Abstract
This article examines uses of Indonesian third person singular pronouns *ia* and *dia* in news reports. It takes as its departure point the general account of the pronouns which specifies that *ia* can occur only in subject position, while *dia* can occur in subject or object position. The article shows that, although both pronouns can occur in subject position, they differ distributionally and functionally. *Ia* occurs almost three times as frequently as *dia* and predominates in subject position, while *dia* occurs mostly in non-subject position. *Ia* is primarily used to convey the notion that the referent is a reliable and authoritative source of information and to focus on the referent as an agent or protagonist who is initiating or performing some action or a series of actions. By contrast, *dia* tends to be selected for contexts in which the referent is presented as a speaker who is elaborating on what has been said previously rather than introducing a new point. The predominance of *ia* in news report accords with its characterization as a pronoun strongly associated with formal registers.

Keywords
Third person pronoun, news reports, reported speech, quotatives, rhetorical structure.

This article examines functional differences between two forms of third person pronouns in Indonesian news reports. *Ia* predominates in subject position and is used to convey the notion that the referent is a reliable and authoritative source of information. By contrast, *dia* occurs mostly in non-subject position and is selected for contexts in which the referent is presented as a speaker elaborating on previously said information.
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singular pronoun in Standard Indonesian, *ia* and *dia*, both meaning ‘she’ or ‘he’. These pronouns are generally distinguished syntactically according to whether or not they can occur as object in a clause. *ia* can occur in pre-verbal position as subject in an active sentence, as shown in (1), subject of a passive sentence, as in (2), or as agent in passive type two (so-called *pasif semu*; see Cole, Hermon, and Chung 2006), as in (3) (Sneddon 2010: 168-169). In (2) *ia* occurs as subject in passive type one. In this type of passive, the subject precedes the verb (which is prefixed by *di*). In type two passive, the agent comes before the verb to which no prefix is attached.

**Subject of Active sentence:**

(1) *ia* juga mengajak semua pihak mengambil hikmah dari kesulitan ini.

‘He also urged all parties to learn from this problem.’ (*Kompas* 7/1/1998; *ia* referring to President Soeharto).

**Subject of passive type one (ia is the surface subject):**

(2) *ia* dimintai pendapat-nya mengenai dekrit itu.

‘He was asked to give his opinion about the decree.’ (*Kompas* 25/5/2001; *ia* referring to political observer Prof. Dr. Ichlasul Amal from the Gadjah Mada University).

**Agent in passive type two (sejumlah menteri is the surface subject):**


‘He instructed several ministers to go to Aceh, among whom were the Minister for Public Works, Minister for Internal Affairs, and Minister of Health.’ (*Kompas* 27/4/2004; *ia* referring to Vice president Jusuf Kalla).

---

2 For consistency and simplicity, I gloss all suffixes (*–i* and *–kan*) as APP (applicative markers), whether or not the verb to which they are attached is used transitively.

3 Professional titles correspond to the referents’ positions at the time of reporting, not the present. Thus, Jusuf Kalla is written here as Vice-President although he no longer holds that position.
In some written genres ia can occur post-verbally, as shown in (4).

\[(4) \text{Harus pergikah ia?} \quad \text{must go-PRT 3Sg}\]

‘Must s/he go?’ (Standard word order: Ia harus pergi?) (Sneddon 2010: 169).

Ia can also occur as subject of a complement clause, as in (5).

\[(5) \text{Saya menganggap ia bodoh.} \quad 1Sg consider 3Sg stupid}\]

‘I consider him/her stupid.’ (Sneddon 2010: 169).

However, ia cannot occur as object of a prepositional phrase (*bersama ia ‘with her/him’) or as possessor (for example, *buku ia ‘her/his book’) (Purwo 1984: 56). Dia, by contrast, does not have these restrictions and can occur in all positions, including as object in active or passive sentences. Historically, dia is an inflectional form of ia (Sneddon 2010: 169).

Though both ia and dia can be used for referring to third person singular, ia is essentially the property of formal Indonesian, particularly written discourse. It occurs in some types of formal spoken discourse such as sermons (particularly when a speaker quotes from a holy book) and formal speeches. Ia is not attested in conversational data presented in Englebretson (2003), Ewing (2005), and Sneddon (2006). The permissibility of both ia and dia to occur in subject position in formal discourse raises an interesting question. If these pronouns are equally acceptable in this position, what governs the use of one or the other? To explore this question, I examine their occurrences in one type of written discourse in which both pronouns are commonly found, namely, newspaper reports. In front page news reports, ia and dia are often used to refer to speakers in positions of authority, such as the president, ministers, political observers, and other public figures.

The analysis to be presented is based on a relatively small corpus consisting of 57,093 words from 84 news reports, taken mainly from Kompas, with two additional reports from Suara Merdeka and Surabaya Pos. The reports were published between 1996-2005 and appeared as the berita utama, the main news item. All texts are taken from the online version of the newspapers, which means there might be differences with the printed version (these differences are not discussed here). These texts cover an important period within the recent Indonesian history in which the country witnessed a quick succession of five presidencies, beginning with the period shortly prior to the fall of Soeharto in May 1998, to the presidencies of B.J. Habibie, Abdurrahman Wahid, Megawati Soekarnoputri, and Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. This is also an important period within the history of the Indonesian language, with significant changes in the use of third person pronouns.

\[\text{These are also called berita terkini ‘latest news’ (for example, in Poskota newspaper).} \]
transition period toward democratization following over three decades of an authoritarian government under Soeharto. Consequently, the texts make ample references to events during this period and the words and actions of the five presidents. The data was collected as part of a larger project examining patterns of person reference in Indonesian.

A quantitative analysis of the 84 texts reveals that whilst *ia* and *dia* can both occur in subject position, they pattern differently. The difference is most observable when we consider the occurrences of these pronouns in reported speech. *Ia* tends to be selected for referring back to a speaker in clauses of the type “speaker X does/says (that) …” (active sentence, or “agent-trigger” (see Cumming 1991)). In this type of clause, the referent is presented as an agent who is initiating or performing an action and one who is important within the overall structure of the text. That is, the referent is treated as a reliable source of information and an authority of that information. The referent’s words are quoted to render the report newsworthy whether or not that referent holds an important position in society. *Dia*, on the other hand, tends to be used in non-subject position and for contexts in which what the referent says is a continuation of what has been said rather than a new piece of information.

