

Evidential Modality in Kampar Malay Dialect

Mangatur Sinaga, Arza Aibonotika, and Silvia Permatasari*

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia

Abstract. Forms of evidence as a subcategory of modality have yet to receive particular attention in Indonesian linguistics studies. Researchers do not give a distinct classification to the modality subcategory of the form of the marker, which has a distinctive characteristic. It means that the public's expression of Indonesian language modalities in lexical patterns for both oral and written is not observable. Moreover, it is different from languages like Japanese with grammatical construction. Other research has identified the equivalent of evidential forms in Japanese in Indonesian and found a unique use of the term's appearances, taste, function, and meaning the evidential. The Malay language has contributed to the Indonesian language and must have a distinctive form of evidence. It is commonly caused by many unexpected attitudes of the speaker when conveying a proposition (state of the matter or events). However, this study investigates the form, function, and meaning of evidential modalities in Kampar Malay dialects in Riau Province, Indonesia. The Kampar Malay dialect is one of the sub-dialects of the Malay language in Riau. This study refers to Narrog's concept of pure evidence, where the speakers' attitudes do not contain elements of inference (allegations) and inferential evidence that the speaker can distance himself from consideration, at least partially, with doubts of doubt. The data was obtained from native speakers through interviews. Furthermore, the markers of modality evidence were analyzed for syntactic behavior by the distribution method. Based on the analysis results, in Kampar Malay dialect, it was revealed that the revealer of pure evidence was not marked, while inferential evidence was marked by the use of *sobuik*, *condoe*, *dongow cito*, *dongaw-dongaw cito*, *kecekyo*, *gakde*, *ndak kan lai*, *aso den*, *aso-aso*, *nampak*, *nampaknyo*, *nampak e*, *nampak a*, and *nampak-nampak*.

1 Introduction

The Kampar language is one of the various dialects used by a group of people residing in the Kampar Regency, specifically in the part of the Kampar River in Riau Province. Structurally, phonetically, and lexically, it is very similar to the Malay language spoken in the Riau region. The significant difference found in the use of intonation and the addition of the vowel [o] in certain forms is that, for example, the word "adik" is pronounced as "adiok." The change in sound indicates a closeness to the Malay language of the Minang dialect, especially the language that is directly bordering geographically.

* Corresponding author: silvia.permatasari@lecturer.unri.ac.id

Studies on phonetics, morphological structure, and syntax related to form, function, and meaning have been extensively researched in various studies. These studies have provided us with a more detailed understanding of the Kampar Dialect of Malay (KDM). This research aims to expand the study into the realm of modality to explain grammatical categories that play a role in conveying the speaker's opinions or attitudes in KDM. The initial study examined a subcategory of evidential modality, which is generally considered a subcategory of epistemic modality. The term "epistemic" refers to an opinion related to a 'lack of knowledge.' In other words, the issue of epistemic modality relates to the speaker's attitude based on their belief or lack of certainty regarding the truth of a proposition. Perkins defines this to distinguish it from knowing the truth of a proposition. Therefore, the criterion for epistemic modality is the rational norm or reasoning capacity of the speaker [1].

Based on the above understanding, the attitude of the speaker, which is the study of epistemic modalities in general, is related to the meaning of 'possibility,' 'predictability,' 'necessity,' or 'certainty' [2]. These meanings describe the gradation of the speaker's attitude towards the truth of the proposition. For the attitude of the speaker like that, Coates distinguishes between inferential ('predictability' and 'certainty') and non-inferential ('possibility' and 'necessity').

The study of epistemic modality in Indonesian has been studied comprehensively [2]. Alwi, who authored this research, categorizes epistemic modality into the meanings of 'possibility' through the use of words such as can, able to, may, might, maybe, perhaps, and the use of phrases such as can be, might be, could be, and maybe; the meaning of 'predictability' expressed through words like will, seemingly, apparently, it appears, and it feels; and in the form of prepositional phrases according to, in my opinion; in the form of clauses such as if I am not mistaken or I think; the meaning of 'necessity' with words like must, have to, mandatory, necessary, appropriate, should, ought to, it would be better to, it should be, it should, it would be appropriate; and the meaning of 'certainty' expressed by words like definitely, certainly, surely, of course; phrases like of course, it goes without saying, and no doubt about it; and in the form of clauses such as I am certain/believe or I am certain/believe, or I am sure.

