kena belanja juga....
[cp]-tetapi you have pay also....
But you still have to treat me to a
meal.
2276. <jetman> nak belanja kena laa...ado pengeras
nye edora..weii
hendak belanja kena lah ada
pengerasnya edora..weh
want treat have 'lah' have price 'nya'
edora..weh
There's a price to pay for every treat
Edora.
2277. <edoraku> pengeras nyer pe?
pengerasnya apa?
Price'nya' what?
What is the price?
2278. <jetman> pengeras nye....u kena laaa..single n
mandi i bunga....heheeh
pengerasnya...you kena lah single and
mandi air bunga..heheeh
price 'nya'... you have 'lah' single and
bath water flower..heheeh
The price is that you would have to be
single and take a bath in a pool of
flower.

(Appendix C Data1: 2269-2278)

Extract 11:

1629. <minah> sis.. aie nak masuk askar sis, sedih
le..
sis.. aie nak masuk askar sis, sedih
lah.

Extracts

- sis.. aie want enter army sis, sad
[dm]-lah
Sis, Aie wants to join the Army Sis.
I'm so sad..
1631. <cozza> pas tu? cam ne? bila nak kawin?
lepas itu? macam mana? bila hendak
kahwin?
After that? Like where? When want
marry?
When are you guys getting married
then?
1632. <cozza> mak ayah die tak kate pe ke?
mak ayah dia tak kata apa kah?
mother father he no say what [dm]-kah?
His parents didn't say anything, did
they?
1633. <minah> ayah bangkang.. sis tau lah ayah die..
garang..
ayah bangkang.. sis tau lah ayah dia..
garang..
father against.. sis know [dm]-lah
father his.. fierce
His father is against it. Sis, you
know what his father is like, fierce.
1634. <minah> hmm bagaimanepon... dia pi daftar nama
die semalam..
hmm walaubagaimanapun .. dia pergi
daftar nama dia semalam..
walaubagaimanapun... he go register
name he yesterday..
He went on to register his name
yesterday.

(Appendix C Data4: 1629-1634)

Extract 12:

2885. <poyon> bila hang nak pulang cd aku tu?
when [dl]-you want back cd I that?
When are you going to return my cd?
2886. <poyon> dah lama aku tunggu
sudah lama aku tunggu
already long I wait
I've been waiting for a long time.
2887. <tembok> alaa nanti2 lah.. aku tak de masa nih
alah nanti-nanti lah.. aku tidak ada
masa ini
'alah' later-later 'lah'.. I not have
time this
Well, later...I really don't have the
time.
2888. <poyon> iskkk ape le.. aku punya cd tu.. hang
buat harta pulak..

- Hish apa lah.. aku punya cd itu..hang
 buat harta pula..
 () what 'lah' .. I possession cd
 that..you make possession 'pula'
 Come on..you're turning my cd into
 your possession.
2889. <tembok> kedekut..
 Stingy!
2890. <poyon> tak kirale.. hang anto
 tidak kira lah.. hang hantar
 no count 'lah'..you send
 I don't care. You better return it
 back!
2891. <poyon> esok aku nak..
 esok aku hendak..
 tomorrow I want..
 I want it tomorrow!
2892. <tembok> esok aku keje le..
 esok aku kerja lah
 tomorrow I work 'lah'
 But I'll be working tomorrow.
2893. <poyon> lerr
 Oh no!
2894. <poyon> anto.. aku nak hang anto esok..
 hantar.. aku hendak hang hantar esok..
 send.. I want you send tomorrow..
 I want you to return it back tomorrow.
2895. <poyon> aku tak peduli.. hang anto gak..
 aku tidak peduli.. hang hantar juga..
 I not care.. you send tomorrow.
 I don't care..by all means you better
 return it tomorrow.
2896. <tembok> aku tak boleh.. tak ada masa.. aku
 keje.. takpahaman hang nih
 aku tak boleh.. tak ada masa.. aku
 kerja.. tak paham hang ini.
 I no can.. no have time.. I work.. no
 understand [dl]-you this.
 I can't. I don't have the time. I'm
 working. You just don't understand.
2897. <poyon> ehehe
2898. <poyon> aku tak peduli.. hang keje ke.. hang
 letih ke..
 aku tak peduli.. hang kerja kah.. hang
 letih kah..
 I no care.. [dl]-you work [qp]-kah..
 [dl]-you tired [qp]-kah
 I don't care if you're working or
 tired..
2899. <poyon> hehe.. hang ada hal ngan anak bini pun
 aku tak kira..
 hehe.. hang ada hal dengan anak bini
 pun aku tak kira..
 [laughs].. [dl]-you have problem with
 son wife [dp]-pun I no count..

Extracts

2900. <poyon> Even if you're having problems with your family, I don't care.
hang anto gak..
hang hantar juga..
[dl]-you send also..
You have to return (the cd).
2901. <tembok> kekeke.. ye lah ye lahhh..
2917. <poyon> senyap lah shahrinn.. aku nak cd aku..
quite [dm]-lah shahrinn.. I want cd I..
Be quiet Shahrin. I want my cd.
2918. <tembok> tak paham bahas ke... tak boleh..
tak paham [sp]-bahasa kah.. tak boleh..
no understand language [qp]-kah.. no can..
You don't understand that I can't?
2919. <poyon> hang tak boleh..
[dl]-you no can..
You can't..
2921. <poyon> gaimanapun.. hang anto shahrinnn..
walaubagaimanapun hang hantar shahrin..
[cp]-walaubagaimanapun [dl]-you send shahrin
You have to return (the cd, I don't care).

(Appendix C Data3: 2885-2921)

Extract 13:

1036. Namakupan: jangan tido...
don't sleep..
1047. Namakupan: yg lain dok diam jer
yang lain duduk diam sahaja
'yang' others sit quiet only
The others are only being quiet.
1048. gMie: nak suruh aku tercekik!!
Hendak suruh aku tercekik!!
Want ask me choke!!
You're letting me choke.
1049. Namakupan: ekekekke
1050. gMie: aku nak tido dahhh..
aku hendak tidur sudah..
I want sleep already..
I'm going to bed.
1051. Namakupan: jangan lahh... aku sorang2 nih
jangan lah... aku seorang seorang ini
don't 'lah'... I alone alone this.
Don't go. I'm going to be alone.
1052. gMie: mijaa pon ada!!
Mijaa pun ada!!
Mijaa also have!!

Extracts

1053. Namakupan: Mijaa is here too.
mija dari dulu lagi
1054. Namakupan: mija dari dulu lagi
mija dari dahulu lagi
mija since (dahulu) again
Mija has always been here.
1055. gMie: diorang tu sume baik2 tuu!!
Diaorang itu semua baik baik itu!!
They that all kind kind that!!
These are nice people.
1056. gMie: ko layan jek!!
Kau layan sahaja!!
You serve only!!
Just talk to them.
- a. gMie: aku nak tido dahhh..
aku nak tidur sudah..
I want sleep already
I want to go to sleep now.
- b. Namakupan: jangan lahh... aku sorang2 nih
jangan lah.. aku seorang-orang ini.
Don't [dm]-lah.. I one-one this
Please, don't. I'm on my own.
1057. Namakupan: jangan lah tido... hang tak suka aku
ke?
jangan lah tidur... hang tak suka aku
kah?
don't [dm]-lah sleep... [dl]-you no
like me [qp]-kah?
Please don't go to sleep. You don't
like me?
1058. gMie: eishh sapa kata tak suka.. tapi aku
ngantuk lah..
eishh siapa kata tak suka.. tapi aku
mengantuk lah..
[ex] who say no like.. but I sleeply
[dm]-lah
I never said that but I'm sleepy.
1059. Namakupan: alaa... sekejap je.. ko kan baik
alah.. sekejap saja.. kau kan baik.
[dm]-alah.. while only.. you [qp]-kan
nice
Just for a while. You're nice person.
1060. gMie: eishhh..
1061. Namakupan: hehehe
1062. Namakupan: tok sah tido..
tidak usah tidur..
not don't sleep
1063. gMie: laa aku tau aku baik tapi aku esok aku
keje...
lah.. aku tau aku baik tapi esok aku
kerja...
[dm]-lah I know I nice but tomorrow I
work..
I know I'm nice but I'm working
tomorrow.

Extracts

1064. Namakupan: setengah jam je.. lepas tu, baru lah tido
setengah jam sahaja..selepas itu, baru lah tidur..
half hour only..after that, only 'lah' sleep
Just for half an hour..then you can go to bed.
1065. Namakupan: boleh lah kan... untuk kawan..
can 'lah' 'kan'...for friend..
Come on...for a friend.
1066. gMie: aku nak temankan hang... tapi aku tak boleh
I want friend [dl]-you... but I no can
I want to stay with you, but I can't
1068. Namakupan: walaubagaimanapun.... ko kena duk sini
gak...
walaubagaimanapun.... kau kena duduk sini juga.
walaubagaimanapun.... you have sit here also
Walaubagaimanapun... you have to stay.
1070. gMie: walaubagaimanapun.... aku nak tido gak....
gak....
walaubagaimanapun.... aku nak tidur juga...
walaubagaimanapun.... I want sleep also...
Walaubagaimanapun... I want to go to sleep.

(Appendix C Ddata2: 1036-1070)

Extract 14:

1828. <Ratu_Meen> abang mai..kim salam kat haji khutbah
noooooo
Abang Mai..kirim salam dekat Haji
Khutbah noooooo
Abang Mai.. send regards near Haji
Khutbah 'noooooo'
Abang Mai..send my regards to Haji
Khutbah o.k?
1837. <blaCkCrow> tak kose aku nak cakap kat dia.
Tidak kuasa aku hendak cakap dekat
dia.
No power I want say near him.
Oh no! I'm not going to do that!
1839. <blaCkCrow> kang nanti dia bagik kutbahhhh,, ngan
aku lak
karang nanti dia bagi khutbah dengan
aku pula

- 1844.<blaCkCrow> later later he give lecture with me
'pula'
I'm afraid I'll end up having to
listen to his lecture.
haji khutbah tu berdedikasi betuiiii..
hehehe
haji khutbah itu berdedikasi betul..
hehehe
haji khutbah that dedicated right..
[laugh]
Haji Khutbah is dedicated.
berdedikasi cam ne?
berdedikasi macammanna?
dedicated how?
Dedicated (in what way)?
- 1847.<Ratu_Meen> ye lah.. walaupun dia sakit.. dia mai
kerja gak..
ya lah.. 'walaupun' dia sakit.. dia
[dl]-mai kerja juga..
yes [dm]-lah [cp]-walaupun he ill.. he
[dl]-come work also..
Well, walaupun he's ill, he still
comes to work.
- 1848.<blaCkCrow> malu pulak kitorang
malu pula kita orang
shy 'pula' we people
He put shame on us
1850. <blaCkCrow>

(Appendix C Data6: 1828-1850)

Extract 15:

95. Aserk: nanti aku..belanja hang kenny
roger..nak?..
nanti aku belanja hang kenny roger
hendak?
Later I treat you kenny roger want?
I'll take you out for Kenny Roger's
later, if you want?
96. zaiYani: tak nak aku serkk
tidak hendak aku serkk
not want I serkk
No, thanks. I don't want to.
97. zaiYani: lagipun aku tak suka makanan barat
lagipun aku tidak suka makanan barat
lagipun I not like food west
I don't like western food anyway.
98. polong: chehhh makanan barat.. tapi chinese
food hang maakn kan?
cheh.. makanan barat.. tapi chinese
food hang [sp]-makan kan?

Extracts

- [ex]-cheh.. food west.. but chinese food [dl]-you eat [qp]-kan?
Western food! But you do eat Chinese food?
106. zaiYani: bila pulak aku makan makanan cine?
bila pula aku makan makanan cina?
when [dm]-pula I eat food china?
When did I ever eat Chinese food?
109. zaiYani: tak sanggup aku makan walaupun aku kebuluq
tak sanggup aku makan walaupun aku kebulur
no willing I eat walaupun I starving to death.
I'll never be willing to eat (Chinese food) walaupun I'm starving to death.

(Appendix C Ddata2: 95-109)

Extract 16:

379. <shanee`> awak tido cukup ke?
awak tidur cukup kah?
You sleep enough 'kah'
Did you get enough sleep?
381. <emas`> tak cukupp tidur..
tidak cukup tidur..
not enough sleep..
No, I didn't get enough sleep.
- 382.<emas`> makan cukup
makan cukup
eat enough
(I'm) eating well..
- 383.<emas`> tapi kurus gak ni
tapi kurus juga ini
but thin also this.
But (I'm) still thin.
384. <shanee`> tu lah.. burn pun kurus macam papan..
itu lah.. burn pun kurus macam papan
that lah.. burn also thin like plank
Well..Burn is thin too..as thin as a plank of wood.
385. <emas`> iye.. kurus nampak tulang..
ya.. kurus nampak tulang..
yes think see bones
That's true..so thin you can see the shapes of his bones.
386. <shanee`> hehehe...
(laugh)

(Appendix C Data6: 379-386)

Extracts

1718.<Ratu_Meen>

ya lah ziana tu.. hari tu die makan
sedap2 kat restoran
ya lah ziana itu..hari itu dia makan
sedap-sedap dekat restoran
yes lah ziana that..day that she eat
delicious-delicious near restaurant
well, she was having a nice meal at
the restaurant the other day...

1722.<Ratu_Meen>

sedangkan anak2 die kat rumah tak
makan lagi dari pagi
sedangkan anak-anak dia dekat rumah
tidak makan lagi dari pagi
'sedangkan' child-child she near house
not eat again from morning
...while her children hadn't been eating
since the morning at home.

1727. <Ratu_Meen>

org gaji die cite kat org gaji aku
le.. tengah malam baru die balik..
orang gaji dia cerita dekat orang gaji
aku lah.. tengah malam baru dia balik..
person salary her story person salary
me ..middle night new she home..
'Her servant told mine that she only
returned home at mid-night.

(Appendix C Data6: 1706-1727)

Extract 19:

558. *** LadySue^ has quit IRC (Leaving)

562. <buGz>

takut ah tuhnhhhh
takut lah itu
afraid lah that
she must be affraid..

565. <buGz>

jago ko sue..
jaga kau sue
beware you sue

566. <buGz>

you better be careful sue
aku ingatt ko sampai bile2..
huhhhh,..
aku ingat kau sampai bila-bila
I remember you until forever
I will remember you forever.

567. <buGz>

ko ingat ko legg lepas gitu2 jek.
kau ingat kau boleh lepas begitu saja?
you think you can get away that only?
you think you can get away just like
that?

569. <buGz>

ooooooo lari ekk.. dia..
ooooooo lari ya dia...
ooooooo run yes she...

Extracts

571. <buGz> oh, getting away, is she?
emmm...
572. *** selam is now known as LadySue^
573. <LadySue^> tarangggggggg!!!!
574. <LadySue^> hehehehe..
575. <buGz> aku tak pu'a ati tul lerr ngan budak nihh
Aku tak puas hati betul lah dengan budak ini.
I not satisfy heart right [dp]-lah with child this.
I'm not really pleased with this girl.
- (Appendix C Data5: 558-575)

Extract 20:

426. <NADIA98> sapa tersayang ko canda
Siapa tersayang kau canda?
who loved you canda?
427. <Canda> who's your loved one Canda?
nadia..dia ader masuk kat #mahligai hari tu
Nadia... dia ada masuk dekat channel mahligai hari itu
Nadia... he has enter near channel mahligai day that
Nadia, he was in channel Mahligai the other day.
428. <Canda> dia jumpa baru dua kali bertenet kat mahligai tu
Dia jumpa baru dua kali bercakap dekat mahligai itu
He meet new two times talk near mahligai that
I've only met and spoken to him twice in mahligai
429. <NADIA98> sapa?
Siapa?
Who?
430. <NADIA98> cakap la
Cakap lah.
Tell lah
Come on, tell me.
431. <Canda> hmm..nama dia caltex123
hmm..name his caltex123
well, his nick is caltex123.
432. <NADIA98> jap aku tengok
Sekejap, aku tengok
A short time, I see
Hold on, I'll look for that nick.
433. <NADIA98> tak da pun
Tidak ada pun
No have pun.

Extracts

434. <Canda> No sign of him.
dia tak der
Dia tidak ada.
He no have.
He's not in.
435. <Canda> dia jarang masuk la nadia
Dia jarang masuk lah Nadia.
He seldom enter lah Nadia.
He seldom join in.
436. <NADIA98> oooooo
oh...
437. <NADIA98> rindu giler la ko ya canda
Rindu gila lah kau ya Canda?
Miss crazy [dp]-lah you yes Canda?
You miss him like crazy, yes Canda?
438. <Canda> hehehe
[laughs]
439. <Canda> yer la..
Ya lah.
Yes [dp]-lah.
Yes.
440. <Canda> dia kata nak datang ke manchester..nak
jumpa
He say want come to Manchester.. want
meet.
He says he wants to come to Manchester
to meet.

(Appendix C Data2: 426-440)

Extract 21:

2552. <freego> izand...tu saper yg nak wat gathering
tu?
izand.. itu siapa yang nak buat
gathering itu?
izand.. that WHO [rel]-yang want do
gathering that?
Izand, who wants to do the gathering?
2553. <izand> free.. Hakimi yang nak buat.
free..Hakimi [rel]-yang want do.
Free, Hakimi wants to do it.
2554. <freego> kat mane ek?
dekat mana ya?
near WHERE yes?
Where (is going to do it)?
2555. <izand> dia kate nak buat kat sunway pyramid
dia kata nak buat dekat Sunway Pyramid
she say wat do near Sunway Pyramid
She says she wants to do it in Sunway
Pyramid.

(Appendix C Data3:2552-2555)

Extracts

Extract 22:

1464. <LEBuhRAya> dora: umah dia dekat ngan umah MAYA kah?
dora: rumah dia dekat dengan rumah Maya kah?
dora: house he near with house Maya [qp]-kah?
Dora: Is house near Maya's house?
1466. <putri`Ha> yer.. dekat..
ya.. dekat.
yes.. near
Yes. Near.

(Appendix C Data5: 1463-1466)

Extract 23:

- <KingFahd> ade sapa nampak sue tak???...ade projek baik ni aku nak bagi dia ada siapa nampak sue tak???... ada projek baik ini aku nak bagi dia. have who see sue [qp]-no?.. have project good this I want give her. Have anybody seen Sue, no? I have a good project to pass to her.

(Appendix C Data5: 183)

Extract 24:

622. <azrin> babe you tengah buat apa tu
babe you tengah buat apa itu?
babe you [t]-middle do what that.
Babe, what are you doing?
626. <azrin> esok jumpa boyfren kan?
esok jumpa boyfriend kan?
tomorrow meet boyfriend [qp]-kan?

(Appendix C Data4: 622-626)

Extract 25:

34. <emas`> projek burn cam ne?
Projek Burn macam mana?
Project Burn like where?
How's Burn's project going?

Extracts

35. <shanee`> sian kat burn ler..
Kasihlah dekat Burn lah
Sympathise at Burn lah
I sympathise with Burn.
36. <emas`> ler burn dah ada isteri
Lah, Burn sudah ada isteri.
Lah, Burn already has wife.
Well, Burn already has a wife.
37. <emas`> ohhh
38. <shanee`> ler..
39. <shanee`> slow nye awak
Slownya awak.
Slow'nya' you.
You're so slow.
40. <shanee`> ada isteri tapi tak reti nak tolong
wooo
Ada isteri tetapi tak mengerti hendak
tolong wooo.
Has wife but no know want help wooo.
Yes, he does, but the wife doesn't
know how to help.
41. <emas`> a'aa
Iya.
Yes.
42. <shanee`> saya tak reti ler nak tolong..
Saya tidak mengerti lah hendak tolong.
I no know lah want help
I don't know what to do to help him.
43. <shanee`> kalau reti kaler2 cam zura ok gak
Kalau mengerti warna-warna macam Zura
o.k. juga.
If know color-colour like Zura o.k.
too.
If only I know about colouring like
Zura does.
44. <emas`> lah
Lah
Well..
45. <emas`> macam nie
Macam ini.
Like this
Listen..
46. <emas`> tanya burn macam mana nak buat
Tanya Burn macam mana hendak buat.
Ask burn like where want do.
Ask Burn how to do it.
47. <shanee`> kang kaler tak lawo.. haaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
Karang warna tidak
lawa.....haaaaaaaaaaaaaa
Later colour no
beautiful.....haaaaaaaaaaaaaa
What if I colour it wrong and make it
ugly?
48. <shanee`> saya pun tengah buat keje saya
sendiri..

Extracts

- Saya pun tengah buat kerja saya sendiri.
I also middle do work I myself.
I have my own work to do too.
49. <emas`> ishhhh
50. <emas`> apa kira
What count
It doesn't matter.
51. <shanee`> nak kejar keje saya.. hmmm..
Hendak kejar kerja saya.. hmmm..
Want chase work me..hmmm.
I want to catch up ith my work.
52. <emas`> kak long
53. <shanee`> yupp..??
Ya?
Yes?
54. <emas`> burn tak ajar ker
Burn tidak ajar kah?
Burn no teach kah?
Did Burn not show you how to do it?
55. <shanee`> hmmm die suh saya buat keje saya
Hmmmm dia suruh saya buat kerja saya.
Hmmmm he ask me do work me.
Well, he asked me to do my own work.
56. <shanee`> saya duk teman kan die je.. takut die panik.. tu je
Saya duduk teman kan dia saja.. takut dia panik.. itu saja
I sit [n]friend-kan he only.. fear he panic.. that only.
I only accompany him, just in case he's panicking, that's all.

(Appendix C Data6: 34-54)

Extract 26:

- * temBOK tengah kuruskan kan badan
* temBOK [asp] [adj]thin-vep'kan' body.
* temBOK is slimming down.
(Data1: 2143)
2144. <LadySue^> laaa takyah kuruskan ain!! dah lawo dah body tuu!
Lah tidak payah kuruskan Ain!! Sudah lawa sudah itu.
'Lah' no difficult thin'kan' Ain!!
Already beautiful already that.
You don't have to get any thinner. You already look beautiful.
2145. <edoraku> a'aaaa

Extracts

2146. <temBOK> Ha ah
Ya.
Yes.
That's true.
lom
Belum
Not yet.
2147. <temBOK> lom lawa lagik
Belum lawa lagi
Not yet beautiful.
No, I don't look beautiful yet.

(Appendix C Data1: 2143-2147)

Extract 27:

1523. <Lizaa> rahizaa
Rahiza
1524. <Z-O> yooo
Ya
Yes.
1525. <Lizaa> can u do me a favour plizzzz
Can you do me a favour please.
1534. <Lizaa> emm ko selalu tak pegi imbi plaza?
Hmm kau selalu tidak pergi Imbi Plaza?
Hmm you usually not go Imbi Plaza?
Do you usually go to Imbi Plaza?
1535. <Z-O> jangan kata selalu
Jangan kata selalu.
Don't say usually.
It's more than usually
1536. <Z-O> tak pernah gi pong..hehee
Tidak pernah pergi pun.
No have go 'pun'.
Well, actually, I've never even been
there.
1537. <Lizaa> hehehe
(laugh)
1539. <Lizaa> ooo selalu ler nih
Ooo selalu lah ini.
Oh, usual 'lah' this.
Oh, you're a regular.
1540. <Lizaa> lerrrrrrrrrrrr
Lah.
Well.
1541. <Lizaa> sebelah .. cathay lerrrr
Sebelah Cathay lah.
Next Cathay 'lah'.
The one next to Cathay.
1542. <Z-O> jehehe..
(laugh)
1543. <Lizaa> cathay tu depannn pertama complex
Cathay itu hadapan Pertama Complex.

Extracts

1544. <Z-O> Cathay that front Pertama Complex.
Cathay is opposite Pertama Complex.
nape? nak beli ape?
kenapa? nak beli apa?
why? Want buy what?
Why? What do you want to buy?
1546. <Lizaa> nak mintak ko belikan aku installerr
nak minta kau belikan aku installer.
want ask you [vb]beli-'kan' I
installer.
I want you to buy me an installer.

(Appendix C Data1: 1523-1546)

Extract 28:

1625. <Lizaa> rahiza nak tanyer sjett
Rahiza hendak tanya sedikit
Rahiza want ask a bit.
Rahiza, can I ask you a question?
1626. <Z-O> shoot
shoot!
1627. <Lizaa> b4 u enrolled to utm ko kat MPIK kan?
Before you enrolled to UTM kau kat
MPIK kan?
Before you enrolled to UTM you at
MPIK, kan?
Before you enrolled at UTM, you were
at MPIK 'kan'?
1628. <Z-O> haa..yeap
Ha'ah. Ya.
Yes.
1629. <Z-O> apesai?
Apa pasal?
Why?
1630. <Lizaa> what was ur dad's reaction bile ko nak
get out of mpik?
What was your dad's reaction when you
wanted to quit mpik?

(Appendix C Data1: 1625-1630)

Extract 29:

1715. <Liza`> kelas SADM bawah cik norhayati ramai
yg fail ..
kelas SADM [cs]bawah Cik Norhayati
ramai yang fail.
class SADM under Miss Norhayati many
that fail.

Extracts

1716. <Z-0> Many fail the SADM class under Miss Norhayati.
mak oiii
Mak Oi.
Oh Mother._
Oh Mother! (an exclamation)
1717. <Z-0> bahaya nih
bahaya ini.
danger this.
This is dangerous.
1718. <Liza`> aik .. pepasal lak bahatye .. kan ko
daj amik
aik.. apa pasal pula [cs]bahaya.. kan
kau [cs]dah ambil.
[ex], what why [dp] danger, 'kan' you
already take.
Why is it dangerous? kan you already
took (the subject)?
1719. <Z-0> iye ler
Ya lah
Yes lah
That's true
1720. <Z-0> aku ingat nak pilih dia jadk penyelia .
Aku ingat hendak pilih dia jadi
penyelia
I think want choose her become
supervisor.
I was thinking of having her as my
supervisor.

(Appendix C Data1: 1715-1720)

Extract 30:

963. <lomang> suee ader owang kim salam kat sueee
Sue, ada orang kirim salam dekat Sue.
Sue, have person send regards near
Sue.
Sue, somebody sends his regard to you.
965. <LadySue^> sapa??
Siapa?
Who?
966. <LadySue^> w'salam!
(Greetings)
967. <LadySue^> rimo ek??
Rimo ya?
Rimo yes?
Is it Rimo?
968. <LadySue^> kekekekekekeke
(Laughs)
969. <LadySue^> kim salam windu kat depa! muash untuk
dia!
Kirim salam rindu dekat depa. Muash
untuk dia.