**THIRD PERSON PRONOMINAL REFERENCE**

The popular definition of the pronoun says that it is a form which stands for or substitutes for a noun or noun phrase (NP) (see for example, Leech and Svartvik 1993[1975]; Greenbaum 1991). According to Wales (1996: 1), the personal pronoun is often considered the prototypical pronoun, in contrast with other subclasses of pronouns, such as the demonstrative, possessive, reflexive, reciprocal, relative, interrogative, and indefinite. She also suggests that of the three types of personal pronouns (first, second, and third), the third person can be considered the prototypical pronoun. Her suggestion is based on the consideration that it is the third person pronoun that is generally used to refer back to an NP; that is, it is the pronoun which typically serves an anaphoric referring function. Wales points out that in many discussions of personal pronouns, it is suggested that the motivation for substitution (that is, substituting an NP for a pronoun) is avoidance of repetition. Consider (6a) and (6b) for example (about Babar the elephant, a character in children’s stories written by De Brunhoff; the sentence in (6b) is the original; cited in Wales 1996: 2).

(6a) Babar grew fast. Soon Babar was playing with the other baby elephants. Babar was one of the nicest of them.

(6b) Babar grew fast. Soon he was playing with the other baby elephants. He was one of the nicest of them. (J. de Brunhoff 1991, *The story of Babar*, London: Methuen, pp. 4-5).
A similar example from the Indonesian data is given in (7a). The pronoun ia is used to refer to Gus Dur, the person known at the time of reporting as chair of one of Indonesia’s largest Islamic organizations, the Nahdlatul Ulama. The first mention of the person (in the first clause) is done with a proper name, while the second mention is with the pronoun ia. In this example, it would be awkward to repeat the name in the second clause, as in (7b), because it creates an impression of clumsiness. However, repetition seems acceptable when used for emphasis, as shown in (7c) – a slightly modified version of (7b).

(7a) Gus Dur mengatakan, tidak memberi usulan soal masalah Ambon, tetapi ia mengatakan akan pergi ke sana.

‘Gus Dur said he would not make any recommendation about the problem in Ambon but said he would go there.’ (Kompas 8/3/1999; ia referring to Gus Dur in his role of Chair of Nahdlatul Ulama).

(7b) Gus Dur mengatakan, tidak memberi usulan soal masalah Ambon, tetapi Gus Dur mengatakan akan pergi ke sana.

‘Gus Dur said, he would not make any recommendation about the problem in Ambon, but Gus Dur said he would go there.’

(7c) Gus Dur mengatakan, tidak memberi usulan soal masalah Ambon. Gus Dur juga mengatakan dia akan pergi ke sana.

‘Gus Dur said, he would not make any recommendation about the problem in Ambon. Gus Dur also said he would go there.’

These examples illustrate Wales’s point about repetition, that is, it may be chosen on pragmatic considerations. These considerations may include comparing and contrasting, classifying the referent(s), and so forth (Fox 1987). As Tannen (2007) also articulately demonstrates, repetition serves as a rhetorical strategy to convey affect.

The definition of “pronoun” in the latest version of the Oxford English Dictionary (OED online, draft revision March 2010) does not mention substitution. The pronoun is rather defined in terms of its referring function: “A word that can function as a noun phrase when used by itself and that refers either to the participants in the discourse (for example, I, you) or to someone or something mentioned elsewhere in the discourse (for example, she, it, this)”. The personal pronoun is defined as “a pronoun which denotes the grammatical person, as (in English) I, you, and he, in its various genders, numbers, and cases”. In a similar view, but working within the framework of conversation analysis, Schegloff (2007: 436) states that, pronouns differ from other forms of
person reference (for example, noun phrases, proper names) in that the former are used to do little else other than simply referring, whereas the latter can be used to describe, identify, and categorize (for example, man, woman, nurse, teacher). In this sense, pronouns are often said to be semantically empty.

The use of pronouns in anaphoric function – that is, to refer back to a previously mentioned referent – according to Chafe (1994: 93-107), implies that a speaker believes the addressee can identify the person referent either through shared knowledge or through an association with something that is shared knowledge. In Chafe’s cognitive account, identifiable referents are those that the speaker/writer believes to be “active” or “semi-active” in the addressee’s mind. A referent is said to be “active” when it is in the focal state of consciousness, and “semi-active” when it is in peripheral state. Identifiability involves three components: shared knowledge, verbalization, and salience. A referent is identifiable when it is assumed to be already shared by the addressee, directly or indirectly. It also has to be verbalized in a sufficiently identifying way, and it is also contextually salient (1994: 94). In relation to verbalization, Chafe points out that the typical function of personal pronouns is to provide a minimum verbalization of the shared referent. However, minimum verbalization does not equate to a low status of identifiability, as shown by Ariel (1990) in her hierarchy of referent “accessibility” (similar to “identifiability”). Ariel argues that pronominalized referents are high in the hierarchy (that is, highly accessible), while those expressed as NPs are in the intermediate and low levels of the hierarchy. This is because referents verbalized as pronouns are typically already mentioned in the preceding discourse, so in terms of information status, it is not new information (see Chafe 1994). However, the question remains that, when there is more than one pronoun that can fulfil a verbalizing function, what sorts of considerations do speakers/writers make in choosing one pronoun over the other?

Relating Ariel’s accessibility hierarchy to the use of referring expressions in Swedish news reports, Ledin (1996) argues that the use of pronouns and NPs, as well as reflecting the cognitive status of the referents, is also reflective of social and ideological processes. Examining the distribution of personal pronouns (first and third person) and NPs (proper names and other NPs) in their anaphoric function, Ledin demonstrates that the use of NPs suggests either an invitation for empathy with or distancing from the person being referred to. NPs invite an “identification with a person” in cases where these NPs are used to refer to a person presented in a positive light (for example, an ordinary citizen confronted with injustice, a public figure who generously assists the poor, someone who succeeds against all odds). Through the use of the NPs reporters highlight the referent’s personal qualities – qualities that set them apart as a person. Thus repetition, in this case, serves an authorial purpose of presenting a particular point of view and persuade the readers to share that view. Correspondingly, the use of pronouns suggests that the qualities of the referent are assumed to be known by the reader. This, argues Ledin, accords with the assumption that pronouns are semantically empty,
therefore by using pronouns, reporters expect readers to be able to identify the referents easily. In Swedish news reports, pronouns tend to be used more often to refer to public figures in their official roles, indicating that it is assumed the readers are familiar with the qualities of these figures. When it is their personal qualities that are discussed, Ledin finds that reporters tend to use NPs. This finding in fact accords with the cognitive view advanced by Chafe and Ariel which says that NPs are used for identifiable referents (that is, referents that are highly accessible). The public are familiar with figures of authority in their public roles, and therefore these figures can be referred to with pronouns, whereas information pertaining to their particular personal qualities is something the public does not always know and therefore would constitute new information. As such, the use of NPs can be expected.