There are several things that need to be considered in the study of Alwi's epistemic modality. First, Alwi did not specifically classify the attitudes of speakers based on evidence, which many linguists such as [3–5] categorize as evidential modalities. It might be because the expression in the Indonesian language is seen as not having specific grammatical forms, such as in Japanese. However, [6] studies Japanese linguistic theories in comparison with the Japanese language, explaining and providing specific subcategories like apparently, it seems, and probably as an evidential modality. It means that the Indonesian language also has specific elements to express evidentiality in its linguistic forms. Both [2] and [6] do not explain the forms of speaker attitudes that are pragmatically oriented and appear in epistemic and evidential forms, such as 'mungkin' (perhaps), 'kayaknya' (seems like), and 'kelihatannya' (it appears), which often occur in everyday usage. It may be related to the usage of modality theory as a grammatical category that is considered to operate at the sentence level, where the context is not considered an acceptable part of the analytical model, which is common in many sentence analysis models.

This study aims to identify the forms, functions, and meanings of evidential modality in KDM and to explain the forms that undergo a shift in function from proposition-oriented modality to speaker-oriented modality focused on the listener. Here are some examples:

- (1) *Kayaknya* buah ini segar. (It seems that this fruit is fresh)
- (2) *Kayaknya* saya pulang dulu. (I think I should leave now)

In (1), the form "kayaknya" is an expression of the speaker's consideration based on visible evidence of fresh fruit (proposition). On the other hand, in (2), "kayaknya" is used to 'soften the firmness' of the intended realization of the speaker's action. In other words, in (2),

"kayaknya" is not used to speculate about the content of the proposition but rather to convey a certain attitude towards the listener, such as a desire to speak politely. In (2), it can also be observed that the actor of the action is the speaker themselves (first-person persona). In this case, the semantic assumption of an action to be performed by oneself is unusual because the realization of the event depends on the speaker themselves.

2 Methods

This study aims to identify the forms of expressing evidential modality in KDM, explain its functions and meanings, and describe the shift in the use of evidential modality in KDM as a mode of expression. Therefore, this study adopts a qualitative descriptive approach using the method of equivalence and the distribution of markers. Specific techniques, such as paraphrasing, are also used to clarify meanings. The data for this study were obtained through interviews with several native speakers of KDM. The interview questions were structured based on Narrog's framework of direct and indirect evidential domains [5]. Prior to each question, a simple explanation of the concept and examples of usage in Indonesian was provided. This approach facilitated the achievement of the research objectives by maintaining focus on the theory being employed. For the use of an evidential modality beyond the scope of the theory used, further interviews were conducted, allowing informants to engage in dialogue related to the research topic freely.

3 Results and Discussion

Data and descriptions of evidential modalities in KDM, including form, function, and meaning, are discussed in this regard. The discussion is classified into two domains, namely the direct and indirect domains.

In the direct evidential domain, Indonesian does not have specific grammatical forms for expressing evidential elements. The forms, functions, and meanings are conveyed within the propositions as the sentence predicates. In other words, in this domain, the presentation of information based on direct observation does not have specific forms as modal markers. This is demonstrated in the following sentences (1) and (2):

(1) *Den nampak inyo tadi di kamar.*
'I saw him in the room.'

(2) *Den tadi mandongou inyo malogu di kamar*
'I heard him singing in the room.'

In Indonesian, it is common to use this sentence only using predicates such as the use '*nampak*,' '*melihat*,' and '*menengok*' which are used as sentence predicates (propositional elements). However, there are uses, for example, as paraphrasing from sentence (1) to (3).

(3) *Saya {*secara langsung/dengan mata kepala sendiri*} melihat dia tadi ada di kamar.*
'I {directly/with my own eyes} saw him in the room earlier.'

The sentence in number 3 is more related to the pragmatic function rather than syntactic, which must be analyzed at the level of context.