Extracts

- Send regards miss near them. Muash (kisses) for him.
Send my regards to them and kisses to him.
971. <lomang> bukan aaa rimo kat lab dah
Bukan lah. Rimo dekat lab sudah.
No lah. Rimo near lab already.
No. Rimo is already in the lab.
977. <LadySue^> huh?? awai nyer mamat tu!
Huh?? Awalnya mamat itu.
Huh?? So early guy that.
What? Why is the guy so early?
980. <LadySue^> behtu sapa??
Habis itu siapa?
Finish that who?
Who is it then?
981. <lomang> bukan rimo la sue .. mysterious guy
bukan Rimo lah Sue.. Mysterious guy.
is not Rimo [dp]-lah Sue.. Mysterious
guy.
It is not Rimo Sue. Mysterious guy.
983. <LadySue^> sapa lomang??
Siapa Lomang?
Who Lomang?
Who is it Lomang?
984. <LadySue^> sapa lomang?? ko ker?? *ahaks*!
Siapa Lomang? Kau kah? *laughs*
Who Lomang? You [qp]-kah? *laughs*
Who is it Lomang? Is it you?
985. <LadySue^> behtu?? kalau bukan ko sapa lak??
Habis itu? Kalau bukan kau siapa
pula?
Finish that? If is not you who [nt]-
pula.
So? If it is not you, who is it then?

(Appendix C Data3: 963-985)

Extract 31:

452. <TengokAja> sue..kita dah cakap kat dia tak nak
kawan lagi
Sue..kita sudah cakap dekat dia tidak
hendak berkawan lagi.
Sue..we already say near him don't
want friend again.
Sue. I've already told him that I
won't be seeing him anymore.
454. <TengokAja> sebab dia dah kawin
Sebab dia sudah kahwin.
Because he already marry.
Because he's a married man.
455. <TengokAja> tapi menggatal dia..tuhan jer yang tau

- Tapi menggatal dia tuhan sahaja yang tahu
 But flirtatious he god only 'yang' knows.
 But god knows how flirtatious he is.
456. <TengokAja> pasal canda tak nak mainkan org lagi
 Apa pasal tidak hendak mainkan orang lagi.
 What reason no want fooling people again.
 Why do you not want to make fool out of other people anymore?
458. <TengokAja> biar dia tak tau sapa canda ni
 Biar dia tidak tahu siapa Canda ini.
 Let him not know who Canda this.
 I prefer him not to know who I really am.
459. <LadySue^> hehehehehehe
 (laugh)
460. <TengokAja> tapi canda tak nak mainkan org dah
 Tetapi Canda tidak hendak mainkan orang sudah.
 But Canda not want fooling people already.
 But I am not fooling around with other people anymore.
461. <LadySue^> laa canda.. dah kawin pun apa salah nyer
 Lah Canda sudah kahwin pun apa salah nya
 'Lah' Canda already married also what wrong 'nya'
 What's wrong with fooling around with a married man?
462. <TengokAja> tambah dia lak dah kawin
 Tambah dia pula sudah kahwin.
 Moreover he 'pula' already married.
 Moreover, he's a married man.
463. <TengokAja> yer la.
 Ya lah.
 Yes lah.
 I know...
464. <TengokAja> dia dah kata sayang kat canda..
 Dia sudah kata sayang dekat Canda.
 He already say love near Canda.
 He already told me that he loved me.
465. <TengokAja> tu laa..
 Itu lah
 That lah
 That's the thing.
466. <LadySue^> kuota 4 tu canda!
 kuota 4 itu Canda!
 kuota 4 that Canda!
 That's the four quotas Canda!
467. <TengokAja> yer la..

Extracts

- Ya [dp]-lah.
Yes [dp]-lah.
Yes, I know.
469. <TengokAja> memang la kuota 4..
Memang lah kuota 4.
[nt] [dp]-lah kuota 4.
I know it has four quotas.
470. <TengokAja> tapi kita ni bukan termasuk dalam
senarai 4 tu
tapi kita ini bukan termasuk dalam
senarai 4 itu.
but we this bukan included in list 4
that.
but I'm not included in that list of
4.

(Appendix C Data3: 452-470)

Extract 32:

960. <aitakute> kite kalut tadi
Kita kalut tadi
We 'kalut' a moment ago
I was 'kalut'.
961. <PemadaM> cehhh kalut
Cehhh ... Kalut
Wow ... 'kalut'
962. <aitakute> ye lah nengok org ensem lalu
Ya lah tengok orang lawa lalu.
Yes lah see people handsome walk by.
Of course, everytime looking at a
handsome guy walks by.
963. <PemadaM> punya lah bahasa ... peehhh
Punya lah bahasa...peehhh
What lah language ..peeh
Wow! What a word to use!
964. <aitakute> hehehe
(Laugh)
965. <aitakute> eh tak betul ke?
Eh..tidak betul kah?
Eh..not correct kah?
Isn't it correct?
966. <PemadaM> kehkehkehe
(Laugh)
968. <PemadaM> anim tak pernah guna bahasa tuh
Anim tidak pernah guna bahasa itu
Anim no ever use language that.
I've never used that word.
979. <aitakute> pe maksudnyer?
Apa maksudnya?
What means nya?
What does it mean?
980. <PemadaM> macam bahasa org dulu2 pakai

Extracts

- Macam bahasa orang dahulu dahulu pakai.
Like language people ages ago use.
Like a word only old people would use.
982. <PemadaM> ntah ... anim pun tak tau
Entah... Anim pun tidak tahu.
Don't know. Anim also not know.
I don't know.
983. <NickiJ> azieeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeee
984. <PemadaM> anim bukan pakar bahasa
Anim bukan specialist language.
Anim is not a language specialist.

(Appendix C Data4: 960-984)

Extract 33:

414. <TengokAja> kita hanya lawat scotland...hanya pegi ke rome..hanya pegi ke istanbul..itu saja
415. <LadySue^> hehehehe.. besh gaks tu canda!
416. <LadySue^> tapi kat sana takder abg bomba!
ahaks
427. <TengokAja> tapi kat sana tak der freego!!
428. <TengokAja> tapi kat sana tak der freego!!
433. <TengokAja> dia comel....kan awak suka dia
he cute.. [dp]-'kan' you like him.
He's cute, you like him, don't you?
- 437.* LadySue^ suka dia??
like him??
438. <LadySue^> hehehehehehehe
(laughs)

(Appendix C Data3: 414-438)

Extract 34:

1945. <Izand> teapottttttttt
teapot (nsxx's other nickname)
1946. <Izand> apo mimpi ko dalam ni pepagi nih
apa mimpi kau dalam ini pagi-pagi ini?
what dream you in this morning-morning
this?
What did you dream coming here early
in the morning?
1947. <nsxx> sajo la weii cuti kan
Saja lah wei cuti kan.
nt-saja dp-lah ex-wei holiday [dp]-kan
No particular reason, it is a holiday.

(Appendix C Data4: 1945-1947)

Extracts

Extract 35:

1871. <izand> tata..orait dahh..sistem aku dah cun,
hehe
Tata..'alright' sudah..'system' aku
sudah bagus, hehe.
Tata..alright already...system me
already good.
Tata..my system is o.k. now.
1872. <TaTa> izan ye ke?
Izan ya kah?
Izan yes 'kah'
Izan, really?
1873. <TaTa> ko' guna lotus notes??
Kau guna Lotus Notes?
You use Lotus Notes?
Are you using Lotus Notes?
1874. <TaTa> teori domino tu ke?
Teori domino itu kah?
Theory domino that 'kah'?
That domino theory software?
1875. <TaTa> versio bape?
Version berapa?
Version how many?
Which version?
1876. <izand> tata..bukan domina..lotus notes 4.5
tata.. not domina.. lotus notes 4.5.
1877. <TaTa> ye la lotus notes kan guna concept
domino
ya lah lotus notes 'kan' guna concept
domino.
Yes [dp] lotus notes 'kan' use concept
domino.
Yes (I know) but lotus notes uses
domino concept, (doesn't it?).

(Appendix C Data3: 1871-1877)

Extract 36:

1949. <nsxx> ijand samat taun baru
izand selamat tahun baru.
Izand safe new year.
Izand, Happy New Year.
- 1952.<Izand> teapot..samat tawun baru
teapot.. selamat tahun baru.
Teapot.. safe new year.
Teapot, Happy New Year.

(Appendix C Data4: 1949-1952)

Extracts

Extract 37:

1878. <TaTa> ye la lotus notes kan guna concept domino
ya lah lotus notes 'kan' guna concept domino.
Yes [dp]-lah lotus notes [dp]-kan use concept domino.
Yes, lotus notes uses domino concept, (doesn't it?).
1879. <izand> ver4.5
Version 4.5
1881. <TaTa> yang ko buek tu buek apo? mail?
yang kau buat itu buat apa? Mail?
[rel]-yang you do that do what? Mail?
The one that you're doing is what for? Mail?
1883. <izand> bukan
No.
1883. <izand> application system
application system.
(I'm doing) application system.
1886. <izand> application system utk org bahagian khidmat pengguna
'Application system' untuk orang bahagian khidmat pengguna.
Application system for people division customers service.
The application system for the people at customers service department.
1887. <TaTa> abis ko buat pe? bahagian ane?
Habis kau buat apa? Bahagian mana?
Finish you do what? Part where?
Then what do you do? Which part?
1888. <izand> the whole system ler
The whole system lah
The whole system.
1889. <izand> la ni aku dok betolkan sana sket, sini sket, bos baru komen
La ni aku duduk betulkan sana sedikit sini sedikit.
Now this I sit fixing there a bit here a bit.
I am fixing a little bit of here and there.

(Appendix C Data3: 1874-1889)

Extracts

Extract 38:

- 1663.<Ratu_Meen> heheheh....mijaa.....sonok tak *****
[laughs]... mijaa.. seronok tak *****
[laughs]... Mijaa.. fun no
[censored]*****
[laughs]. Mijaa, is it fun *****?
- 1664.<mijaa`> meen.. bebaik
meen.. baik-baik.
meen.. good-good.
Meen, careful.
1665. <mijaa`> tak baik tau tanya25 bende cam tu
tak baik tahu tanya-tanya benda macam
itu.
no good know ask-asik thing like that.
It's not nice to ask such thing.
- 1667.<Ratu_Meen> ekekekke
[laughs]
- 1668.<Ratu_Meen> eleh mijaa
[dp]-eleh Mijaa.
- 1670.<Ratu_Meen> kite kan sama status
we [dp]-kan same status
We've the same status.
- 1673.<mijaa`> iye... tapi ko tau ler bend25 `ni tak
leh cit25 cam tu
ya... tapi kau tahu lah benda-benda
ini tak boleh cerita-cerita macam itu.
yes...but you know [dp]-lah thing-
thing this no can story-story like
that.
Yes... but then you know we shouldn't
be discussing things like this.

(Appendix C Data6: 1663-1673)

Extract 39:

100. <NenaZ> kite coba nak install photoshop nih
Kita cuba hendak install photoshop
ini.
We try want install photoshop this.
I'm trying to install photoshop.
103. <NenaZ> tapi kan pott.. tak leh gak
Tapi 'kan' Pott..tidak boleh juga.
But 'kan' Pott.. not can also.
But it didn't work..
112. <nsxx> guna cd lah.. semua ada..
Guna cd lah...semua ada..
Use cd 'lah'..all have.
Use a cd. It's all there.
114. <NenaZ> dah...
Sudah.

Extracts

- Already.
I did.
116. <NenaZ> pott die kate suh carik disk2
Pott dia kata suruh cari disk-disk.
Pott it say ask find discs.
It told me to get other discs.
119. <NenaZ> disk2 tu dah ade dah
Disk-disk itu sudah ada sudah.
Discs that already have already.
The discs were all there.
120. <nsxx> aik ko pakai cd kan
aik kau pakai cd kan.
[exp]-aik you use cd [qp]-kan.
Are you using CD?
121. <NenaZ> iyer ler...
ya lah.
yes [dp]-lah.
Yes.
122. <NenaZ> pakai cd..
use cd.
I'm using CD.
123. <nsxx> dah tu..?
Sudah itu..?
After that?
Then?
124. <nsxx> pe maksud ko?
apa maksud kau?
what mean you?
What do you mean?
125. <NenaZ> tapi tak boleh lah..
but no can [dp]-lah.
But still cannot.

(Appendix C Data1: 100-125)

Extract 40:

772. TaTa: izan <-- ko izan mane?
Izan ←- Kau Izan mana?
Izan ←- You Izan where?
Izan, which Izan are you?
774. izan: izan tahu ada banyak izan...
izan know have many izan..
Izan knows there are many izans.
776. weck: izan ni kat tmn pelangi jb kan
izan ini dekat taman pelangi jb kan.
izan this near garden pelangi jb [dp]-
kan
Izan stays at Pelangi Garden in JB?
777. izan: alamak weck....silap oghang le....
alamak weck....silap orang lah....
[ex]-alamak weck....wrong people [dp]-
lah.

Extracts

778.izan: Oh no Weck! You got the wrong person.
nie izan BBU....
ini izan BBU...
this izan BBU...
This Izan is from BBU.
(Appendix C Ddata2: 772-778)

Extract 41:

134. *** zaiYani (koka@brk-22-95.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
137. <NenaZ> zaii
(shouts Zai's name)
140. <NenaZ> baru nak masuk.. kekekekkeekek
New want enter..(laugh)
You're just joining in?
141. <zaiYani> heheh assalamualaikummmm
(laughs then greets)
144. <zaiYani> sape nak kuau?
Siapa hendak keluar?
Who want out?
Who's signing off?
145. <NenaZ> w'salam
(Greetings)
146. <nsxx> w;salam
(Greetings)
147. <NenaZ> tu apott tu aaa tunggu zai tu
Itu apott itu lah tunggu zai tu.
That apott that [dp]-lah wait zai
that.
Apott has been waiting for Zai.
148. <zaiYani> oits....heheeh muahsssss kat nenaz
[ex]-oits.. [laugh][kiss] at nenaz.
[ex]
150. <NenaZ> heheh kan pott??
[laughs] 'kan' pott??

(Appendix C Data1: 134-150)

Data 1

APPENDIX C
IRC Sample Data

Data 1

<snip>

66. Session Start: Sat Feb 14 15:32:20 1998
67. *** Now talking in #dusun
68. #dusun topic is ()
69. #dusun topic set by X on Sat Feb 14 15:07:24
70. #dusun created on Sun Jan 12 21:45:50
71. *** ^fish (lisa@klj-18-131.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
72. <NenaZ> ermhhh
73. <padiBAIK> weh mana satu intan mana satu kaca nih meen
74. <meen> mana meen tau
75. <DeViLSoLe> aku baik la
76. <meen> nenazzzzzzzz
77. <meen> bye sumer
78. <NenaZ> eh?
79. <NenaZ> a'kum
80. <meen> wa'a'laikum salam warah matullah hiwabarokatuh
4 NenaZ
81. <NenaZ> cehhh
82. *** padiBAIK is now known as paDiGiLer
83. <NenaZ> meen ade auto jawab salam dah ek?
84. nsxx nak rest jap
85. <meen> haah
86. <NenaZ> mana si gliii nih
87. <NenaZ> weiii
88. <NenaZ> pottt
89. <meen> cangguh dakkkkk
90. <NenaZ> dak eh
91. <NenaZ> tak cangguh hehehhee
92. <NenaZ> a'kum gliii
93. <meen> wa'a'laikum salam warah matullah hiwabarokatuh
4 NenaZ
94. <nsxx> apo makcik
95. <NenaZ> haaaaaaaaaaa tengok
96. <NenaZ> kite kasi salam kat gliii meen yg jawab
97. <NenaZ> kekekekke
98. <NenaZ> pottt
99. <meen> citttttttt
100. <NenaZ> kite coba nak install photoshop nih
101. <eye_knee> sapo nampak kogie
102. <meen> cilakak nenaz
103. <NenaZ> tapi kan pott.. tak leh gak
104. <eye_knee> sapo nampak kogie
105. *** zaiyani is on IRC
106. <NenaZ> uk elehhhhh
107. <meen> bye
108. <NenaZ> sampai mencarut lak die
109. <NenaZ> sampai nye ati
110. *** weah (kardu@202.188.82.222) has joined #dusun
111. <NenaZ> pott.. zai dah masuk dah
112. <nsxx> guna cd lah.. semua ada..
113. *** meen has quit IRC (for dating at coral beach resort....sape nak ikut, jom....)
114. <NenaZ> dah...

Data 1

115. <nsxx> makcik zai mano tak ingat laa ehehhee
116. <NenaZ> pott die kate suh carik disk2
117. *** badai (elle@j22.glg87.jaring.my) has joined
#dusun
118. *** weah (kardu@202.188.82.222) has left #dusun
119. <NenaZ> disk2 tu dah ade dah
120. <nsxx> aik ko pakai cd kan
121. <NenaZ> iyer ler...
122. <NenaZ> pakai cd..
123. <nsxx> dah tu..?
124. <nsxx> pe maksud ko?
125. <NenaZ> tapi tak boleh lah..
126. <NenaZ> masa install kan
127. <nsxx> try lagik aa
128. <NenaZ> dah coba dahhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhh
129. <DeViLSoLe> blah dulu
130. <NenaZ> semue tempat dah coba weii
131. <DeViLSoLe> a'kum
132. *** DeViLSoLe (KeTWOaT@klg-58-39.tm.net.my) has left
#dusun
133. <NenaZ> geram ler
134. *** zaiYani (koka@brk-22-95.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
135. <nsxx> lerr
136. <NenaZ> w'salam
137. <NenaZ> zaiii
138. <nsxx> tak bley gakk ke
139. <zaiYani> ehemmmmm
140. <NenaZ> baru nak masuk.. kekekekkekeke
141. <zaiYani> heheh assalamualaikummmmm
142. <NenaZ> tak bleh
143. *** paDiGiLer (mengkuang@j22.jrc16.jaring.my) has
left #dusun
144. <zaiYani> sape nak kuau?
145. <NenaZ> w'salam
146. <nsxx> w;salam
147. <NenaZ> tu apott tu aaa tunggu zai tu
148. <zaiYani> oits....heheeh muahsssss kat nenaz
149. *** badai (elle@j22.glg87.jaring.my) has left #dusun
150. <NenaZ> heheh kan pott??
151. <zaiYani> nsxx hehe aiseyyyyyy
152. <NenaZ> alamak sorang lagi muah nih.. bahye nih
153. <nsxx> zai pe sal lambat masuk nih?
154. <zaiYani> apott terharu aku muahahahaa
155. <NenaZ> pott tolong ler.. cam ne nih?
156. <NenaZ> zai die tunggu kawan zai ari tu tuuu
157. <NenaZ> mana die???
158. <nsxx> emm canno nak tolon aa
159. <zaiYani> huyoooooooo srina tuh ek? iskk
160. <nsxx> photoshp ver bapo tu makcik
161. <zaiYani> apott aku ingatkan tunggu aku
tadik.....iskkkk
162. <NenaZ> 4.0
163. <nsxx> oooo
164. <NenaZ> kekek zaiiii haaa sudahhhh takyah tuu

Data 1

165. <nsxx> aku install ok jek
166. <zaiYani> hehehehe
167. zaiYani esok gi kenduri tawin
168. <NenaZ> pe sal kite tak leh lak??
169. <NenaZ> zai nak kawin?
170. <NenaZ> lor..
171. zaiYani esok gi kenduri tawin
172. <nsxx> emmm ntah aaa makcik
173. <nsxx> tak tau la
174. <NenaZ> pott .. dcc lah kat kite program tu
175. <zaiYani> ehhhh mijaaa.....camne ari nih sehat?
176. <NenaZ> sihat jekkkk
177. <nsxx> oitt beso beb
178. <NenaZ> badan sakit2..
179. <zaiYani> nenaz apsal lak ngan badan?
180. <NenaZ> sakit lah beb
181. <nsxx> aku ingat ko tanye kat aserk la
182. <nsxx> dio tu terer tuh
183. <nsxx> mahguru aku
184. <NenaZ> ler.. nak nanye org lain lak dah
185. <zaiYani> mahguru chot chet ekk hehehehe
186. <nsxx> eheheh
187. <nsxx> betui zai dio banyak ngajo aku
188. <nsxx> buat hp pon dio aja
189. <zaiYani> ye aku tau.....dia pon banyak ajar aku gak
190. <nsxx> itu aaa
191. <nsxx> kat opis aku pc sumo dio mantain
192. <zaiYani> tapi aku nih.....lembap ler.....tak leh nak absorb pon
193. <NenaZ> iye ke?
194. <NenaZ> kekekkek
195. <zaiYani> hehehehhe.....
196. <NenaZ> zai awak tu memang lembab sokmo
197. <nsxx> lerrr ko ati tak terang kot
198. <nsxx> ehehhe
199. <NenaZ> buat hp??
200. <NenaZ> gile
201. <NenaZ> oo hompej
202. <NenaZ> ingatkan handphone
203. <NenaZ> kekkeekkekke
204. <zaiYani> nenaz hehehehe.....lembap bab bab nih jer nenaz hehehe
205. <NenaZ> sori
206. <NenaZ> sori
207. <nsxx> muhaaaaaaa
208. <nsxx> makcik mamai
209. <NenaZ> a'aa mamai gile
210. <NenaZ> pott tak leh ke??
211. <nsxx> ehehhe
212. <NenaZ> tak pe lah
213. *** gliii (dist@klj-17-247.tm.net.my) has left #dusun
214. <nsxx> tak leh aa
215. <nsxx> try la install lagik
216. <nsxx> slow slow
217. <nsxx> ehehhe

Data 1

218. <NenaZ> tak leh ler
219. <NenaZ> malas dah
220. *** NenaZ is now known as mija
221. zaiYani nak gi round round kejap
222. <mija> eh tertinggal lak
223. <mija> hehehe
224. <nsxx> mlaas sudahh
225. *** ^fish (lisa@klj-18-131.tm.net.my) has left #dusun
226. *** mija is now known as mijaaaaa
227. <mijaaaaa> haaaaaaaaaaaaa
228. <mijaaaaa> ok ler
229. <mijaaaaa> kite nak kuar gak
230. <mijaaaaa> babai ler
231. <zaiYani> babaiiiiiiiiiiiiiii
232. <nsxx> ok babaii
233. <zaiYani> a'kummmmm
234. <mijaaaaa> take care
235. *** zaiYani (koka@brk-22-95.tm.net.my) has left
#dusun
236. <mijaaaaa> w'salam
237. <nsxx> w'salam
238. <mijaaaaa> a'kumm
239. Session Close: Sat Feb 14 15:43:33 1998

<snip>

1402. Session Start: Wed Feb 18 02:52:09 1998
1403. *** Now talking in #dusun
1404. #dusun topic is Time is a Relationship Through
Events ()
1405. #dusun topic set by X on Wed Feb 18 02:20:46
1406. #dusun created on Sun Jan 12 21:45:50
1407. <^mijaa^> adehhh
1408. <^mijaa^> silap..
1409. <Z-O> hehe
1410. <Z-O> haa..angel
1411. <Z-O> kepak dah pasang balik ke? tadi kepak patah?
1412. <Canda> lalalala
1413. <Canda> we r gonna be...forever u and me...
1414. <Canda> dora..jawab cepattt
1415. <Canda> dora..jawab cepattt
1416. <Canda> mana dia ni
1417. <^mijaa^> a'aa kena tembak
1418. <Canda> kita lag ker?
1419. <Canda> !ping
1420. <^mijaa^> ler.. dora ngan canda masih tak bersua ke?
1421. <^mijaa^> ler..
1422. <Canda> yer laaa
1423. <Canda> mana pernah
1424. <Z-O> hehe
1425. <Canda> dora..mana ni..
1426. <^mijaa^> dora weiii
1427. [E`dora] PING
1428. <^mijaa^> dora tenet kut?
1429. <E`dora> kekke

Data 1

1480. *** Hunky (~pinggan@202.188.127.2) has joined #dusun

1481. *** X changes topic to "Time is a Relationship Through Events () "

1482. <Z-O> mpeg?

1483. <Z-O> xing bleh..vd station bleh..mpeg player bleh

1484. *** Hunky (~pinggan@202.188.127.2) has left #dusun

1485. <TaTa> sape nak beling xing mpeg card?

1486. *** Orchid (Me..@202.160.4.206) has joined #dusun

1487. <Orchid> halo korang pekabar

1488. *** jandalawo has left IRC

1489. <TaTa> wokeh

1490. *** Lizaa (Tin@jhb-12-67.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun

1491. <Z-O> lizaaa oiiii

1492. <Lizaa> emm emmm

1493. <Z-O> isk..isk..isk..

1494. <Lizaa> helo?

1495. <Z-O> heloooooo

1496. <Lizaa> sori lerrr

1497. <Lizaa> ari nih ... tmnet buat hal lakk

1498. -Lizaa- **Your ping reply is 6 second(s)**. Today is 02/18/98 at 23:10:19 12- 10= 12 Glôw 10Ñ 12dark 2.5 10= 12-

1499. <Lizaa> great .. u guys are lagging??

1500. <Lizaa> or am i lagging????

1501. *** TaTa has quit IRC (Write error to TaTa[202.188.66.228], closing link)

1502. <Z-O> akua de nih

1503. <Lizaa> [^mijaa^ PING reply]: 6 seconds

1504. *** tata is on IRC

1505. Z-O pening kepala aah

1506. <Lizaa> [Orchid PING reply]: 44 seconds

1507. <Lizaa> [Orchid PING reply]: 44 seconds

1508. <Lizaa> [Z-O PING reply]: 11 seconds

1509. <Lizaa> why?

1510. <Lizaa> rahiza oits

1511. <Z-O> entah aa

1512. *** apek_1 (~X@klj-17-83.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun

1513. <Z-O> dah 2 ,3 hari asyik pening aje

1514. <Z-O> dok ngadap mende ni aje kot..pasai tu ler

1515. <Lizaa> makan tidur cukup tak?

1516. *** apek_1 (~X@klj-17-83.tm.net.my) has left #dusun

1517. <Lizaa> oo

1518. <Lizaa> mm biasa lah tu

1519. <Z-O> tido lebih dari cukup

1520. <Lizaa> pc ada ...