Ledin’s study is worth mentioning because it demonstrates the way in which pronouns and NPs are used in a register-specific and language-specific context and shows what counts as new information or given information in that register. However, Ledin’s study does not take into account the position of the third person pronoun within the rhetorical structure of the text. As will be shown, the co-occurrence of a pronoun with other linguistic elements such as the quotative verb, as well as its position within a rhetorical structure also need to be considered in determining its use patterns.

Types of Indonesian reported speech
The term “reported speech”, following Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1023) and Coulmas (1986), refers to the reporting of speech and thoughts in spoken and written texts. Reported speech is further distinguished into two types: direct reported speech (or “direct quotation”) and indirect reported speech (“indirect quotation”). Direct reported speech purports to give a verbatim report of the original, whereas indirect reported speech gives only the content of the speech. Direct speech is prototypically marked by a colon and quotation marks. These two types are illustrated by the examples in (8) and (9). (Example (8) is a rendering into direct reported speech of the original sentence in (9), which is in indirect reported speech.)

(8)  
3Sg AT-say-APP also Indonesia still must much
belajar tentang demokrasi.

‘He also said: “Indonesia still has a lot to learn about democracy.”’ (Kompas 15/4/99; ia referring to President Habibie).

(9)  
3Sg AT-say-APP also Indonesia still must much
belajar tentang demokrasi.

learn about democracy
'He said Indonesia still has a lot to learn about democracy.' (Kompas 15/4/1999; ia referring to President Habibie).

In these examples, the clause containing *ia mengatakan pula* ‘he also said’ called the “reporting frame” (Huddleston and Pullum 2002) or “framing clause” (Englebretson 2003) because this clause “frames” the reported or quoted material (namely, *Indonesia masih harus banyak belajar tentang demokrasi*), while the verb is called the framing morpheme or “quotative morpheme” (Cumming 1991: 66). The type of reporting frame “*ia/dia* + quotative morpheme prefixed by *meN–*” does not occur clause finally (following the quoted material), unlike English “*s/he said*” which can occur before or after the quoted material. Hence, the sentence in (8) cannot occur as follows: “*Indonesia masih harus banyak belajar tentang demokrasi*”, *ia mengatakan pula*.

The framing clause may also be inserted in the middle of the sentence, as illustrated in (10). Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1024) refer to instances of this sort as “parentheticals”, “a kind of supplement”. The parenthetical in (10) takes the form of *katanya* ‘*s/he said*’ (literally, in her/his words), –*nya* being a third person enclitic. The frame “*ia/dia* + quotative morpheme prefixed by *meN–*” is not used in this position.

(10) Tetapi, *katanya* ia menjadi presiden karena rakyat Indonesia dan Tuhan.

‘But, *he said*, he only became president because the Indonesian people and God (made him one).’ (Kompas 15/4/1999; –*nya* and *ia* referring to President Habibie).

A variant of *katanya* is *kata dia*. The latter periphrastic form only occurs once in the data and seems to be a recent variant. The next section will briefly discuss the semantic difference between these two forms. *Katanya* and *kata dia* can occur before or after the quoted material, as well as a parenthetical.

Another type of framing clause in Indonesian is *menurut dia* ‘according to her/him’ (literally, ‘following her/him’) and its variant *menurutnya*. Similar to *katanya* and *kata dia*, *menurut dia* and *menurutnya* can occur before or after the quoted material or in the middle of it. *Menurut dia* and *menurutnya* are exemplified in (11) and (12) respectively.

(11) *Perjuangan menegakkan demokrasi, menurut dia, memang tidak mudah.*

‘The struggle to uphold democracy, according to him, is indeed not easy.’
According to Sneddon (2010: 274), morphemes such as bahwa, agar, or supaya indicate that what follows is a complement clause, which he defines as a clause which behaves like an object but cannot be the subject of a passive. Englebretson (2003) disputes this definition of complement and argues that bahwa should be treated as a discourse marker. The debate is not entered into here. For the purposes of this article, bahwa will be referred to as a complementiser.

Kalau ‘if’ is also used as a complementiser, particularly in informal
Indonesian where it is also spelt *kalo*. In the present data, this morpheme is used mainly as a conditional marker “if/when”. Of the total 120 occurrences of *kalau* (found in 50% of the total number of texts), only in 2 occurrences is *kalau* used as a complementiser. These are given in (15) and (16), both in direct reported speech (these examples are not glossed due to their length).

(15) *Menegaskan hal itu, Direktur Yayasan Paramadina Nurcholish Madjid yang juga ikut pada pertemuan, mengatakan, “Pak Harto akan tidak mau dicalonkan lagi. Bahkan Pak Harto sempat guyon: saya ini kapok jadi Presiden. Itu sampai tiga kali, saya bilang kalau orang Jombang itu, bukan kapok, tapi tuwuk (kekenyangan).”*

‘Reiterating the point, the Director of Paramadina Trust Nurcholish Madjid who also attended the meeting, said, “Pak Harto doesn’t want to be nominated again. Pak Harto even said jokingly: I’ve had enough of being a president. He said it three times, so I said that for a man from Jombang it’s not the case of having had enough but rather of having had more than ample of it.”’ *(Kompas 20/5/1998).*

(16) “*Kalau Wakil Presiden dicalonkan atau mencalonkan diri di dalam munas, itu wajar saja karena beliau tokoh Golkar yang sejak dulu berjuang di Golkar, dan kalau juga kalau orang Golkar, DPD-DPD mencalonkan beliau,” ucapnya.