Sentences (4) and (5) there is also where modalities are not used but are part of the proposition.

- (4) Kertas ini warnanya putih.
'This paper is white in color.'
- (5) Ruang ini berisik.
'This room is noisy'

Unlike the direct domain, in an indirect domain (indirect evidence), KDM shows the emergence of a variety of evidential modalities as follows:

The situation when the speaker delivered a state of the case based on pure evidence from a third party (pure/reporting) that did not contain the alleged speaker (element of inference):

- (6) *Manuwuik Kompas malam tadi lai yang tapanggih di Pokanbawu.*
'According to Kompas, there was a fire last night in Pekanbaru.'
- (7) *Sobuik (dek) Ali, Budi isuok pai ka Jakarta.*
'Ali said, Budi is going to Jakarta tomorrow.'

The markers "manuwuik" (6) and "sobuik" Ali (7) indicate that the truth of the fire incident in Pekanbaru is not the speaker's responsibility as it does not involve the speaker's conclusion or speculation.

The situation when a speaker presents a situation based on pure evidence from a third party (pure evidential) but contains the speaker's reasoning (inferential element):

- (8) *Condoe tadi malam lai yang tapanggih di Pokanbawu.*
'It seems that last night there was a fire in Pekanbaru.'

The use of the word "kayaknya" indicates that the speaker has obtained the information from a third party and is using it to communicate that information to the listener (the second person) without committing to the truthfulness of the reported content.

In the case of direct reporting, but with considerations from the speaker, in KDM, there is a pragmatic usage with politeness goals, such as in the case where the interlocutor (listener) has just sold a house. Instead of using "kecekyo" (which means "they say") as in (10), the speaker uses "dongaw-dongaw" ("dengar-dengar" in standard Indonesian), which means "rumors" or "hearsay" (9).

- (9) *Dongaw-dongaw (cito) sodang banyak piti e.* (more polite)
'The rumour is that there is a lot of money!'

- (10) *Kecekyo, sodang banyak piti e.* (impolite)
'He said you have a lot of money now (because you just sold the house).'

1. In case A, knocks on door B and there is no response from B, then the speaker conveys it to C, and the speaker conveys the matter by assuming that B is not in the room based on the evidence of the absence of a response from inside the room. KDM marks it with a non-deformed shape like in (11).

- (11) *Ndak lai gak de inyo di kamar.*
'It looked like he wasn't in the room.'

2. In the case where the speaker feels they know that someone is not in the room and concludes that the person will not respond to their call, KDM expresses this with "ndak kan lai" (lit. 'will not be there') and "dana aso den" ('in my opinion').

(12) *Ndak kan lai inyo (kini) di kamar de.*

'Won't you (now) be in your room.'

(13) *Aso den inyo ndak kan lai di kamar de.*

'He shouldn't be in the room right now.'

3. There is the use of "aso den" (13) in the form of "aso-aso den." These two forms differ in that "aso-aso den" is used when there is no evidence at all about the matter. In other words, the use of "aso-aso den" is not within the domain of evidentiality but rather a subcategory of epistemic modality.

When the speaker interprets (their own conclusion or opinion) about direct impressions (especially visual ones), such as when seeing the listener's face, KDM uses the adverb "nampak" ('visible') (not a verb category).

(14) *Oman (muko) waang (kaw) nampak pucek e.*

'Your face looks pale, you know!'

In cases where it is indicated that a conclusion is the result of a thought process that seems to lack evidence (the state of affairs cannot be accessed by the speaker's perception, such as being seen or heard) or the state of affairs is unexpected/unanticipated, or when the speaker wants to create distance from that conclusion, KDM uses "nampake" (15) and "aso-aso" (16).

(15) *Tapi nampake bowuok punyo tujuan sughang lah.*

'But the monkey seems to have its own purpose.'

(16) *Aso aso bowuok punyo tujuan sughang lah.*

'But the monkey seems to have its own purpose.'

In cases (15) and (16), the speaker is not an expert on monkeys and has no special knowledge of the matter being spoken of.

4. In terms of conveying visual impressions of an object, such as sentence (17), KDM uses appears.

(17) *Nampak-nampak soto ko lomak e.*

'This soup looks delicious.'