1521. <Z-O> kul 9.30 dah belayor dah

1522. <Lizaa> hehehe

1523. <Lizaa> rahizaa

1524. <Z-O> yooo

1525. <Lizaa> can u do me a favour plizzzz

1526. <Z-O> iye liza sayang

1527. <Z-O> gapo dio?

1528. <Lizaa> ceyyy

Data 1

1529. <Lizaa> nasib baik matlap tak dok
1530. <Z-O> hehehehehe
1531. <Z-O> nape weh?
1532. <Lizaa> kalau takkk .. karang abiss die kate kite
les karang haa .. gilo
1533. <Z-O> hari tuh dia dah kate pon..lantak pi aaa
1534. <Lizaa> emm ko selalu tak pegi imbi plaza?
1535. <Z-O> jangan kata selalu
1536. <Z-O> tak pernah gi pong..hehee
1537. <Lizaa> hehehe
1538. *** mork is on IRC
1539. <Lizaa> ooo selalu ler nih
1540. <Lizaa> lerrrrrrrrrrrr
1541. <Lizaa> sebelah .. cathay lerrrr
1542. <Z-O> jehehe..
1543. <Lizaa> cathay tu depannn pertama complex
1544. <Z-O> nape? nak beli ape?
1545. <Z-O> oo..ye ke? hehe
1546. <Lizaa> nak mintak ko belikan aku installerr
1547. <Z-O> eh..tu bukan cathay ler
1548. <Lizaa> installer .. VB5 ngan VB4
1549. <Z-O> depan pertama panggung lain..dah tutup dah
1550. <Lizaa> aku nak bersiap sedie utk next sem nih]
1551. <Z-O> kat JB takdok ke?
1552. <Lizaa> kat KL murah ..
1553. <Lizaa> emm payahhh ...
1554. <Z-O> ler..JB lagi murah kot
1555. <Z-O> ko nak orginal ke?
1556. <Lizaa> jb ari tu .. aku carik ... tak de yg
berkenan ler
1557. <Lizaa> entah pe pe ler installer yang die jual
1558. <Lizaa> nope .. original mahal giler
1559. <Z-O> haa..sebab tu ler aku ingat JB lagi murah
1560. <Lizaa> imbi tu boss die aaa
1561. <Z-O> liza..ko tengah buat ape aa?
1562. <Z-O> nak study ke?
1563. <Lizaa> kat sane melambak choice
1564. <Lizaa> kat sane melambak choice cd
1565. <Z-O> tengok aa..kalu aku gi, aku carik ek
1566. <Lizaa> kat sini HP jek
1567. <Lizaa> aku tgh makan roti bakar
1568. <Z-O> oit..jom lawan dam jom
1569. <Lizaa> hah
1570. <Lizaa> ape pasal lak nih?
1571. <Z-O> lawan main Dam aa
1572. <Z-O> jom aa..hehe..aku boring nih
1573. <Lizaa> nak main dam kat mane? aku chess ok laa ...
dam tak gheti
1574. <Z-O> ler..chess reti, dam plak tak
reti..aperaa..dam lagi senang dari chess
1575. <Z-O> kat sini..http://www.classicgames.com
1576. <Lizaa> uwekk uwekk sarghhhhhhh
1577. <Z-O> chess aku plak tak berapa reti
1578. <Lizaa> guess what ...
1579. <Lizaa> i cut my own hair

Data 1

1580. <Z-0> ??
1581. <Lizaa> hahhahahah
1582. <Z-0> hah?
1583. <Z-0> err..aku tau ler ko tgh weng
1584. <Lizaa> i cut my own hair
1585. <Z-0> betul ke ko potong tuh?
1586. <Lizaa> yapp
1587. <Z-0> tak senget ke?
1588. <Lizaa> baru jap TADI
1589. *** mork has left IRC
1590. <Lizaa> emm senget gak kat belakang
1591. <Lizaa> depan ngan tepi alrite jek
1592. <Z-0> ler
1593. <Z-0> pesal tak gi saloon?
1594. <Lizaa> http:
1595. <Lizaa> saloon mane aku nak pi .. pepagi nih
1596. <Z-0> gi ler pepetang yang oi
1597. <Lizaa> hehehe
1598. <Lizaa> ntah aa
1599. <Orchid> tak sabar agaknya
1600. <Lizaa> lepas jer aku terdiscon dari irc kul 10 tadi
.. aku terus masuk bilik air gunting teruih rambut
hehehehe
1601. <Z-0> ler..makpak ko tak marah ke
1602. <Lizaa> tak ...
1603. <Lizaa> die orang heran jek ... pepasal ler anak die
nih ..
1604. <Lizaa> weh kire aku weng giler gak nih hehe
1605. *** tata has left IRC
1606. <Z-0> hehehehe
1607. Lizaa tgh msuk url nih
1608. <Z-0> url yg aku bagi ke?
1609. <Z-0> aku dah terkeluar nih..dia hang plaks
1610. <Lizaa> ooooo
1611. Z-0 nak nyanyi lagiks
1612. <Z-0> mijaaaa...oo...mijaaa...jom aaaa nyanyi
1613. <Z-0> suddenly i'm in too deep
1614. <Orchid> aku chow dulu lah
1615. <Z-0> to ever get outtttttt
1616. <Orchid> assalamualaikum
1617. <Z-0> i give u my heart and my soul to keep
1618. *** Orchid (Me..@202.160.4.206) has left #dusun
1619. <Z-0> w'salams
1620. <Z-0> to ever get outttttt
1621. <Z-0> i'm over my headdddd
1622. <Z-0> and it scared me sooooo
1623. <Z-0> wooo....wooo..
1624. <Z-0> lizaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
1625. <Lizaa> rahiza nak tanyer sjett
1626. <Z-0> shoot
1627. <Lizaa> b4 u enrolled to utm ko kat MPIK kan?
1628. <Z-0> haa..yeap
1629. <Z-0> apesai?
1630. <Lizaa> what was ur dad's reaction bile ko nak get
out of mpik?

Data 1

1631. <Z-O> dia suka
1632. <Lizaa> aku nak bersediakan diri aku nih ngan
reaction ayah aku nih
1633. <Z-O> hehehe
1634. <Lizaa> aaaaaa???
1635. <Lizaa> die suke????
1636. <Lizaa> aaaaa????
1637. <Z-O> ha-ah
1638. <Z-O> coz dia mmg nak suruh aku balik johor, masuk
UTM
1639. <Lizaa> ler
1640. <Lizaa> aku tak leh ler .. banding kan cam nih
1641. <Z-O> dia yg tolong karangkan surat berenti MPIK
1642. <Lizaa> iskkk
1643. <Lizaa> hahhahahahhaahahaha
1644. <Z-O> ha-ah ler..kes lain
1645. <Z-O> sahhhhhhhhhhhhhh
1646. <Z-O> sahhhhhhhhhhhhhh
1647. <Lizaa> emm ... ko lak camne ?
1648. <Z-O> sahhhhhhhhhhhhhh laaa ko dah weng
1649. <Z-O> aku mmg nak berenti pon
1650. <Lizaa> eh
1651. <Z-O> tension dok MPIK
1652. <Lizaa> aku gelak sebab ayah ko yang karang
1653. <Z-O> then masuk Rima seronok
1654. <Z-O> pas tu masuk UTM pon seronok gak
1655. <Z-O> ooo..hehe
1656. <Lizaa> ko tau tak ayah aku kate pe bile die nampak
aku dok potong potong job vacancies
1657. <Z-O> haa..cakap ape?
1658. <Lizaa> tak payah ler kerje kerje nih
1659. <Lizaa> enroll kursus graphics ke ... multimedia ke
... lagi baguss
1660. <Lizaa> hiskkkkkk
1661. <Z-O> kalau tak keje, nak buat ape?
1662. <Lizaa> tu aaaaaaa
1663. <Z-O> ler..suruh study lagi?
1664. <Z-O> sampai bile dia nak suruh ko study?
1665. <Lizaa> aku pikir .. takkan le sepanjang idup aku
... aku ditanggung oleh parents aku jer
1666. <Lizaa> aku nak gakk kerje ..
1667. <Lizaa> hiskk ... hiskkk
1668. <Z-O> ha-ah ler
1669. <Lizaa> sekali ko pon kene maca aku hehehe padan
muke
1670. <Z-O> hmm...ada petanda
1671. <Z-O> aku interested nak sambung study kalau amik MBA
aje
1672. <Z-O> kalau comp. gak..hmm..pikir 100 kali dulu
1673. <Lizaa> petanda?
1674. <Lizaa> yeahhh
1675. <Z-O> petanda dia nak suruh study ler
1676. <Lizaa> aku kalau boleh nak buat masters tu tapi ..
aku mmg nak kerje dulu
1677. <Lizaa> and then i don't want to do it in UTM

Data 1

1678. <Z-O> haa..correct aahh

1679. <Lizaa> i'm telling u lah rahiza jangan buat kat utmmmmmm

1680. <Z-O> tapi kalu aku kene keje johor..maybe kene utm gak

1681. <Z-O> nak buat MBA mmg tak kat utm ler

1682. <Lizaa> ko jadi tutor ke?

1683. <Lizaa> tutor kat utm??

1684. *** mork is on IRC

1685. <Lizaa> fakulti mane tuh?

1686. <Z-O> kalu keje ngan utm, kat fsksm ler

1687. *** mork has left IRC

1688. <Z-O> baik aku sumbangkan tenaga pada fak aku sendiri

1689. *** Hunky (~pinggan@202.188.127.2) has joined #dusun

1690. *** X changes topic to "Time is a Relationship Through Events () "

1691. <Lizaa> hehehe

1692. <Lizaa> kalau macam tu u have to be ready ler

1693. *** Lizaa is now known as Nur`

1694. *** Hunky (~pinggan@202.188.127.2) has left #dusun

1695. *** Nur` is now known as Liza`

1696. <Z-O> ready for what?

1697. <Liza`> coz u'll be the only tutor not wearing tudung ... and plus .. ko jadi tutor utk sistem or KP ler

1698. *** mork is on IRC

1699. <Z-O> ler..MIS tak bleh ke?

1700. <Liza`> emm sekarang ni die orang nak ... sistem ngan KP

1701. <Liza`> kalau ko major MIS pon .. ko kene ajr programming ler beb

1702. <Z-O> aiyakkk

1703. <Z-O> kengsel aa

1704. <Z-O> hehe

1705. <Liza`> aku tengok senior aku ngajor data com , networking , C programming, pascal .. senibina kompyter

1706. <Liza`> kalau MIS aku rasa bile dah dapat masters baru boleh .. die juruskan ler .. macam cik norhayati

1707. <Z-O> oooo

1708. <Z-O> leceh aa

1709. <Liza`> MIS .. orang kuat die zailani , norhayati, rosealinda ,

1710. <Z-O> kene bodek cik yati ler nih

1711. <Liza`> yang lain tuh study overseas

1712. <Z-O> oooo

1713. <Liza`> heheheh

1714. <Liza`> emmm ade adik junior tahun 2 citer kat aku

1715. <Liza`> kelas SADM bawak cik norhayati ramai yg fail

1716. <Z-O> mak oiii

1717. <Z-O> bahaya nih

1718. <Liza`> aik .. pepasal lak bahatye .. kan ko daj amik

1719. <Z-O> iye ler

Data 1

1720. <Z-O> aku ingat nak pilih dia jada penyelia
1721. <Liza`> eh tu abang azagoth ko ada tuh
1722. <Liza`> oooo
1723. <Liza`> eii amik die lerrrrrr
1724. <Liza`> amik die lerr
1725. <Liza`> die tu ok ler
1726. <Z-O> hehe..tau..chat ngan dia gak nih
1727. <Liza`> isk ... aku ingatkan ko chat ngan cik
norhayati terkejut aku
1728. <Liza`> mijaa tu pesal senyap?
1729. <Z-O> ler..hehehe
1730. <Z-O> dia kat lab tu kot
1731. <Z-O> keje ler
1732. *** mork` is on IRC
1733. *** mork has left IRC
1734. <Z-O> jom aa masuk classic games weh
1735. <Z-O> ni aku tgh main dam ngan budak new jersey
1736. <Liza`> KO NIH KATE DAH KELUAR ..aku dah bukak site
lain nih
1737. <Liza`> hiskk
1738. <Liza`> eh ok gak rambut aku ni .. tak ler senget pe
pon ..
1739. <Z-O> ler
1740. <Z-O> tadi terkeluar
1741. <Z-O> pas tu masuk balik
1742. <Z-O> hehe..nanti balik sana aku check
1743. <Liza`> eh ko balik bile aa?
1744. <Z-O> ujung bulan mac
1745. <Z-O> but awal bulan pon aku balik kejap kot
1746. <Liza`> roti bakar aku dah terbakar
1747. <Z-O> ler..hehe
1748. <Liza`> serius .. tadi aku pi kat toaster .. berasap
keluar dari toaster tuh
1749. *** Liza` is now known as Liza
1750. <Z-O> ko bebaik
1751. <Z-O> terbako rumah ko kang
1752. *** dara-ria (~pinggan@202.188.127.2) has joined
#dusun
1753. <Liza> hehehehehh
1754. <dara-ria> heyyyyy..girls
1755. <Liza> ape laaaaaaaa
1756. <Liza> rahiza .. ada orang mexican plak msg kite ni
haaaaa
1757. <dara-ria> hei liza....r u still a dara..
1758. <Z-O> what kind of question was that
1759. <Liza> watch it okay
1760. *** hits (hans@161.139.67.4) has joined #dusun

<snip>

2041. <edoraku> yer keeee
2042. <TaTa> iye
2043. <edoraku> keekkekekekeek
2044. <edoraku> apek tu dah belah ker?

Data 1

2045. <TaTa> dah
2046. <TaTa> hehe
2047. <TaTa> dah blah leh main irc balik
2048. <edoraku> oooooooooo
2049. <edoraku> macam tu kerrrr
2050. <TaTa> a'aa
2051. <edoraku> a'aa betul laaaaaa
2052. <TaTa> apa yang boto?
2053. <edoraku> pe=pe jer ler yang ko cakap tadi tuuuu
2054. <TaTa> ok laa
2055. <TaTa> nak kuar
2056. TaTa dora sayang
2057. TaTa tembok
2058. TaTa all
2059. <edoraku> kkekekek
2060. <TaTa>
ellaa
2061. <TaTa>
ellaa
2062. <TaTa>
ellaa
2063. <TaTa>
ellaa
2064. <edoraku> terima kasih
2065. <TaTa> tak nampak ler
2066. TaTa ella
2067. *** ella` (guest@202.185.100.106) has left #dusun
2068. <JemBerl> hehehehe
2069. *** LadySue^ (~Peace@pc98.dataprep.com.my) has
joined #dusun
2070. <LadySue^> assalamualaikum!
2071. <edoraku> hai sue
2072. <edoraku> w'salam sue
2073. <LadySue^> haii dora.. pekaba?? lama tak nampak??
2074. <edoraku> sihat sue
2075. <edoraku> baru balik jer niiii
2076. <edoraku> ada baru kuar dari tempat bertapa laaa
2077. <LadySue^> laaa ilmu apa ko tapakan dora?? ilmu alam
ker?? ilmu hisab?? hehehehe
2078. <LadySue^> mijaaa buat apa tu??
2079. <JemBerl> tengah buat jem
2080. <JemBerl> :))
2081. <LadySue^> oits ain! semalam pi dorai ker??
2082. <temBOK> idaaaaaaaaaaa
2083. <LadySue^> laa.. bak meh sini jem tu skit!! kawan-2
nak gaks!
2084. <edoraku> ilmu archi laaaaa
2085. <LadySue^> sayaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
2086. <temBOK> pi
2087. <edoraku> biasa la tuuu
2088. <LadySue^> dora :ooooooooo baru ku tau
2089. *** vaRS (~Anarchist@jrc-6-159.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
2090. <temBOK> ida
2091. <vaRS> a'kum sume

Data 1

2092. <JemBerI> tak leh ler.. duk lekat2 lagi nih#
2093. *** Adat (adat@161.139.67.1) has joined #dusun
2094. <LadySue^> laaa mijaa ...
2095. <LadySue^> bila leh makan tu sis??
2096. <LadySue^> ain apa??
2097. <JemBerI> tengah buat ni
2098. <edoraku> sue pe yang ko tahu tu?
2099. <edoraku> sue pe yang ko tahu tu?
2100. <LadySue^> hehehe.. siap nanti jangan lupa dcc kat
sini skt ekk.. hehehehe
2101. LadySue^ tau ler yang ko baru abis betapa!! lerrr
budak inii!
2102. <JemBerI> lor..
2103. <JemBerI> mane leh
2104. <JemBerI> hehhee
2105. <JemBerI> pi beli lah sue
2106. <JemBerI> ni kite nye nih
2107. <LadySue^> laaaa mijaa kemut!
2108. LadySue^ nak rasa yang sis buat tu!
2109. <Adat> salammm
2110. <LadySue^> salam
2111. <Adat> adr siapa nampak lomang tak ?
2112. <JemBerI> alamak
2113. <JemBerI> kang nyesal lak nanti
2114. <JemBerI> hehehe
2115. <Adat> edora ni satu fakulti ngan lomang ker? mana
dia?
2116. LadySue^ angkat tangan! hehehehehe.. tak nampak!
2117. edoraku bukan satu falkuti dengan lomang
2118. LadySue^ pun bukan satu falkuti dengan lomang!
2119. <edoraku> Sue tahu tak dora bertapa pe?
2120. <LadySue^> laa dora ko yang betapa surelah ko yang
lebih tauu!!
2121. LadySue^ tau sikit-2 jerr
2122. <Adat> anyway thanks.. kalau dia ader send my regard
to him ok
2123. <LadySue^> hehehehehehe...
2124. <Adat> ok bye all
2125. <Adat> wasallam
2126. <LadySue^> tata
2127. *** Adat has quit IRC (Leaving)
2128. edoraku baru habih submission presentation drawing
untuk final projek dia
2129. <edoraku> adat bye
2130. <edoraku> w;salam
2131. <LadySue^> oooooooooooooo good luck sis..
2132. <temBOK> ida
2133. <edoraku> tq sue
2134. <edoraku> lom tidor niiii
2135. <edoraku> esok baru nak cover tidor untuk 1 minggu
nyer
2136. <LadySue^> laaa samat tido pulak!
2137. <LadySue^> saya ain! apa??
2138. temBOK is back

Data 1

2139. <LadySue^> iskh si tembokk nie panggil orang pastu senyap lk!
2140. <LadySue^> jadik ker korang pegi dorai semalam??
2141. <temBOK> eeeeeee
2142. <temBOK> fugf
2143. temBOK tengah kuruskan badan
2144. <LadySue^> laaa takyah kuruskan ain!! dah lawo dah body tuu!
2145. <edoraku> a'aaaa
2146. <temBOK> lom
2147. <temBOK> lom lawa lagik
2148. <edoraku> ye la sampai tinggal tulang dan kulit jer
2149. *** PENGait (Miid@dial135.brunet.bn) has joined #dusun
2150. *** PENGait (Miid@dial135.brunet.bn) has left #dusun
2151. <temBOK> lop
2152. <LadySue^> laaa nak tinggai tulang jer ker baru lawa?? heheheheh udah ler tu!
2153. <edoraku> mana lak lawo terus jadi mayat hidop lakkk
2154. <temBOK> tu baru gans
2155. <edoraku> a'aa semua orang lari lintang pukang lak kanh
2156. <LadySue^> hehehehe dora..
2157. <temBOK> tak larinye
2158. <temBOK> algi suke ada laaa
2159. <edoraku> pe sue?
2160. temBOK oakai ilmu
2161. *** leP (opisbox@jrc-6-15.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
2162. <LadySue^> ilmu apa?? ilmu hisab ker?? hehehehe
2163. *** X changes topic to "Time is a Relationship Through Events () "
2164. <leP> yo yo
2165. <leP> salamualaikum...
2166. *** X sets mode: +o leP
2167. <LadySue^> w'salam matt
2168. leP slaps LadySue^ a Hi 5
2169. <LadySue^> matttttttt!! ari tu ida cari ko ler nak ajak ko!! tapi ko takder.. lama ida tunggu!
2170. <LadySue^> hehehe.. matt...
2171. <temBOK> mat zimbooo
2172. <leP> !ping
2173. <leP> ida muhung la....
2174. <leP> ida muhung la....
2175. <temBOK> lepp
2176. <temBOK> amacam exammm
2177. <leP> kalau cari awaat taak tipon ja..
2178. <leP> saja ja nak kelentong la tuh...
2179. <LadySue^> betuii matt!! ida tak tipu nyerr..
2180. <leP> tembok muka tembok..
2181. <temBOK> lep
2182. <LadySue^> laa tak caya tanya sapa ekk yang ada time tu!
2183. <LadySue^> haa.. badang.. lagi tata.. ha lagi.. tah sapa tah..

Data 1

2184. <temBOK> aku doakan ko fail
2185. <LadySue^> tak baik ko ain!
2186. <edoraku> wei pe lak fail score la
2187. <temBOK> saje je
2188. <temBOK> lep
2189. <temBOK> ko nye paper arab amaca
2190. *** suezie (~axl@161.142.137.184) has left #dusun
2191. <LadySue^> majukk ker matt!
2192. *** Z-O (~popeye@161.142.137.184) has joined #dusun
2193. <Z-O> a'kum semua
2194. <lep> oi aku lag....
2195. <lep> nak blah la.....
2196. <Z-O> aik..semua lag ke?
2197. <lep> lembab aku nye skrin nih...
2198. <lep> babai
2199. <Z-O> lepppppp
2200. *** lep (opisbox@jrc-6-15.tm.net.my) has left #dusun
2201. <LadySue^> laa matt lex ahh!
2202. <LadySue^> haii zand!
2203. <Z-O> [lep PING reply]: 32 seconds
2204. <Z-O> -
2205. <Z-O> yo sue!
2206. *** siamShaDe (wyatearp@192.156.147.164) has joined #dusun
2207. <edoraku> hai cik zullllll
2208. <edoraku> hai cik zullllll
2209. <Z-O> erkks
2210. <Z-O> hi edora
2211. <Z-O> kogieeee
2212. <temBOK> ilang laks si lep
2213. <siamShaDe> aikkk sapo tu
2214. <edoraku> cik zul sihat ker?
2215. <Z-O> alhamdulillah
2216. *** boyz (yyyy@202.186.51.3) has joined #dusun
2217. *** boyz (yyyy@202.186.51.3) has left #dusun
2218. *** Z-O is now known as Izand
2219. *** Izand is now known as Z-O
2220. <siamShaDe> le izand ke
2221. <Z-O> hehehe..ha-ah ler
2222. <siamShaDe> camna ari ni
2223. <siamShaDe> ada baik kaa iza
2224. Z-O nak gi amik air jap
2225. Z-O baik aje
2226. <Z-O> gie..ko sihat ke?
2227. <siamShaDe> sihat aje
2228. <siamShaDe> ko lak camna
2229. <siamShaDe> ngan praktikal tu
2230. <Z-O> sihat gaks
2231. <Z-O> biase ler..aku malas nak keje
2232. <siamShaDe> ape la ko nih
2233. <siamShaDe> abis tu ko nak buat ape tak nak keje
2234. <temBOK> ida
2235. <Z-O> aku main irc ler
2236. <siamShaDe> le ada ke praktikal main irc
2237. *** edoraku (~azmi@161.139.98.121) has joined #dusun

Data 1

2238. <edoraku> a'kum semua kekaawan
2239. LadySue^ gtg!
2240. *** LadySue^ has quit IRC (Leaving)
2241. <Z-O> w'salams
2242. *** X sets mode: +o Langsu|r
2243. <SeLaNg> muhehhehe..
2244. <SeLaNg> apo kau org dusun
2245. <edoraku> sihatttttttttttttttttttttt
2246. <SeLaNg> senyap ajo..
2247. <SeLaNg> edora.. hmm dah lame ke mainkat sini..
2248. <SeLaNg> edora.. hmm dah lame ke mainkat sini..
2249. <edoraku> lama gak ler
2250. <SeLaNg> hmm...tak pernah jumpe eekkk..
2251. <edoraku> sejak azali lagi kot
2252. <SeLaNg> eleh..sejak azali tanye mijaa sape..
2253. <SeLaNg> eleh..sejak azali tanye mijaa sape..
2254. <SeLaNg> muhehhehe..
2255. <edoraku> ada laaa
2256. <jetman> wqaaaa...
2257. <edoraku> pesal jetman?
2258. <SeLaNg> edoraku..study lagi kee.
2259. <edoraku> a'aa study lagi
2260. <edoraku> selang?
2261. <SeLaNg> yer yerrr.
2262. <SeLaNg> nadiaa.
2263. <NADIA98> selang
2264. <Z-O> aik..dedua blah
2265. <Z-O> tenet tempat lain ka
2266. <edoraku> a'aa
2267. <edoraku> pesal senyap semua aaaaaaa
2268. <jetman> adoooooooooooooooooooo
2269. <jetman> hei edoraaaaa..dah makan ke
2270. <edoraku> tunggu orang belanja jer
2271. <jetman> edora..economy meleset..
2272. <edoraku> aku tau, ekonomi meleset..
2273. <edoraku> tetapi hang kena belanja gak....
2274. <Z-O> *sighs*
2275. *** Langsu|r (darkstarx@millennium.webbnet.net)
has joined #dusun
2276. <jetman> nak belanja kena laa...ado pengeras nye
edora..weii
2277. <edoraku> pengeras nyer pe?
2278. <jetman> pengeras nye....u kena laaa..single n mandi
i bunga...heheeh
2279. <edoraku> kekeekkekek
2280. <edoraku> baik tak yahhhh
2281. <jetman> laa...edoraku..baru laa berbalong
menbelanja wang kat uuuu
2282. <jetman> u nie..dah berpunye ke edora..or dahhh
kawin..heheheh
2283. *** karburato (Gerald@j13.brf55.jaring.my) has
joined #dusun
2284. <edoraku> dah berpunya laaaa
2285. <edoraku> tapi lom kahwin lagi laaaa
2286. <karburato> salamlekumm...