‘“If the Vice-President is nominated or nominates himself in the National Congress, that’s to be expected because he is an important figure in Golkar who has long been working for Golkar, and it’s also to be expected that Golkar members, the DPDs, nominated him,” he said.’ *(Andi Mallarangeng, presidential spokesperson, referring to Vice-President Yusuf Kalla; Kompas 15/12/2004).*

The small number of occurrences of complementiser *kalau* in the data confirms the assumption that this function of *kalau* is mainly played out in informal contexts. In (15) above, *kalau* is used by public figure Nurcholish Madjid to relay to the reporter an informal exchange he had had with former President Soeharto. In (16) *kalau* is used in a news report focusing on an uncertainty whether a vice-president (in this case, Jusuf Kalla) can nominate himself to be leader of a major political party (Golkar) and whether he would need the permission of the president to do so.

Compare in this case with the 159 occurrences of *bahwa* (found in 60% of the total number of texts). Interestingly, this morpheme mostly occurs in framing clauses in which the subject is an NP (proper name or a title) or the first person singular pronoun *saya* ‘I’ ([NP/1Sg + quotative morpheme + *bahwa*]). There are only 4 (2.5%) occurrences in which it is used with the pronoun *ia* or *dia* as subject of the clause. One of these is shown in (13) above.
The occurrence with a first person pronoun, a proper name, and a title are shown in (17), (18), and (19) respectively.

(17) "Dalam hal ini penting sekali saya sampaikan bahwa baik Timur Tengah, Australia, maupun Selandia Baru menyambut gembira gagasan as well as Zealand New welcome glad idea pembentukan forum Pasifik Barat …”

"In this connection it is important that I report to you that the Middle East, Australia, as well as New Zealand have welcomed the idea of the formation of the West Pacific Forum …” (Kompas 2/6/1998; quoting the words of President Abdurrahman Wahid).

(18) Gus Dur mengatakan bahwa apa yang mereka capai ini sudah merupakan hasil terbaik.

‘Gus Dur said that what they have achieved so far is the best outcome of a compromise.’ (Kompas 27/10/1999; referring to President Gus Dur (the affectionate name (diminutive) for Abdurrahman Wahid).

(19) Presiden mempertegas lagi bahwa pemerintah tidak ada pemikiran sedikit pun untuk mengubah sistem devisa bebas.

‘The President stresses once again that the government has no intention to alter the free system of foreign exchange.’ (Kompas 7/1/1998; referring to President Soeharto).

Given that bahwa is the property of formal discourse, it is hardly a surprise that in news reports it occurs in clauses where the subject is expressed with either first person pronoun (in direct speech), proper name and/or a title (in indirect speech). Its use with first person pronoun in (17) shows a context in which a public figure is saying something important (notice the phrase penting sekali ‘very important’). In (18) the co-occurrence of bahwa with a proper name
suggests that what the reporter relays in writing is something s/he considers to be an authoritative evaluation of a situation. Similarly, in (19) we find that bahwa is used with a title (presiden) and a speech-act phrase mempertegas lagi ‘to stress once again’ to suggest that the news relayed by the reporter is important and authoritative. The use of proper name such as in (18) also enables easy identification of the referent as the source of information being reported. As Searle (1997 [1958]; also see Enfield and Stivers 2007: 6-7) states, proper name provides a speedy identification without the necessity to provide descriptions of the referent’s physical and personal qualities. In newspaper reports names are often used with titles (for example, Presiden Soeharto) in first mention to introduce the referent. Subsequent mentions are done either with the name or title alone, or variation of the title (for example, Kepala Negara ‘Head of State’), or variation of the proper name if there is one (for example, ‘Gus Dur’ as a diminutive for ‘Abdurrahman Wahid’). Public figures so identified are more immediately recognisable as figures of authority.

It is interesting to compare referring expressions for public figures with those used for relatively unknown persons. The excerpt in (20) is taken from a report published shortly after the appointment of B.J. Habibie as Indonesia’s third president, at a time when the country was experiencing a deep economic crisis. The words of a woman at a market in East Java were presented in direct quotation (first paragraph) to illustrate the kind of situation Habibie was reported as being concerned to address. (Due to its length, this excerpt is not glossed). Notice the long description of the person in the second paragraph.


Kalimat itu meluncur begitu saja dari seorang ibu kurus dan tua, pedagang sayur kecil-kecilan di Pasar Singosari, Kabupaten Malang, Jatim. Mengenakan kain kebaya yang sudah pudar warnanya, ia menceritakan kondisi krisis saat ini yang cukup memusingkan.

‘I’m lost. I can’t buy the produce. It’s too expensive. There is no profit. I only have a small amount of things to sell. Even 250 grams of shallots now cost Rp 2500. The price of soap has also gone up. It’s difficult if I want to sell it. So, even to make a profit of Rp 50 or Rp 25 is very difficult.’

‘The sentence flowed out spontaneously from the mouth of an old and thin woman, a small vegetable seller at the Singosari Market, Malang Regency, East Java. Wearing a faded kebaya, she described the current economic condition which is causing a headache for her.’ (Kompas 27/6/1998).

Here the woman is introduced through her speech, followed by a long
description of her physical appearance and her social role. Unlike proper names and/or titles, this long description is necessary in order to introduce the referent. The details provide the information needed to contextualize her words and to invite the reader to empathize with her. The pronoun ia is used only after the details of her occupation and physical appearance are established. The difference between the use of ia in (20) and to public figures (as in (17)-(19) for example), is in the quotative morpheme. In (20), the person is only “describing” her situation. The verb menceritakan ‘tell, narrate, describe’ is used only after her situation and physical features have been detailed. In references to public figures, ia mostly co-occurs with verbs indicating an authoritative position such as saying, stressing, warning, explaining, adding, questioning, judging, and confirming.

Whether the case such as (20) represents a usual pattern in the reporting the words of unknown individuals can perhaps be explained through an analysis of a larger pool of data. However, it is useful for the purposes of this article to compare the description of unknown individuals in Kompas and those in another newspaper. Examples from Poskota, a markedly different newspaper from Kompas, suggests a similar pattern in that reference to a relatively unknown individual seems to necessitate a longer and more detailed description than reference to a publicly known person. In the case of unknown persons, proper name does not by itself facilitates identification. This can be seen in (21), taken from the first two paragraphs of front-page news in Poskota.

(21) Suryadi, 28, karyawan pabrik sepatu di Serpong terancam gak bisa berlebaran bersama istri dan anaknya, karena ia tertangkap bawa ganja 2 linting, Rabu (8/9).