The good impression is based on evidence that the soto observed has common elements that are understood as delicious soto, such as visual elements like heat indicated by rising smoke or forms like texture, color, and so on.

5. When drawing conclusions based on impressions heard, such as hearing people discussing without reaching a solution, as in (18), the phrase "nampaknyo 'nampaknya/kelihatannya'" is used.

(18) *Nampaknyo masalah ko payah disolosaikan.*

'It seems that this problem is difficult to solve.'

In KDM, there is no equivalent word for "lihat" (which means "see" in English) in Indonesian, apart from "nampak" (which is used to mark modality).

6. In terms of conveying someone's condition based on visual observations, for example, seeing someone who might be sad, as in sentence (19).

(19) *Nampaknyo inyo sodang baibo ati.*
'It seems he is sad.'

7. In the case of conveying the impression of seeing and suspecting something that will happen soon (20), it is used as '*nampak'a*'.

(20) (See the cloudy sky)
Nampak'a nak ujan.
'It looks like it's going to rain.'

8. In terms of conveying interim predictions (where the substance of the source is removed or the evidence source can no longer be seen), it expresses general predictions about things that will happen in the near future, as in sentence (21).

(21) (Based on rumors circulating within the company or the speaker's knowledge of work activities within their company)

(22) (*Dongou cito/nampaknyo*) *bulan dopan Den disuwuoh juo (untuok pai) ka Jakarta.*
'It seems that next month I will also be ordered to go to Jakarta.'

4 Conclusion

KDM, as a subdialect of Malay, shares many grammatical and lexical similarities with Indonesian. This also applies to its use of evidentiality.

In the direct evidential domain, KDM does not have specific markers of modality. Instead, the verbs "nampak" ('see') and "mandongau" ('hear') function as predicates or propositional elements in sentences. However, it is possible to have markers used at the contextual or pragmatic level.

In the indirect evidential domain, KDM exhibits various markers of evidential modality. These include the clause "manuwuik..." ('according to...'), "sobuik..." ('said by...') as markers of pure or reportive evidentiality, adverb + pronoun "condoe" ('seems like') as markers of pure evidence containing the speaker's considerations, "gak de" as a marker of supposition based on evidence, the clause "ndak kan lai" ('will not be there') and "aso den" ('in my opinion') as markers of supposition based on feeling or knowledge, adverb "nampak" as interpretations or personal opinions based on direct visual impressions, adverb + pronoun "nampak'e" and the reduplicated verb "aso-aso" ('feeling') as markers of speculation indicating conclusions based on limited evidence or when the speaker wants to distance themselves from the conclusion.

There are also forms like the reduplicated adverb "nampak-nampak" for visual impressions of an object, the adverbial + pronoun "nampaknyo" for conclusions based on auditory impressions and to convey someone's condition based on visual observations, the adverbial + pronoun "nampak'a" and the clause "dongaw cito" to convey impressions of seeing and predicting something that will happen soon, and the clause "dongaw cito" and adverbial + pronoun "nampaknyo" to convey temporary predictions whose substance has

been omitted or whose source of evidence is no longer visible or to express general predictions about things that will happen in the near future.

The use of evidential modality for politeness purposes (pragmatics) includes the form "dongaw-dongaw" (cito).

References

1. M. R. Perkins, *Modal Expressions in English* (Ablex Publishing Co, Norwood, 1983)
2. H. Alwi, *Modalitas Dalam Bahasa Indonesia. Seri ILDEP* (Kanisius, Yogyakarta, 1992)
3. F. R. Palmer, *Mood and Modality* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986)
4. Y. Nitta, *Gendai Nihongo Bunpou. Nihongo Kijutsu Bunpou Kenkyuukai* (Kuroshio Shuppan, Tokyo, 2003)
5. H. Narrog, *Modality in Japanese; The Layered Structure of the Clause and Hierarchies of Functional Categories* (John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 2009)
6. T. Hariri, *Nihongo-Indoneshiago Ni Okeru Ninshiki No Modariti—Choukousei Handan Modariti Wo Chuushin*, Osaka Gaikokugo, 2002