Data 1

2287. <edoraku> w'salam burato
2288. <jetman> hmnm...ado harapan lagi
laa..nampok..nye..tapi ongkos nye tinggi kot..edora
2289. <edoraku> a'aa ye la tuuu
2290. <jetman> hehehe..persan laa tu edora nie
2291. <jetman> hehehe..perasan laa tu edora nie
2292. <edoraku> tak ponnnnn
2293. <edoraku> tak ponnnnn
2294. <Z-O> arghhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhh
2295. <jetman> edora....oh edora...
2296. <edoraku> pesal jet
2297. <jetman> aku sakit perut laaa..
2298. <edoraku> gi ler toilet tu
2299. <jetman> nak terberak...tapi...sembelit kot...
2357. Session Close: Thu Feb 19 05:28:31 1998

Data2

245. Session Start: Mon Feb 23 02:08:56 1998
399. *** X changes topic to "Love all, trust a few, do wrong to none. () "
400. <Canda> aku yang besar laa
401. <NADIA98> aku tanya ko yg mana satu
402. <Z-O> hehe..senang aje canda describe diri canda
403. <Canda> nadia..la...aku dah cakap ni..yang paling besar la..pakai la spek tu nadia...iskk
404. <NADIA98> ehhehehehe
405. <Canda> hehehe
406. <Canda> mak padi ni..<---kan dah kena!!
407. *** SurianE (~ouytliu@202.185.112.103) has left #dusun
408. <NADIA98> hampah ko canda
409. <Canda> hehhehehe
410. <Canda> nadia...kita ader lagi gamba yang lain
411. <Canda> tapi malas la nak bagi
412. <Canda> salah satu gamba yang lain tu..canda pakai baju kurtal
413. <NADIA98> bagi la
414. <Canda> hehehe
415. <Canda> gamba canda tu ayu sangat laa
416. <Canda> tak nak laa
417. <Canda> nadia..tu untuk yang tersayang jer
418. <Canda> heheheh
419. *** mork has left IRC
420. <NADIA98> lerrrrrr
421. <Canda> heheheh
422. <NADIA98> banyak la ko punya sayang
423. <Canda> yer la..
424. <Canda> dia tak der la malam ni
425. <NADIA98> hehehehe
426. <NADIA98> sapa tersayang ko canda
427. <Canda> nadia..dia ader masuk kat #mahligai hari tu
428. <Canda> dia jumpa baru dua kali bertenet kat mahligai tu
429. <NADIA98> sapa?
430. <NADIA98> cakap la
431. <Canda> hmm..nama dia caltex123
432. <NADIA98> jap aku tengok
433. <NADIA98> tak da pun
434. <Canda> dia tak der
435. <Canda> dia jarang masuk la nadia
436. <NADIA98> oooooo
437. <NADIA98> rindu giler la ko ya canda
438. <Canda> hehehe
439. <Canda> yer la..
440. <Canda> dia kata dia nak datang ke manchester..nak jumpa
441. <Canda> dia kata dia nak declare..tu yang tak larat tu
442. Session Close: Mon Feb 23 02:52:34 1998

1201. <Nowhere> hakimi nko tak tahu ella tu nisa ke..tadi aku pun tak tahu hehehe

Data2

1202. <JemCiKu> iyerrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr
1203. <Z-O> nowhere..nak simpan buat koleksi
1204. <Z-O> siannn mie nih..lag gilos..tukar seber ler bro
1205. <JemCiKu> die tak mo tukar2 tu
1206. <JemCiKu> hehehe
1207. JemCiKu nak balik sat lagi.. duk pikir nak makan pe
lak dah
1208. <Canda> mija...jangan makan ...nanti gemuk
1209. <JemCiKu> dah gemuk pun canda
1210. <hakimi> nowhere: aah .. aku tak tau die tuh nisaaa
1211. <JemCiKu> tak leh nak save kan lagi
1212. <Canda> mijaa..hehehhe
1213. <JemCiKu> hehehe
1214. <JemCiKu> nak naik tangga pun susah bebenor..
1215. <KAG32> kak ngah jangan makan bebanyak lerrrrrr
1216. <KAG32> kang gemokkkk tak cukup pintu lakkk kanggg
1217. LadySue^ Sue_Away
1218. <JemCiKu> lapar lah dora.. sebab tu le makan tuuuuuu
1219. *** LadySue^ is now known as Sue_Away
1220. <JemCiKu> ehehe
1221. Sue_Away nak pi tengok gambo makwe canda jap! hehehe
1222. <Canda> hehehhe
1223. <JemCiKu> makwe canda?
1224. <Canda> tak laa
1225. <JemCiKu> canda ade makwe.. tak habaq pun..
1226. <Canda> mijaa..tak laa
1227. <Canda> mana ader
1228. <JemCiKu> adehhh
1229. <JemCiKu> dah weng dah
1230. <JemCiKu> hehehe
1231. <JemCiKu> ngantukssss
1232. <Canda> heheh
1233. <Canda> pi la mijaa..
1234. <Canda> tapi jangan makan lagi
1235. <Canda> nak tido dah tu
1236. <JemCiKu> pi mano?
1237. <Nowhere> z-o ya ke
1238. *** ellaaway is now known as ella`
1239. <ella`> aikum
1240. <JemCiKu> wisalam
1241. <JemCiKu> bangun tido ke?
1242. <JemCiKu> ke byk keje?
1243. Nowhere tak seronok nak main la sebab lag
sesangat...nko org cita la aku nak jadi permahati je
1244. <ella`> erk
1245. <ella`> a'aa
1246. <ella`> hhehe
1247. <ella`> byk keje lah sis..
1248. <JemCiKu> ooooOOOOO
1249. <JemCiKu> hehe
1250. <ella`> nowhere tuko seve guna rockhill
1251. *** bug (kardu@202.188.82.70) has left #dusun
1252. <Sue_Away> canda: gamba tu takder yang gelap lagi
ker?? ciss

Data3

Session Start: Sun Mar 15 23:52:14 1998

357. LadySue^ kat skudai nie canda!
358. <TengokAja> yer ker?
359. <TengokAja> apasal gi sana?
360. <LadySue^> sajor lawat kengkawan!
361. <TengokAja> yer ker
362. <TengokAja> rajinnyer
363. <LadySue^> hehehehehe...
364. <TengokAja> bagus laa.
365. <TengokAja> tapi berhati-hati memilih kawan
366. <LadySue^> kawan??
367. <LadySue^> napa ngan kawan??
368. <TengokAja> yer..
369. <TengokAja> saja jer
370. <TengokAja> pesanan org tua....hehehe
371. <LadySue^> laa bebudak utm skudai nie lah canda..
372. <LadySue^> bomba
373. <LadySue^> zuria
374. <LadySue^> dora
375. <TengokAja> sue..rajinnyer...
376. <LadySue^> lomang
377. <TengokAja> bestnyer...
378. <LadySue^> rimo
379. <TengokAja> hmm...
380. <TengokAja> kim slaam kat diorang
381. <LadySue^> sha2
382. <LadySue^> azin
383. <LadySue^> laa sue tak jumpa dah!
384. <TengokAja> yer ker?
385. <TengokAja> ok
386. <TengokAja> tak per
387. <LadySue^> yang tinggai azin ngan si zaira jek tengah titon!
388. <LadySue^> titon kat lab nie haa
389. <TengokAja> yer ker?
390. <TengokAja> laa..
391. <LadySue^> logam-2 pun ader
392. <TengokAja> awak tu awal sangat masuk nak main irc ker?
393. <LadySue^> diorang bawak sue pi jenjalan..
394. <LadySue^> beshh tu
395. <TengokAja> yerker?
396. <LadySue^> kalu tak sue nak balik dah semalam
397. <TengokAja> bagus laa.
398. <LadySue^> tapi ati nie berat no nak balik lak canda..
399. TengokAja sedih sebab tak dapat dah rasa macam tu lagi kat sini
400. <LadySue^> rasan cam tanak balik jekkk
401. <TengokAja> yer ker?
402. <TengokAja> laa..
403. <TengokAja> balik jer..
404. <TengokAja> tinggal kan apa yang ader..
405. <LadySue^> hehehehe
406. LadySue^ nak eksen kat canda!
407. <TengokAja> hehehe

Data3

408. <LadySue^> hehehehehe
409. <TengokAja> sue....eksen la kat canda ni..
410. LadySue^ tanak bazirkan walau sesaat disini!
411. <TengokAja> mentang-mentang la kita hanya kat uk...
412. <LadySue^> heheheheeh..
413. <TengokAja> hmm..bagus laa..
414. <TengokAja> kita hanya lawat scotland...hanya pegi ke rome..hanya pegi ke istanbul..itu saja
415. <LadySue^> hehehehe.. besh gaks tu canda!
416. <LadySue^> tapi kat sana takder abg bomba! *ahaks*
417. <LadySue^> kekekekekekekeke...
418. <TengokAja> memang ler..
419. <TengokAja> memang takder..
420. <TengokAja> apa nak buat
421. <LadySue^> ;)
422. <LadySue^> tu yang sue leh eksen kat canda tu!
423. <LadySue^> *ahaks*
424. <TengokAja> bagus laa eksen ngan kita..
425. <TengokAja> hhehe
426. <LogamMaya> salam
427. <TengokAja> tapi kat sana tak der freego!!
428. <TengokAja> tapi kat sana tak der freego!!
429. <LadySue^> mayaaaaaaaaaaaaa
430. <LadySue^> yahooooo...
431. <LogamMaya> hehehheeh
432. <LogamMaya> hai sue
433. <TengokAja> dia comel.... awak suka dia kan
434. <LogamMaya> sape tengok?
435. <LogamMaya> canda?
436. <TengokAja> iyer saya
437. LadySue^ suka dia??
438. <LadySue^> hehehehehehehe
439. <LadySue^> canda..
440. <LadySue^> canda..
441. <TengokAja> iyer sue..
442. <LogamMaya> lame ta nampak
443. <TengokAja> yer ker?
444. <TengokAja> ni nanti lagi la tak nampak..
445. <TengokAja> sebab ingat nak stop sat irc ni
446. <TengokAja> kalau masuk pun kejap jer
447. <LadySue^> hehehehehehe
448. <LadySue^> napa canda..majuk ker??
449. <LadySue^> oo tunggu abg weck akk!
450. <LogamMaya> kenapa canda..
451. <TengokAja> sue..tak laa..
452. <TengokAja> sue..kita dah cakap kat dia tak nak kawan lagi
453. <LogamMaya> eiiss tak bets ahhh
454. <TengokAja> sebab dia dah kawin
455. <TengokAja> tapi menggatal dia..tuhan jer yang tau
456. <TengokAja> pasal canda tak nak mainkan org lagi
457. <LogamMaya> eeiissss sape nak kawin nie
458. <TengokAja> biar dia tak tau sapa canda ni
459. <LadySue^> hehehehehehe
460. <TengokAja> tapi canda tak nak mainkan org dah
461. <LadySue^> laa canda.. dah kawin pun apa salah nyer

Data3

462. <TengokAja> tambah dia lak dah kawin
463. <TengokAja> yer la.
464. <TengokAja> dia dah kata sayang kat canda..
465. <TengokAja> tu laa..
466. <LadySue^> kuota 4 tu canda!
467. <TengokAja> yer la..
468. <LogamMaya> hehehe
469. <TengokAja> memang la kuota 4..
470. <TengokAja> tapi kita ni bukan termasuk dalam senarai
4 tu
471. <LogamMaya> tak faham tak faham lalaok
472. <LogamMaya> lalok baru bangun'
473. <LadySue^> saba maya...
474. <LadySue^> saba maya...
475. <TengokAja> maya..laa..ni bukan lalok ni
476. <TengokAja> ni semua benar belaka..
477. <TengokAja> takder bahasa yang berbunga..
478. <TengokAja> semuanyer yang straight forward'jer
479. <LogamMaya> basuh muka jap
480. LogamMaya lalok
481. <TengokAja> laa..
482. <LadySue^> maya tu lahh
483. <LadySue^> suh tido awal pi tido lewatt
484. <LadySue^> kan dah lalok
485. <TengokAja> oooo...
486. <TengokAja> hehehe
487. <LadySue^> haa.. awai bangun nie ader apa-2 ker??
kekekekekeke
488. <TengokAja> hmm..ok
489. <LadySue^> canda masak aper ari nie??
490. <LadySue^> hehehehehehehe
491. <LogamMaya> hehehe...cek email
492. <LogamMaya> lama dah
493. <LogamMaya> lama dah tak cek..
494. <TengokAja> sue..canda masak nasi halia dan sambal
tumis ikan bilis..dan telur rebus
495. <LogamMaya> bangun terus cek nie
496. <TengokAja> hmm...
497. <LadySue^> perrgghhh
498. <LadySue^> beshh tu
499. <TengokAja> hmm..
500. <LogamMaya> telur ayam kampung
501. <TengokAja> masih ader lagi sambal tu
930. <Canda> kalau mijaa masuk kul 5 petang waktu uk dia
ader laa
931. <Canda> kalau mijaa masuk kul 5 petang waktu uk dia
ader laa
932. LadySue^ nak dok kat sungai seget!
933. <LadySue^> hehehehe
934. <LadySue^> weii korang nak join sue tak pi mandi kat
sinun??
935. LadySue^ pakai swimming suit!
936. <nickiJ> a'aa sue ko buat rumah rakit sue cun gak tu
937. <mijaa`> ooooo
938. <LadySue^> jom wei!
939. <LadySue^> hehehehehehehe

Data3

989. <TaTa> 10Waalaiikum Salam WarahMatullah

Hiwabarakatuh.... 3 Canda

990. <LadySue^> w'salam canda..

<SNIP>

Session Start: Mon Mar 16 04:39:32 1998

1851. <T^shadow> kenapa ngan nadia tu tata
1852. <TaTa> shadow padia weihhh mau dok jengoi mau dok keriau pasai pa hehe
1853. <TaTa> nadia biasa ler semekut
1854. <T^shadow> mana ada pe
1855. TaTa lalok ke?
1856. <TaTa> hmm
1857. *** T^shadow is now known as KingFahd
1858. <KingFahd> entah lerr..aku pun lalok gak
1859. <KingFahd> hang tak kerja ka?
1860. *** silverLD (sependel@bat-46-214.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
1861. <TaTa> keja laa ni
1862. <TaTa> skip sat main irc saja nak kacau mijaa
1863. <KingFahd> cehh..kerja pun sempat tenet gak ka
1864. <TaTa> kacau sekerat mijaa dok panat lak
1865. <TaTa> manade nenet
1866. <KingFahd> mana mijaaa
1867. <TaTa> izan tensen?
1868. <TaTa> tu mijaa
1869. <KingFahd> mana rozebud
1870. <KingFahd> mana.. rozebud ker
1871. <izand> tata..orait dahh..sistem aku dah cun, hehe
1872. <TaTa> izan ye ke?
1873. <TaTa> ko guna lotus notes??
1874. <TaTa> teori domino tu ke?
1875. <TaTa> versio bape?
1876. <izand> tata..bukan domina..lotus notes 4.5
1877. *** nojob (germorcie@ppp-x9-10.ecn.purdue.edu) has joined #dusun
1878. <TaTa> ye la lotus notes kan guna concept domino
1879. <izand> ver4.5
1880. *** huggy (hup@288.88.97.00) has joined #dusun
1881. <TaTa> yang ko buek tu buek apo? mail?
1882. <izand> isk..oo..i mean, bukan lotus domino
1883. <izand> bukan, application system
1884. <TaTa> abis tu?
1885. *** nojob (germorcie@ppp-x9-10.ecn.purdue.edu) has left #dusun
1886. <izand> application system utk org bahagian khidmat pengguna
1887. <TaTa> abis ko buat pe? bahagian ane?
1888. <izand> the whole system ler
1889. <izand> la ni aku dok betolkan sana sket, sini sket, bos baru komen
1890. *** KingFahd (fathnomore@mc-38-115.tm.net.my) has left #dusun
1891. <TaTa> ooo
1892. <TaTa> ko sambung ke ko buat dari mula?

Data3

1893. <izand> sambung ape dianye?
1894. <TaTa> tade pe
1895. <TaTa> hehe
1896. <TaTa> dah tak moo tanye kang ko tensen haha
1897. <TaTa> kang terbelit ngan solan
1898. <izand> ler..hehe
1899. <izand> aku buat dari mula ler..aku yg develop
1900. <izand> buat pesaka aku kat sini, muahehehe
1901. <TaTa> hehe
1902. <TaTa> caya laa
1903. <TaTa> ko ko tak buat backdoor ke? :)
1904. <izand> err..backdoor tu menede alah ape lak
1905. <TaTa> iskk
1906. <TaTa> ko ni
1907. <TaTa> baguss otak ko tak tercemar lagi hehe
1908. <TaTa> tak yah tau
1909. <TaTa> bila abis practical?
1910. <izand> ler..dia nih
1911. <izand> ujung bulan nih
1912. <izand> tu aa aku tensen
1913. <izand> selama2 nih, aku takde keje sangat
1914. <TaTa> ooo
1915. <TaTa> hehe .
1916. <TaTa> ye laa
1917. <TaTa> ok laaa
1918. <izand> la ni aku dah nak abih, dok sibuk buat
repot, time tu ler nak betulkan tu aah, betulkan ni aah
1919. <TaTa> bila lagi nak blasah budak practical haha
1920. <izand> ciss..sabor aje aa
1921. <izand> ta..ko tau lotus notes tak? aku nak tanye
something nih
1922. <izand> aku bukannya reti sangat mende alah nih
1923. <TaTa> izan tak tau
1924. <TaTa> ko tanye exchange tau lah
Session Close: Mon Mar 16 07:15:11 1998

<SNIP>

Session Start: Wed Mar 18 23:49:36 1998

2455. <Tulipz> heheh
2456. <Tulipz> bulan nov ler
2457. <Tulipz> cuti sekolah
2458. <ella`> 11?
2459. <ella`> bukan bulan 9 ke cuti sekolah
2460. <Tulipz> a'aa
2461. <Tulipz> nov rasanye
2462. <Tulipz> member kite nikah bulan nov nih
2463. <Tulipz> due2 29 nov
2464. <izand> bulan nov ler..11/11
2465. <izand> ehehe
2466. <Tulipz> haa kan
2467. <Tulipz> hehehe
2468. <ella`> ooo
2469. <ella`> hehehe

Data3

2470. loa dah lama tak nampak nisa ngan izand...citer
pasal kawin lak tu! kekeke
2471. <izand> eh
2472. <izand> sape lak loa nih..kenal aku ke?
2473. <loa> heheheh...cuak izand...lek ler
2474. <ella`> lerr
2475. <ella`> loa ko nie nape
2476. <ella`> sape ko nie kenal nisa ke
2477. <Tulipz> hehehe
2478. <ella`> hehehehe kenal ek ..meh aa nisa nak kenal
gak ko sape
2479. <loa> ye lah...org dah nak kawin...mane lah nak
ingat big bro dia...isk isk
2480. <ella`> big bro?
2481. <izand> loa is ~aol@167-52-24.ipt.aol.com * aol <--
- sape yek
2482. <ella`> sape gamaknye dia nie
2483. *** mork has left IRC
2484. <loa> izand...nanti ler aku merajinkan diri aku
antor poskad ek
2485. <ella`> emm ye aa sape aaa
2486. <ella`> emm big bro aku free
2487. <ella`> setau aku big bro aku free
2488. *** azrin (m@g18-17.cc.strath.ac.uk) has joined
#dusun
2489. *** azrin (m@g18-17.cc.strath.ac.uk) has left #dusun
2490. <Tulipz> aikkk
2491. *** loa is now known as freego
2492. <freego> :)
2493. <ella`> haaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
2494. <izand> laaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
2495. <ella`> kan betoiiii???
2496. <izand> freegooooooooooooo
2497. <Tulipz> freego?
2498. <ella`> kekekekekeke
2499. ella` hugss freego
2500. <ella`> hhehehhe
2501. freego hugs nisa back!
2502. <freego> naper mijaa? tergezut?
2503. <freego> hehehe
2504. <ella`> hehehe
2505. <ella`> pe hal laa dok dediam
2506. <Tulipz> a'aa pengsan nih
2507. <ella`> hehehe
2508. <freego> blah lah nisa...nak kawin tak bagitau pong!
2509. <ella`> leee lom kawin aaa
2510. <ella`> hehehe free ngan org tuh ehehehhe
2511. <Tulipz> erkkk..
2512. <Tulipz> a'aa lah si free nh
2513. <ella`> sis?
2514. <freego> jap...adoll tak marah ker kita peluk2 tadi?
kekekekeke
2515. <Tulipz> duk senyap jek
2516. <TaTa> elelele freego
2517. <ella`> hehehehe tak
2518. <TaTa> cammajuk je muahahahaha

Data3

2519. <ella`> peluk big bro jek kekekeek
2520. <ella`> peluk angin aaaa
2521. <ella`> bukan bebtul
2522. <ella`> hehehe
2523. <ella`> free sihat ke
2524. freego surf tadik...tu senyap jek
2525. <freego> byk download tapi tak reti camne nak
bukak...hehehe
2526. *** freego has quit IRC (Read error to freego[167-
52-24.ipt.aol.com]: Connection reset by peer)
2527. *** freego (~aol@167-52-24.ipt.aol.com) has joined
#dusun
2528. <freego> shut!
2529. <ella`> heheheh
2530. <TaTa> weih freego canda mana?
2531. <ella`> laaa
2532. <freego> discon lak!
2533. <ella`> tak reti bukak
2534. <TaTa> tak tau bukak gatai p d/l buat pa
2535. <ella`> pe file
2536. <freego> heheh tata
2537. <freego> tata...aku tak tau canda mane
2538. <ella`> eh bukan kawan baik free ke
2539. <freego> nisa...mostly desktop theme
2540. <TaTa> abis pe ko tau?
2541. <ella`> hehehe
2542. <freego> cet!
2543. <freego> cet!
2544. <freego> cet!
2545. <ella`> hehehehehe
2546. <izand> ekekekekekeke
2547. <freego> izand...tak wat keje ker?
2548. <izand> freego, aku dah nak abih..maleh aku
2549. <izand> ehehe
2550. <ella`> err err jangan tanya ella tak wat keje ke
dok heheheeh
2551. TaTa away
2552. <freego> izand...tu saper yg nak wat gathering tu?
2553. <izand> free..si Hakimi yang nak buat.
2554. <freego> kat mane ek?
2555. <izand> dia kate nak buat kat sunway pyramid
2556. <ella`> uwaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
2557. <ella`> abis aaaa dah selsema
2558. Tulipz is back
2559. <Tulipz> salams sekali lagi
2560. <Tulipz> hehehehe
2561. <ella`> sis wasalam pi mana? toilet ke
2562. <Tulipz> dak..
2563. <Tulipz> gi tengok member kat atas tu aaaa
2564. <Tulipz> ingat nak mintak air..
2565. <ella`> ooo
2566. <Tulipz> tak de laks
2567. <Tulipz> kering ler tekak nih
2568. <ella`> laaa
2569. <ella`> masak aa ait
2570. <Tulipz> kat lab sis

Data3

2571. <ella`> oooo
2572. <freego> mijaa...tak tido lagi ker?
2573. <Tulipz> dak lagi..
2574. <Tulipz> free kat mana?
2575. <freego> kat umah ler
2576. <freego> kat bilik
2577. <freego> ingat nak tido dah
2578. <Tulipz> guna aol ek?
2579. <freego> skali tgk nisa ada
2580. <Tulipz> mahal dak?
2581. <ella`> heheheh dah tu ingat org mesia ke
2582. <freego> izand ada
2583. <LogamMaut> rahiza...hai
2584. <freego> mijaa pun ada
2585. <izand> iskandar..hi
2586. <ella`> hehehheheeh
2587. <ella`> hehehheheeh
2588. <freego> <ella`> heheheh dah tu ingat org mesia ke<-
--tak paham!
2589. <freego> mijaa...kita pakai trial nye jer...hehehe
2590. <Tulipz> oooo
2591. <ella`> err tak de pe free heheehh sajek usik
2592. <Tulipz> elo?
2593. TaTa back
2594. *** gerobok (~user@208.140.205.83) has joined #dusun
2595. <Tulipz> mana org semue dah pi? senyap jek?
2596. <ella`> yuppp
2597. ella` ade hehe
2598. TaTa ade
2599. ella` layan idung nie haaa dah selsema
2600. <ella`> sape ade tisu lebih pass sini

<SNIP>

2875. <LogamMaya> akum
2876. *** TaTa (xyz@sja-68-83.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
2877. <LogamMaya> t
2878. <LogamMaya> a
2879. <LogamMaya> a
2880. *** poyon (~a@j34.ptl37.jaring.my) has joined #DUSUN
2881. <poyon> a'komm
2882. <poyon> shahrinnnnn buat kerjaaa weiiiiiiiiiii
2883. <poyon> aku kasi tau bos hang kangggggg...
2884. <tembok> oittt.. pe jerit2 nih??
2885. <poyon> bila hang nak pulang cd aku tu?
2886. <poyon> dah lama aku tunggu
2887. <tembok> alaa nanti2 lah.. aku tak de masa nih
2888. <poyon> iskkk ape le.. aku punya cd tu.. hang buat harta pulak..
2889. <tembok> kedekut..
2890. <poyon> tak kirale.. hang anto
2891. <poyon> esok aku nak..
2892. <tembok> esok aku keje le..
2893. <poyon> lerr
2894. <poyon> anto.. aku nak hang anto esok..
2895. <poyon> aku tak peduli.. hang anto gak..