Suryadi warga Kamorang, Serpong Tangerang Selatan ini berboncengan motor dengan Eko melintas di Jalan Hasyim Ashari Cipondoh, Kota Tangerang.

‘Suryadi, 28, employee of a shoe factory in Serpong may not be able to celebrate the Idul Fitri with his wife and children as he was caught carrying 2 smoke-rolls of marijuana on Wednesday (8/9).’


Poskota describes itself as harian independen yang mengupas tentang ibukota dan kriminal ‘independent daily with a focus on the metropolitan area and crime’. Its news are generally considered sensationalist and are aimed at lower socio-economic readership. The language used is not as well structured as that in Kompas and the editing is often sloppy.
Notice in this example that proper name (Suryadi) is chosen although the referent is not publicly known. Other details supplied for identification include his age (28 years old), his place of work (pabrik sepatu ‘shoe factory’), the location of that place (di Serpong ‘in Serpong’), his marital status (that he has a wife and children), where he lives (including the name of the neighbourhood unit (Kamorang), regency (Serpong), and the name of the town (Tangerang Selatan ‘South Tangerang’). These details are necessary to establish his identity as the protagonist in the text. Ia is selected for referring to him in the first paragraph.

Another example from the same newspaper also includes proper name but this name is introduced after a description of the referents’ facial expression, what they were doing when the reporter found them, where they were spotted and when, as well as the physical appearance of one of the referents has been given. The proper name is followed by the name of his place of origin (name of the town and the province) and his wife’s name. The mention of his wife’s name identifies the two referents relationally (the two referents are husband and wife).


‘Cheerfulness was apparent on the face of two middle-aged persons who were sitting on footpath, in the area of South Jakarta, Wednesday (8/9). They occasionally joked around and giggled. Who knows what they were discussing.’

‘“Wah … Hasilnya nggak jauh turun dibandingkan tahun lalu,” ucap lelaki tua berkaos biru lengan panjang dengan ekspresi cuek.

“Agak sulit mendapatkan rezeki sekarang ini,” ujar pria yang mengaku bernama Warsono, asal Pemalang, Jateng di sela pembicaraan dengan istrinya, Tukiyem.

‘“Gee … our income hasn’t gone down that much from last year”, said the old man wearing a blue long-sleeve t-shirt with an air of indifference.’

‘“It’s a bit difficult to make a living these days,” said the man who calls himself Warsono, originally from Pemalang, Central Java, during a chat with his wife, Tukiyem.’ (Poskota 9/9/2010; http://www.poskota.co.id/berita-terkini/2010/09/09/penghasilan-pengemis-anjlok; accessed 9/9/2010).
The last three examples show that a reporter may use detailed description of a referent’s attributes (physical or otherwise) at the beginning of a text to introduce a referent relatively unknown to the reader. In (20) and (22), the description is followed by the pronouns ia ‘she’ and mereka ‘they’ respectively. The use of these pronouns suggests that the reporters assume the referents are already identifiable. Nevertheless, they may supply further details even after the referent is assumed identifiable, as in (22). Similarly in (21), the name Suryadi followed by his personal details is used to introduce him to the reader. However, even after this initial introduction, this name is repeated in the second paragraph and more details are supplied. This pattern of reference suggests that, first, to establish the identity of referents relatively unknown to the reader, it is not sufficient to use a proper name or a pronoun. The name needs to be accompanied by other details. Second, even after the referent is assumed identifiable (that is, cognitively active in the mind of the reader) and therefore can be referred to by a pronoun, reporters seem to feel the need to press on with supplying additional details to ensure that they create an adequate picture of the referent in order to make a case for the referent’s role in the event reported, and ultimately, to persuade the reader that the event reported is worthy of their attention.

**Comparing ia and dia in reported speech**

Between ia and dia, it is ia which predominates in the data. It occurs 130 times, while dia occurs 47 times. The two pronouns are not the only reference forms attested in the data. The enclitic –nya as well as passive verbs are also used in framing clauses, as described earlier. The types of framing clause in Indonesian reported speech (direct or indirect) can be schematized as follows.

(a) [ia/dia + quotative verb]
(b) [menurut dia/-nya] (literally, ‘following her/him’) ‘according to her/him’
(c) [kata dia/-nya] (literally, ‘in her/his words’) ‘s/he said’
(d) [di–base–kan] (passive type 1)

The total number of occurrences for all framing types is 94. Of these, framing clauses in which ia or dia appears as in subject position constitutes the majority of the use (72 occurrences, 76.6%). The distribution of the four framing types are given in Table 1, in descending order according to the total number of tokens and percentage.

---

7 Not included in the count are variants of katanya ‘s/he said’, such as ujarnya ‘s/he said’, paparnya ‘s/he describes’, tuturnya ‘s/he uttered’, legasnya ‘s/he asserted/confirmed’, jelasnya ‘s/he explained’, lanjutnya, and tambahnya ‘s/he added’. These are not discussed in this article as it is assumed that they fulfil a similar rhetorical function to katanya.
Table 1 shows that the majority of reported speech, both direct and indirect, is of the type \([ia/dia + quotative verb]\); that is, where either \(ia\) or \(dia\) is in subject position. \(ia\), however, occurs four and a half times more frequently than \(dia\).

Of the occurrences of \(ia\), 4 are embedded within the sentence. \(Dia\) occurs twice in this type of sentence. An example of embedding is given earlier in (6a). In that sentence, the framing clause \(ia\) mengatakan “he said” appears in a co-ordinating clause. The example below in (23) shows the framing clause \(ia\) meminta “he’d asked” embedded within the quoted material (example not glossed, due to space) which follows the frame of the type \([title + proper name + quotative morpheme]\).

(23) Sementara itu, kepada wartawan usai pengumuman personalia kabinet, Menhankam/Pangab Jenderal TNI Wiranto menyatakan, ia meminta masyarakat untuk mendukung sepenuhnya pemerintahan baru ini, dan jangan diganggu, digerogoti, digaruk-garuk, atau digelitiki.

‘Meanwhile, to the journalists after the announcement of the composition of the cabinet, the Minister of Defence and Security/Commander of the Armed Forces, General Wiranto said, he asked the people to fully support the new government, and (urged them) not to hassle, gnaw, scratch, or tickle them.’ (Kompas 23/5/1998).