Data3

2896. <tembok> aku tak boleh.. tak ada masa.. aku keje..
takpahaman hang nih
2897. <poyon> ehehe
2898. <poyon> aku tak peduli.. hang keje ke.. hang letih
ke..
2899. <poyon> hehe.. hang ada hal ngan anak bini pun aku
tak kira..
2900. <poyon> hang anto gak..
2901. <tembok> kekeke.. ye lah ye lahhhh...
2902. *** madli (~madli@202.185.106.149) has joined #dusun
2903. <poyon> tataaaaaaaaa
2904. *** madli (~madli@202.185.106.149) has left #dusun
2905. <LogamMaya> dia gelak jek nanti dia call dia kata
2906. <izand> poyon?
2907. <TaTa> poyon
2908. <izand> sapo tuh
2909. <TaTa> izan tak too hehe
2910. <poyon> aku laa weiii
2911. <poyon> takkan tak kona samo den
2912. <poyon> ehehhe
2913. <tembok> die nyamo..
2914. *** ella` (guest@202.185.100.106) has joined #dusun
2915. <TaTa> sapo hehe
2916. <izand> sapo?
2917. <poyon> senyap lah shahrinn.. aku nak cd aku..
2918. <tembok> tak paham bahas ke... tak boleh..
2919. <poyon> hang tak boleh..
2920. <izand> aku sapo
2921. <poyon> gaimanapun.. hang anto shahrinnn..
2922. <TaTa> siut je poyon
2923. <ella`> aaa? ye ke
2924. <TaTa> nyamar
2925. <ella`> ade aaaa
2926. <poyon> ella windu aaa
2927. <poyon> ehehhe
2928. <ella`> ehhehe
2929. <ella`> sape poyon nih
2930. *** poyon is now known as alcapott
2931. <alcapott> weyhaaaaaaaa
2932. <TaTa> hehe
2933. <ella`> alcapott
2934. <TaTa> so dah kenal?
2935. <ella`> lom
2936. <izand> laaaaaa
2937. <izand> cehhhhh
2938. <ella`> emmm
2939. <izand> aku inhgatkan sape ler
2940. <alcapott> tata jek yg kenal aku cayo la tata ko la
geng aku
2941. <alcapott> ehehhe
2942. <alcapott> muhaaaaaaaaa
2943. <ella`> sape aaa alcapott
2944. <TaTa> hehe
2945. <TaTa> cpott adik badik gitar kapok hehehe
2946. <alcapott> ella ade la budak tuh
2947. <TaTa> capott adik badik gitar kapok hehehe

Data3

2948. <LogamMaya> ekeke
2949. <ella`> ok ok
2950. *** Babyzie (~women@j2.jrc1.jaring.my) has joined
#dusun
2951. <alcapott> ella ko kat opis ke weii
2952. <ella`> yep kat opis
2953. <alcapott> izandd ko dah makan lom
2954. izand away..nak lunch
2955. <Babyzie> 4,14assalamualaikum semuaaaaaaaaa
2956. <Babyzie> 4,14assalamualaikum semuaaaaaaaaa
2957. <alcapott> opis ko kat mana aa
2958. <TaTa> 10Waalaikum Salam WarahMatullah
Hiwabarakatuh.... 14 Babyzie
2959. <TaTa> 10Waalaikum Salam WarahMatullah
Hiwabarakatuh.... 14 Babyzie
2960. <alcapott> w'salam
<snip>
Session Close: Thu Mar 19 07:01:32 1998

Data4

Session Start: Wed Mar 25 00:09:58 1997

<SNIP>

600. <No_14`> w'slm
601. <azrin> benci aku bot ni semua
602. <azrin> pantang bagi salam
603. <azrin> nak jawab je
604. <No_14`> aku le tu
605. <azrin> rasa nak pelempang je kadang-kadang
606. <azrin> macam syiallll
607. <azrin> aku rasa nak marah lak ni
608. <azrin> tah pasal
609. <No_14`> biasa leee
610. <No_14`> dekat krit
611. <azrin> aku ni kadang -kadang tak betul
612. <azrin> aku rasa kadng-kadang tu
613. <azrin> bila dah tua
614. <azrin> aku cepat heart attack
615. <azrin> aku ni tak cool lah burn
616. <No_14`> coool
617. <No_14`> sapa kate tak cool?
618. <azrin> semuanya ambik serius sangat
619. <No_14`> engko bukan je ambik semua serius..
620. <No_14`> .. malah nak semua perfect..
621. <No_14`> tak perrr...nanti dah krit
622. <azrin> babe you tengah buat apa tu
623. <No_14`> dah tenang
624. <No_14`> dah jadi akitek
625. <No_14`> banyak duit
626. <azrin> esok jumpa boyfren kan
627. <No_14`> sure ko rilek skit
628. <azrin> siapa nama mat salleh tu
629. <azrin> michael
630. <imah`> boringgggg
631. <imah`> ntah
632. <azrin> boring
633. *** LogamMaut (WarlorD@202.188.80.189) has joined
#dusun
634. <azrin> nak nyanyi
635. *** X changes topic to " () "
636. <imah`> die tak balas email
637. <azrin> bergadam jangan bergadam
638. <azrin> kalau tiada ertinya
639. <azrin> bergadam bolehh sajaaaaaaa
640. *** mork is on IRC
641. <azrin> bergadam boleh sajaaaaaaa
642. azrin nak nyanyi lagu sharifah aini
643. <azrin> kalau ku sedang rindu
644. <No_14`> bukan bergadam le jin
645. <No_14`> bergadam laaaa
646. <azrin> pada siapa ku mengadu
647. <azrin> lahhhhhhhhhhhhhhhh
648. <azrin> hiii malunya kau
649. <imah`> hehehe
650. <imah`> hehehe

Data4

651. <imah`> hehehe
652. <azrin> hiiii malunya akuuuu
653. <imah`> hahahaha
654. <No_14`> lebih kurang le tuuuuuuuu
655. <azrin> hiiii
656. <No_14`> dude..
657. <No_14`> haizal balik kul baper tadi
658. <azrin> lepas kau belah
659. <azrin> duia punn belah
660. <No_14`> lepas tu ko tido ke?
661. *** manz (~nizam000@klj-7-156.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
662. <azrin> belakang aku masuk duvet
663. <azrin> tak sampai 2 minit dude
664. <No_14`> bangun kul baper dude?
665. <No_14`> ye la
666. <azrin> terus aku hilang
667. <No_14`> ko letih
668. *** manz (~nizam000@klj-7-156.tm.net.my) has left
#dusun
669. <azrin> jaop nak salin pakaian
670. <azrin> huiiiiiiiiiii leganya
671. <azrin> bernafas sikit
672. <No_14`> bogel ka?
673. <azrin> tadilahhhh
674. <azrin> sekarang dah pakai seluarr
675. <No_14`> boring lee..
676. <No_14`> ko baru bangun tido ke dude?
677. <azrin> bangun pukul 1 tadi
678. <azrin> lamanya aku tido
679. <azrin> dari pukul 8 sampai 1
680. <azrin> berapa jam tu
681. <azrin> 5 jam
682. <No_14`> tak perrr... sekarang boleh buat keje...
683. <azrin> bangun terus panik
684. <No_14`> hehehehe
685. <No_14`> aku boleh imagine
686. <azrin> dude
687. <azrin> kerja kau dah siap
688. <No_14`> banyak lagi tak siap dude
689. <No_14`> aku malas...
690. <azrin> geng tak boleh cakap lama ni
691. *** TaTa (xyz@sja-66-101.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
692. <azrin> 3.30 kita berhenti
693. <No_14`> aku aim untuk competition nye submission ni
694. <No_14`> o.k.
695. <azrin> aku lak aim semau research habis by friday ni
696. <azrin> sekarang ni semua dah habis
697. *** ju2 (timberland@klj-60-46.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
698. <azrin> tinggal yang last ni jelah
699. <imah`> sat aaaaa
700. <azrin> yang map solid void
701. <azrin> blah blah blah
702. *** ju2 (timberland@klj-60-46.tm.net.my) has left
#dusun

Data4

703. <imah`> zura tengah soal2 si burn tu aaaa
704. <imah`> pasal autocad
705. <azrin> easter nanti aku buat design dengan model je
706. <azrin> okayyyy
707. <azrin> babe
708. <imah`> haaaaaaa
709. <azrin> jom makan
710. <azrin> kat rumah zura
711. <azrin> zura ade burger
712. <imah`> zura panggil die pi meja die laks
713. <imah`> gile
714. <imah`> budak tu bz tu
715. <azrin> saya ni tak bercukur dari hari tu
716. <imah`> ler
717. <azrin> macam landak
718. <imah`> kekekeke
719. <imah`> mesti tak ensem
720. <azrin> dah raasa muka ni
721. <azrin> pagi nanti kot?
722. <azrin> awak tahu tak
723. <azrin> my bowel system pun dah tak betul
724. <imah`> ler
725. <imah`> tu pun nak cite gak ke?
726. <azrin> lahhhh
727. <imah`> bowel system tu
728. <imah`> sama laaaaaaaa
729. <imah`> tapi sebab saya malas
730. <azrin> cite kat awak bukan cite kat orang lain
731. <imah`> nak duduk kat bowl tu
732. <azrin> malssssssssss
733. <imah`> haa burn dah mai dah
734. <imah`> jumper awak bau lah burn
735. <imah`> sebulan tak basuhhhh
736. <azrin> huiiiiiiii berat tu
737. <imah`> hehehehe
738. <No_14`> wangi leee.....
739. <azrin> saya lagilahhh
740. <azrin> baju dah takde
741. <No_14`> nanti bila dah balik malaysia saya bagi
jumpaer ni kat awak
742. <azrin> tinggal yang lawa-lawa je
743. <imah`> buat pe??
744. <imah`> pakai je lah yg lelawa tu
745. <No_14`> nanti awak rindu kat saya boleh cium jumpaer
ni
746. <imah`> saya lagi le
747. <No_14`> hehehehe
748. <azrin> buat seronok-seronok
749. <imah`> tak de baju nak pakai dah.. baju kurung ade
lah
750. <azrin> say bagi seluar dalam saya
751. <imah`> pirraahhhhhhhhh
752. <azrin> hahahhaha
753. <azrin> siap yang ade bulu terlekat punya
754. <azrin> hahahhahahaha
755. <imah`> kate tak de bulu?

Data4

926. <aitakute> nak ngorat tak leh ler
927. <aitakute> lebih dari 6 kaki kut?
928. <aitakute> tinggi
929. <aitakute> teramat lah tinggi
930. <aitakute> iye lah hh
931. <aitakute> alamakk
932. <aitakute> die lalu lagi
933. <aitakute> tapi kite bau masakan ler
934. <aitakute> hehehe
935. <PemadaM> alaaaaa kalau tinggi boleh ajust2
laaaa
936. <aitakute> uwaaaaaaaaaaaaa
937. <aitakute> tak canggi lah camnih
938. <smash`gal> hah? bau masakan?
939. <PemadaM> apa yg tak canggi tu kak mijaa?
940. <aitakute> a'aa
941. <aitakute> tadi pi masak kat rumah member.. pakai tudung nh
942. <aitakute> ni duk pakai lagi tudung yg sama
943. <aitakute> ni anim.. tudung akak bau masakan
944. <smash`gal> oooo..
945. <aitakute> sepatutnye sembur issey tadik
946. <aitakute> ingat tak de org dah kat sini
947. <smash`gal> ingatkan spanish tuh yg bau masakan
948. <smash`gal> ehehe
949. <aitakute> hehehehe
950. <aitakute> kite ler
951. <PemadaM> hehheheh ntah kak mijaa ... ingatkan org tu ek kak rahiza..
952. <smash`gal> ha-ah, hehe
953. <aitakute> ler
954. <smash`gal> lain kali tukor topik bagi salam dulu ler, hehe
955. <aitakute> hehehehe
956. <aitakute> heheheehhe
957. <PemadaM> betul tuh
958. <aitakute> alaaaa
959. <aitakute> sori ler
960. <aitakute> kite kalut tadik
961. <PemadaM> cehhh kalut
962. <aitakute> ye lah nengok org ensem lalu
963. <PemadaM> punya lah bahasa ... pehhh
964. <aitakute> hehehe
965. <aitakute> eh tak betul ke?
966. <PemadaM> kehkehkehe
967. *** NickiJ
(hawk@Aku.Adalah.BOT.Dari.Kampus.Untuk.master.comserv.net)
has joined #dusun
968. <PemadaM> anim tak pernah guna bahasa tuh
969. <smash`gal> ekeke
970. <aitakute> selalu nampak org guna..
971. <PemadaM> itu utk org bersastera
972. <aitakute> pe maksude die?
973. <aitakute> eh nape kengkawan kite selalu guna?
974. <PemadaM> hehehhehe .. utk org bersastera
975. <PemadaM> ntah ... diorang jiwang2 kot?

Data4

976. <PemadaM> kehkehkeh
977. <aitakute> iyer?
978. <PemadaM> iyeeee
979. <aitakute> pe maksudnyer?
980. <PemadaM> macam bahasa org dulu2 pakai
981. *** Azie (sanusi@166-122-142.ipt.aol.com) has joined #dusun
982. <PemadaM> ntah ... anim pun tak tau
983. <NickiJ> azieeeeeeeeeeeeeeeee
984. <PemadaM> anim bukan pakar bahasa
985. <aitakute> hehehehe
986. <aitakute> pulak
987. <aitakute> iza?
988. <PemadaM> aik ... ni azie lelaki ke azie perempuan
989. <aitakute> mana lak si iza
990. <aitakute> lelaki kut?
991. <smash`gal> adeee
992. <smash`gal> ehehe
993. <PemadaM> kak rahiza tenetttt
994. <smash`gal> byk plak peminat..ahaks
995. <PemadaM> kak rahiza tenetttt
996. <PemadaM> kak rahiza tenetttt
997. <smash`gal> hehe..ni bukan tenet lagi dah
998. <smash`gal> beribu2 tenetm, ekekeke
999. <PemadaM> cissss ... ape laaa
1000. Azie watching around
1001. <aitakute> ler..
1002. <aitakute> tenet ek?
1003. <aitakute> ish
1004. <PemadaM> hehehehe
1005. <aitakute> nak tenet ape lagi sis??
1006. <aitakute> kang jeles lak org tu
1007. <aitakute> hehehe
1008. <smash`gal> hehehe
1009. <smash`gal> ala..sesaja chat je
1010. <PemadaM> kehkeh
1011. <aitakute> hehehe
1012. <smash`gal> kalu guna nick nih
1013. <smash`gal> perghh! glamor siot, hehe
1014. <aitakute> chehhh
1015. *** aitakute is now known as aishi`gal
1016. <aishi`gal> hhehe
1017. <smash`gal> ehehe
1018. <aishi`gal> nak guna gak
1019. <NickiJ> wehh sis .. masih lagi ko kat sinie ????
1020. <PemadaM> aziee ... ooo azie takleh guna nick lain ke?
1021. <PemadaM> macam nama kawan kita lak
1022. <NickiJ> dah abish ker kemas barang tu ?
1023. <PemadaM> ellehhh kak mijaa tiru lak
1024. <smash`gal> nickiJ ni cakap ngan sape nih
1025. <Azie> bai
1026. *** Azie (sanusi@166-122-142.ipt.aol.com) has left #dusun
1027. <aishi`gal> heheheeh
1028. <smash`gal> sapo lak nih

Data4

1029. <aishi`gal> kite nak gak ramai peminat
1030. NickiJ cakap ngan smash
1031. <smash`gal> laaaaaaaa
1032. <smash`gal> haiyaaa..angry aaa
1033. <PemadaM> hehehhehehe apedaaa sorang je peminat
dah aaaa
1034. smash`gal kat opis laa..nak kemas barang mende
1035. <aishi`gal> mana bolehhhh
1036. <aishi`gal> nak reramai gak.. cam iza
1037. <aishi`gal> hehehe
1038. <smash`gal> hehehe
1039. <PemadaM> pulakkkk
1040. <PemadaM> hehehhehe
1041. <smash`gal> syhhhhh..jgn cakap ngan org tuh, jelos
maut plak kang
1042. <aishi`gal> hehehehhehe
1043. <aishi`gal> nak cakap nanti
1044. <aishi`gal> maka iza kena share lah ngan kite
1045. <PemadaM> hehehehe cakap jugakkk
1046. <smash`gal> aisey mannn
1047. <smash`gal> ehehe..ni dah kes black-mail nih
1048. <NickiJ> hehe .. tak perasan lak dia !
1049. <aishi`gal> iye lah blackmail
1050. *** tata is on IRC
1051. <smash`gal> laa..si nicki ni lag ke
1052. <NickiJ> tak eh ...
1053. <NickiJ> kite tengah discusion sekijap tadi niee
1054. <smash`gal> lerr..
1055. <smash`gal> nyempat lagi irc tuh
1056. <NickiJ> heheh ... sorry yek ...
1057. <NickiJ> sure lah sempat ..
1058. <NickiJ> tangan ade dua .. mata ade dua .. jari ade
sepuluh ...
1059. <NickiJ> nasib baik main irc tak gune mulut
1060. <NickiJ> mulut cume satu jerrr
1061. <smash`gal> nak diskas, diskas je ler
1062. <NickiJ> diskas gune mulut lerr .. main irc gune
jari
1063. <NickiJ> :)
1064. *** tata has left IRC
1065. <smash`gal> lerrrr
1066. <smash`gal> berbalik ke isu tadi
1067. <smash`gal> siapakah gerangannya bakal akak ipar
saya? ahaks

<SNIP>

Session Start: Sat Apr 18 01:16:18 1997

*** Now talking in #dusun

#dusun topic is ()

#dusun topic set by X on Sat Apr 18 00:50:10

#dusun created on Sun Jan 12 21:45:50

1512. *** JoeJambul (joe@g18-17.cc.strath.ac.uk) has
joined #dusun

1513. *** Wa|_|_ (ttopa@j19.pt133.jaring.my) has joined
#dusun

Data4

1514. *** skat (ibrab@j16.als32.jaring.my) has joined #dusun
1515. *** X changes topic to " () "
1516. <skat> ellloooooo
1517. <Wa|_|_> yup
1518. *** fuchi (X@133.45.107.66) has joined #dusun
1519. <fuchi> assalamualaikum cozza!
1520. *** tata has left IRC
1521. *** X changes topic to " () "
1522. *** mork has left IRC
1523. *** ella` (guest@202.185.100.106) has joined #dusun
1524. <ella`> a'kumm
1525. <ella`> helo mijaa
1526. <ella`> elo cas
1527. *** apakabar (joe@g18-17.cc.strath.ac.uk) has joined #dusun
1528. <fuchi> waalaikumsalam
1529. <fuchi> selamat pagi!
1530. <fuchi> :))
1531. <apakabar> a'kum
1532. <ella`> wasalam
1533. <fuchi> w,salam apakabar!
1534. <apakabar> korang main kat mana ni?
1535. <ella`> kat mesia hehe
1536. *** Nurfahana (Nurfarhana@ppp7.user.artdo.org) has joined #dusun
1537. *** anai (~emz@161.142.72.138) has joined #dusun
1538. <anai> samekommm
1539. <ella`> wasalammm
1540. <ella`> heeee
1541. <apakabar> main main lak bagi salam
1542. <apakabar> dosa
1543. apakabar 11,12I am not a brat! 13,12 am not... am not... am not 11,12_ !
1544. <anai> aikk ape lakk
1545. <ella`> erkk
1546. <anai> betui la tuu
1547. <anai> apolaa apakabar nihh
1548. <anai> ell nko tercekik kee
1549. <ella`> terkezut hee
1550. <anai> terkezutt ape lak tu
1551. <ella`> tu si pakabar tuh
1552. <apakabar> takazut apasal?
1553. <anai> ape lak??
1554. anai tak pahamm daaa..tulonn
1555. <ella`> tak de pe aaa
1556. <ella`> hehehe
1557. <ella`> tetiba jek si pakabar nie bunyi
1558. <apakabar> korang tau tak kat uk sekarang dah ada anai anai?
1559. <anai> huk alaa nko nih ella
1560. <anai> ahaksss
1561. <anai> huh??
1562. <ella`> heeee
1563. <anai> yahooooooooo
1564. <anai> yahooooooooo

Data4

1565. <anai> yahooooooooo
 1566. anai sonokk aa pasai dapat gengs baruuu..kat uk lagiksss
 1567. anai kate bila2 leh pi lawattt gengs kat uk tuu..senang sket nak lepak ade gengss
 1568. anai kate bila2 leh pi lawattt gengs kat uk tuu..senang sket nak lepak ade gengss
 1569. <ella`> lee
 1570. <anai> muahahaha
 1571. <ella`> tuh mijaa
 1572. <ella`> tu pakabo tu same tempat ngan mijaa
 1573. <ella`> emm balak mijaa kot tuh? heheh
 1574. <anai> ekkeekke
 1575. anai tauu kott ahaksss
 1576. <ella`> hehehehee
 1577. *** MaYbe (~YaM@202.185.103.47) has joined #dusun
 1578. <anai> maybe not maybe yess ahakss
 1579. <cozza> salamss
 1580. <cozza> hehehe
 1581. cozza is back
 1582. <EMPEROR> kak ngah
 1583. <EMPEROR> kak ngah
 1584. <EMPEROR> kak ngah
 1585. <cozza> alo alo..
 1586. <cozza> yer?? ape nyerrrr..... ko senyap jaga ko....
 1587. <anai> alo alo
 1588. <ella`> heee balik dr tenet yaaaaa
 1589. <EMPEROR> iyahhhh...toink2
 1590. <ella`> hehehhe
 1591. <cozza> tak ahhhh
 1592. <cozza> tadi tengah scan gambo
 1593. <cozza> hehehe
 1594. <anai> huk alaa..punya laa ramai orgg tapi sonyapp yoo
 1595. anai nak nengok gambo yg mijaa
 scannn
 1596. <EMPEROR> scan ka?? dcc laa 7-8 sini
 1597. <EMPEROR> scan ka?? dcc laa 7-8 sini
 1598. <cozza> ler.. gambo tak lawo
 1599. <anai> ehh lupaaa laksss
 1600. <cozza> nak kasi cam ne?
 1601. <cozza> hehehehheh
 1602. *** EMPEROR is now known as Logam
 1603. anai kate sesapa yg kenal ngan DORA, dia kemsalamsss wenduu buat semuaaa
 1604. <cozza> ler..
 1605. <cozza> w'salam
 1606. <ella`> wasalam
 1607. <Logam> scan ka?? dcc laa 7-8 sini
 1608. anai tak kireee nak gakss gamboo ehheh..tu la sapa soh habaq scan gamboo..ehehe
 1609. <Logam> haha..betui ieem
 1610. <cozza> ler..
 1611. *** tata has left IRC
 1612. <cozza> sat aaaaaaaaaaaa

Data4

1663. <anai> tak merasa lerrr buah doyan dusunn
1664. [ella`] PING
1665. *** ikanMasin is now known as ErDelaiy
1666. *** tUn- (~pak@klj-60-26.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
1667. <tUn-> a'kum
1668. <anai> tunnn
1669. <anai> tun tan tin
1670. <anai> tun tumbakkk
1671. <tUn-> anai anai
1672. <tUn-> ler
1673. <anai> wsalamss
1674. <tUn-> haha
1675. <Logam> tunnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn
1676. <tUn-> iemm
1677. <Logam> tunnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn
1678. <tUn-> ko tak keje ker
1679. <tUn-> mohddddddddddddddddddddddlogam
1680. <tUn-> hehe
1681. <tUn-> mana yg lain..senyap jer
1682. <anai> tun biasakk aa akuu...
1683. <anai> eheheh
1684. <tUn-> ler
1685. <anai> yg lain sebok makan doyan tun
1686. <anai> ehhe
1687. <Logam> yg lain bot...mane leh cakap
1688. <anai> logam ahaksss
1689. <tUn-> doyan
1690. <tUn-> nak jugakkkk
1691. tUn- lama tak makan doyan nii
1692. <Logam> tun...tak bole...ko domam
1693. <anai> ko mintak ngan maut tuu..dia tokey tuu
1694. <anai> tapi ehhh...nko mana leh makannn
1695. <anai> maut betui tuu kan ke ko domamm
1696. <anai> ahakss
1697. <anai> melopeh laa ekauu
1698. <tUn-> ala..doyan kan ker ubat domam
1699. <tUn-> laa.aku nak aa cikit pun jadik aaa
1700. <Logam> tu laaa....
1701. <Logam> mane lehh...
1702. <tUn-> lagipun aku dah baik laaaa
1703. <tUn-> alaaaaa
1704. <anai> chettt
1705. <Logam> pirahhhh
1706. <anai> banyak la nkonyer baikkk
1707. <Logam> dah baik gi keje laaa
1708. <tUn-> tak per...aku boleh beli kat pasar malam
1709. <tUn-> kang..aku pulun aaa abih2
1710. anai rasa dahi tun..haaa..panehh meletupppsss
1711. <anai> ehhee
1712. <tUn-> hahahaha
1713. <Logam> beli bebanyak tun..bagi aku skit
1714. <tUn-> tak leh..la mohd..ko kan tokey..mana leh kasi
ngko
1715. mijaa` lag ke??
1716. tUn- cuti aa ari sabtu..

Data4

1717. <Logam> alaa...tokeh jual jer...dia tak makan
1718. <anai> huk alaaaa
1719. <anai> serber nih dah makan byk doyann dahh sampai
semputt nak jalannn
1720. <Logam> sume bot laaa
1721. <Logam> makan doyan jadik bot
1722. *** X changes topic to " () "
1723. <Nurfahana> tunnnnnnnnnn
1724. Nurfahana tak perasan tun ade
1725. *** ^tUn^ (~pak@klj-17-239.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
1726. <^tUn^> semekommm
1727. <^tUn^> tunnnn pi kuar
1728. <Logam> ala tun..cian dia
1729. <anai> iskh
1730. anai mengalami dunia lag yg amat dasatt
1731. *** ^tUn^ is now known as tUn-
1732. <Nurfahana> tun pi mane ?
1733. <tUn-> dc lak tadi
1734. <tUn-> nampak sue tak
1735. <tUn-> hmm..
1736. <Logam> sue berak tadi
1737. <tUn-> ada lak
1738. *** ^fish (lisa@klj-18-52.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
1739. tUn- cikui kapla mohd
1740. <tUn-> hehehee

<SNIP>

Session Start: Tue Apr 28 04:41:03 1997

(<http://www.geocities.com/SouthBeach/Sands/3153>)

1927. *** extremezo (~queen@202.188.39.69) has left #dusun
1928. <nsxx> ok ok
1929. <nsxx> al dios
1930. <mijaa`> tunggu ehemmm tengah tampal presentation
1931. <mijaa`> esok ada krit..
1932. *** LadySue^ is now known as SUci^
1933. <nsxx> aik krit apo makcik
1934. <mijaa`> krit..
1935. *** Izand (Glow25@j9.jhb55.jaring.my) has joined
#dusun
1936. <mijaa`> alaa krit ler
1937. <mijaa`> u know...
1938. <mijaa`> hehehe sis..
1939. <Izand> a'kummmmmmmmmmmmm
1940. <Izand> no i don't know
1941. <Izand> ehehe
1942. <nsxx> yo laa final krit ko interim krit
1943. <nsxx> ehehhe
1944. <nsxx> oittt ijandddd
1945. <Izand> teapottttttttt
1946. <Izand> apo mimpi ko dalam ni pepagi nih
1947. <nsxx> sajo la weii cuti kan

Data4

1948. <Izand> oits..suci dalam debu buatpe tuh?
1949. <nsxx> ijand samat taun baru
1950. <Izand> tayamum ka? hehe
1951. <Izand> teapot..samat tawun baru
1952. <Izand> KL cuti tak aa?
1953. <nsxx> cuti aaa
1954. <Izand> oo
1955. <Izand> sissssssss...seber dah ok ke
1956. *** tata is on IRC
1957. <Izand> isk..lag ke aku nih
1958. <mijaa`> w'salamm
1959. -Izand- **Your ping reply is 4 second(s)**. Today is
04/28/98 at 11:40:55 12- 10= 12 Glôw 10Ñ 12dârk 2.5
10= 12-
1960. <mijaa`> eh?
1961. <mijaa`> ade nihh
1962. <mijaa`> pening ler...
1963. <Izand> eh
1964. <Izand> hehe
1965. <mijaa`> sabry suh print gambo.. kite tak reti
1966. <mijaa`> uwaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
1967. <nsxx> makcik ko tak tolong tampal ke
1968. <nsxx> ehehhe
1969. <Izand> gambo apo lak
1970. <mijaa`> pott.. tengah tolong plot nih
<SNIP>
2040. Session Close: Tue Apr 28 05:23:10 1997

<SNIP>
120. <iinaku> tak leh ke?
121. *** shahbea (fssa@j12.bkj23.jaring.my) has left #dusun
122. <iinaku> ok
123. <buGz> oittttt.... ijattt
124. <KingFahd> iinaku..ngurat leh
125. *** iinaku is now known as NADIAKU
126. <buGz> ler
127. <NADIAKU> eheheheeh
128. <NADIAKU> ngorat lah daku
129. <NADIA98> ceh itam
130. <Zoetic> <kelkatu> laaaaa takkan tengok je <== ialahh
tengok jer laa!!
131. <Zoetic> hi NADIA!
132. <NADIAKU> hai
133. <Zoetic> jom tenet!
134. <Zoetic> hehe..
135. <NADIA98> kekke
136. <NADIAKU> i le nadia yang sebenar... aw!!
137. <NADIA98> main pedang la koitam
138. <NADIA98> main pedang la ko itam
139. <NADIAKU> tak mo.. aku nak carik sesapa yang ada
perisai berlubang
140. <NADIAKU> hehehe
141. <Zoetic> main pedang?
142. <manisss> lerrrrr pedang plak dah
143. <KingFahd> lagggg pulakkk dahhhhh
144. <NADIA98> kekekeke
145. *** TaTa` is now known as TeTomoih
146. <NADIAKU> tak mo main pedang... tak best... aku nak
carik sesapa yang ada perisai berlubang
147. *** TeTomoih (xyz@161.142.208.77) has left #dusun
148. *** telytubby (ironmaiden@h1r-42-81.tm.net.my) has
joined #dusun
149. <NADIA98> ceh itam
150. <NADIA98> gatai
151. <NADIAKU> kikikikikikikikiook!!!
152. *** telytubby (ironmaiden@h1r-42-81.tm.net.my) has
left #dusun
153. *** Zoetic is now known as PedanG
154. <NADIAKU> ok le oi
155. <PedanG> hehehehe..
156. *** Ryu007 (~email@202.188.102.175) has joined #dusun
157. *** NADIAKU is now known as Perisai
158. <Perisai> hehehe
159. <NADIA98> kena la tu
160. <Perisai> oi pedang...
161. <Perisai> oi pedang..
162. <Perisai> meh main bola petang nihhh..
163. <PedanG> malas lah..
164. <PedanG> lagipun kat luar tu ujan...
165. <Perisai> tak ada kawan lah akuuuu...
166. <KingFahd> nadiaku sayanggggg...sudikah apa
kiranya..kita bermadu asmara diwaktu malam sedang
terpancar dengan sinaran bulan yg indah

Data5

167. <Perisai> ehehhe
168. PedanG tajam!
169. Perisai kukuh
170. *** cube (~melayu@gp093.gp.umist.ac.uk) has joined #dusun
171. PedanG cemburu!
172. <Perisai> tak best laa
173. <PedanG> hi cube!
174. <Erniee> umist??
175. <cube> ellooo
176. <Erniee> umist??
177. <Erniee> ello org umist
178. *** telytubby (ironmaiden@hlr-42-81.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
179. <Perisai> ello org pedang
180. <cube> ellooo
181. <PedanG> iskhkh gatal lak kaki aku nie!
182. <Erniee> ello cube..
183. <KingFahd> ade sapa nampak sue tak???...ade projek baik ni aku nak bagi dia
184. <Perisai> tak de
185. <cube> erniee
186. <telytubby> isk
187. NADIA98 gtg bye semua bapak gula dah nak balik
188. <PedanG> sue ?? siapa tu?
189. *** Perisai is now known as Andaga
190. <PedanG> leh kenalan?
191. <PedanG> hehehehe..
192. <Andaga> leh leh
193. <Erniee> sue -=sudu
194. <Andaga> hehehe..
195. <Andaga>eh Pedang..
196. <Andaga> hang balik drive ke?
197. <PedanG> iyer... aku drive
198. <Andaga> Hang drive malam tak?
199. <PedanG> dak lah..
200. <Erniee> susu
201. NADIA98 gtg bye semua bapak gula dah nak balik
202. <Andaga> napa Pedang?
203. <PedanG> sebab aku rabun lahhhh..
204. <Erniee> surirumah
205. <PedanG> lagipun jalan selalu busy memalam..
206. <Ryu007> nadia98
207. <KingFahd>
208. *** NADIA98 has quit IRC (Write error to NADIA98[j23.bkj32.jaring.my], closing link)
209. <Andaga> tak cool lah hang pedang...
210. <Erniee> sumur
211. <manisss> bapak gula ada ke
212. <PedanG> apa lak tak cool nya..
213. <PedanG> sukan
214. <PedanG> sumbing
215. <PedanG> suriram
216. <Andaga> ni su
217. <Andaga> sutur
218. <PedanG> ceh king

Data5

219. *** PedanG is now known as sue
220. <sue> hehehe..
221. <sue> aku
222. <sue> aku
223. *** Andaga is now known as ^sue^
224. sue lah sue!
225. <^sue^> aku aku
226. ^sue^ lah sue
227. <KingFahd> laaaa.....ni nak main menyusun perkataan
ker
228. <Erniee> sutera
229. *** Ryu007 has quit IRC (Read error to
Ryu007[202.188.102.175]: EOF from client)
230. <Erniee> susumasam
231. <Erniee> sutrak
232. <^sue^> su.. weeyyy!!!
233. <^sue^> isk
234. <sue> uuu bertanduk kao yer sue
235. *** KingFahd is now known as LadySue^
236. *** HALBA (~pokok-g@trm-81-215.tm.net.my) has left
#dusun
237. ^sue^ adik beradik IblyRock
238. <^sue^> halba oits
239. <LadySue^> hahahaha

<SNIP>

523. cikosss 13"Assalammualaikum"
524. <LadySue^> hi sue
525. <LadySue_> lamo lerr tu sayangg oiii
526. <LadySue^> kejap jer tu!
527. <LadySue_> yer ler tu
528. <LadySue^> iskhk nak kuar aaa
529. <LadySue^> bosan!
530. *** buGz (tempee@klj-20-111.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
531. <buGz> tadaaa,,
532. <buGz> heheh
533. *** cocomo has left IRC
534. <LadySue^> aik!
535. <buGz> dek sueee..
536. <buGz> ooooooo dek suee
537. <LadySue^> tadik yea..yea.. nak pi tido!
538. <buGz> dek sue bagik abang pe ha?
539. <LadySue_> hahaha...blackkk
540. *** zaiyani has left IRC
541. *** LadySue_ is now known as Jembalang
542. <buGz> e-mail pe yg dek sue bagik kat abang?
543. * LadySue^ 8,1 Hugs buGz 11,1 buGz
9,1 buGz 13,1 buGz 9,1 buGz
544. <buGz> mehh sinii,, cite sikit kat abang
545. LadySue^ 1,1 --- 4 1 --- 4 A
546. LadySue^ 1,1 - 4 .' 1 4` 1 4`. 1 - 4 kiss
547. LadySue^ 4,1 .'_.-...-._` 4 for
548. LadySue^ 1,1 4`. 1 ----- 4 .' 1 4 you

Data5

549. * LadySue^ 1,1 -- 4 `-.--.' 1 -- 4 buGz
550. <buGz> mehh sini sayangggggggg,,,
551. <buGz> mehh sini sayangggggggg,,,
552. <buGz> mehhehhh
553. <buGz> iskk ko nihh....
554. <buGz> mehh sayanggggg.... cite kat aku pe ko bagik
aku nih..
555. <buGz> heehhehehhhehhhe
556. <LadySue^> uwaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa aku lak lagg ker??
557. <buGz> ko rase bersala tak?
558. *** LadySue^ has quit IRC (Leaving)
559. <buGz> hheheheeh
560. <buGz> cietttt
561. <buGz> huhhhhh
562. <buGz> takut ah tuhhehhh
563. <buGz> takut ah tuhhehhh
564. <buGz> ciet
565. <buGz> jago ko sue..
566. <buGz> aku ingatt ko sampai bile2.. huhhhh,..
567. <buGz> ko ingat ko legg lepah gitu2 jek.
568. <Jembalang> hahahaha
569. <buGz> oooooo lari ekk.. dia..
570. <Jembalang> blackkk ko sergah dia buat perr
571. <buGz> emmm...
572. *** salam is now known as LadySue^
573. <LadySue^> taranggggggg!!!!
574. <LadySue^> hehehehe..
575. <buGz> aku tak pu'a ati tul lerr ngan budak nihh
576. <buGz> huhhh
577. <LadySue^> e-mail apa bang tempee??
578. <buGz> oooooooooo
579. <buGz> main tarang2 ek..
580. <buGz> hehehe
581. <LadySue^> hehehhee..
582. <LadySue^> leks aa
583. <buGz> meh cite sikit dek sue..
584. <buGz> meh cite sikit dek sue..
585. <buGz> pe yg dek sue bagik kat abang ha?
586. <Jembalang> arghhhhhhh
587. <buGz> hehehehhehheh
588. <LadySue^> citer apa bang?? hehehehe
589. <LadySue^> bagi apa??
590. <LadySue^> manader
591. <buGz> mehh ahh cite,.. pe dia..
592. <Jembalang> mati aku
593. <buGz> abang nak tauu gakk.. pe dia..
594. LadySue^ bagi yang bebaik jek!
595. <LadySue^> hehehe..
596. <buGz> hheehh
597. <LadySue^> laa nak tau bukak laa dulu! baru tau!
hehehe
598. <buGz> bebaik ekk..
599. <buGz> hehehehhehehe
600. <LadySue^> hehehehheh...
601. <buGz> lom ape2 lagik ko dah mintak maapp...
602. <LadySue^> a'ah bebaik jek

Data5

603. <buGz> pastu file exe lak tuh
604. <LadySue^> muuuuaaaahhhhhhaaaaaaa!!
605. <LadySue^> muuuuaaaahhhhhhaaaaaaa!!
606. <LadySue^> muuuuaaaahhhhhhaaaaaaa!!
607. <buGz> hehehhhe
608. <LadySue^> kan dah mintak maaf dah tu!
609. <LadySue^> hehehehe
610. <buGz> tuh yg aku betul musyikill nih
611. <buGz> hhehehehheh
612. <LadySue^> nak lagik ker??
613. <LadySue^> ader lagik tu!! hehehehe
614. <buGz> file exe tuh..
615. <buGz> file ade lagik
616. <Jembalang> argghhhhhhhh
617. <LadySue^> hehehehhe
618. <buGz> aku dah copyy dahh
619. <buGz> tapi lom bukak lagik
620. <LadySue^> laa jembalang!
621. <Jembalang> sekali lagi aku telah dipeningkan oleh suasana malam yg begitu menyeramkan
622. <LadySue^> lum bukak?? napa tak bukak??
623. <LadySue^> laaaaaa
624. <buGz> hehehehe
625. <LadySue^> bukak laa
626. <buGz> pasal aku musykilll
627. <LadySue^> laaaa napa tu jembalang?
628. *** Padifield (Bayam@j60.jrc7.jaring.my) has joined #dusun
629. <buGz> nape ko mintak maaf dulu..
630. <buGz> cube ko cite sikit
631. <LadySue^> laa.. mintak maaf pun tak bley ker??
632. <Padifield> Lasdy sueeeeeeeeeeeeeee
633. <LadySue^> pak padiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii!!! muaasshhh
634. <buGz> hehehhe
635. <Padifield> mana koh dah gih lama tak jumpa
636. <buGz> hehehhheehhe
637. <Padifield> buzssssssssss
638. *** kelkatu has quit IRC (Ping timeout for kelkatu[t1-79-228.tm.net.my])
639. <buGz> pakpadiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii muaaaahhhhhssssss
640. <buGz> hhehehehheh
641. <Padifield> muahahahhahaa
642. LadySue^ main sembunyi..sembunyi.. hehehe
643. <buGz> sueeee aku bagik ko balik ko nak tak?
644. <Padifield> sue koh tak ikut ziana zain honeymoon kerrrrrrrr
645. <Jembalang> iskkkkkk
646. <Jembalang> lagg lagiii
647. <Jembalang> ade aku hempuk lakkk pc ni kangggg
648. <Jembalang> nasib baik milik orangggg
649. <Jembalang> iskkkk tensionnya akuuuuu
650. <Jembalang> japppp
651. *** Jembalang has quit IRC (Read error to Jembalang[mc-38-233.tm.net.my]: EOF from client)
652. *** KinG_DooM (~jur@mc-38-233.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun

Data5

653. *** cheni is on IRC
654. <Padifield> sue tuh hari nyer e mail dapat tak?
655. <buGz> hehehhehhehhehheehe
656. *** cheni (~guest@tl-79-188.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
657. <Padifield> lag tuh jempbalang ,,relax lahhhhhhh
658. <KinG_DooM> arghhhhhhhhh
659. <KinG_DooM> geramm tul akuuu
660. <KinG_DooM> pak padiii

<SNIP>

1348. <WhiteHawk> op ko kat maner ?
1349. <LEBuhRAYa> kat sini jer
1350. <WhiteHawk> kat sinie aku takde access camner aku nak kan ko
1351. <LEBuhRAYa> mmm.....
1352. <LEBuhRAYa> mijaaaaaa
1353. <LEBuhRAYa> luv u
1354. <anatonia> eh?
1355. <WhiteHawk> sowie .. takde access
1356. <anatonia> sapa lak ni?
1357. <anatonia> eh?
1358. <anatonia> sapa lak ni?
1359. <LEBuhRAYa> dua tiga egek jak nick ekekekek
1360. <LEBuhRAYa> hawk: sik hal
1361. <anatonia> saje je.. buat ramai sikit
1362. <anatonia> ler..
1363. <anatonia> sapa tok?
1364. <LEBuhRAYa> mijaaaaaa: waaaaaaa
1365. <LEBuhRAYa> muekekekkekeke
1366. <LEBuhRAYa> sik kan sik kenal
1367. <anatonia> nyesik eh
1368. *** Kooool (bogo@stm-45-137.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
1369. <anatonia> sapa tok?
1370. <anatonia> err.. kimi kah?
1371. <LEBuhRAYa> muahhahahahahahahah
1372. *** GoldFinch
(~hawk@Aku.Adalah.BOT.Dari.Kampus.Untuk.master.comserv.net) has left #dusun
1373. <LEBuhRAYa> cube teke sape saye
1374. <anatonia> kimi nak?
1375. <LEBuhRAYa> awok eh
1376. <LEBuhRAYa> sian ndiat lok
1377. <LEBuhRAYa> mijaaaaa
1378. <LEBuhRAYa> lamak sik ngangar kitak koh
1379. <anatonia> haaa
1380. <LEBuhRAYa> sini pegi tek
1381. <LEBuhRAYa> hanimun
1382. <LEBuhRAYa> muekekekkekeke
1383. <anatonia> sik eh
1384. <anatonia> sik ada honeymoon..
1385. <anatonia> hehehehehe
1386. <anatonia> malas bah
1387. <anatonia> sik ada duit tok

Data5

1388. <LEBuhRAYa> mijaa
1389. <LEBuhRAYa> mek nak nanyak sket
1390. <anatonia> haaaa
1391. <anatonia> tanya lah
1392. <LEBuhRAYa> mm..
1393. <LEBuhRAYa> kamek ada received komen pasal venue
gath la
1394. <anatonia> oooo
1395. <anatonia> and then?
1396. <anatonia> dengar2 kat taipan kali tok nak?
1397. <anatonia> sik jauh gilak ya?
1398. <LEBuhRAYa> awok
1399. <anatonia> out of the way utk sesetengah org??
1400. <LEBuhRAYa> ya lah nok ditanyak mek tuk
1401. <putri`Ha> a`kum semuaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
1402. <LEBuhRAYa> ya lah nok ditanyak mek tuk ialah Tembok
dah book tempat ya
1403. <LEBuhRAYa> w'salam
1404. <LEBuhRAYa> dora: maner maya?
1405. <anatonia> oooooo
1406. <anatonia> w'salam
1407. <putri`Ha> ler tanya kita lak dahhhhhhh
1408. <LEBuhRAYa> gutten abent
1409. <putri`Ha> mana ler dora tahuuu
1410. <LEBuhRAYa> eh
1411. <LEBuhRAYa> aku ingat nak pi JB tengahari nih tadik
1412. <LEBuhRAYa> aku try telpon maya
1413. <LEBuhRAYa> tapi tak dapat2 gak
1414. <LEBuhRAYa> tensen gila aku
1415. <putri`Ha> dia tenet tu
1416. <putri`Ha> sape lebuhraya ni?
1417. <LEBuhRAYa> hamdan kashogi
1418. <LEBuhRAYa> adik adnan kashogi
1419. <LEBuhRAYa> kilatttttttttttttttttttttttttttttt
1420. <LEBuhRAYa> mijaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
1421. <anatonia> eh?
1422. <anatonia> ye ye?
1423. <putri`Ha> sape tu?
1424. <putri`Ha> tak kenal pun
1425. <putri`Ha> kak ngahhhhhhhhhhhhh
1426. <anatonia> ler...
1427. <anatonia> iye doraaa?
1428. <anatonia> hehehehe
1429. <NADIA98> doraaaaaaaa
1430. <putri`Ha> amacam ?
1431. <anatonia> sehat je
1432. <putri`Ha> nADDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDd
1433. <NADIA98> apa ceta
1434. <NADIA98> hawkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkk
1435. <putri`Ha> tu aaa mijaa dah ada leh ler ko ceter
dengan dia
1436. <NADIA98> sayang ku hawk
1437. <anatonia> eh?
1438. <NADIA98> ahakssssss
1439. <anatonia> eh?
1440. <WhiteHawk> ye nadia

Data5

1441. <anatonia> cite mende?
1442. <NADIA98> hawk tenet giler2
1443. <NADIA98> hawk tenet giler2
1444. <LEBuhRAYa> bat
1445. <LEBuhRAYa> bak
1446. <WhiteHawk> a'aa
1447. <WhiteHawk> tengah tenet ler nieee
1448. <WhiteHawk> cite jiwang !!!!!
1449. <NADIA98> ceh!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
1450. <NADIA98> jiwang karat la u hawk
1451. <WhiteHawk> mesti dahhh
1452. LEBuhRAYa tenet
1453. putri`Ha buat kerja....kerja banyak siuutttttt
1454. *x@channels.undernet.org* login #dusun nabila
1455. NADIA98 tenet power
1456. <WhiteHawk> Hi X
1457. <WhiteHawk> welkam bek my dear X
1458. *** telefon (Sk8Cun@tsk-34-126.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun*** telefon (Sk8Cun@tsk-34-126.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
1459. <LEBuhRAYa> ekekekkek
1460. <LEBuhRAYa> weckkkkkkkkkkkkkkk
1461. <telefon> a'kum
1462. <LEBuhRAYa> w'salam
1463. <LEBuhRAYa> doraaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
1464. <LEBuhRAYa> dora: umah dia dekat ngan umah MAYa ke
1465. <LEBuhRAYa> tel: aku tak sihat
1466. <putri`Ha> yer.. dekat..
1467. putri`Ha tak tahu umah dia kat mana
1468. <putri`Ha> pesal ni???
1469. <putri`Ha> pesal ni???
1470. <LEBuhRAYa> dora: JJB ujan ker?
1471. <LEBuhRAYa> jb
1472. <putri`Ha> senyap jer.....
1473. *** sHaLai (~SunYi@202.160.4.210) has joined #dusun
1474. <putri`Ha> a'aa hampir2 nak ujan ni
1475. <LEBuhRAYa> yooooo
1476. *** redah (derli@klj-20-152.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
1477. <LEBuhRAYa> rejah
1478. <LEBuhRAYa> eh
1479. <redah> salam..
1480. <LEBuhRAYa> redah
1481. <LEBuhRAYa> salams
1482. <LEBuhRAYa> dora: try la call MAYa.. die sakit tuh..
1483. <LEBuhRAYa> shalaiiiii
1484. *** lep is on IRC
1485. <LEBuhRAYa> Sind Leute nun beim Privaten chatten?
1486. <LEBuhRAYa> muehheeh
1487. <putri`Ha> call pe nyer
<SNIP>

Data6

1. Session Start: Sun May 17 03:43:00 1998
2. *** Now talking in #dusun
3. #dusun created on Sun Jan 12 21:45:50
4. *** kasyah has quit IRC (2 [1 AR 14MO 15 R 2])
5. *** kogie is on IRC
6. *** kogie has left IRC
7. *** Izand (zulkif@202.188.153.225) has joined #dusun
8. *** Izand has quit IRC (You can't have a better tomorrow, if you are thinking about yesterday all the time)
9. *** WhiteSwan (hawk@master.comserv.net) has joined #Dusun
10. *** WhiteSwan (hawk@master.comserv.net) has left #Dusun (nak pi mancing kat laut lerrrrr .. cuaca best ari nieee !!!)
11. *** izureen (muffin@j28.jrc26.jaring.my) has joined #dusun
12. *** izureen (muffin@j28.jrc26.jaring.my) has left #dusun
13. *** emas` (diaz@130.159.18.162) has joined #dusun
14. <shanee`> aikkk
15. <shanee`> tak balik lagi ke ni ajin?
16. <emas`> a'kum
17. <shanee`> w'salam
18. <shanee`> ajin yek?
19. <emas`> balik mana?
20. <shanee`> ler.. ingat zura tadik
21. <emas`> zura dah balik
22. <shanee`> a'aa nampak tadik
23. <emas`> burn mana?
24. <shanee`> burn kat rumah die ler
25. <emas`> kat rumah yek kak long
26. <shanee`> sian..
27. <shanee`> dak eh
28. <shanee`> kat dept nih
29. <emas`> awak kat mana nie
30. <emas`> siapa kat bilik awak?
31. <shanee`> malas duk rumah..
32. <shanee`> tak de org..
33. <shanee`> saya on je komputer tu aaa
34. <emas`> projek burn cam ne?
35. <shanee`> sian kat burn ler..
36. <emas`> ler burn dah ada isteri
37. <emas`> ohhh
38. <shanee`> ler..
39. <shanee`> slow nye awak
40. <shanee`> ada isteri tapi tak reti nak tolong wooo
41. <emas`> a'aa
42. <shanee`> saya tak reti ler nak tolong..
43. <shanee`> kalau reti kaler2 cam zura ok gak
44. <emas`> lah hh
45. <emas`> macam nie
46. <emas`> tanya burn macam mana nak buat
47. <shanee`> kang kaler tak lawo.. haaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
48. <shanee`> saya pun tengah buat keje saya sendiri..
49. <emas`> ish hhh

Data6

50. <emas`> apa kira
51. <shanee`> nak kejar keje saya.. hmmm..
52. <emas`> kak long
53. <shanee`> yupp..??
54. <emas`> burn tak ajar ker
55. <shanee`> hmmm die suh saya buat keje saya
56. <shanee`> saya duk teman kan die je.. takut die panik.. tu je
57. <emas`> okaylah tu
58. <shanee`> last2 saya lak nangis..
59. <emas`> dia panik ker
60. <shanee`> nak tido dah ke?
61. <shanee`> ler.. sapa tak panik
62. <emas`> kerja dia banyak dah siap kan
63. <shanee`> kalo awak panik..
64. <emas`> a'aa
65. <emas`> burn tido satu hari berapa jam
66. <shanee`> die mesti le panik gak
67. <shanee`> ntah.. byk gak..
68. <shanee`> rasanye lah
69. <emas`> suruh dia kurang tido
70. *** atiqah (~atiqah@j49.btn.jaring.my) has joined #dusun
71. <shanee`> kang die kurang tido terus die tak leh nak buat keje haaaaaaaaa
72. <shanee`> die perfectionist gak le ajin
73. <emas`> burn dah banyak siap krerja dia
74. <shanee`> tadi suh die ink kan keje die
75. <emas`> heheh
76. <emas`> baru awak tahu
77. <shanee`> die tak mo.. nak perfectkan lak line tu
78. <emas`> hehehe
79. <shanee`> kalau nak straight sangat.. baik guna ruler je
80. <shanee`> tul dak?
81. <emas`> pandailahhhh burn tu
82. <emas`> betul
83. <emas`> ink
84. <emas`> kaler
85. <emas`> buat model
86. <shanee`> tu lerrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr
87. <shanee`> bila nak buat semue tuuuuu?????????????????
88. <emas`> habis cerita
89. <emas`> buatnya
90. <shanee`> saya suh die produce jer...
91. <shanee`> keluar je.. hehehee..
92. <emas`> by hook or by crook
93. <shanee`> tapikan.. saya ni
94. <shanee`> berat mata memandang
95. <emas`> apasal
96. <shanee`> berat lagi lah bahu die memikul
97. *** atiqah (~atiqah@j49.btn.jaring.my) has left #dusun
98. <shanee`> sebab tu ler... saya tak nak lepak kat situ.. biar die duk buat keje die je
99. <emas`> a'aa
100. <emas`> jangan risau

101. *** ex-el has quit IRC (StLouis-R.Mo.US.Undernet.org
Chicago.IL.US.Undernet.org)
102. <emas`> burn tu survivor
103. <shanee`> insyaallah..
104. <emas`> he will survive
105. <shanee`> harap2 pas ler awak berdue
106. <emas`> saya ni pandai cakap ornag
107. <shanee`> insyaallah...
108. <emas`> kerja sendiri tak siap-siap
109. <shanee`> ler dah byk dah tu
110. <emas`> aminnn
111. <shanee`> nak siapkan ape lagi?
112. <shanee`> kalau awak byk lagi
113. <emas`> ishh
114. <emas`> sikit jer
115. <emas`> model
116. <shanee`> burn lagi ler banyak weiiiiii
117. <emas`> section
118. <shanee`> haa awak nak tunggu buat tu semue
119. <emas`> sketches
120. <shanee`> die nak kaler2 lagi
121. <emas`> 3 lagi babe
122. <shanee`> burn ada 100 lagi kut
123. <shanee`> hehehehehe
124. <emas`> lejhh
125. <emas`> ish hh
126. <emas`> tak banyak lagi
127. <emas`> suruh dia boh jer
128. <shanee`> kalau lah saya ambik phd dlm arkitecer
129. <shanee`> kan best..
130. <shanee`> heheheh siap nye keje die
131. <emas`> janagan pikir bnyak
132. <emas`> buat jer
133. <shanee`> skrang leh minum milo ais je
134. <emas`> saya dengan zura hari tu
135. <shanee`> insyaallah..
136. <emas`> masa mengaler
137. <emas`> bagi time limit
138. <emas`> 2 hari maximum
139. <shanee`> haa awak ada org tolong kaler..
140. <shanee`> another arkitek
141. <shanee`> saya nak tolong... tak leh..
142. <emas`> zura kaler pokok jer tau
143. <shanee`> kaler pokok pun saya tak reti weiii
144. <emas`> dia spent in a day
145. <shanee`> kang jadi cam lukisan budak sekolah..
146. <emas`> 4-5 hours
147. *** ex-el (~tembok@klg-56-139.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
148. <shanee`> tu ler..
149. <shanee`> saya risau ni
150. <emas`> in total 10 jam kot masa dia
151. <emas`> dal;am dua hari
152. <shanee`> saya nak tolong burn kaler..
153. <emas`> taklahhh
154. <shanee`> kang keje saya lak yg terbuat..