The high percentage of \(ia\) as subject in the framing clause of the type \([ia + quotative verb]\) accords with the general description of this pronoun as a pronoun that can occur only in subject position. The range of quotative verbs with which it co-occurs and other linguistic elements that make up the context suggests that in reported speech \(ia\) is predominantly used to present the referent as an important and reliable source of information or to mark the referent as agent, that is, as a person who carries out or initiates an action or series of actions. It is worth mentioning that in saying that the referent is important, we mean that s/he is significant in the discourse world, whether or not in reality s/he holds an important position within their community. An important speaker may be a president, minister, a person attached to a prominent organization or institution, or a relatively unknown person, as
we earlier saw in (20). In the case of persons not known to the public, details pertaining to their physical features and situation are provided. These details function not only to provide identification of the referent but also to indicate that what s/he says is to be treated as a reliable account, as account based on first-hand experience of a situation. That most of the referents in the data are people in positions of authority and hence may be considered socially important is a virtue of the selection of texts, which focuses on main items in the national news category.

Compared to the range of quotative morphemes co-occurring with *dia*, the range for *ia* is greater (totalling 23 morphemes; see Table 2). These morphemes range from ‘say’ verbs (for example, *mengatakan* ‘say’), speech act verbs (for example, *mengajak* ‘invite’, *mengusulkan* ‘to recommend/suggest’, *mengimbau* ‘to appeal’) to mental verbs (*yakin* ‘certain’). By contrast, the data only shows eight morphemes co-occurring with *dia* (that is, about one third of the total number of morphemes co-occurring with *ia*). Four of these also co-occur with *ia* (marked with an asterisk). By far, the most frequently used morpheme for both pronouns is the ‘say’ verb *mengatakan* ‘to say/state’. The list of morphemes co-occurring with *dia* is given in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotative morpheme</th>
<th>English translation</th>
<th>Total tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>mengatakan</em></td>
<td>‘say’</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mengharapkan</em></td>
<td>‘hope’</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mengingatkan</em></td>
<td>‘remind’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>menjelaskan</em></td>
<td>‘explain’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>menyebutkan</em></td>
<td>‘mention’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>menegaskan</em></td>
<td>‘stress, emphasize’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mengajak</em></td>
<td>‘invite’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>menilai</em></td>
<td>‘evaluate, judge’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>meminta</em></td>
<td>‘ask, request’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mengungkapkan</em></td>
<td>‘express, disclose’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>menambahkan</em></td>
<td>‘add’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mengusulkan</em></td>
<td>‘recommend, suggest’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>menyatakan</em></td>
<td>‘state’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>membenarkan</em></td>
<td>‘confirm’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mempertanyakan</em></td>
<td>‘question, query’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>menceritakan</em></td>
<td>‘narrate, tell’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>menuturkan</em></td>
<td>‘tell, narrate’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>menekankan</em></td>
<td>‘stress, emphasize’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mengimbu</em></td>
<td>‘appeal, call upon’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>menyuruh</em></td>
<td>‘instruct’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>menduga</em></td>
<td>‘suspect, assume’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mengundang</em></td>
<td>‘invite’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>yakin</em></td>
<td>‘certain’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: List of quotative morphemes co-occurring with *ia* as subject.
The co-occurrence of *ia* with the range of quotative morphemes shown above suggests that this pronoun is used for conveying a variety of speech acts, however that in itself is not sufficient evidence to show that this pronoun is used to signal the importance of the referent. It needs to be demonstrated that the surrounding linguistic context is also supportive of that contention. In the following, I would like to offer three of such contexts.

The first context is where *ia* is used to indicate that the referent is important in rendering the event reported believable and newsworthy. This is exemplified in (24), part of which we saw earlier in (20). The excerpt is taken from a text reporting the visit of newly appointed President B.J. Habibie to a traditional market in Malang (a city in the province of East Java) to see for himself the impact the Asian economic crisis on small traders. The report mentions that Habibie had also talked to farmers in Karawang, West Java. His visit to Malang was significant because the president was keen to gain a wider perspective of the situation by visiting places outside the capital Jakarta. A long description of a trader in a market in Malang whom Habibie talked to thus serves as a necessary component of the report as it gives a concrete example of what he gleaned from his visit. In that sense, the trader can be considered an important figure in the event. *ia* is used in second and third paragraphs to refer to this figure.


Ia cukup pusing atau ngelu, karena sekarang makin tak punya modal untuk kulakan. Sementara kalau pun bisa membeli, ia berhadapan dengan persoalan penjualan, karena harga terkadang sudah tak terjangkau oleh pembeli. Sehingga untuk mencari untung Rp 25 pun belum tentu mampu.

‘I’m lost. I can’t buy the produce. It’s too expensive. There is no profit. I only have a small amount of things to sell. Even 250 grams of shallots now cost Rp 2500. The price of soap has also gone up. It’s difficult if I want to sell it. So, even to make a profit of Rp 50 or Rp 25 is very difficult.’

‘The sentence flowed out spontaneously from the mouth of an old and thin woman, a small vegetable seller at the Singosari Market, Malang Regency, East Java. Wearing a faded kebaya, she described the current economic condition which is causing a headache for her.’

‘She has quite a headache because now there is even less capital to buy goods. Meanwhile, even if she can afford to buy them, she is still confronted with the problem of selling them because some prices are too high for customers. So even to get a profit of Rp 25 can be impossible.’ (Kompas 27/6/1998).

The significance of the woman trader is indicated textually in four ways. First, the excerpt represents the first three paragraphs of the report. This structural position in the text suggests that these paragraphs constitute important information. Second, direct reported speech is presented in the first paragraph. The use of a construction in which the speaker’s words are quoted verbatim creates an impression that what is reported represents reliable information because they are supposed to be the actual words of the speaker. Third, in the second paragraph the reporter is at pains in describing the trader, giving a description of her physical appearance as well as her location. This description, apart from being necessary for introducing an unknown person, also accords with the overall purpose of the text, which is to report on Habibie’s attempt at getting a sense of how the economic crisis impacted on people of the lower socio-economic background such as the woman trader. Fourth, in the third paragraph the woman’s words are repeated in the form of a reformulation. The repetition serves to emphasize the importance of the referent within the context of a report that seeks to give a picture of the serious impact that the economic crisis has had on small traders.

The second context is where the referent is presented as agent performing a series of actions in a “list” construction, as illustrated in (25). All actions all treated as equal, as indicated by syntactic and semantic parallelism (Fox 1987: 81). According to Fox, this type of construction represents a “powerful organizing rhetorical structure” and is prevalent in English expository texts.

‘On Thursday Bung Rudy was sworn in as the President of the Republic of Indonesia. That evening he formed the cabinet. He rang his future ministers himself. On Friday (22/5) he was late by half an hour in announcing his cabinet. He said (literally ‘in his words’) (it was because) he first consulted the Minister of Defence/Commander of the Armed Forces General Wiranto about (the role of) the Armed Forces and security. He also made a clear stand on the issue of changing the Commander of the Army Unit. (Kompas 7/6/1998).

Parralelism is found in the following: the referent is subject of the transitive clause [ia + meN- verb], which occurs four times; subject of intransitive clause [ia + ber– verb], occuring once), lexical items referring to time occurs sentence initially three times (hari Kamis ‘on Thursday’, malamnya ‘that evening’, hari Jumat ‘on Friday’). The series of actions presented in this example impresses upon the reader that the newly appointed president, Bung Rudy (diminutive for President B.J. Habibie, Indonesia’s third president), was quick to act. It is worth mentioning here that Habibie was appointed under a difficult circumstance following the toppling of President Suharto and at a time when Indonesia was in deep financial crisis. Speediness of action following his appointment was therefore expected of the new president.

Worth noting in example (25) is the use of katanya ‘in his words’ as the framing clause in the fourth sentence, which contrasts with the preceding two sentences where the referent is described as performing a series of actions (forming a cabinet and ringing the future ministers, respectively). The clause framed by katanya gives the reason for the event reported in the preceding sentence, namely that Habibie was late in announcing his cabinet. Notice that the quoted material framed by katanya presents Habibie as a person performing an action of consulting the appropriate person before making a decision. To this end, it can be said that the choice frame is strategic in that it marks a temporary break in the series of action being reported.

The third context is exemplified in (26). Here ia is used in contrast with dia to present the referent as initiator of an action. The referent, Tom Beanal, is mentioned initially with a proper name. He is then referred to with dia in the framing clause menurut dia (literally ‘following him’, non-subject position). The third reference is done with ia.

(26) Mengenai permintaan beberapa tokoh masyarakat Irja yang menghendaki kemerdekaan Papua, Gus Dur dengan tegas menolaknya. Sebelumnya, Tom

‘As for the request by several West Papuan figures for Papuan independence, Gus Dur firmly rejected it. Minutes before, Tom Beanal, one of the Papuan leaders informed (the president) of the grief experienced by the Papuan people during the 36 years of living under the Indonesian government (literally, ‘living with the Indonesian nation’). According to him, there has been a lot of suffering as a result of a past decision and government policies which had not benefitted the West Papuan people. He asked Gus Dur to return [Papua’s sovereignty] and recognize the right of the Papuans for independence, independence which Papuans once enjoyed for two years, between 1961 and 1963. (Kompas 1/1/ 2000; Gus Dur was referred to here in his role as President.)

The frame menurut dia ‘literally, following him; according to him’ is not the only choice for framing the referent’s words. The reporter could have selected a different frame such as ia mengatakan/ menambahkan/ menjelaskan ‘he said/ added/ explained’. However, by selecting menurut dia a particular rhetorical function is fulfilled. The clause framed by it is an elaboration of the previous clause. The use of ia marks a shift to a new action; the referent is not merely informing the president about the sentiment of the West Papuans but is now making a demand for the return of Papuan sovereignty. Ia also suggests that the referent is a protagonist in the event reported.

We saw in Table 1 that there are 13 occurrences of dia in subject position. Example (27) below is an illustration of this use. The excerpt is taken from a report on a visit to China by President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono and his delegation, with the aim to boost trade co-operation between China and Indonesia. The President was reported as saying that co-operation agreements needed to be followed up by implementation and that real projects needed to be realized.

(27) Ketua Umum Asosiasi Pengusaha Indonesia Sofjan Wanandi yang hadir di Beijing mendukung harapan itu. Namun, dia mengingatkan bahwa persoalan yang sering kali muncul dan menghambat implementasi adalah dukungan dari birokrasi yang tidak sesuai dengan harapan.

‘The Chair of the Indonesian Business Association Sofjan Wanandi who was present in Beijing supported that aim. However, he reminded (us) that the problem that often arises and which prevents the implementation (of such an aim) is the less than adequate support from the bureaucracy.’ Kompas 28/7/2005).
Dia is used in this example in subject position, preceding the speech act verb mengingatkan ‘to remind’. It occurs in a concessional relation (Fox 1987: 86-87). The first sentence expresses a proposition that is somehow at odds with that expressed in the second sentence, but the two are not in opposition. In this example, Sofjan Wanandi supports the President’s contention but he is also aware that government red tapes have often made it difficult for business projects to be carried out. Dia occurs as the subject of the second sentence, which expresses the main proposition. Concession, according to Fox, sits at the “lower levels” of a text. In this text, Sofjan Wanandi is only one of the people who were quoted as supportive of the president’s statement and the quote is presented in the second half of the report. This contrasts with the woman trader in (24) who is described and quoted in the first three paragraphs of the report and who is referred to by ia.

NON-SUBJECT DIA, ENCLITIC –NYA AND THE PASSIVE FORM

We saw in the preceding discussion that dia occurs in framing clauses of the types menurut dia ‘according to her/him’ (11 instances) and kata dia (literally ‘in her/his words’) ‘s/he said’ (1 instance). We saw an example of menurut dia earlier in (11). Kata dia only occurs once in the data, as shown in the following.

(28) Kata dia, sesuai Undang-Undang Dasar 1945, word 3Sg according to law-PL basic 1945

ditegaskan bahwa Presiden tidak bisa
PT-emphasize APP COMP president NEG able
membubarkan Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat (DPR), AT-dissolve APP council representative people
sebaliknya DPR tidak bisa menjatuhkan Presiden.
conversely DPR NEG able AT-topple APP president

‘He said, in the 1945 Constitution, it is specified that the President cannot dissolve the People’s Representative Council, conversely the People’s Representative Council cannot fire the President.’ (Kompas 20/5/2001; dia referring to ex-general Try Sutrisno).