Data6

207. <emas`> ishyyy
 208. <shanee`> tu ler..
 209. <shanee`> lagipun die risau kat saya
 210. <shanee`> risau kat keje
 211. <emas`> burn bila nak mount gambar
 212. <shanee`> bila saya tak de kat situ.. ok skit ler..
 213. <shanee`> ermmm tak tau..
 214. <emas`> tanya dia
 215. <emas`> awak ghi potonh
 216. <shanee`> eee tak nak ler
 217. <emas`> itu gambar
 218. <shanee`> kang die panik lak
 219. <emas`> apa yang nak takut
 220. <shanee`> saya dah tanye die
 221. *** ex-el has quit IRC (Ping timeout for ex-el[klg-56-139.tm.net.my])
 222. <shanee`> bila nak buat itu ini
 223. <emas`> ghi tolong apa yang patut
 224. <shanee`> die panik..
 225. <emas`> hehehe
 226. <shanee`> hehehehe
 227. <shanee`> awak tau le saya ni
 228. <shanee`> penyibuk
 229. *** manisss (sap@wmu-53-45.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
 230. <emas`> alamak
 231. <shanee`> bebel je
 232. <emas`> tak bukan sibuk
 233. <shanee`> eh awak duk ngan din ngan nina yek?
 234. <manisss> assalamualaikum
 235. <emas`> burn tu satu
 236. <shanee`> w'salam..
 237. <shanee`> memang le burn satu
 238. <shanee`> hehehehe
 239. <emas`> time tak gheti limit
 240. <emas`> suruh dia limit
 241. <emas`> waktu macam nie
 242. <shanee`> tu ler...
 243. <emas`> lawa tak lawa belakang kira
 244. <shanee`> die leh pas kan ajin?
 245. <emas`> zura tak bagi saya mount hari nie
 246. <emas`> suruh tunggu lagi
 247. <shanee`> oooo
 248. <emas`> saya kater
 249. <emas`> tak boleh
 250. <emas`> hari nie
 251. <shanee`> a'aa
 252. <shanee`> memang ler
 253. <shanee`> kena produce
 254. <emas`> jugak mesti mount
 255. <shanee`> bila dah siap tu
 256. <shanee`> leh lupakan
 257. <shanee`> saya suh burn
 258. <emas`> betulll
 259. <shanee`> masa tak leh nak buat design tu
 260. <manisss> korang cite pe ni

Data6

261. <shanee`> kejar bende lain
262. <emas`> betull
263. <shanee`> kalau dah letih design
264. <shanee`> tukar ler angin skit
265. <shanee`> maniss..cite keje
266. <emas`> betul
267. <shanee`> but.. die tak nak gak
268. <manisss> keje pe?
269. <shanee`> duk gak
270. <emas`> layan awak
271. <manisss> b'kaitan ngan design
272. <shanee`> presentation
273. <emas`> hehehe
274. <emas`> lahh
275. <shanee`> dak ler
276. <emas`> insya'Allah burn pas
277. <shanee`> layan saya tu tak de lah
278. <manisss> presentation???studi lagi ke
279. <emas`> mesti pas punya
280. <shanee`> emas lapan stadi
281. shanee` dah jadi mak org.. tunggu suami abis stadi
282. <emas`> heheh
283. <shanee`> ajin awak duk ngan din kat mana???
284. <shanee`> pindah kat mana??
285. <manisss> oooo hubby studi mana?
286. <shanee`> hari apa?
287. <shanee`> bila??
288. <emas`> kat central station
289. <emas`> 5 haribulan jun
290. <shanee`> maniss.. hubby stadi sama ngan emas
291. <shanee`> jauh nyer?
292. <shanee`> teruk yek.. semua terpisah
293. <emas`> atas what everyone wants
294. <shanee`> :((
295. <emas`> takper
296. <shanee`> oo
297. <manisss> oooooooooooooooooooooo
298. <shanee`> kat situ
299. <shanee`> jauh gak tu
300. <emas`> din kater rumah tu okay
301. <emas`> saya boh jer
302. <shanee`> ok ler..
303. <emas`> tak kiralahhh
304. <shanee`> kalau dah dpt rumah
305. <emas`> okay ker tak okay
306. <emas`> sekarang ni
307. <shanee`> awak nanti leh ke duk ngan Nina ngan Din?
308. <shanee`> hehehehe
309. <emas`> saya nak pgdip dan masters
310. <emas`> tak kira
311. <shanee`> insyaallah
312. <emas`> insya'Allah dapat
313. <shanee`> hmmm...
314. <shanee`> saya nak sambung buat keje saya ni
315. <shanee`> awak nak tido dah ke?
316. <shanee`> tadi ada polis

Data6

317. <shanee`> naik van
318. <shanee`> ada hal kut kat thomas campbell
319. <emas`> bolehhh
320. <emas`> saya buat hal saya
321. <emas`> lagipun joe je duduk ngan orang kawin
322. <emas`> janji diorang tak kacau saya
323. <emas`> saya nak suruh landlord buang katil
324. <emas`> nak jadikan bilik tu studio
325. <emas`> tido atas duvet jer
326. <emas`> summer kan
327. <emas`> tak perlu duvet
328. <emas`> hehehhe
329. <emas`> beli satu lagi duvet
330. <emas`> jadi
331. <emas`> nanti ader dua duvet
332. <shanee`> oooo
333. <emas`> nak tido buka
334. <emas`> tak tido
335. <emas`> gulung
336. <shanee`> ada bilik sendiri ke?
337. <emas`> hehehe
338. <emas`> tapi
339. <emas`> iyer
340. <shanee`> ada due bilik yek?
341. <emas`> ader
342. <emas`> ader
343. <shanee`> ok le tu
344. *** manisss (sap@wmu-53-45.tm.net.my) has left #dusun
345. <shanee`> nanti awak pindah habaq tau
346. <emas`> diaornag abik living room
347. <emas`> awat
348. <shanee`> ye lah
349. <shanee`> awak sewa van ke?
350. <shanee`> nak tumpang ler..
351. <shanee`> saya pun kena pindah nih
352. <emas`> nak tolong angkat ker
353. <shanee`> aisey..
354. <emas`> nak sewa rasanya
355. <emas`> boeh
356. <shanee`> mana le nak letak barang2 saya
357. <shanee`> bilik burn dah tak de space dah
358. <emas`> kita sewa 4 jam
359. <shanee`> ari tu saya membersih rumah die
360. <emas`> ader
361. <shanee`> giler...
362. <emas`> board
363. <emas`> hantar kat dept
364. <shanee`> board letak kat living room ler
365. <emas`> a'aa
366. <shanee`> letak tv die kat situ
367. <emas`> saya board ni
368. <shanee`> pas tu die buat keje kat situ ler..
369. <emas`> hantar kat dept
370. <shanee`> board awak letak dept yek?
371. <emas`> bila dah habis
372. <shanee`> oooo ok

Data6

373. <emas`> nanti
 374. <shanee`> awak nak buat keje kat dept je lah??
 375. <emas`> nak simpan buat apaer
 376. <shanee`> ok gak tu..
 377. <emas`> tak
 378. <emas`> bila dah habis
 379. <shanee`> awak tido cukup ke?
 380. <emas`> baru hntar kat dept
 381. <emas`> tak cukupp tidur..
 382. <emas`> makan cukup
 383. <emas`> tapi kurus gak ni
 384. <shanee`> tu lah.. burn pun kurus macam papan..
 385. <emas`> iye.. kurus nampak tulang..
 386. <shanee`> hehehe...
 387. <emas`> tapiiiiiiiiiiiii.....
 388. <emas`> hehehe.. tak de...
 389. <shanee`> ler.. bersungguh tapi
 390. <shanee`> hehehe
 391. <emas`> ye lah.. walaupun saya kurus, tapi saya byk energy..... boleh tak tido
 392. <shanee`> haa betul
 393. <emas`> haaa sudah
 394. <shanee`> dah dah
 395. <shanee`> dah lah tu
 396. <emas`> jamuuu
 397. <shanee`> syhhhhhhh
 398. <emas`> so
 399. <emas`> you and burn
 400. <shanee`> well..
 401. <emas`> ok?
 402. <shanee`> boleh le
 403. <emas`> baguiah
 404. <shanee`> hehehehe
 405. <shanee`> takpe
 406. <shanee`> ni masa sibuk
 407. <emas`> a'aa nanti dah tak sibuk.. boleh jejalna
 408. <shanee`> memang nak pergi pun
 409. <emas`> gi lah north
 410. <shanee`> cam lah plannya
 411. <shanee`> weiiiiiiiiiiiiiii
 412. <shanee`> tak siap keje aku nih
 413. <emas`> dah
 414. <emas`> okay
 415. <emas`> bye now
 416. <emas`> cakap burn
 417. <shanee`> mandi tu
 418. <shanee`> berbauuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuu
 419. <emas`> have faith
 420. <shanee`> a'aa
 421. <emas`> dah mandi
 422. <shanee`> die dah semayang dah skrang
 423. <emas`> dan sbuh
 424. <shanee`> seronok saya
 425. <shanee`> kalau dulu
 426. <shanee`> suh semayang
 427. <emas`> bagus

Data6

428. <shanee`> ajak semayang
429. <emas`> saya pun
430. <shanee`> die leh kate
431. <shanee`> silakan silakan
432. <emas`> hehehehehe
433. <shanee`> skrang..
434. <emas`> macam saualah tu
435. <shanee`> dah semayang.. sejuk ati
436. <shanee`> a'aa awak due serupa
437. <emas`> dah tua kak long
438. <shanee`> eh awak jgn lah habaq saya cakap pasal keje die tu
439. <emas`> dah more responsible
440. <shanee`> kang die kecik ati lak..
441. <emas`> as a muslim, ambitious man
442. <emas`> tak
443. <emas`> burn okay
444. <emas`> dia will survive
445. <shanee`> jgnnn
446. <emas`> jangan risau
447. <shanee`> a'aa
448. <emas`> saya kenal dia
449. <shanee`> nak push die tu je yg susah tu
450. <emas`> awak buat kerja
451. <emas`> awak
452. <shanee`> yeppp
453. <shanee`> ok le yek
454. <shanee`> tadi nak mai sini
455. <emas`> cium sekali
456. <shanee`> kena mintak izin kat burn
457. <shanee`> alahaiiii
458. <emas`> cakap molek molek
459. <emas`> takk
460. <emas`> cium sekali kat burn
461. <shanee`> ler..
462. <emas`> cakap molek molek
463. <shanee`> a'aa tau
464. <emas`> sejuk hati dia
465. <emas`> push dia
466. <emas`> jangan
467. <emas`> cakap
468. <shanee`> hmmm
469. <emas`> macam nak marah
470. <emas`> peluk dia
471. <shanee`> dak ler
472. <emas`> cium
473. <shanee`> cakap cam ne pun
474. <emas`> cakap
475. <emas`> sayang
476. <shanee`> kalau die dah panik
477. <emas`> you kena habis kan kerja tau
478. <shanee`> semua die anggap aggression
479. <emas`> untuk kiter
480. <shanee`> chehh
481. <shanee`> you
482. <shanee`> hehhehehehe

Data6

539. <emas`> sepatutnya
540. *** manisss (sap@wmu-53-45.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
541. *** manisss (sap@wmu-53-45.tm.net.my) has left #dusun
542. <emas`> you are the source of his inspiration
543. <emas`> his smile
544. <shanee`> memang ler
545. <emas`> kalau awak risaua
546. <shanee`> tapi kalau saya dah nangis
547. <shanee`> die naik risau ler
548. <emas`> dia akan risau
549. <emas`> siapa suruh nangis
550. <emas`> ish
551. <shanee`> ye lah
552. <shanee`> sayu ler
553. <emas`> jangan nangis
554. <shanee`> saya kemas2 kan katil
555. <shanee`> elok2
556. <shanee`> wangi2 dah cuci
557. <shanee`> pas tu saya duduk semula
558. <shanee`> defeat the purpose of kemas
559. <emas`> hehehe
560. <shanee`> pas tu.. for the past few days
561. <emas`> ish
562. <shanee`> duk atas katil..
563. <shanee`> tengok tv
564. <shanee`> baca buku
565. <shanee`> tido..
566. <shanee`> sapa tak depress
567. <emas`> ish
568. <emas`> dah ader otrang yang sayang pun depress
569. <shanee`> awak tau ler saya ni.. i need space..
570. <emas`> put it this way kak long nyeer
571. <emas`> i may have everything
572. <emas`> but what i don't have
573. <emas`> is what both of you have right now
574. <emas`> so
575. <emas`> if you put yourself in my shoes
576. <shanee`> i know..
577. <shanee`> tau ler
578. <emas`> awak untung
579. <shanee`> i'm there for him
580. <shanee`> he's there for me
581. <emas`> addr orang sayang
582. <emas`> dekat
583. <emas`> nak mengadu
584. <shanee`> cuma.. bila dah duk dlm bilik tu
585. <shanee`> 24 jam
586. <emas`> there
587. <emas`> hehehehe
588. <shanee`> tak de tempat nak gerak langsung
589. <emas`> buat kerja awak
590. <shanee`> sapa tak pening gak
591. <shanee`> buat ler tu
592. <shanee`> ada meja kecil tu
593. <emas`> kat bilik buen

594. <shanee`> meja saya lah tu
595. <emas`> bujat kat dapur
596. <shanee`> nak mandi
597. <emas`> pindah rumah lahhh
598. <shanee`> alahaiii
599. <shanee`> my skin crawls
600. <shanee`> everytime saya pi toilet die
601. <shanee`> hehehehhe
602. <shanee`> pas tu bau negro tu
603. <shanee`> ishshhhhhhhhhhh
604. <emas`> heheheh
605. <emas`> pukul 5v kiter stop yek
606. <emas`> lagi 10 minit
607. <emas`> rindu lak
608. <shanee`> eh
609. <emas`> lama kiter semua tak lepak yek
610. <emas`> gelak-gelak
611. <shanee`> a'aa
612. <shanee`> tu ler
613. <emas`> ghi tengok wayang
614. <shanee`> saya duk pikir
615. <shanee`> nanti semua dah pindah
616. <shanee`> awak kat ceruk sana
617. <shanee`> kitorang kat ceruk sini
618. <emas`> esok nanti kak azimah
619. <shanee`> zura kat ceruk nuuu
620. <shanee`> sedih weiii
621. <emas`> bila burn dah kerja
622. <emas`> awak kena tahan
623. <emas`> kahwin architect ni
624. <shanee`> pahammm
625. <emas`> forever macam nie
626. <emas`> you must understand that first
627. <emas`> wrell i presume eny understands
628. <emas`> when it comes to work
629. <shanee`> i know..
630. <shanee`> saya duk campur ngan budak archi
631. <shanee`> dah lama dah
632. <shanee`> duk ngan zakiah pun dah
633. <emas`> hehe
634. <shanee`> dulu exbf saya
635. <shanee`> interior designer
636. <emas`> harap eny faham lah
637. <shanee`> keje cam awak gak ler
638. <emas`> sekarang cakap fahan
639. <shanee`> memang ler
640. <shanee`> ada gak masa tu
641. <emas`> kalau nanti asyik kerja jer macam mana yek
642. <shanee`> akan merengek gak
643. <emas`> adelah
644. <shanee`> soooo
645. <emas`> hari sabtu petang
646. <shanee`> awak kena set satu hari
647. <emas`> ahad sehari
648. <emas`> tapi duk rumah jer
649. <shanee`> make sure...

Data6

- 650. <shanee`> awak akan spend ngan family
- 651. <emas`> malas nak keluar
- 652. <shanee`> tu jer....
- 653. <emas`> penat
- 654. <shanee`> sekali seminggu
- 655. <shanee`> kuar makan duorang
- 656. <shanee`> tak pikir keje
- 657. <emas`> yelah
- 658. <emas`> awak 9-5
- 659. <emas`> kiter
- 660. <emas`> 9-12
- 661. <shanee`> saya kengkadang ahad keje gak
- 662. <shanee`> kalau ada kelas tambahan
- 663. <emas`> yahoooo
- 664. <shanee`> kengkadang bebudak exams
- 665. <shanee`> hari ahad gak
- 666. <emas`> badan saya ni macam papan
- 667. <shanee`> hehehe
- 668. <emas`> tak lawar langsung
- 669. <emas`> masa mandi tadi
- 670. <emas`> saya perasan
- 671. <emas`> tulung rusuk saya ni
- 672. <emas`> nampak habis
- 673. <emas`> jari nie
- 674. <emas`> tulang jer
- 675. <shanee`> a'aa
- 676. <shanee`> sama cam burn
- 677. <emas`> dah takder isi
- 678. <emas`> hehehe
- 679. <shanee`> die peluk je
- 680. <shanee`> sakit badan
- 681. <shanee`> tulang
- 682. <emas`> sama
- 683. <emas`> lah hh
- 684. <emas`> i know
- 685. <emas`> wahat you can do
- 686. <emas`> masak untuk dia
- 687. <shanee`> a'aa
- 688. <shanee`> tau
- 689. <emas`> that is the best that you can do
- 690. <shanee`> masak gak
- 691. <emas`> right now
- 692. <emas`> at least
- 693. <emas`> dia ade makanan
- 694. <shanee`> tau
- 695. <emas`> jangan macam say anie
- 696. <shanee`> awak makan cam ne?
- 697. <shanee`> zura masak yek?
- 698. <emas`> kalau eny ader
- 699. <emas`> saya suruh mnasak
- 700. <emas`> ghi tesco
- 701. <shanee`> memang ler
- 702. <emas`> beli rokok
- 703. <shanee`> hmmm
- 704. <shanee`> lerrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr
- 705. <shanee`> beli rokok

Data6

706. <emas`> saya duk jer
707. <emas`> kayt sini buaat kerja
708. <shanee`> a'aa
709. <shanee`> eh ajin
710. <emas`> hehe
711. <shanee`> saya nak ke toilet
712. <shanee`> ok ler..
713. <emas`> dahlah
714. <shanee`> nak terkencing..
715. <shanee`> sejuk lak
716. <shanee`> saya tak pakai stokin
717. <emas`> okay
718. <shanee`> ingat panas
719. <shanee`> ok
720. <shanee`> see u sometime
721. <emas`> bye
722. <emas`> see you
723. <emas`> when
724. <emas`> i see you
725. <emas`> hehe
726. <emas`> a'kum
727. <emas`> take care yek
728. <emas`> yourself ahnd burn
729. <emas`> ingat apa saya cakap
730. <emas`> jnagan tunjuk resah awak
731. <shanee`> w'salam..
732. <shanee`> sure..
733. <emas`> you have to be confident in him
734. <shanee`> thanks..
735. <shanee`> i have
736. <emas`> and he will be confidentg
737. <emas`> burn lack
738. <emas`> confidence
739. <shanee`> a'aa..
740. <emas`> he needs someone strong to be stramng
741. <emas`> himself
742. <shanee`> yes..
743. <shanee`> awak nanti
744. <shanee`> masa die crit.. jgn tengok ler
745. <shanee`> kang die nervous
746. <shanee`> hehehe
747. <emas`> hehehe
748. <shanee`> saya kate nak pi tengok
749. <shanee`> die marah
750. <shanee`> die nak pesan... kat semua jgn tengok
751. <emas`> okay
752. <shanee`> die conscious..
753. <emas`> apelahhhh
754. <emas`> mamat tu
755. <shanee`> saya teringin gak tengok
756. <shanee`> hehehe
757. <emas`> bini sendiri pun tak boleh tengok
758. <emas`> hehe
759. <emas`> bye
760. <shanee`> tapi that's his future
761. <emas`> a'kumm

Data6

762. <shanee`> w'salammmm
763. <emas`> lain kali cerita lagi
764. <emas`> doakkn aunytuk sya
765. <emas`> bye

<SNIP>

1570. Session Start: Sun May 17 14:22:29 1998
1571. *** Now talking in #dusun
1572. #dusun topic is HWAHAWHWA
1573. #dusun topic set by butet-16 on Sat May 16 15:25:03
1574. #dusun created on Sun Jan 12 21:45:50
1575. *** `Mega (~bum911@klg-41-25.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
1576. <tukul> ha camni la ramai sikit
1577. <mijaa`> aikk?
1578. <tukul> baru ada feel
1579. <tukul> baru ada feel
1580. <`Mega> a'kum
1581. <tukul> apasal lak mija
1582. <tukul> w"salam
1583. <mijaa`> tak de mende..
1584. <mijaa`> bengang je..
1585. *** `Mega (~bum911@klg-41-25.tm.net.my) has left #dusun
1586. <tukul> pasal apa lak ni mija
1587. <tukul> ko ni org enjoy ko bengang lak
1588. <mijaa`> komputer rosak..
1589. <tukul> ko ni org enjoy ko bengang lak
1590. <mijaa`> yo lah
1591. <mijaa`> bengang ler..
1592. <tukul> alah kom. rosak pun kau nak bengang
1593. <tukul> aku ni awek lari pun aku tak sedih2
1594. <tukul> enjoy beb
1595. <mijaa`> ler..
1596. <mijaa`> ko lain
1597. <mijaa`> aku lain
1598. <mijaa`> mana nak sama..
1599. *** ain (~ainnie@jrc-72-215.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
1600. *** ain (~ainnie@jrc-72-215.tm.net.my) has left #dusun
1601. <tukul> alah ko ni apa yang lain lak
1602. <mijaa`> ko tukul..
1603. <mijaa`> mana nak paham
1604. <mijaa`> aku manusia..
1605. *** doolah (dokterGG@j29.ptl39.jaring.my) has joined #dusun
1606. <mijaa`> tu le perbezaan nye..
1607. <doolah> waiii
1608. <doolah> waiiiii
1609. <doolah> waiiiii waiiiii
1610. <doolah> wai mijaa
1611. <doolah> dah kenal dolah ke belum ??
1612. <tukul> wei ko ni loyar buruk la
1613. <tukul> wei ko ni loyar buruk la mija

Data6

1614. <tukul> wei ko ni loyar buruk la mija
1615. *** YANI (~st31323@j57.als32.jaring.my) has joined #dusun
1616. <tukul> ada ke aku cakap serius ko lak main2 je
1617. <tukul> ada ke aku cakap serius ko lak main2 je
1618. <doolah> alamak ..
1619. *** doolah has quit IRC (ape nii ??!!)
1620. <tukul> tak paham aku2
1621. <tukul> tak paham aku2
1622. <mijaa`> wai?
1623. <mijaa`> ye lah
1624. <mijaa`> ko lain
1625. <mijaa`> aku kalau lelaki
1626. <mijaa`> ilang awek
1627. <mijaa`> mau menangis aku
1628. <mijaa`> apa tah lagi komputer kesayangan aku rosak
1629. <mijaa`> haaa haaa..
1630. <mijaa`> senyap doh..
1631. *** YANI (~st31323@j57.als32.jaring.my) has left #dusun
1632. *** YANI (~st31323@j57.als32.jaring.my) has joined #dusun
1633. <mijaa`> nape yani?
1634. *** cheni has quit IRC (Ping timeout for cheni[tl-79-51.tm.net.my])
1635. *** _hahs (fssa@j16.brf44.jaring.my) has joined #dusun
1636. <_hahs> akummmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmm
1637. <mijaa`> tukul majuk yek?
1638. <mijaa`> w'salam..
1639. <_hahs> mijaaaaaaa
muahssssssssss
1640. <mijaa`> ler..
1641. <_hahs> ello everybadiiiiiiii
1642. <mijaa`> shahbea ke?
1643. <_hahs> haahhhhhh mijaaaaaaa
1644. *** Ratu_Meen (ratu@tl-79-147.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
1645. <Ratu_Meen> mijaaaaaaa
1646. <Ratu_Meen> mijaaaaaaa
1647. <Ratu_Meen> how's life?
1648. <mijaa`> ler.
1649. <mijaa`> baik baik
1650. <mijaa`> ok je
1651. <mijaa`> hehehe
1652. <YANI> mijaa nampak gmie?
1653. <mijaa`> yani.. tak de ler.
1654. <mijaa`> ni yani jepun ke?
1655. <YANI> mijaa..ok tq
1656. <YANI> mijaa a'a
1657. <mijaa`> ooo
1658. <mijaa`> bila balik?
1659. <YANI> ujung mac ari tu
1660. <mijaa`> dah jumpa adik angkat yani dah?
1661. *** TaTa (xyz@kmr-28-204.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun

Data6

1662. <YANI> abott?
1663. <Ratu_Meen> heheheh....mijaa.....sonok tak *****
1664. <mijaa`> meen.. bebaik
1665. <mijaa`> tak baik tau tanye2 bende cam tu
1666. <YANI> tata
1667. <Ratu_Meen> ekekekke
1668. <Ratu_Meen> eleh mijaa
1669. <TaTa> yannnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn
1670. <Ratu_Meen> kite kan sama status
1671. <YANI> taaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
1672. <Ratu_Meen> tataaaaaaaaaaaaa
1673. <mijaa`> iye... tapi ko tau ler bende2 ni tak leh cite2 cam tu
1674. *** ain (~ainnie@jrc-72-215.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
1675. <TaTa> meennnnnnnnn
1676. <Ratu_Meen> hehehehe mijaaa
1677. <Ratu_Meen> yer tata
1678. <Ratu_Meen> yer tata
1679. <Ratu_Meen> yer tata
1680. *** ain (~ainnie@jrc-72-215.tm.net.my) has left #dusun
1681. <TaTa> meen dah mandi rempah? hehhe
1682. <Ratu_Meen> `dahhhhhh
1683. <Ratu_Meen> baru lepas facial ni
1684. <Ratu_Meen> tgh pakai topeng
1685. <_hahs> babaiiiiiiii nakkkkkkk
chiowwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwww.....
1686. <Ratu_Meen> takleh senyum2
1687. <TaTa> perh topen lagi
1688. <TaTa> the mask
1689. <TaTa> hehe
1690. <Ratu_Meen> kang retak muka
1691. <TaTa> meen <-- ratu rempah
1692. <Ratu_Meen> heheheh
1693. <Ratu_Meen> nak keluar dinner nih...
1694. <_hahs> topeng ape topeng macam citer the mask ke meen.....
1695. <Ratu_Meen> ngan laku aku..
1696. <Ratu_Meen> dating
1697. <_hahs> retak seribu muhahahahah
1698. <Ratu_Meen> ini topeng kecantikan laaaaa
1699. *** matderis (~matderis@klj-20-89.tm.net.my) has joined #dusun
1700. <TaTa> mak mentua tak ikut ke?
1701. <TaTa> hehe
1702. <TaTa> retak seribu hehehe
1703. TaTa geletek meen kasi gelak
1704. <_hahs> hheeh topeng ape yang cantik tu meen .. ade macam topeng btman tak..
1705. <Ratu_Meen> ikutttttttttttttt
1706. <Ratu_Meen> aku tak macam si ziana tu aaaaaaaaaa
1707. <_hahs> muahahahhaa
1708. <Ratu_Meen> teruk minah tuuuu
1709. <Ratu_Meen> ishh shah....takleh tengok aku jelita sikitttttt

Data6

1710. <_hahs> bagii meen gelakkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkk
1711. <Ratu_Meen> ade je yang jeles
1712. <_hahs> muhahahahah
1713. *** cocomo (adol@202.188.153.223) has joined #dusun
1714. <_hahs> babaiiiiiiiiiii lerrrrr... nakkkk kuarrrrrrrrr
1715. *** _hahs is now known as _shah
1716. <cocomo> asalamualaikum
1717. <TaTa> nape ngan ziana meen?
1718. <Ratu_Meen> ya lah ziana tu.. hari tu die makan
sedap2 kat restoran
1719. <_shah> w'salamm adolllllllll
1720. <_shah> bye adolllllll.....
1721. *** _shah (fssa@j16.br44.jaring.my) has left #dusun
1722. <Ratu_Meen> sedangkan anak2 die kat rumah tak makan
lagi dari pagi
1723. <Ratu_Meen> matderisssssssssss
1724. <Ratu_Meen> matderisssssssssss
1725. <Ratu_Meen> lama tak nampak ko
1726. <TaTa> ishshh mana ko tau benda ni meen?
1727. <Ratu_Meen> org gaji die cite kat org gaji aku le..
tengah malam baru die balik..
1728. <Ratu_Meen> teruks
1729. <matderis> pesal lambat ni
1730. <matderis> woi woi
1731. <Ratu_Meen> muka rasa fresh.... je
1732. <Ratu_Meen> matderis ko lag ke
1733. *** matderis (~matderis@klj-20-89.tm.net.my) has
left #dusun
1734. <tukul> wei mija kau ado lagi ko ni
1735. <tukul> wei mija kau ado lagi ko ni
1736. <tukul> wei mija kau ado lagi ko ni
1737. <tukul> wei mija kau ado lagi ko ni
1738. <tukul> wei mija kau ado lagi ko ni
1739. <Ratu_Meen> pasni buh toner
1740. <Ratu_Meen> pas buh toner pakai krim malam lak
1741. <Ratu_Meen> pastu tido
1742. <Ratu_Meen> mijaa tenet!
1743. *** matderis (~matderis@klj-20-89.tm.net.my) has
joined #dusun
1744. <TaTa> meen mak aii susah nya
1745. <Ratu_Meen> senang jer
1746. <Ratu_Meen> kalu nak kulit lawo kena usaha sikit
1747. *** blaCkCrow (tempee@klj-60-5.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
1748. <Ratu_Meen> kena rajin....jgn malas-malas
1749. <Ratu_Meen> abang maiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii
1750. <TaTa> blackkk
1751. <Ratu_Meen> abang maiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii
1752. <Ratu_Meen> abang maiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii
1753. <TaTa> tua sok kedut gak heehe
1754. <blaCkCrow> a'kum.....
1755. <TaTa> 10Waalaikum Salam WarahMatullah
Hiwabarokatuh.... 3 blaCkCrow
1756. <Ratu_Meen> kedut pon awet mudaaaaaaataaaa
1757. <Ratu_Meen> bukan cam ko tata
1758. <TaTa> hehhehe

Data6

1759. <blaCkCrow> adekkkkk meennnnnnnnnn
1760. <Ratu_Meen> ekekekke
1761. <blaCkCrow> hehehe
1762. <YANI> blackkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkk
1763. TaTa sentiasa awet muda hehe
1764. <YANI> gi mandi
1765. <Ratu_Meen> hehehe black gagak
1766. <TaTa> ko lum nengok lum tau hehahhahahah
1767. <TaTa> tak yah nak mandi rempah siksa badan hahahaha
1768. <matderis> weh
1769. <Ratu_Meen> taknok tengok..sebab taknok tahu
1770. <mijaa`> aikk
1771. <mijaa`> cocomo
1772. <TaTa> ko tak caya tanya black hahahahahaha
1773. *** cocomo (adol@202.188.153.223) has left #dusun
1774. <mijaa`> ler.
1775. <TaTa> spawn yang berawet
1776. <blaCkCrow> pe dia nihh..
1777. <YANI> blackkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkk
1778. <Ratu_Meen> mandi rempah untuk kesihatan
dalamaman....jgn tak tau
1779. <YANI> aik
1780. <blaCkCrow> weiiiiiii yani..
1781. <blaCkCrow> aku ingat ko dah pupus..
1782. <blaCkCrow> idup lagik ko ekk..
1783. <YANI> baru ujud balik
1784. <YANI> tapi nak kena pupus dah ni
1785. <blaCkCrow> leerr
1786. <Ratu_Meen> abang maii....dah mandi lom
1787. <blaCkCrow> pe sall..
1788. <YANI> ko pun idup lagi yek
1789. <Ratu_Meen> abang maii....dah mandi lom
1790. <Ratu_Meen> abang maii....dah mandi lom
1791. <blaCkCrow> adekk meen aku dah mandiii ahh
1792. <YANI> dah nak tutup
1793. <Ratu_Meen> banyak ke air
1794. <blaCkCrow> nape ko nak mandikan aku kerr?
1795. <blaCkCrow> heheehe
1796. <blaCkCrow> lerr yani..lex ahhh
1797. <Ratu_Meen> tanok
1798. <Ratu_Meen> takuttttttttttttttttt
1799. <blaCkCrow> ko cakap yg jagoo.. lab.. aku suh..
tunggu dulu
1800. <blaCkCrow> heheeh
1801. <blaCkCrow> meen ko takut pe lakk.
1802. <matderis> anak itit
1803. <Ratu_Meen> takut ko!
1804. <blaCkCrow> ngan aku ko pon takut ekk.
1805. <TaTa> black jom mandi rempah jom hahahahahaha
1806. <TaTa> black jom mandi rempah jom hahahahahaha
1807. <TaTa> black jom mandi rempah jom hahahahahaha
1808. <Ratu_Meen> abang pon bukan leh caye
1809. <YANI> black tak mandi..air takde
1810. <blaCkCrow> huihhhh..
1811. <TaTa> pastu tumis kari h ahahahaha
1812. <blaCkCrow> mandi rempahhhhh.....

Data6

1813. <TaTa> jadi laa masakan berempah blackcrow
hahahahaha
1814. <blaCkCrow> jommmmmmmmm.....
1815. <blaCkCrow> heheehhehe
1816. <Ratu_Meen> tata ngan black nak berkubang dalam
rempah kari ke woi
1817. <YANI> jomm
1818. <Ratu_Meen> heheheheh
1819. <blaCkCrow> crow masak kicappp ahh.. baru beashh
1820. <Ratu_Meen> dia buat dahhhhhh
1821. <blaCkCrow> baru namo dia blackcroww
1822. <Ratu_Meen> lama dah tak havoc camni
1823. <YANI> black kim salam pott & mie & aserk
1824. <Ratu_Meen> hakhakhak
1825. <TaTa> black haha tu ratu rempah ada nak awet hahaha
sok tua tak kedut muahahahaha
1826. <blaCkCrow> wokey yaniii
1827. <mijaa`> matderis... ooo matderis..
1828. <Ratu_Meen> abang mai..kim salam kat haji khutbah
noooooo
1829. <blaCkCrow> kang isok aku cakap kat dia org
1830. <mijaa`> yani org alor setar yek?
1831. <Ratu_Meen> abang mai..kim salam kat haji khutbah
noooooo
1832. <Ratu_Meen> abang mai..kim salam kat haji khutbah
noooooo
1833. <mijaa`> yani org alor setar yek?
1834. <blaCkCrow> huishhhh...
1835. <Ratu_Meen> hakhakhak
1836. <blaCkCrow> aji kutbahhhh lak
1837. <blaCkCrow> tak kose aku nak cakap kat dia.
1838. <Ratu_Meen> bapak mentua aku punye atuk sedara punye
besan tu
1839. <blaCkCrow> kang nanti dia bagik kutbahhhh,, ngan
aku lak
1840. <Ratu_Meen> jgn tatau
1841. TaTa yani
1842. <matderis> mijaa weh.. selamat pengantin baru.. lagi
main irc ka ? hehe
1843. <Ratu_Meen> berasap tine
1844. <blaCkCrow> haji khutbah tu berdedikasi betuiiii..
hehehe
1845. TaTa hands yani 4@ 3}-`---,---
1846. <Ratu_Meen> tak paham le abang mai..
1847. <Ratu_Meen> berdedikasi cam ne?
1848. <blaCkCrow> ye lah.. walaupun dia sakit.. dia mai
kerja gak..
1849. <blaCkCrow> huhhhh...
1850. <blaCkCrow> malu pulak kitorang
1851. <YANI> caw
1852. <YANI> a kum
1853. <mijaa`> mat..
1854. <mijaa`> komputer rosak..
1855. <blaCkCrow> yaniii wehh
1856. <blaCkCrow> lex ah
1857. <mijaa`> ni duk tanye kat depa ni

Data6

1858. *** crackers (~boul@jrc-72-168.tm.net.my) has joined
#dusun
1859. <blaCkCrow> aku lom lagik bermanja ngan ko..
1860. <blaCkCrow> hehehe
1861. <mijaa`> kat #macintosh
1862. <YANI> black...mana leh lex...org dah halau
1863. <blaCkCrow> makcikk.... fhiweeeettssssss....
1864. <blaCkCrow> lerr
1865. <Ratu_Meen> no tipon abang le
1866. <blaCkCrow> yaniii sape yg halau ko tuh
1867. crackers 12,1is using 4,1- 8= - 9(11,1SeGa
ScRiPt - 9,1) 8,1= 4- 12,1 v1.5 12,1By -[-SeGa-]
12,1.The BeSt AnD cOoLeSt ScRiPt!!!GeT It RiGhT NoW At -
7,1(8,1http://segascript.home.ml.org - 7,1)
1868. <blaCkCrow> meh habaq kat aku..
<SNIP>

1. Log file opened at: 11/2/98 10:33:03 pm

80. Aserk: hehe..aku bukan kira sapa..mengurat jaa..apa pedulik.

81. nsxx: ehehehe

82. zaiYani: iskkkkkkk

83. nsxx: zaii kalu jadik ok pa

84. nsxx: ensem tuh Aserk tu

85. nsxx: ehehe

86. Aserk: boleh nanti..hang jadi ka ipaq aku...paa..

87. ~~~polong (ree@202.185.150.7) has joined channel #dusun

88. ~~~X has set the topic on channel #dusun to ()

89. polong: ohh

90. zaiYani: ye laa. isk

91. nsxx: ok laa tuh jadik kak ipaq

92. zaiYani: hehhe suke ko laaaa

93. polong: kat sini ko dok ekk

94. zaiYani: weih polong hehehehe

95. Aserk: nanti aku..belanja hang kenny roger..nak?..

96. zaiYani: tak nak aku serkk

97. zaiYani: lagipun aku tak suka makanan barat

98. polong: chehhh makanan barat.. tapi chinese food hang maakn kan?

99. polong: makanan barat gak tu

100. ~~~Srina (cappocino@bat-46-62.tm.net.my) has joined channel #dusun

101. polong: hehehehe

102. polong: srina..wife tengah ku

103. zaiYani: polong peh ko nih iskkkkkkkkk

104. polong: hehehehee

105. Srina: ooiit Zaiyani....

106. zaiYani: bila pulak aku makan makanan cine?

107. polong: mana wife tua ku zaiyani

108. polong: hahahahahaha

109. zaiYani: tak sanggup aku makan walaupun aku kebuluq..

110. nsxx: huk alaa sapo plak tu

111. Srina: polong ko sibuk leee

112. zaiYani: apott nih geng aku

113. ~~~Mang_Kok (mengkuang@j37.jrc21.jaring.my) has joined channel #dusun

114. polong: zaiyani..makanan cine halal ler.. heheh

115. polong: zaiyani..soh si nur salimah masok sama

116. mijaa` is back

117. Aserk: awek mana lak nii?..

118. zaiYani: apott heheheheehe

119. zaiYani: mijaaaaa

120. mijaa`: ler..

<SNIP>

738. ~~~izan (izan153@jhb-12-155.tm.net.my) has joined channel #dusun

739. ~~~Aserk (ASr@klg-58-204.tm.net.my) has joined channel #dusun

Ddata2

740. izan: hai tata
741. ~~~Aserk has left channel #dusun
742. izan: tata ingat izan lagi?
743. ~~~weck (nya@202.188.81.21) has joined channel #dusun
744. TaTa: izan
745. ~~~D`Dud[sx] has left channel #dusun
746. izan: hem...ingat pun....kat mana tu?
747. TaTa: izan
748. TaTa: izan mane ni?
749. TaTa: takde D pun :)
750. ~~~DuD[18sx] (mengkuang@j37.jrc21.jaring.my) has joined channel #dusun
751. izan: yup....izzaan ae nie...
752. DuD[18sx]: dududududududududud
753. izan: izan nak cari kawan le
754. TaTa: ,1 P"-g øv'@fføw [izan PING
reply]: 24 seconds
755. izan: alamak...mane semua nie?
756. izan: sonyap ajo....pie mana?
757. weck: hi izan
758. TaTa: izan nenet ler
759. izan: hai weck....
760. izan: izan rasa kawan kita shasha ada masalah le
761. izan: tadi dia bagi message.....tak paham le
762. izan: mij_out...still there?
763. Zurria: pesal izand
764. Zurria dah lama tak nampak sha2
765. izan: nenet tu apa tata?
766. Zurria: zand..kenapa ngan sha2
767. izan: entahle...dia bagi message tadi.....tapi tak clear
768. TaTa: ,1 P"-g øv'@fføw [izan PING
reply]: 11 seconds
769. izan: izan actually tak pernah kenal sha2....tapi semua member irc izan anggap friends..
770. Zurria: mmmmmmm

<SNIP>

984. gMie: nama kupan...aku nak tido dah nih?
985. gMie: ngantuk lee!!!
986. Namakupan: blum lagi
987. gMie: ko jaga diri ko bebaik namakupan!!
988. Namakupan: ok
989. Namakupan: nak blah ker
990. gMie: jangan sampai dino..sawa tu telan ko dah lee!!
991. gMie: aku nak belah le!!!
992. Namakupan: Bye Bye gMie
993. gMie: esok ke lusa kee tulat kee aku masuk ek?
994. Namakupan: wokehhh
995. gMie: namakupan!!! nantik bila aku masuk ko tunjuk aku gamba yg lain lak ek!!!
996. weck: gmie, wat awal sgt nok gi...
997. gMie: gamba badak sumbu lak ekk
998. Namakupan: ade lagi kalau nak tengok
999. gMie: weck dah ngantuk lee weck!!!

Ddata2

1000. Namakupan: ade lagi kalau nak tengok
1001. gMie: esok nak keje?
1002. gMie: nantik boss marah!!!
1003. gMie: heheheheeee
1004. Namakupan: nak tengok takk
1005. gMie: namakupan pasai ko aku tunggu!!
1006. gMie: ko tunjuk lee!!
1007. gMie: pehtu lepas tu aku nak tido tau!!
1008. Namakupan: jap
1009. weck: memang keje boss marah org....
1010. gMie: okey tunjuk cepat!! aku tunggu nih!
1011. Namakupan: ,1 * +
,1.
1012. Namakupan: ,1 *
,1.
1013. Namakupan: ,1 _____ ,1 .*
,1.
1014. Namakupan: ,1 + _.-"~~ _"- . ,1
,1.
1015. Namakupan: ,1 ,-" .-- ~"- \ ,1
* ,1.
1016. Namakupan: ,1 .^ / () ,1
* ,1.
1017. gMie: weck ye ke>>cam gitu!!
1018. Namakupan: ,1 + { _.-.-. _ / ~ ,1
,1.
1019. Namakupan: ,1 / . Y
* ,1.
1020. Namakupan: ,1 / _j +
,1.
1021. Namakupan: ,1 / (--|__
,1.
1022. gMie: pdan lee saya kena marah seselalu!!
1023. Namakupan: ,1 | "-. 2,1 Good ,1
* ,1.
1024. Namakupan: ,1 | (____ \ 2,1 Nite
,1 ,1.
1025. Namakupan: ,1 * | .)~-._/ *
* ,1.
1026. Namakupan: ,1 | _) 2,1
Everyone,1 ,1.
1027. Namakupan: ,1 \ "|
,1.
1028. ~~~kyry (kyry@as000343.singnet.com.sg) has joined
channel #dusun
1029. Namakupan: ,1 \ \
,1.
1030. ~~~Signoff: TaTa
1031. Namakupan: ,1 + \ ^ . * +
,1.
1032. Namakupan: ,1 ^ . "-.
,1.
1033. Namakupan: ,1 "-. _ ~-. _ ,
,1.
1034. Namakupan: ,1 * "--. _ . ^
,1.

Ddata2

1035. Namakupan: ,1 *
,1.
1036. Namakupan: jangan tido...
1037. gMie: FOOOOOH!!!! NAMA KUPAN!!!!sure aku mimpi ko nyee!!!
1038. Namakupan: Offers gMie some gum 4,14.,8<~Juicy-Fruit~>4,14.
1039. Namakupan: or 4,14.,9<~,9SpearMint,9~>4,14.
1040. ~~~kyry has left channel #dusun
1041. gMie: heheheeee!!!
1042. gMie: APPLAUSE!!!!!!
1043. Namakupan: nanti aku sorang laa dlm nie..
1044. gMie: APPLAUSE!!!!!!
1045. gMie: APPLAUSE!!!!!!
1046. gMie: AKU DAH NAK TDIO KO NAK BAGI GUM BAKPE!!
1047. Namakupan: yg lain dok diam jer
1048. gMie: nak suruh aku tercekik!!
1049. Namakupan: ekekekke
1050. gMie: aku nak tido dahhh..
1051. Namakupan: jangan lahh... aku sorang2 nih
1052. gMie: mijaa pon ada!!
1053. Namakupan: mija dari dulu lagi
1054. Namakupan: mija dari dulu lagi
1055. gMie: diorang tu sume baik2 tuu!!
1056. gMie: ko layan jek!!
1057. Namakupan: jangan lah tido... hang tak suka aku ke?
1058. gMie: eishh sapa kata tak suka.. tapi aku ngantuk lah..
1059. Namakupan: alaa... sekejap je.. ko kan baik
1060. gMie: eishhh..
1061. Namakupan: hehehe
1062. Namakupan: tok sah tido..
1063. gMie: laa aku tau aku baik tapi aku esok aku keje...
1064. Namakupan: setengah jam je.. lepas tu, baru lah tido
1065. Namakupan: boleh lah kan... untuk kawan..
1066. gMie: aku nak temankan hang... tapi aku tak boleh
1067. ~~~awat (Q@pc021069.shef.ac.uk) has joined channel #dusun
1068. Namakupan: walaubagaimanapun.... ko kena duk sini gak...
1069. gMie: weyy!! ko nih!!!
1070. gMie: walaubagaimanapun.... aku nak tido gak....
1071. Namakupan: ok laaa
1072. gMie: hehehehe
1073. Namakupan: pegilaa tidur
1074. Namakupan: pegilaa tidur
1075. Namakupan: pegilaa tidur
1076. Namakupan: pegilaa tidur
1077. Namakupan: Hope to see you soon gMie
1078. gMie: kang aku terlentok kat keyborad ni kang!!
1079. gMie: hehheeeee
1080. gMie: okey namakupan!!!
1081. gMie: selamat malam!!!
1082. Namakupan: wokehhhhh
1083. Namakupan: alammmsssss
1084. weck: tidurrlah wahai gmie/.....

Ddata2

1085. gMie: see yea...around d' clock
1086. Namakupan: oit weck
1087. weck: bye bye
1088. gMie: ialah cik weck!!!..nak tunggu awak nynyikan
sampai berjanggal lee saya!!!
1089. gMie: namakupan walsalam!!!
1090. gMie: weck wasalam!!!!
1091. gMie: mijaa wasalam!!
1092. gMie: amin!!!!
1093. ~~~Signoff: gMie (ingat buah ingat joy..ingat dusun
ingat gMie...)

<SNIP>

1175. ~~~Namakupan (demang@j40.btn.jaring.my) has joined
channel #dusun
1176. anim`: dr maner ni
1177. Iguana: dari Penang
1178. anim`: :)
1179. anim`: :)
1180. Iguana: aneem dari mana?
1181. anim`: tk intan...
1182. anim`: tau tak?
1183. Iguana: ooho kat Perak...
1184. Namakupan:
assalamualaikumwarahmat4ullahiwabara5katuhhhh
1185. weck: welcome back... namaku
1186. anim`: pandaiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii.....
1187. Iguana: waalaikumussalam
1188. Namakupan: heheh
1189. Namakupan: dah ramai
1190. Namakupan serves up a fresh cup of coffee for all
those who need the extra caffine? ,1__P 5~~~
1191. Iguana tanya namakupan; cappucino tak der ke?
1192. Namakupan passes X a cup of hot chocolate. ,5__P
5~~~~
1193. Namakupan: ade tapi gula abis
1194. Namakupan: sori..
1195. Namakupan: ,8(æ)
1196. weck: namaku kau ni mamak teh tarik ekkk
1197. Iguana: aisey tapi bekalan gula mencukupi laaa macam
mana leh habis?
1198. Namakupan: tak laa
1199. Namakupan: tue kat tempat ko
1200. weck: annnnnnnneeem, ngaper diam membisu
1201. Namakupan: weck
1202. anim`: hehhehehe
1203. weck: yer namaku..
1204. Namakupan: ,8:,8)
1205. anim`: tak tau nak cakap ape la
1206. anim`: tak tau nak cakap ape la
1207. Namakupan offers anim` some ,2(m)&,5(m)'s and tries
to make friends ;)
1208. Iguana: namakupan bak lerr cappucino blast...
1209. Namakupan: gula tak delaaaa
1210. anim`: time kacih.....

Ddata2

1211. Namakupan: heheh
1212. Namakupan: sama2
1213. Namakupan: butet 16 < 16 tuh aper
1214. Namakupan: umo ker
1215. Iguana kata nak buat cappucino blast tak yah pakai gula...cuma syrup cappucino skit, ketul ais, satu scoop aiskrim..dahh...dan jangan lupa blender
1216. Namakupan: puhhhhhh
1217. Namakupan: say meniaga cuma kat warung jer cik
1218. Namakupan: saya meniaga cuma kat warung jer cik
1219. ~~~BabyGiantT (adiksimba@202.188.89.27) has joined channel #dusun
1220. ~~~X has set the topic on channel #dusun to ()
1221. BabyGiantT: ehemmm..ehemm akummm
1222. Namakupan: aloo...
1223. Namakupan: ola
1224. Namakupan: salammaa

<SNIP>

1950. ~~~everlong (everlong@c7p34.dialin.iupui.edu) has joined channel #dusun
1951. keCik: oiiiiitsssss
1952. keCik: lol
1953. Canda: everlong
1954. everlong: Canda.....
1955. Canda: a'kum
1956. Canda malas nak layan kecil
1957. keCik: tak pee.....
1958. Canda: everlong
1959. Canda: everlong
1960. keCik: sabar....
1961. Canda: nanti tolong antor assignment aku....
1962. everlong: tak boleh canda.. aku dah lambat dah nih..
1963. Canda: ishkkk..
1964. nobadi: long everlasting
1965. keCik: hehehehehe
1966. Canda: tak pe aaaa.. tolong lah..
1967. everlong: tak boleh le.. lagipun aku tak lalu building hang..
1968. keCik: nobadi: kao sapa.....
1969. Canda: hmmm
1970. keCik: cam kenal jeeee
1971. keCik: kao kee yg buat dajal kat #sampah ari tuuuuu
1972. nobadi: wei kecil bukan aku laaa
1973. nobadi: aku tak join aa set2 zetty tu
1974. Canda: nak keluar dah...
1975. everlong: tak boleh lah macam tu..
1976. Canda: nak tengok tv
1977. keCik: nobadi: hehehehehe... nasib baik log file aku dah tak deee
1978. Canda: everlong??
1979. Canda: everlong??
1980. ~~~Signoff: everlong ([AR4MO5R 5V14.50] By QURUS 1997/1998(c))
1981. keCik: nobadi: bagus....

Ddata2

1982. nobadi: aku ni member cincin

1983. keCik: gtg....

1984. nobadi: k

1985. ~~~Canda has left channel #dusunLog file closed at:

12/2/98 9:02:54 am