It is interesting to note that while it may be unproblematic to consider dia in the frame menurut dia as being in object position, its syntactic position in kata dia is less clear. According to Cumming (1991: 66-69), the morpheme kata in this type of frame is ambivalent between a verb and a noun. If we treat it as a verb, then the following issue arises. The verbal forms of kata are mengatakan ‘to say (something)’ (a verb which can be used transitively or intransitively) and berkata ‘to say’ (intransitive). When mengatakan is used in passive type 1, the prefix di– replaces meN–, giving us the form dikatakan (attested only once in the data). In passive type 2, the prefix meN– is dropped but the suffix –kan remains (for example, Itu dia katakan ‘s/he said that (literally, ‘that s/he
said’; ‘s/he said it’). However, the suffix –kan is absent in the frame kata dia, and therefore kata cannot be interpreted as a passive verb. Correspondingly, kata does not seem to be derived from the intransitive verb berkata, given that prefix dropping does not apply to this verb. An alternative would be to treat kata as a noun and dia is a possessor, hence kata dia can be translated as ‘in her/his words’. Under this interpretation, the enclitic –nya in the framing clause katanya is interpreted also as possessor and translates similarly. This is the interpretation I adopt here.

The framing clauses menurut dia, menurutnya, kata dia, and katanya are similar in that all of them have the third person pronoun in non-subject position. In the first two, dia and –nya is the “object” of the verb menurut, while in the latter two, they function as possessor. These frames invite the interpretation that what is said are not the reporter’s words but the words of the speaker (“according to her/him, not me (the reporter”)). By using these types of framing, the reporter implies that s/he is not to be held accountable for the truth or falsity of the quoted material. However, we also saw earlier in (25) and (26) that reporters also select these frames for such strategic purposes as indicating reason and elaboration.

Aside from these rhetorical considerations, the choice of framing may also reflect a convention within journalism in which objectivity in reporting is expected. An impression of objectivity can be created in several ways, among which are (a) by the use of direct reported speech, (b) use of the frames menurut dia/–nya and kata dia/–nya, and (c) the passive frame di–base–kan ‘be said’. An example of the passive frame was given earlier in (13). This type of frame may consist of only a verb [di–base–kan], or a verb followed by the referent [di–base–kan + (–nya/ proper name/title)]. In either case, this frame is similar to menurut dia/–nya and kata dia/–nya in that it seems to be chosen for contexts in which the referent is expanding on a previous point rather than introducing a new one, or initiating a new action. The focus of the clause is on the action of explaining or elaborating rather than on the referent performing an action. In the following example, two variants of the frame are used: dijelaskan ‘it was explained’ and dikatakan ‘it was stated/said’.


It was explained by Gus Dur that this cabinet does not have a name, unlike previous ones. However, it was said that the cabinet reflects national unity. “This cabinet was formed collectively by me, Mbak Mega, Pak Amien Rais, Pak Akbar Tandjung and General Wiranto as the Commander of the Armed Forces. This cabinet is a result of compromises and exchange of views among several parties”, he said.8

It was also stated that the five of them used a guarantee system. There are thus cabinet members who are guaranteed by Megawati, Akbar Tandjung, Wiranto, Amien Rais, and also Gus Dur. “Hopefully, the cabinet which consists of old faces as well as new can work together as well as possible. The tasks faced by the president and the vice-president will be increasingly challenging given the (increase in) demands by the people. So we ask you to be supportive of us,” said Gus Dur.’ (Kompas 27/10/1999; Gus Dur was quoted here in his role as President).

The first two instances of the frame occur in a concessional context, expressing the following concessional relation: “although the cabinet does not have a name which reflects national unity, the process of its formation is a reflection of unity”. The main proposition is placed in the second sentence and introduced by dikatakan ‘it was stated/said’; the first sentence, introduced by dijelaskan ‘it was explained’, is a concession that the state of the cabinet not having a name pertains. The use of two different frames instead of the same one demarcates these two parts of this relation. The frame dikatakan pula ‘it was also stated/said’ in the second paragraph is a variant of the passive frame. The quoted material following this frame is an elaboration of the point made in the preceding paragraph (notice the word pula ‘also’ following this verb).

**Conclusion**

This article begins by asking, if the third singular pronouns ia and dia can both occur in subject position, what governs the selection of one over the other? In this article I have approached the question from a functional perspective by examining the occurrences of these pronouns in news reports, focusing the analysis on reported speech but also taking into account non-reported type of constructions to show the contexts in which the two pronouns are used. I have argued that whilst the occurrences of ia in the data accord with the general description of this pronoun as a pronoun which can only occur in subject position, the contexts of its occurrences show that ia is predominantly used to suggest that, (a) that the referent is treated as a reliable source and an authority of the information being quoted, and (b) that the referent is presented as an agent who initiates or performs some action. To support this contention I have offered two kinds of evidence: the range of quotative morphemes that

---

8 A faithful rendering of this passive frame into English results in an awkward translation here. However, I sacrifice idiomatic translation to show the syntactic position of the verb and the referent, and that the focus of the clause is on the action.
co-occur with ia and dia and their surrounding discourse contexts. Ia occurs with a wider range of quotative morphemes than dia does. Many of the morphemes indicating a position of authority such as menegaskan ‘to stress/confirm’, mengajak ‘to invite/appeal to’ and meminta ‘to ask/instruct’ are speech act verbs that occur with ia and not shared by dia. This suggests that ia tends to be selected when the reporter wants to present the referent as an authoritative figure. Ia is also chosen to present the referent as initiating an action or performing a series of action. When the referent is presented as a speaker who is elaborating on a point previously mentioned or giving a reason for it rather than introducing a new point, dia tends to be selected.

This study has concentrated on the analysis of ia and dia in a particular type of written texts, namely newspaper reports. This text type is characterized among others by its use of the formal register. As such, it is not surprising to find ia occurring nearly three times as frequently as dia, given that ia is strongly associated with that register. Whether a similar pattern is observable in other formal registers of Indonesian is an interesting question that awaits further research.

ABBREVIATIONS
1Sg: first person singular
3Sg: third person singular
AT: agent trigger
COMP: complement
DEF: definite article
DEM: demonstrative
NEG: negative marker
PERF: perfective marker
PL: plural
PRT: particle
PT: patient trigger
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